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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was two-fold: first, to determine the relationships among gender, knowing styles and psychological type for Asian international students. In Women Ways of Knowing (1986), Belenky and colleagues assumed that separate and connected knowing styles have their origin in differential gender conditioning. The thinking and feeling dimension of Jung’s theory of psychological type (1921) logically seems similar to the separate and connected knowing styles. In two previous studies, Rodgers and colleagues (1998; 2000) and Ullman-Petrash (2000) found evidence that psychological type was more associated with knowing style than with gender. Hence, this study asked is gender or psychological type more associated with knowing style preferences for Asian international students? The second purpose asked how Asian international students constructed their own and the others knowing style?

Twenty-five Asian international students from the People’s Republic of China, Taiwan, Korea and Japan were either given the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Form M and a workshop on psychological type, or the instrument only, then they participated in an interview to determine knowing style. Thinking and feeling was determined by either the participants’ selection of their “true type” or on the instrument type. Two independent raters determined the knowing style of each student. Because of the small sample size,
however, the quantitative hypotheses could not be addressed; nonetheless, the qualitative results were rich.

The results support the existence of knowing styles regardless of gender. However, cultural conditioning strongly affects the expression of external behavior. For this sample, external behavior was more connected in style, even though separate knowers internally were thinking of the contrary. Women separate knowers struggled the most for a voice in opposition to their cultural socialization.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Separate and connected knowing were first introduced as two styles of procedural knowledge in Women’s Ways of Knowing (1986). A connected knowing style emphasizes developing an understanding of another person’s point of view through empathetically listening, being collaborative and supportive, and clarifying inferences rather than judging. A separate knowing style emphasizes finding “truth” or evaluating another person’s point of view through being critical and doubting, debating, and defending one’s arguments with evidence. A connected style is presented as strongly associated with, but not distinctively female, and separate knowing, male.

The authors of Women’s Ways of Knowing assume that separate and connected knowing styles probably have their origin in differential gender conditioning. Some of the characteristics of the two styles, however, are also similar to personality preferences for “feeling” and “thinking” in Jung’s (1921) theory of psychological type. Persons preferring thinking judgment tend to make decisions by standing back, being as objective
as possible, debating, competing, and finding flaws in logic. People preferring feeling judgment tend to make decisions by being participant observers, finding commonalities rather than differences, seeking to understand the other’s perspective, and using prioritized values to make decisions. These personality preferences are believed to be natural propensities and not learned behaviors, although environmental conditioning can operate in support of or opposition to one’s natural preferences (Jung, 1921; Myers, 1980; Bouchard & McGue, 1990).

The thinking-feeling dimension is the only dimension of Jungian personality type that has gender distribution differences. Approximately 65-75% of males in the USA prefer thinking and 65-75% of females prefer feeling. Hence, when studying males and females, it is important to be aware of this dimension of personality since a representative sample of females will be heavily feeling and a representative sample of males, thinking. Type may be confused as gender.

Separate and connected knowing may be a function of several factors, including gender conditioning and/or psychological type. In a recent study involving 120 U.S. college students ages 18-25, Rodgers and colleagues (2000) found that type was associated with knowing style much more so than gender. Men and women thinking types overwhelmingly preferred separate knowing, and men and women feeling types, connected knowing. Nevertheless, a few thinking type females scored as connected and some feeling type males as separate. In these cases gender conditioning appeared to override type preferences, or perhaps type preferences were in error.
Gender conditioning can be stronger in some cultures than in others. The East Asian cultures of China, Taiwan, Korea and Japan, although distinct in their histories and languages, share some common religious and philosophical traditions that reinforce strong gender roles in education and societies. They are also among the most highly represented nationalities in international undergraduate and graduate enrollment in colleges and universities in the United States (Althen, 1995).

The purpose of the present study was two-fold: first, to investigate the relationship between knowing style and gender conditioning and type preference in Asian international students from these four countries; secondly, to describe and compare the patterns in how each gender and knowing style, either connected or separate, constructed its own and the opposite knowing style.

This study is important in the field of Higher Education and Student Affairs Administration for two main reasons. First, as increasingly more studies are designed to test the usefulness of theories first generated using either dominant culture U.S. men or women, international students must be included in order to understand some of the unique challenges those students face, to appreciate the ways in which they construct their knowing styles, and to check the validity of the theories for these students. Storey (1982), for example, questions the validity and usefulness of cognitive developmental theories for international students. This study’s purpose is to begin to apply two of those models, namely Psychological Type and Knowing Styles, to Asian international students, in order to understand their particular ways of making meaning and begin to appreciate
some of the similarities and differences between those students and their U.S. counterparts.

Secondly, the question of gender or psychological type as an indicator of knowing style has direct implications for designing classroom and other learning environments. Rodgers (1992) found that a naturally connected knower/learner can learn in a separate style, but that student may be less comfortable with it, may learn less well, and may never “identify” with the discipline or profession that is being taught in that style. The same was found for separate knowers/learners in a connected learning environment. Rodgers and colleagues (2000) also found that women and men who had identified themselves as connected had very negative perceptions of separate knowers and the environments they fostered. Incorrectly identifying the importance of gender rather than type in how one’s needs may be manifest could therefore result in inhibiting the learning of students who do not fit the dominant gender/type trend. It may be far more productive and helpful for faculty members or Student Affairs practitioners to base their decisions on teaching styles and learning environments on psychological type rather than on gender.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Knowing Style, Personality Type and Gender

Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (1986) first introduced separate and connected knowing as two styles of procedural knowledge, a way of knowing where women try to acquire and apply procedures for obtaining and communicating knowledge. Subsequent work seems to support the existence of these two styles in all of their positions or ways of knowing (Clinchy, 1996; Goldberger, 1996; and Kegan, 1994). A separate style of knowing is marked by the paradigm of debate. When one hears something about a knowledge claim, then the separate style will tend to doubt and apply logical criticism to those ideas, especially to ideas based upon feelings (Belenky et al., 1986). Individuals who fit this style tend to divorce themselves from theirs and others ideas, stressing the importance of objectivity. The goal is to find truth or validity.

Connected knowing, on the other hand, is marked by the paradigm of non-judgmental empathy. A connected knower tends to use empathetic listening, accepting another’s ideas and feelings in order to better understand how the other person could hold their view. This style leads to an emphasis on collaboration and personal contact, rather than
competition and individualism. The goal is to understand the others’ viewpoint and the experience that led to it. Connected knowing is strongly associated with, but not exclusively female and separate knowing, male.

In *Women’s Ways of Knowing* and in *Knowledge, Difference, and Power* (Goldberger, Tarule, Clinchy, & Belenky, 1996), the authors argue that the characteristics of knowing styles may have their origin in differential gender conditioning. That is, the U.S. culture conditions women to focus on relationships, empathy and feelings, and men to focus on independence, objectivity and logical reasoning. Many of the characteristics of separate and connected knowing, however, also are similar to the characteristics of personality preferences for “thinking” and “feeling” in Jung’s theory of psychological type (Jung, 1921; Myers, 1980; Myers & McCaulley, 1985). According to Isabel Briggs Myers (1980), who was one of the creators of the Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), thinking types value logic and debate above sentiment. They strive to be impersonal and are “likely to question the conclusion of other people on principle—believing them probably wrong” (p.68). They prefer to stand back and be as objective as possible. Feeling types, on the other hand, value sentiment and human connection above logic. They are much more personal. Feeling types “are likely to agree with those around them, thinking as other people think, believing them probably right” p.68). They prefer to see how others see themselves in their own shoes and then try to respond. Personality preferences are believed to be genetic propensities and not learned behaviors (Myers, 1980), although environmental conditioning can operate in support of or opposition to one’s natural proclivities. Bouchard & McGue (1990) argue that identical twins who had
been separated at birth and raised by different families were found to prefer the same personality type; however, about 50% of their characteristics are associated with genetic heritage and 50% with environmental conditioning.

The thinking-feeling preference in Jungian personality type is the only dimension that has a marked difference in gender distribution (Macdaid, McCaulley, & Kainz, 1986; Myers, 1980; Stokes, 1987). Approximately 65% to 75% of males in the United States culture tend to prefer thinking and 65% to 75% of females prefer feeling, although this finding might be inconclusive since the MBTI form G was re-weighted in 1977 in order to keep the gender representation the same as 20 years earlier (Harris & Caruskadon, 1988). Therefore, it is important to be aware of this dimension when studying across genders.

Ullman-Petrash (1993) first explored the relationship of Jung’s thinking and feeling decision-making preferences to Belenky et al.’s separate and connected knowing styles. Rodgers and colleagues (1998) later reasoned that separate and connected knowing might be a function of both gender conditioning and personality type, not either dimension alone. Males may then be more separate in their knowing style because the vast majority are thinking types and/or because of gender conditioning, whereas females may be more connected because of mostly being feeling types and/or gender conditioning. In order to test the hypothesis of whether gender conditioning or type might be more associated with separate and connected knowing styles, it was important to include equal numbers of male and female thinking types and male and female feeling types in the research design. Otherwise, a random sample of women would be heavily
biased toward feeling, and random sample of men, toward thinking. Type preferences could be confused with gender. Given equal numbers of male and female “thinkers” and male and female “feelers”, would thinking types or males be more separate in their knowing style and feeling types or females be more connected?

Rodgers and colleagues (1998) found in their study of 48 US college students ages eighteen to twenty five that overwhelmingly thinking types (84%), regardless of their gender, showed a high preference for separate knowing, and feeling types (87%), regardless of gender, connected knowing. Adding an additional seventy two 18-25 year old college students to the original study, Rodgers (2000) found that the relationship between psychological type and knowing styles remained consistent, with 88% of the thinking types rating as separate and 80% of the feeling types connected. Hence, type was associated with knowing style much more so than gender.

Very recently, Ullman-Petrash (2000) investigated the same question using 21 college women ages 20-48 in Canada. She too found strong evidence supporting this relationship, with 80% of thinking types identifying with the separate knowing style and 73% of the feeling types with the connected style.

In all three studies a few thinking type females did score as connected and in Rodgers and colleagues (1998) and Rodgers (2000) some feeling type males were identified as separate, even though the major findings supported the association of knowing style and type preferences. In a few cases gender conditioning appeared to override type preferences. Why was that? Under what cultural and environmental
conditions does gender conditioning override type preferences as originally hypothesized by Belenky et al. (1986)?

**Type Preference/Knowing Style and Effect of Socio-educational/Cultural Conditioning**

In the study performed by Rodgers (2000) the question of the relationship between type and knowing style was asked with a sample of 120 eighteen to twenty-five year old U.S.A. undergraduate and graduate students from three large universities, one in the Mid-West, one in the South and one in the South-West. The majority of the students in their sample were white and middle-class. Interestingly, of the eight African American students in the original sample (Rodgers et al., 1998), five fit the type hypothesis and three fit the gender hypothesis. In the entire sample there were only seven exceptions of the original 48 sampled. There were four of the seven who were members of minority groups. Three of those seven exceptions were African-American and one was Asian-American. Ullman-Petrash (2000) also sampled students from non-dominant Canadian culture. Seven of the 21 participants were born in countries other than Canada (i.e., India, England, the Philippines, Malaysia, Italy, Czechoslovakia and Denmark), and three of the seven did not migrate to Canada until the age of 18 or older. Unfortunately the author did not specify which women in her sample fit the exceptions to the trends of the relationship of psychological type and knowing style; however, she too found exceptions that could have been due in part to gender conditioning.
The particular students in Rodgers and colleagues (1998) were split 50%-50% between Belenky et al.’s (1986) original hypothesis that the separate-connected difference was gender related regardless of their type preferences and the hypothesis that the difference was related to type preferences. If there was this marked difference amongst students of color in this sample (albeit a small sample), could those students have been more influenced by their particular cultural expectations and norms according to gender roles? Could socio-educational/cultural conditioning of gender be stronger and have more of an effect on the knowing style preferences of students from the non-dominant culture? Is the conditioning of gender of African-American and/or Asian cultures stronger than middle class white American culture in the USA? If so, gender may over-ride type preferences more often than in Rodgers’ original study.

One reason separate males and connected females might have been more prevalent in the sub-sample of students of color was that cultural and socio-educational pressures were asserting more of an influence than one’s natural propensity towards a type preference. In the Chinese culture there is reason to believe that socio-educational/cultural pressures can lead to differences in developmental patterns from their American counterparts. Li-fang Zhang (1998) found that Mainland Chinese college students were greatly influenced by the political culture’s lack of tolerance of deviation from governmental definitions of truth. In her study, seniors seemed less cognitively complex than first year students; whereas in the U.S. seniors had seemed more complex than first year students (Perry, 1970). Zhang hypothesized that the difference was due to the level of decision-making opportunities provided by cultural/educational systems in both cultures.
American students, who were encouraged to engage in higher degrees of questioning truth throughout their college careers, progressed from a dualistic framework, marked by unquestioning acceptance of authority and belief in an absolute truth, to a relativistic framework, in which the student recognized and accepted the multiplicity of beliefs and ways of making meaning for different individuals. The data for the Chinese students, however, was markedly different.

As Chinese students progressed in their college careers their level of complexity decreased, and their level of dualistic thinking increased. First and second-year students tended to be more relativistic in their thinking than their third and fourth year counterparts. Kathryn Storey (1982) argued that “providing experiences for a student to move to a higher stage may create conflict between the individual and his or her culture” (p.69). That would certainly seem to be true for the Chinese students in Zhang’s study who would immediately have found themselves in conflict with the cognitive “press” (Stern, 1970) of their college or university had they attempted to become more relativistic as their rewards and choices were narrowed.

In the Asian cultures that have been heavily influenced by the Buddhist and Confucian patriarchal socio-educational systems, such as China, Taiwan, Korea and Japan, the question of the effect of gender conditioning on knowing styles is an important one. This is especially true when considering how to put theory to practice in light of recent research on knowing styles and learning styles. Rodgers (1992) found that a naturally connected knower/learner can learn in a separate style, such as the lecture format with debate and the competitive climate of an economics or business classroom;
however, the student is less comfortable with it, she or he may learn less well, and may never “identify” with the discipline or profession because of it. The same was found for separate knowers/learners in a connected learning environment, such as a classroom marked by collaboration and cooperation, with an emphasis on group work, such as a Women’s Studies Classroom (Rhoads, 1997). These individuals were found to encounter the same difficulties in relating to the material and the profession associated with it. Rodgers (2000) also found that women and men who had identified themselves as connected had very negative perceptions of separate knowers and the environments they foster. Incorrectly identifying the importance of gender rather than type in how one’s needs may be manifest could result in inhibiting the learning of students who do not fit the dominant gender/type trend.

Gender Roles and Patterns of Socialization in

China, Taiwan, Korea and Japan

According to the post-Confucian hypothesis first proposed by Kahn (1979, cited in Redding & Wong, 1986) there is a common cultural heritage for China, Taiwan, Korea and Japan, which reaches back thousands of years to the Confucian Age. There are, however, variations in its manifestation much in the same way as European countries display a wide variety of interpretations today of their Graeco-Roman heritage (Redding & Wong, 1986). Kahn proposes four traits, which Redding and Wong believe are consistent with Confucian ideology, have remained constant and have a significant impact on present day organizations in those four countries (pp.271-272).
These are:
(a) socialization within the family unit in such a way as to promote sobriety, education, the acquisition of skills, and seriousness about tasks, job, family, obligations;
(b) a tendency to help the group (however it might be identified);
(c) a sense of hierarchy and of its naturalness and rightness;
(d) a sense of complementarity in relationships which, combined with the sense of hierarchy, enhances perceptions of fairness and equity in institutions. For example, a boss's paternalistic concern for subordinates will be complemented by their willingness to cooperate without excessive resentment of (or perhaps even perception of) their relative subordination. (p.272)

There also seem to be marked similarities in the ways in which men and women were traditionally socialized in these four countries. Explanations of the family structure in China are the richest in the literature; however, the research on the cultures of Korea and Japan are found to have demonstrated striking similarities (Pharr, 1980; Tomeh, 1982). For the sake of exploring this traditional mindset and living arrangement, the Chinese system will be explored in greater depth than the others.

According to Cheung et al. (1997), the most important socialization agents for a child are family and school. Traditionally, the Chinese family (and consequently that of the Korean and Japanese) was male dominated with its descent in the male line and within the family, relationship among members was based on the supremacy of males over females and of age over youth (United Nations, 1997). The head of the family was always a male, with the family name and property being handed down primarily from father to son (patrilineal descent) (p.40).

In China, most marriages were arranged between male elders of two different families with the groom's family paying a “body price” to the bride's family and the bride and groom often not meeting until the actual marriage itself (Johnson, 1980). After
most marriages the bride then moved to the residence of the groom’s family (patrilocal residence), especially in rural areas. There, women were faced with establishing their credentials in circumstances that were most often far from welcoming (Watson, 1991, p. 350). Instead of helping to raise her family’s children, a woman raised the children of her husband’s family and tended to the needs of the elderly of that new family. “Because the husband and his family had paid, often dearly, for the bride’s services as a wife and daughter-in-law, they felt they had the right to regulate her labor and activities according to family needs” (Johnson, 1980, p. 63). These women were “housebound, voiceless, and under strict domination of their parents and in-laws” (Tomeh, 1982, p. 1).

Many argue that the condition of life for Chinese women has improved since the on-set of The Communist Revolution in 1949 (Hooper, 1991; United Nations, 1997; Watson, 1991). In terms of marriage practices, the enactment of the Marriage Law of the People’s Republic of China in 1950, which was aimed at improving the status of women, mandated that the marriage system be based on the free choice of both partners, on monogamy, and on equal rights for both sexes (United Nations, 1997). This ideal of the equality for women that was promised in the constitution of the People’s Republic of China, however, has not yet been reached. There is still major inequity in the education of men and women. According to Hooper (1991), there have consistently been fewer females than males both overall and at each level of education – primary, secondary and tertiary – throughout the history of the People’s Republic (p. 355).

One of the major obstacles that persists even today is the Confucian ethics prescribing a subordinate role for women: “male honorable, female inferior,” which led to
such sayings as “an educated woman is bound to cause trouble” (p. 356). This is compounded by the trend in rural households of pulling young women out of school before completion of high school in order to help with household chores and rural production/agriculture (p.360).

Even those women who are educated, even at the higher levels, are not guaranteed work and are often expected to out-perform their male counterparts in order to get jobs. Some 60-70% of unemployed young people, described euphemistically as ‘awaiting employment youth’ in the post-Mao Tse Tung Era have been female (p. 358). Female intelligence is considered to be of a fundamentally different and often less desirable nature than males: females being seen as verbal and tactile and males as analytical and technical (p. 359).

Research on the patterns of socialization across genders in Chinese cultures has revealed pertinent data to this study. Ho (1986) concluded, after having conducted a critical review of the literature on patterns of Socialization in Chinese cultures, that great emphasis is placed on obedience, proper conduct, moral training, and the acceptance of social obligations, in contrast to a lack of emphasis placed on independence, assertiveness and creativity. Positive values of sharing and non-competitiveness are stressed in these patterns of socialization, including an encouragement of older children to set an example for their “younger” siblings in “gentleness, good manners, unselfishness, and willingness to concede during a quarrel” (p.10). These traits are indicative of the filial piety (elder brother and younger brother), which is one of the Five Cardinal Relations of the Confucian tradition, the other four being sovereign and subject, father and son, elder
brother and younger brother, husband and wife, and friend and friend (Bond & Hwang, 1986).

There are two aspects of this pattern that deserve comment. Firstly, since the maintenance of harmony in relationships is an important value repeatedly reinforced in the socialization of Chinese children, as well as those of Korea and Japan, then the patterns that lead to competitiveness, such as independence and assertiveness will not be stressed or reinforced. They may in fact be suppressed. It would seem, therefore, that the majority of Chinese, Korean and Japanese are socialized in much the same way as the Connected knowers naturally behave, i.e., empathetically listening without judgment and engaging in open dialogue rather than debate and competition. Secondly, it is no coincidence that the Five Cardinal Relations stress key male-to-male relationships, other than that of husband to wife; but even then the woman is subordinated to her mate. This has significant implications for the socialization of Chinese, Korean and Japanese women and men.

Little was done to systematically study gender roles in Chinese society before the mid-1980s when three women or gender studies centers were set up independently in China, Taiwan and Hong Kong (Cheung, Yip, & Kwok, 1995). The only data currently available is based on descriptive studies performed in Hong Kong, which shares some cultural similarities to Mainland China, but has been far more “Westernized” by British influence in relative isolation from the Communist government of the People’s Republic. This data, however, is consistent in other ways with the literature on Chinese socialization patterns.
According to these authors gender roles for Hong Kong Chinese are similar to traditional gender roles in the United States, with males being socialized to fix things and work and women helping their mothers with household/domestic duties. When educational opportunities in a family are scarce they most often are reserved for sons, who are considered breadwinners (p. 222). These boys are expected to be doctors, engineers and scientists, while girls are expected to be nurses housewives or work in the service fields (Ibid.). According to Au (1993), these gender roles have been further reinforced in the textbooks used in primary schools, in which students learn to “integrate and consolidate systematically what they observe and experience in life, which in turn shape their gender identity” (Cheung et al., 1997, p. 224). These trends are found in the majors that students are encouraged to pursue and the ways in which men and women are portrayed in the media.

Cheung et al (1997) warn that the studies done primarily with Hong Kong Chinese have been strictly descriptive and have lacked an integration of the way in which changing gender roles have affected the expectations of both men and women. Ho (1986) earlier warned that the studies published on socialization patterns within the Chinese cultures had lacked a cohesiveness or an accumulation of a body of knowledge, in which later investigations were “built upon the refinement of earlier ones and avoidance of their failures” (p.32) Nevertheless, the findings of multiple authors have pointed to the differential and preferential treatment in the gender socialization of men over women in the Chinese cultures.
Similar findings have been reported in research performed with Japanese women. According to the results of a survey conducted by the Prime Minister’s Office in 1976, 41% of parents wanted their daughters to attend high school and junior college, but only 25% supported the idea of giving them a college education; opposed to 57% of parents who wanted to send their sons to colleges or universities (Iwao, 1993, p.38). Just ten years earlier, in the mid-1960’s, it was typical for a man to say, “A woman who is too smart can’t find a husband” (Ibid.). The mentality of the time was a (supposedly) pragmatic acceptance of norms:

“Men have to support the family, and the education they receive makes a big difference in the kind of job they can find and the caliber of life they can achieve. For women, it is more practical to find a promising husband who can guarantee her a comfortable situation than to invest inordinately in her own education.” (p.38)

Admittedly these statistics are now 25 years old; however, as has been evidenced in the Chinese culture, old norms often “die hard.” Nevertheless, there are increasing indications in Japan, as well as Korea and Taiwan that a more industrialized and modern economy has led slowly to a diversification in the roles of women, especially in the work place. Although in China women are struggling very hard to find employment, in Japan and Korea it is becoming more common to see women graduating from college and entering the workforce. Men of the older generations often don’t know what to make of it. For young women and children it can have wide-reaching consequences.

According to Tomeh (1982), a mother’s work experience has a strong effect on the sex/gender role attitudes of her children, both boys and girls. Whereas traditionally young girls would be expected to follow the traditional roles of servant and homemaker,
in this case presumably young girls would look to their mothers for cues on how to behave in a professional environment. Tomh found that Korean women may be shifting to more non-traditional sex roles than their male counterparts.

An interesting case study of how an industrial society might shape the behavior and expectations of its members is Taiwan. In only 50 years, the culture has been transformed from an agrarian one, in which the Confucian system thrived, to an industrial and professional one. According to Yang (1991), under the impact of modernization, the Chinese in Taiwan have tended to change from a social orientation (explored above) to a more individual orientation in their need for achievement (p.153). This process, the author argues, might be making the Taiwanese gradually more like people in the modern industrialized societies, such as the U.S. The young people of China, Taiwan, Korea and Japan seem, therefore, to be in a time of significant social change in the expectations and socialization patterns of men and women. Although grounded in similar traditional social structures, these four cultures may be experiencing their own unique changes in their particular social, cultural and political realities and contexts. Those cultures of Taiwan, Korea and Japan have demonstrated the most similarities in modernization and industrialization; however, as China opens its doors to free-market trade, it too may be transformed.

**True verses Reported Type**

In light of differences in socialization patterns across cultures, another important question is: How does gender conditioning affect one's identification of type preference?
This is a difficult question to answer since isolating gender conditioning from natural preference might seem at best artificial, and at worst, impossible. However, one important distinction that can shed light on this difficult problem is that of “true type” (that which is an individual’s natural preference) versus “reported type” or “instrument type” (that which is determined strictly by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator). There are three assumptions that are being made when we make this distinction (Hammer & Flavil, 1987). First, each individual has a “true” set of preferences, presumably based on in-born pre-dispositions. Secondly, the expression of these preferences is sensitive to influence by various factors. And thirdly, that individuals are able to “identify” their “true” type based on self-knowledge and a thorough and “competent” explanation of type theory.

Correspondence between “true” type and “reported/instrument” type has ranged from 63% (Kummerow, 1988), which is surprisingly low in light of the assumed accuracy of the M.B.T.I., to 85% (Hammer & Yeakley, 1987).

The question of true verses reported type is a fascinating one and one which can reveal some of the subtleties of gender conditioning, type preference, and knowing style. For example, if a student is first identified as a thinking type through use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator but after a workshop explaining the more subtle distinctions between type preferences identifies instead a preference for feeling type, it raises the first question about the possible effect of gender conditioning. Have the gender roles that are reinforced in a particular culture outweighed one’s natural inclination in one direction or another? Could one be completing the instrument through the lense of his or her culture rather than his or her natural preference?
These issues then can have wide implications for how type data is collected: either by way of instrument alone or self-selection based on the instrument and a workshop. Myers et al. (1998) argues that the latter method is better since it allows the individual respondent the opportunity to test the hypothesis which is revealed in the instrument type according to their experiences, and to develop a deeper understanding of the theory of psychological type and type dynamics. This then allows for a more accurate judgment of one’s type preference. Therefore, the most valid type data would be available from persons who both take the MBTI and self-select their true type after a workshop. This study will attempt to use this procedure.

Evidence of a correlation between “true” type preference and knowing style would contribute valuable data that would either support or call into question the universality of the hypothesis first introduced by Rodgers et al (1998) that separate and connected knowing styles are more associated with thinking and feeling preference than gender. It would also eliminate the possibility of using incorrect type data, based solely on the M.B.T.I. instrument, which was controlled in Ullman-Petrash (2000) through verification, but which could not be controlled for in the studies conducted by Rodgers and associates (1998) and Rodgers (2000). In addition, appreciating the unique ways in which both men and women construct their knowing styles would help us begin to understand the unique challenges that some International Asian students face in American classrooms, and the extent to which data first gathered from US and Canadian college students is generalizable to their international counterparts.
Type accuracy

An assumption that is made in studies of type is that the type descriptions are accurate in the way in which people of particular types identify themselves; for example, one would assume that a male and female feeling type would both identify with the descriptions of feeling types, in general. McCarley and Caruskadon (1986) helped to demonstrate the validity of the 16 type descriptions in an exploratory study using 609 eighteen to twenty-one year old US college students. They sought to determine which type descriptions (the foundation of Jung/Myers-Briggs) (Ruhl, 1988) were perceived as accurate by subjects classified into type according to the MBTI, Form G, the older version of the instrument. The authors found that the descriptors for the sixteen types were accurate. One of the potential problem areas reported with their study was that the sample was entirely college age students, posing a problem in generalizability. For the current study, such data is helpful since this sample was also college age, but admittedly, not US students.

Ruhl (1988) sought to replicate the 1986 study using a smaller sample of 145. She, too, found that the descriptors used for the study of type were determined as accurate by the students sampled. The implications of both studies are that type descriptions accurately reflect the ways in which people identify themselves. This means that one who hears or reads a type description will be able to determine if it accurately describes them according to the theory of Psychological type.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Objectives and definitions of terms

The research aims of this study were two-fold: firstly, to examine the relationship between knowing style (separate and connected), gender, and psychological type (thinking and feeling) and to explore the correlation between “true” and “instrument” type; and secondly, to describe and compare the ways in which men and women of both knowing styles construct their own style and the opposite. All of the data were collected from international students ages 18 to 25 from China, Taiwan, Korea and Japan. In order to conduct the study, the following variables were defined.

Knowing Style

Conceptual Definition, as defined by Belenky et al (1986).

Separate Knowing – the tendency to be doubtful and to use logic and the paradigm of debate when confronting another individual on an idea. Such a style is marked by
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individuals separating themselves from their ideas, in order to evaluate arguments in a climate of competition.

**Connected Knowing** - the tendency to be "believing" and to use empathy and the paradigm of conversation when attempting to understand and clarify an individual’s idea. Such a style is marked by collaborating and cooperating in a group atmosphere.

**Operational Definition.** These two knowing styles were operationally defined according to responses to a rated qualitative interview designed by Mansfield and Clinchy (1992). See Appendix A for the Interview protocol. All participants were asked to respond to the following quotes.

**Separate Knowing** - “I never take anything for granted. I just tend to see the contrary. I like playing the ‘devil’s advocate,’ arguing the opposite of what somebody’s saying, thinking of exceptions, or thinking of a different train of logic.”

**Connected Knowing** - “When I have an idea about something, and it differs from the way another person is thinking about it, I’ll usually try to look at it from that person’s point of view, see how they could say that, why they think that they’re right, why it makes sense.”

Each respondent was asked how both quotes “struck” them, and when/where/with whom they would or would not use each style. They were also asked to reflect on the purposes for each style, and how difficult or easy those behaviors might be for them. Not only were they asked to reflect on their own use, but also on how others had used each style and how that had affected them. Finally, each person was asked to identify
which style they used most and how they might broaden their approach in light of the interview.

Interviews lasted between 30 and 45 minutes. Each interview was audio-recorded and transcribed. The transcripts were then rated by two people, who had no knowledge of respondents’ gender or psychological type, using the manual first developed for identifying connected and separate knowing styles in the 1986 study. For this study there were two protocols where the raters met together to arrive at a consensus on the style of knowing. There was exact agreement on all other persons.

**Psychological Type**

**Conceptual Definition,** a four letter representation of an individual’s personality preferences in the areas of Extraversion/Introversion, Intuition/Sensing, Feeling/Thinking, and Judging Perceiving, according to Carl Jung’s theory of Psychological Type.

“**Instrument Type**” Operational Definition. Psychological type as measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (M.B.T.I.) Form M (Myers et al., 1998)

The M.B.T.I. Form M is a new 93 item instrument recently revised to best reflect social and cultural changes, as well as improved measurement of type preferences from the M.B.T.I. instrument Form G, which had remained unchanged since 1976. The new Form M sought to do the following: update item wording and remove outdated language; increase the capacity of the instrument to differentiate at the midpoint of each scale; base the item weights of the MBTI on the responses from a national representative sample of
adults, which included a diverse group according to gender, race, ethnicity, religion, and socio-economic status; decrease the number of items necessary for determining the four-letter type from 126 (Form G) to 93; improve the item-to-scale correlations; lower scale inter-correlations; eliminate separate gender scoring; minimize the influence of social desirability in responses to the items for different age and gender groups; remove all items with more than two response options; explore new scoring methodologies consistent with the goals of the new instrument; and achieve improved validity of predicting “verified” type (i.e. that type which is verified by the instrument-taker after having learned more about the theory) as an outcome of the increased precision (Myers et al., 1998, p.14-15).

The MBTI Form M divides personality type according to four dichotomous variables.

Extraversion/Introversion (E/I) preferences indicate the direction of the use of one’s energies, that is, externally (extraversion) or internally (introversion). The extravert is more involved with the outer world of people and things while the introvert’s main interests are in the inner world of concepts and ideas (Myers 1980, p.7)

Sensing/Intuition (S/N) preferences are based on how one perceives the world or takes in information: (1) concrete information taken in through the senses and grounded in the here-and-now (sensing) or (2) global, general information about possibilities or relationships among concrete data (intuition).

Thinking/Feeling (T/F) indicates how one makes judgments on the perceived information: either by means of analytical and logical reasoning based on principles
(thinking) or by means of prioritized values, and empathetic listening, factoring the feelings of people about the judgment (feeling).

**Judging/Perceiving (J/P)** indicates one's preferred lifestyle: either structured and planful (judging), or spontaneous and open (perceiving).

The split-half reliabilities for the MBTI Form M range from .91 on the E/I dimension to .92 on the S/N and J/P preferences. The internal consistency of the four MBTI scales is estimated using coefficient alpha, which is the average of all of the item correlations (Myers et al., 1998, p.161). In the national sample (N=2,859) internal consistency ranged from .94 for the E/I preference to .95 on the S/N dimension. There were no differences for males or females in the samples. Interestingly, the internal consistency for a sample of U.S. Asian or Pacific-Islanders ranged from .82 on S/N to .91 on E/I. There was no data available on the use of Form M with Asian internationals. The test-retest reliabilities for Form M ranged from .83 on the T/F dimension to .94 on the E/I dimension. Finally, the test-retest percentage agreement of dichotomies for Form M ranged from 84% on the T/F preference to 88% on the J/P preference. Test-retest reliabilities of the MBTI Form M are improved from the Form G, and show consistency over time, with levels of agreement much greater than by chance (Myers et al., 1998a).

"True Type" Operational Definition- True type is a self-selected type on all four dimensions after a three-hour workshop designed to educate participants about the more subtle distinctions between type preferences, which includes the return of their MBTI
results and interpretations of these results. See Appendix B for Type Workshop Design. For the purpose of the workshop thinking and feeling preferences were defined.

Thinking Type- Analytical and questioning; solves problems logically; reasons through cause and effect; values the impersonal, objective truth; reasonable and fair.

Feeling Type- Sympathetic and empathetic; evaluates the impact on people; reasons through personal values; values harmony, care, and support; compassionate and accepting

Hypotheses

Given the sample was controlled for age (with students ranging from age 18-26 years) and educational experience (undergraduate or graduate college students), the following hypotheses were proposed.

Hypothesis 1

Asian students who have identified themselves as thinking types, or who prefer thinking type on the MBTI, regardless of their gender, will be significantly rated as exhibiting a separate knowing style. Whereas, Asian students who identify themselves as feeling types, or who prefer feeling type on the MBTI, regardless of gender, will be significantly rated as preferring connected knowing.

Hypothesis 2

Discrepancies found between “instrument type” and “true type” in the Thinking-Feeling dimension of the MBTI, will be found in significant frequency (Walck, 1992).
Qualitative Focus

This study will focus on the constructed meaning that Asian women and men students who are rated as either separate or connected knowers use to describe and evaluate their own and the other knowing style. Detailed, in-depth descriptions of the various patterns of meaning construction will be identified. If various patterns exist, they will be compared and contrasted. See the Interview protocol in Appendix A for the detailed questions asked of each participant. Patterns of meaning making will be constructed for each question. This description will include comparing and contrasting any differences in patterns of meaning that may occur.

Research Design

The Relationship Study

This study consisted in part in a relationship analysis, which is a type of correlational study employing a structural use of statistics, defined as an analysis related to some theoretical system or systems (Sax, 1968). The theoretical systems which were correlated for this study were the theory of psychological type as measured by the MBTI and the notion of knowing styles which grew out of Women’s ways of knowing (WWK) measured by way of the Mansfield and Clinchy’s Interview protocol found in Appendix A.
A relationship study looks at how two or more variables are related to each other (Sax, 1968, p. 293). According to Sax, this type of methodology stems from John Stuart Mill’s canon of concomitant variation which states that “whatever phenomenon varies in any manner whenever another phenomenon varies in some particular manner, is either a cause or an effect of that phenomenon, or is connected with it through some fact of causation” (Mill, 1930, p. 263).

Correlational studies, however, demonstrate only that a relationship between two or more variables either exists or does not exist. Therefore, in this study there can be no claim that Type “causes” Knowing style, or vice versa. It can only be concluded that they are either related or not. It is important to note, however, that if there is a zero correlation, i.e., no relationship is found, then it can be concluded that there is not a causal relationship. Therefore, such a design can be very useful in exploring research where little data is currently available, such as the current one. The findings of such a study as this one can then point the direction in which future studies can go to test causal hypotheses (Sax, 1968).

**The Qualitative Study**

The data generated by means of the Mansfield and Clinchy Interview (1992) was rich with the individual experiences and constructed meanings which Asian international students gave it. Although a quantitative method was used in the Relationship study, a qualitative or naturalistic method was also used to appreciate the patterns within individuals and groups.
Lincoln and Guba (1985) describe qualitative or naturalistic inquiry as consisting of five axioms of the naturalistic paradigm that are in contrast to the positivistic or traditional paradigm of quantitative inquiry (pp. 37-38). First, realities are perceived to be multiple, constructed and holistic. Therefore, the purpose of this form of inquiry is to appreciate and understand the multiple ways in which individuals construct a given phenomenon or group of phenomena. In keeping with this methodology, the goal of this part of the study was not necessarily to predict the behavior, belief systems or values of Asian international students according to knowing styles. Instead its purpose was to uncover some of the complexity in how they construct meaning in and through those knowing styles.

Second, the knower and the known, i.e., the researcher and the research participant, are inseparable and interact with one another. The Interview protocol designed and used by Mansfield and Clinchy (1992) was employed in order to minimize external influence and in order to be consistent with past studies, specifically Rodgers et al. (1998; 2000). Since, however, sometimes language was a barrier for participants, concepts and vocabulary were clarified using the language within the interview protocol, with as little variation as possible. Personal or anecdotal information from the researcher was kept to a minimum. Although uniformity was attempted, it was difficult since some of the interviews were not given and transcribed by the researcher. Given the circumstances, every effort at consistency was sought.

Thirdly, working hypotheses are both time and context-bound and therefore cannot be generalized to all cases. The experiences of these Asian students, as well as the
ways in which they construct meaning, may not generalize to all Asian international students; however, detailed descriptions of their experiences will allow readers to determine if patterns exist and if they might be transferable to other similar contexts.

Fourthly, cause and effect cannot be clearly distinguished as both researcher and participant shape each other's responses mutually and simultaneously. As is the case with the Relationship analysis, this study makes no claims at causation, but seeks instead to appreciate and understand how Asian international students make meaning of theoretical constructs that have been primarily developed using US men and women.

Finally, qualitative inquiry is value-bound and un-biased objective positioning is impossible, as is the case in all research. This being said, however, the method of analysis of this study sought to present the data in its complexity and with the patterns that emerged within individuals and groups in such a way that the influence of the researcher's life and interests were kept to a minimum. Granted that if another researcher were to analyze the same data, other patterns and interpretations might very well emerge.

Qualitative inquiry makes use of inductive logic or analysis. Without imposing predetermined categories or expectations on the data, inductive analysis starts with specific observations and builds toward general patterns (p.61-62). For the purpose of this study, the data from each participant was coded into 26 categories based on the questions being asked within the Interview protocol of Mansfield and Clinchy (1992) (See Appendix A). Using the Constant Comparative Method of Glaser and Strauss (1967), this data continuously informed and expanded categories within and across the four groups: Connected women, Connected men, Separate women and Separate men.
The Constant Comparative Method, which is part of Glaser and Strauss' notion of a Grounded theory, consists of four stages. For the purpose of this study, only the first two were employed. Firstly, "the analyst starts by coding each incident in the data into as many categories of analysis as possible, as categories emerge or as data emerge that fit an existing category" (p. 105). In this study, data within the 26 categories were organized in this way using index cards to indicate patterns and specific quotes that would inform given categories.

Secondly, categories and the properties within them are integrated. In the Constant Comparative Method, as a category is formed every new data that is added creates a more complex picture in which patterns emerge. This can happen across categories, as well as within a given category. These patterns then help to generate theoretical properties of the categories. "The analyst starts thinking in terms of the full range of types or continua of the category, its dimensions, the conditions under which it is pronounced or minimized, its major consequences, its relation to other categories and its properties" (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 106). Interestingly, as categories and their properties emerge, the researcher discovers that there are two kinds: ones constructed by the researcher and those that have been abstracted from the research situation (p. 107), i.e. from the words and thoughts of the participants. At this point in the analysis, the researcher is to reflect on and begin to construct preliminary theory which is grounded in the data; hence, the name Grounded theory.

An important component of this process is theoretical saturation or collection of data until a given category is exhausted. This could not be achieved, nor was it the goal
of this study. Instead the data from all 25 participants was fully coded, categorized, and integrated into the beginnings of a conception of how Asian international Connected and Separate women and men construct theirs and the others knowing styles. The last two elements of the constant comparative method were not employed, since the goal was not necessarily to generate new theory, but instead to appreciate variations within an already developed and tested theory.

**Research Methods**

Firstly, all participants were required to take the M.B.T.I. Form M instrument, which assessed their personality type. The Myers-Briggs Personality Type Indicator (MBTI) is an instrument designed to measure the personality preferences of individuals according to the theory of Carl Jung (1921). The 93 item forced choice inventory divides the differences in personality preferences into four alternative dichotomous distinctions: Extraversion/Introversion (E/I), Sensing/Intuition (S/N), Thinking/Feeling (T/F), and Judging/Perceiving (J/P). For the purpose of this study only the Thinking/Feeling dimension was considered, although the other variables were reported. Thinking types rely on logical and analytical ways of making judgments, while feeling types rely on prioritized values, the effects of their behavior on people, and people’s feelings in making judgments.

All participants were given special instructions before taking the instrument, either by the researcher or one of his assistants, who had been trained in this protocol.
See Appendix C for the script used. Firstly, they were told to take as much time as was needed to complete the 93-item instrument. Secondly, it was explained that the instrument was a forced-choice questionnaire, which meant that he or she needed to choose one of two possible responses. If both were equally attractive, then they were asked to choose whichever they would be happiest in using for the rest of their lives. Thirdly, because the participants were from a different culture from the U.S., each participant was asked to reflect on their preferences both within the U.S. and their home culture. The goal of this request was to prevent one who might prefer “extraversion” from indicating “introversion” because of environmental factors, such as language barriers.

A more significant issue which could not be controlled in the study, but was recognized, was the extent to which participants might have answered questions according to particular roles in which they placed themselves in the various scenarios on which they were asked to reflect. According to Irwin (1996), Confucianism was a determining influence in the cultures of Korea, Taiwan, China, and also exerted strong influences on Japanese thought and ethics (p.110). In the Confucian tradition there are Five Cardinal Relations (wu lun), namely those between sovereign and subject, father and son, elder brother and younger brother, husband and wife, and friend and friend (Bond & Hwang, 1986). In each case a strong hierarchical structure is in place with particular expectations of each party. As a result of this social and psychological factor potentially influencing the answers given by the participants, everyone was asked to reflect on their preferences across roles, i.e. their “true” selves. Participants were asked to think about
which behavior or expression would be most preferred regardless of the role in which they might find themselves.

The final issue to be addressed before administering the instrument was that of the language of the instrument. Kirby & Barger (1998) explain in their chapter on “Uses of Type in Multicultural Settings” that according to Wederspahn and Barger (1988), even when a non-native English speakers, such as the international students used in this study, had sufficient command of English to understand words in the MBTI Form G (the prominent instrument at that time), it did not necessarily mean that they could comprehend the meaning of the expressions being used (p.372). As suggested by Wederspahn and Barger, potentially problematic expressions in the Form M were checked and clarified if misunderstood. Potentially problematic words included: (1) “ingenious,” defined as “clever;” (2) “cramp” (“Does a schedule cramp you?”), defined as “(Does a schedule) make you feel confined or restrained;” (3) “hearty,” defined as “affectionate” or “warm-hearted;” (4) “cherish,” defined as “nurture” or “care deeply for.” For the sample, the words most often asked for clarification were “ingenious” and “cramp.” Potentially problematic idiomatic expressions which were often clarified included: (1) “a good mixer,” defined as someone “social” or “who could easily move around a party and talk to many different people;” (2) “leave you cold,” defined as “be off-putting” or “not like;” (3) “to be tied down,” defined as “constrained” or “forced to stay with it” (recognizing that the expression has a negative connotation); (4) “plunge in,” defined as “jump in” or “be spontaneous;” and (5) “go with the flow,” defined as “being flexible and able to adjust to change.”
Since the English language MBTI instrument was used for all participants, one potential problem which could not be resolved was what Kirby and Barger (1998) referred to as “cultural value challenges,” i.e., items which might not have been favored because of differing cultural norms. Sim and Kim (1993) were forced to re-write one such item for the Korean MBTI for “thinking” versus “feeling” since “the Korean culture does not favor the expression of emotions and feelings” (p. 19; p.373 Kirby and Barger).

After completion of the instrument, it was scored on all four dimensions of personality preference: Extraversion/Introversion, Sensing/Intuition, Thinking/Feeling, and Judging/Perceiving, using the Form M templates. Scores on the instrument constituted the “instrument type” scores. Those scores had a rating of either Slight, Moderate, Clear, or Very Clear. These “scores” indicated the extent to which the participant answered consistently in the direction of one dimension opposed to another.

There were 11 of the 25 students sampled who engaged in a one and a half hour workshop designed to teach them more in detail about type characteristics, as well as the characteristics of different type combinations. See Appendix B for a detailed design of the Type workshop. In the workshop, participants were asked to “self-select” their type based on increased knowledge of the four dichotomous variables: extraversion/ introversion; sensing/intuition; thinking/feeling; and judging/perceiving. After self-selecting, the personality type as determined by the instrument was revealed to each student separately. All workshop participants were then asked to compare their self-selected type and the instrument type, and with the guide of the “16 Characteristics Frequently Associated with Each Type” used in Myers and colleagues (1998b),
determined which type they thought fit them best. See Appendix I for Workshop Manual. This type preference constituted the "true type." On the "Selection of Preferences" (See Appendix D), the Self-selected type, MBTI type, and Best estimate for today ("True type) was indicated. For the 14 students who could not attend the workshop, the "instrument type" was used as their "true" type. All study participants were also given a bibliography of resources available on the use of the theory of Psychological type for basic purposes, in research, in organizations and leadership, for use with children and in teaching and learning, on type development, and as related to gender and relationships, career choice and spirituality. See Appendix E for the bibliography.

The Knowing Style Interview

After completing the MBTI instrument each participant was interviewed using the protocol originally designed by Mansfield and Clinchy (1992). See Appendix A for the Knowing Style interview protocol. The Mansfield and Clinchy Interview was designed to determine the knowing style of individuals according to the distinction between separate and connected knowing in the theory of Belenky et al. (1986). Separate knowers tend to use logic and impersonal analysis when looking at ideas or arguments. Connected knowers, on the other hand, tend to use empathy in order to understand and accept another person's thought or idea. This questionnaire has been used informally by the authors of Women's Ways of Knowing (WWK) (1986), specifically by Clinchy, and in a formal study conducted by Goldberger and also by Rodgers et al. (1998) and Rodgers
(2000). There is not as of yet a rating manual and no test-retest reliability or validity has been reported. However, raters in this study are experts on the theory in Women’s Ways of Knowing and have studied rating materials used by the authors for the original study.

For the purpose of the descriptive part of the study those students who were rated as preferring the separate style or the connected style based upon the criteria defining both styles in WWK and their Rating manual. Log-linear analysis was supposed to be performed in order to demonstrate the relationship between knowing style and type preference on the Thinking/Feeling dimension and the gender category. For those students who had participated in the workshop their “true type” determination for the thinking/feeling dimension was used, whereas the “instrument type” on the thinking/feeling dichotomy was used for all others.

The original goal of the researcher had been to have 10 participants in each of the four cells: 10 Male thinking types, 10 Male Feeling types, 10 Female thinking types and 10 female feeling types (See Table 3.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychological Type</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1
Projected Type and Gender distribution
This then could have allowed for a Log-Linear Analysis to determine statistical significance on these categorical data. Log-linear Analysis is similar to factorial analysis of variance (ANOVA). "The variables used for classification become the independent variables, and the number of cases in each cell is the dependent variable" (O'Shea & Mamchur, 1989, p. 56). In this case, the independent variables would have been Gender, Psychological Type, and Knowing Style. The dependent variable would have been 10 cases in each cell. If a Log-linear Analysis is performed, then "by means of logarithmic transformation, the multiplicative model usually used to predict frequencies in a contingency table is converted to an additive model similar to that used in analysis of variance. As a result, all the features of ANOVA become applicable to contingency table analysis, including the advantages of being able to examine simultaneously, the contributions of all main effects and interaction effects of any order" (p.56).

A Log-Linear Analysis requires at least "five" exceptional cases in each category order to run the statistical test. In Rodgers (1998; 2000) studies with 48 and 120 participants, respectively, there were not enough participants in each cell to run the log-linear procedure. Had 40 participants been selected with the abovementioned distribution this study would have run the same risk. Table 3.2 shows the actual distribution for the study. Far fewer men (n=8) participated than women (n=17).
N = 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychological Type</th>
<th>Female n=17</th>
<th>Male n=8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2

Actual Type and Gender distribution Sample

Sample

The sample for the study was purposively chosen from the undergraduate and graduate population of Chinese, Taiwanese, Korean and Japanese international students between the ages of 18 and 26 years old, who had attended a large Mid-Western research university for three quarters or more as of Autumn Quarter, 1999 (N=467). All 467 students were first contacted in mid-November of 1999 via a blind-email which explained the purpose of the study and asked them to participate in both components: the workshop, instrument and interview—altogether a four hour commitment. See Appendix F for the initial email. There was a very small response from this initial email; therefore, two weeks later a second email was sent to all students who had not responded to the first email with either interest or a request to remove their names from the list of prospective participants. This email was more brief and took on a more familiar and relaxed tone. See Appendix G for the email sent.
A group of eight students expressed interest in participating in the workshop and interview. These students were contacted at the beginning of Winter Quarter (January, 2000) with details concerning the time and location of the workshop. Seven students participated in the first workshop on Saturday, January 15, 2000. Following the workshop a third email was sent asking for participation in the workshop and interview. Two weeks later, on February 4, 2000, four students participated in the workshop.

Due to the low response rate and the large commitment that students were being asked to make, the study design was modified in order to remove the workshop. This modified design allowed for prospective participants to meet with the researcher at their convenience to take the MBTI instrument and conduct the Mansfield and Clinchy Interview. In all, this commitment required an hour to an hour and fifteen minutes of students. All students who had requested not to be included in the workshop and those who had not responded to the first three emails were contacted in early February. See Appendix H for the email that explained the modified design.

Two weeks later a final email was sent requesting commitments from students to participate. There were 14 additional students who chose this option bringing the final number to 25. Please see Table 3 for the distribution of the sample. The sample size of 25 was a total response rate of 5.4% from the initial sampling number of 467, after five emails were sent to all students who had not responded. Once, however, a student responded with either interest or a request to be removed, contact would be via email to one student at a time in order to set a time that was convenient for the student.
These modified sessions were conducted in a university office with privacy and confidentiality ensured. The Office of International Education was used, since it was a familiar and easily accessible office for the students. It was also the location of the researcher’s job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Taiwanese</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of participants</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not-registered</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Ages                  | 20 years = 0 | 20 years = 3 | 20 years = 0 | 20 years = 1 |
|                       | 21 years = 0 | 21 years = 1 | 21 years = 0 | 21 years = 1 |
|                       | 22 years = 0 | 22 years = 1 | 22 years = 1 | 22 years = 0 |
|                       | 23 years = 1 | 23 years = 0 | 23 years = 2 | 23 years = 1 |
|                       | 24 years = 3 | 24 years = 3 | 24 years = 0 | 24 years = 1 |
|                       | 25 years = 2 | 25 years = 2 | 25 years = 1 | 25 years = 1 |
|                       | 26 years = 1 |            |          |          |

| Workshops participants | 2       | 5         | 3      | 1        |

Table 3.3

Sample Distribution
Type and Gender Distribution

For the purpose of the study the type used to correlate with knowing style was either the "true type" determined after the workshop or the instrument type, for students who participated in the modified design. Table 3.4 presents the type distribution, as well as the distribution of thinking and feeling types according to gender and their knowing styles. See Table 3.2 above for the specific distribution of type and knowing style.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Connected knowing style</th>
<th>Separate knowing style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female = f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male = m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>ISFJ</td>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 2</td>
<td>n = 0</td>
<td>n = 4</td>
<td>n = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(16%)</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, S</td>
<td></td>
<td>C, C, C, C</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>INFP</td>
<td>INTP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = i</td>
<td>n = 1</td>
<td>n = 3</td>
<td>n = 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td>(12%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C, C, S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTP</td>
<td>ESFP</td>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>ENTP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 0</td>
<td>n = 1</td>
<td>n = 4</td>
<td>n = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td>(16%)</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C, C, S, S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>ENTJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 3</td>
<td>n = 1</td>
<td>n = 2</td>
<td>n = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12%)</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td>(8%)</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S, S, S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C, S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking Types = 9 (36%)</td>
<td>Females = 6 (35%)</td>
<td>Males = 3 (37%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Types = 16 (64%)</td>
<td>Females = 11 (65%)</td>
<td>Males = 5 (63%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4

Type distribution
CHAPTER FOUR

QUANTITATIVE RESULTS AND
RESULTS ON CONSTRUCTION OF KNOWING STYLES

Quantitative Results

The results from the two Quantitative hypotheses were not conclusive since the sample used for the study was too small to run the statistical tests. Firstly, we will look at the results from the correlational study between psychological type and knowing style, followed by the data on “instrument type” versus “true type.”

Psychological type and knowing style

The original hypothesis of this study was that Asian international students who identified themselves as thinking types and feelings types would be significantly related to separate and connected knowing styles, respectively. In order to have determined statistical significance, a Log-linear Analysis would have been performed on the data. With only 25 participants in the final study, it was impossible to run such a test. A Log-linear analysis would have required an equal number of subjects in each of the four cells:
thinking women, thinking men, feeling women and feeling men, and at least five exceptions for each cell, in terms of the relationship between knowing style and psychological type. Of the nine thinking types in this study, eight (89%) were rated as separate in their knowing style; and of the 16 feeling types, 12 (75%) were connected. See Table 4.1 for the data from this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowing Style</th>
<th>Thinking Type</th>
<th>Feeling Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connected</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1

Type and Knowing Style

Instrument type versus True type:

The second hypothesis that could not be tested adequately with the sample chosen for this study was the extent to which there were discrepancies between “instrument type” and “true type” after having taken the MBTI Form M and a workshop on the theory of Psychological type. All 25 who were sampled in this study took the MBTI Form M instrument; however, only 11 of the 25 also engaged in the workshop on Psychological type. Of the 11, only three showed any discrepancy in the thinking-feeling dimension
between instrument and true type. Interestingly, all three had identified themselves as thinking types using the MBTI Form M (with two moderate scores and one slight), but later decided that they preferred feeling type after having learned more about the theory. Of the three participants, two were men and one was a woman. Only one other student showed a discrepancy between instrument and true type in the intuition (N) and sensing (S) dimension, which was not under investigation in this study (See Table 4.2).
Key:
Dimensions of Psychological type
E/I = Extraversion/Introversion
S/N = Sensing/Intuition
T/F = Thinking/Feeling
J/P = Judging/Perceiving

Scores on MBTI Form M instrument
s = Slight
m = Moderate
c = Clear
vc = Very Clear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Instrument type</th>
<th>True type</th>
<th>Discrepancies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>E (m) N (m) F (c) J (c)</td>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E (c) N (m) F (c) P (s)</td>
<td>ESFP</td>
<td>N - S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I (m) N (m) F (c) P (s)</td>
<td>INFP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E (c) N (c) F (m) P (c)</td>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I (vc) S (m) T (c) J (vc)</td>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I (c) N (m) F (m) P (m)</td>
<td>INFP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I (m) S (s) T (m) P (m)</td>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>T - F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>E (s) N (s) T (m) J (c)</td>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>T - F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E (s) S (m) T (s) J (m)</td>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>T - F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I (c) N (s) T (c) J (vc)</td>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I (m) S (m) T (m) J (c)</td>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2

Instrument versus True type
Qualitative Results

The qualitative results of this study will be presented in sections, with the first section describing each group’s perception of separate knowing and the particular ways in which separate women, separate men, connected women and connected men construct that style. Similarities and differences will be presented between groups as well as observations about observed trends within the data. Each question of the Interview Protocol (See Appendix A) will be explored in turn.

Separate Knowing

"I never take anything someone says for granted. I just tend to see the contrary. I like playing the devil’s advocate, arguing the opposite of what somebody is saying, thinking of exceptions, or thinking of a different train of logic."

How does this quote strike you? (SS)

Each participant was asked to reflect on the above quote and respond to the question, “How does this quote strike you?” For many of the students interviewed the word “strike” was unfamiliar; therefore, it was clarified by having the student answer, “How does it make you feel? What do you think of that quote?”

Separate Women (SS). The majority of the separate women (SW) had positive things to say about this style. They either recognized it in themselves or admired those who demonstrated it. Four out of the seven separate women (SW) interviewed answered
that the quote was “natural” to them. One woman commented, “It feels like me...I just do it without thinking. I always have done.” Another woman added, “My husband always says I am...too argumentative, ‘You always say the opposite of others say.’” One other woman sang the praises of the style, “I think it’s quite a...creative personality. (People who use it) can, you know...have many idea, many inventions And...I think I admire this kind of person. I want to be this person.”

On the other hand, two of the three remaining SW recognized that it was natural for them to use the strategy explained in the quote, but they would do it internally rather than externally, in order to maintain harmony. One woman offered, “I wouldn’t try to argue, but I wouldn’t really just take it (in).” The remaining woman seemed to appreciate such a style in the research setting in conducting a project, but not necessarily in a friendship, “I don’t like this person....’Argue’ to me is a really bad word. You may say ‘discuss’ or something.”

Separate Men (SS). Interestingly, only two out of the five separate men (SM) identified with the quote, and even one of them did it with reservations, “I agree with the first sentence. I never take something someone says for granted,” but he didn’t see himself as playing the devil’s advocate. He said instead, “I think harmony is more like my role.” Only one student commented, “that’s a good way to do research. (It’s a) good personality (for it).” The majority of SM (three out of five) instead had negative feelings towards this quote. They felt that the style was an inappropriate way to deal with most people, i.e., to always see the contrary.
A very intriguing answer by one man likened the Separate knowing style to a subjective rather than objective attitude. The majority of the proponents of such a view, in keeping with the philosophical traditions that have shaped it as a tool of inquiry, would argue the opposite, that it is the only way to be objective. This student’s comment embraced the importance of objectivity, in keeping with separate knowers, but saw the style demonstrated in the quote as antithetical to it, “I think it’s the wrong attitude to just always see the contrary to anything before actually finding out. It’s not an objective attitude. It’s subjective. It’s not a good attitude.” One possibility for this negative association could have been that he had had a very negative experience with a person who had been argumentative and always acting as the contrarian. This experience greatly shaped his perception of that particular style, “(The Separate Knowing quote) doesn’t match me. No, this is something I would not do...in the past I had some very bad experience with this kind of person, so I always try my best to avoid showing this kind of attitude toward people.”

Connected Women (SS). In keeping with this negative perception of the Separate knowing quote, half of the connected women (CW) (5/10) commented either that they did not like this type of person or that they did not like to think that way. One added, “(These people) don’t really have a meter for to judge anything.” Eight of the ten women did not at all identify with the quote. One woman said emphatically, “I don’t like to argue with someone.” One other commented, “Usually I don’t think like this. I don’t always want to find opposite opinion.” She and another offered, “I just do what I feel is right.” “I think I am easier to be persuaded by others.”
Only two of the ten CW had anything positive to say about the style. One seemed to demonstrate more separate ways of making meaning, "I don't believe everything that...other people say....If I have a new idea that is different from their ideas, I like to argue about things." One other woman commented that such a personality was "strong," but did not necessarily attribute it to herself.

**Connected Men (SS).** The connected men (CM) also did not see themselves in behaving like the Separate knowing quote; however, two of the three men responded more positively. One said, "I like this statement....I like this kind of person." The other explained, "I'd like to be that way, but I'm not." The third posited that such a strategy for communication should be given with caring, rather than just presenting the opposite of what one is thinking.

**Summary (SS).** Overwhelmingly of the four groups, the SW seemed to identify most, and to see the most positive characteristics, in the Separate knowing quote. A rather distant second, if one were to "rank" order the other two groups, would be the SM, followed by the CM, and finally the CW, who had the most negative things to say about that style.

*When/where/with whom would you use the Separate knowing style?*

The second question asked of all the participants was "when/where/with whom" they would use the style explained in the quote. For many of the students, they instead explained when/where/with whom they would use their particular way of constructing that style, rather than the quote itself. For those students there interpretation of the style
will also be explained in order to place it in its proper context. For the sake of presenting
the data in a coherent fashion, the first two parts of this question will be addressed,
“when” and “where,” and then “with whom.”

When and where? (SW)

Separate Women (SW). Two out of ten SW commented that they would use the
Separate (S) style all the time. One woman added that, “it’s a normal attitude with
people.” Two others commented that they would do this when they “don’t agree with
(what) somebody say(s).” Others were more apt to argue. Two women would argue, “if I
believe I’m right.” One other woman remarked that if somebody didn’t believe her, it
would make her “more active to prove things.”

Proof might not be as necessary if someone felt strongly about something, “if
someone states an idea so very different from mine (and) I disagree strongly...I will, I
just will tell him, ‘Well, I don’t think so.” This student then offers an excellent quote
which demonstrates the challenge she faces in her home culture of China in being apt to
argue when she doesn’t agree.

“Several times (my husband, his classmates, mostly men, and I) usually go to lunch or
dinner and during dinner we will talk about something and (my husband and his
classmates) will, you know, say, ‘Well I think that women’s social status in China is very
high now. It is higher than it is in many other countries.’ And I will say, ‘No, I don’t
think so.’ (Laughter) ‘There are still a lot of women in China and their status in the
family is very low.’ And they will say, ‘Well give me some examples then.’ And I say,
‘No, that’s just part of it. I have many examples to prove myself.’ So my husband, well,
he is a very reserved person, Well he’s not really very talk people or something. Um,
when I go home he will say, ‘You shouldn’t do that today....’ (Laughter) ‘...to argue
with my friends or other people again. You should....’ Well he’s a, he’s a very typical
Chinese man. I mean he inherited a lot of Chinese traditional ideas. For example, ‘Don’t
argue with other people, even if you have different ideas. Keep it to yourself. Or if you
think their ideas are outrageous or absurd, just ignore them. Don’t argue with them.’
He's this kind of person, but I am not. This kind of situation happened several times, so it impressed me a lot."

It seems as if this woman uses the S style when she feels challenged or wants to express her voice. In fact, this student is trying to have the voices of other women heard, too. When she does this, however, it "costs" her, in that she is questioned by her husband and viewed as strange or different by her colleagues. In China people are not supposed to act that way, especially women.

Not everyone was as confrontational as the above case. One woman likened the Separate knowing style to a less confrontational or argumentative stance and instead saw it as sharing her opinion, which she said she would do if asked. The most common places in which these women would use the S style in the way they constructed it was in academic settings: either in the classroom or when doing a research project. They were less apt to use it with friends with the exception being the longer quote explored above.

Separate Men (SW). The separate men were also most apt to use the S style in the classroom or research setting. One man used it as a means of determining the validity of what somebody was saying to him, a stance more indicative of Separate Knowing, "So sometimes if I am pretty sure I have some, uh, objective evidence that what I believe is true, then I won't believe someone else. I believe that he has made a mistake. In this case, I won't take him...what he says for granted." Interestingly, although he won't necessarily take what this person says for granted, this student will not necessarily argue with the person. It is acceptable, however, to do something more akin to this in an "academic affair." One student offered, "in some academic dispute, I would like to...try
something similar to (the Separate style). That is not always to see the contrary. If it is related to academics...I think the (S style) is permitted.”

Two of the men commented that they would use the S style in more negative situations. One offered that he would use it “if (he didn’t) trust someone” and the other if he was in “a very, very bad mood.” This particular student had continuously argued with his brother as a child, “When I was a kid, I always argued the opposite of what my brother said...that was me and my brother’s hobby. Uh, when we were young...when we had dinner together, uh, we always quarreled...for whatever ideas he proposed I will try to...argue against it. So did he to me.” This student now has negative associations with the S style because of how it has been used against him (as was mentioned earlier).

Connected Women (SW). The Connected Women (CW) were more apt to use language such as “presenting” or “offering” their point of view, rather than arguing. These women likened the Separate style to seeing and/or presenting the contrary to someone else, rather than necessarily arguing a point, i.e., seeing the opposite and trying to argue it with a different train of logic. Three women said that they would present the contrary if they believed strongly about something. One other woman would not present the contrary unless she was sure of herself, “When I have a strong faith about what I do and what my actions are.” Interestingly, one other woman also used the word “faith;” however, it was in reference to one who might lack it in her, i.e., if one didn’t “have faith in (her) to make (her) own decisions.” In her case, this had happened with her father on many occasions.
Two other women said they would use this style (presenting the contrary stance/opinion) if they believed something or someone was wrong in what they were doing. One woman offered an example in which she had been very frustrated with her grandmother for having waited on her father and brother, but had instead of arguing presented the opposite view, "For instance, with my grandmother...she is very conservative and when I go to her house she never asks my brother or my father to do any chores...cleaning, cooking, anything...I understand why. In her time things were done a certain way, but I explain to her you think this way, but there is also this way."

This student's reason for presenting this opposite view to her grandmother was because of her being in "an equal position," presumably also a woman in a patriarchal culture. This stance seems to be motivated by a desire of this student to help her grandmother so that she is not overburdened with chores and things to do. There is also a desire for more equity and fairness. Another CW commented that she would present the contrary to friends who were down in order to point out the "brighter side." Such a positive and caring purpose was unique in the sample of 25, but could have been due to the particular way in which that student had thought of the quote. Her tone was always one of a helping attitude, rather than necessarily taking the stance of the contrarian.

As is consistent with this use of the S style, two of the women commented that they take this stance at home where they felt safe and accepted. Two others were consistent with the SW and SM in commenting that they would use it in class if they disagreed with something said. Only one person offered that she would do it also at work.
**Connected Men (SW).** The Connected men were more apt to construct this style according to the paradigm of dialogue, which is more indicative of the Connected Knowing style, in which ideas are freely offered without judgment, rather than arguments presented questioned and re-positioned. These men also offered that they would "present" or "offer" their views, even if they were different from a friend’s or colleagues, but it would be in an exchange of ideas in order to find the best way of doing things in a laboratory or project setting. The tone used, as well as the language, was one of collaboration (Connected) rather than competition (Separate). It would seem then that these men use the separate style in a connected way.

**With whom? (SWW)**

**Separate Women (SWW).** For the majority of participants, the Separate knowing style is used with people who are close to them. Six out of the seven Separate women commented that they would use the style with friends in an informal setting, such as a coffee shop or a friend’s house, or even over the Internet in a chat-room. Three of these women and one other commented that they would use this with these particular people because they were close to her and able to accept her for who she is. The additional woman felt she could use this style with her parents who accepted her for who she was. This was particularly important for these women who may not have felt validated in their knowing style and preference with people from their home culture who might judge them harshly as acting inappropriately, such as the woman illustrated above. Such a style seemed to be viewed by others as upsetting harmony, which is a central value to uphold in the cultures of the students studied.
Although close to these women, partners were also people with whom some students used this style. The reason, however, was not one of closeness; rather it seemed to stem from fighting for a voice with controlling males who were argumentative or did not validate the opinions of the women. One woman commented, "I don’t like forced by somebody else." In her particular instance she was referring to her parents who had tried to control her life and decisions.

As is consistent with the comments given above as to the venues in which the S style would be used, five students commented that they would use this style in academic settings. Two said with classmate, one with colleagues (presumably the same as classmates), and two others with teachers and/or researchers.

**Separate Men (SWW).** The SM showed similar patterns, in that they were apt to use the S style in the academic setting, as well as the family setting. Closeness was not an issue for them, however. One man implied, and another offered that they would use the S style with most people. One added with his brother (as illustrated above); however, his use seemed to be more combative and argumentative in order to get his brother riled up, rather than using it to get at the “truth.” One also included with “colleagues.”

Interestingly, one man who had had a very negative experience with people who had used the S style to hurt him in the past would only use it with people who angered him, or hurt him, “Some people that… make me feel very, very bad. If they are very… uh… very stupid or having a very high, uh, self-estimation, I would like to question their estimation by doing something like this (S style). But, uh, those kind of people are not… in the
majority, especially among my friends. Most of them are not...that kind of people, so I very, very seldom use (that style)."

Connected Women (SWW). Instead of being used to “cut down” hurtful people as in the case above, CW seemed more apt to use this style, especially arguing for something in which they believed, with their parents or people close to them. This was especially true when their parents or partners were trying to control their behavior, or when they were not listening to their needs. One woman recalled how her boyfriend had not listened to her when she had been very upset about him not breaking up with his old girlfriend who was holding him “hostage” by threatening to commit suicide if he left her. In her case, she was arguing for survival in the relationship and in having her needs met. She did not want to “fight” with him, but she saw no other way to get through to him.

On another note, two connected women also commented that they would use the S style, arguing and presenting the contrary particularly, with people who they did not like. In such instances, it was used to punish someone. For two other women, they used the style in the classroom with classmates, in a more benign way. One of these women had learned how to debate and argue in an Ethics class that she had taken. She enjoyed the learning that would come from debate in that particular setting. The other woman commented that she liked to use it with “(her) friends in the educational field...we get together and have discussions and argue.”

Connected Men (SWW). The Connected men do not seem to have the same urgency as the CW in having their voices heard and validated. Their tones are more confident, as if they feel already that their opinions are valued. These men all use the S
style in order either to find the best way of doing something in the research or classroom setting with professors or classmates, or with someone who shares an interest of theirs, also in an informal setting (as noted above). Interestingly, these men were less apt to take the “Devil’s advocate” stance and see the contrary. As was said above, they seemed more apt to use the style in a discussion and dialogue in order to further their minds and find the best solution to various problems.

**Summary (SWW).** It is important to note that the women of both groups were more apt to use the separate style in settings in which they felt compelled to argue to be heard or validated, often presenting the contrary in a heated way; whereas, the men were more apt to discuss their ideas freely and openly with little constraint. Could it be that the environments for men were more supportive of their learning than for women. This theme of development of voice is a central issue in WWK and one which will be given time to explore in the following chapter.

**What is the purpose of the Separate style? (SP)**

The S style as a means of confronting conflicting views served a variety of different purposes for the members of the four groups. The purposes are most easily organized by placing them into four categories, which were first established from the answers of the Separate women; these were either to express, prove, improve, or expand.

**Separate Women (SP).** For the SW express meant for three women to let someone know what she was thinking about a particular topic. One quote that is
indicative of this particular way of using the S style came from the same Chinese woman who had struggled for a voice amidst her husband’s friends and her husband:

“I want to talk my own ideas .... Maybe it happens that I’m not mature enough. My ideas. I mean, you’re not a very grown up person, you can’t.... Actually in China I know what it means...to be a grown up. That means don’t argue with others, always compliment and get along with others. But I know...sometimes I don’t feel...that if I...my ideas are different from others and I tell them my ideas and they tell me their ideas, I don’t think that will affect our relationship, or our friendship. I don’t think so, but my husband thinks that will. Different ideas. We are very different people (giggle). Yeah, but he is much older than me, so it’s Okay.”

For this woman, she simply wants to share her ideas with others in a free exchange with the thought that those ideas will not negatively affect the relationship, even if they might be contrary. This seems to be in opposition to the environmental “press” of her culture, especially as her husband, who is older, sees it. Nonetheless she still follows her natural inclination.

Another purpose presented for the S style is in order to prove something to someone. Only one woman, however, cited this as her purpose. In some ways, one might be able to argue that proof is also part of the motivation of the woman quoted above, especially in light of the discussion she had about women in China with Chinese men. She seems to have something to prove, especially motivated by the desire to give Chinese women a more definite voice.

For two other women the S style was a means by which they could learn more about a particular topic and improve their knowledge base. For these two women, the S style seemed to be the way they learned best. One woman appreciated how taking the contrary position and arguing for it helped her to argue for her point of view. Another
likened it to “search(ing) for the truth.” She added that it was important “to be nearly as objective as (she could) be,” but added, “it’s so hard to get close to objective.”

The S style was finally cited as a means of presenting a new and different view to others, i.e., a way for them to expand their knowledge and understanding. Only one SW explained it according to this value, which from her seemed to be altruistic. One other woman expressed that she would use the style to offer advice to someone about whom she cared. She recognized, however, that this might be viewed negatively, “I will do it for (a friend) even if she may get mad.” This is a risk worth taking to her, “But I don’t think that she will be mad at me for a long time.” One woman, however, did not wish to maintain the relationship in opposition. She instead expressed that she would use the S style to express disagreement with someone because of not liking them.

The purposes for these students was to express their opinions and values about different topics as a way of sharing their ideas, of proving their ideas to some opposing forces, or a way to expand knowledge and continue to be as objective as possible. For some, it was the way in which they learned best.

Separate Men (SP). The Separate men showed similar patterns; however, their answers only fell into the categories of expressing and improving knowledge/ideas. Two men shared that they used the S style in order to express their ideas and opinions, “I’m just stating what am I thinking in my head.” One man wished also to hear what others think. This seems to relate directly to the purpose of improving knowledge, which was given by the other three men. One man remarked that the purpose for him was “to find some exceptions so you can get new discovery…to find the real truth—not just follow
somebody.” This student especially wanted to be different and not to conform to any societal rules. One other student added that the S style could be “(the) kind of personality (which)...may be constructive for people to become more creative, and...less restrained.” This student in particular recognizes the particular virtues of such a procedure for inquiry and seeking “the truth,” whatever that may be.

One SM in a very sarcastic tone offered how one might use the S style; however, his response is peppered with anger that has grown from negative experiences with such people in the past (as has been demonstrated thus far). He relays that this style is “to show (“those people that have very ambitious...whatever occupation they are in”) has a very big ego and he only trust himself...He will be sort of self-satisfied with his ego to show that he is an important man.” There is no recognition of the virtues of such a style, only its vices.

Connected Women (SP). To the majority of the Connected women, the S style and/or strategy was a means by which they could have theirs or others voices heard. For four women it was a way to persuade others of a different side from their own, very much akin to the category of proving that existed in the SW and SM. One woman uses this persuasion as a procedure in class in order to win. She puts it this way, “(I) support my ideas...with...as much evidence I have which I found from books and journals, so that I can win.” One other woman uses it to challenge someone who believes something with which she disagrees. The third expresses her use as a means of “making” someone understand her, “I wanted to make him understand what I was feeling.” And then
I...um...thought he did. I mean it's obvious that I was so sad that he was with his ex-girlfriend...and I mean everybody can see that I am really...mad about it.”

The other most common purpose in the CW group was to use the S style in order to expand someone's understanding or view. One woman, who was quoted earlier, used it as a means of expanding her grandmother's conception of gender roles in the home, in that she wanted her grandmother to know that her father and brother should be helping with house chores rather than the grandmother doing it all. One other woman uses it as a way of offering the opposite view in order to defend people about whom she cares. The last woman uses it to present the opposite side that is optimistic in order to help someone to feel better. In this instance, it is not opposing someone per se; it is instead offering an alternative in order to expand someone's picture, view or conception of a given issue.

In opposition to this altruistic and caring reason was two women who used the S style as a way of hurting someone and being mean to them. As in the case offered above in the student whose boyfriend was not listening to her pleads for him to break up with his ex-girlfriend, this woman expressed her desire not to be mean, but her feeling in having no other choice to get him to listen to her needs. The other woman used it to express her disagreement with people she didn’t like.

Connected Men (SP). Interestingly, although the Connected men also use the S style in order to express, improve, and prove their ideas and opinions, they do not seem to struggle to be heard as their female counterparts do. These men use the S style in order to share their thinking; not necessarily to fight for a voice that is being muted by those who will not listen. One man, who had a very optimistic attitude, shared, “I’m just curious
about human nature, about the nature of Nature.” He loves to learn and share his ideas with others in discussions, “If I don’t give out opinion and keep on using what...others are say, or just follow the book, sometimes it may take longer than what we expected....If I want people to just try to get a...better understanding of what that particular idea is, that’s when I use (this style).” To him, this is a fun endeavor, rather than a fight for survival, as was the case for the woman who would not be heard by her boyfriend.

Is it hard to argue, why or why not? (SWH)

Since an important element of the S style is an ability to “argue,” the next question asked if participants felt that it was hard to argue. Answers varied and reasons varied even more. Some answers help to shed light on some of the ways in which individuals shape and construct their knowing styles.

Separate Women (SWH). None of the Separate women said that it was hard to argue when asked; however, one women shared, “It’s hard for me to argue in language, because you are using in language it usually involves some kind of emotion, which is the part I don’t like. I like to write. If I want to argue with someone, I will write.” Her particular means of writing is to correspond with “pen pals” over the Internet. This may give her a way to distance herself from the difficult emotions that come from using language.

One woman shared that it was not hard for her to argue, but that it was getting hard on her, “If I really want to argue with that person, then I will really try to find all the resources that I can to argue with them....So I don’t hink it’s hard for me argument, it’s
just like, if you like to or you don't...I think I'm getting tired of argue.” For this student she feels that she and her husband argue too much. She wishes not to do that so much so that they will be a “happier family.” For this student, she likens happiness to harmony and lack of disagreement. Although she likes to argue, she sees how it can sometimes give her trouble.

Although the Separate women would think of the opposite of someone else, and see a different train of logic, they did not necessarily embrace argument. One student offered, “I mean sometimes it's good to think of a different train of logic, but, um, I don't think arguing is a good thing.” In her way of thinking about and using Separate knowing as a procedure and way of making meaning, argument with others is not central; whereas seeing the opposite side of something is. She, as well as others, chooses not to express that opposition outwardly.

Separate Men (SWH). The Separate men also feel by and large that it is not hard to argue. Only one man said that it was and his reason was also based on language as a barrier. For him, however, it was the problem of not feeling completely fluent in a second language, “If I want to argue, I can always argue, but in Chinese, not in English. I have some difficulty in expression, but if I want to argue I can.”

Connected Women (SWH). For the Connected knowers it is not as easy. Six out of the ten Connected women said that it was indeed hard to argue and the other four expressed that it was sometimes difficult. None of these women said “No, it’s not hard to argue,” as was almost unanimous for both the female and male separate knowers.

Reasons for why arguing was difficult for these students fell into four categories. The
first was a matter of procedural issues. These women did not feel confident in their ability to analyze an argument or persuade others of a particular point of view. One woman expressed this sentiment succinctly, “I cannot find the other person’s weak point...I cannot say what the logic, uh, what’s wrong with the logic.” These women felt sometimes that they didn’t know “what’s right and what’s wrong.”

Two other women had trouble arguing because they had difficulty in expressing themselves. One woman shared that it was hard for her to “make someone understand” her feeling when they were against her. This person, as well as another, tended to “shut up” when in an argument with someone, even if she didn’t like the other person’s idea, or felt that it was wrong.

This silence may in part be due to fear of punishment or rejection, i.e., a threat to their connection to others. Two women expressed this beautifully. One shared, “I’m afraid...If I say something the other person may think bad about me.” For this student it is of the utmost importance that she be accepted, such that she will not express her opinion if it is opposition in order not to upset the person or in any way harm the relationship. Another woman told us that she was afraid of being yelled at, so she stayed quiet.

Harmony was a reason for silence or difficulty in arguing given by two other students. One remarked, “I think I prefer a quiet and friendly way.” This kind of harmony was not always necessarily just an internal value, but one which had been conditioned through education and social encounter in their home countries. Two of the most powerful and telling quotes came from women who shared their difficulty and
related it to their own conditioning. One Japanese woman felt that part of her difficulty was the way she had been brought up in Japan:

"I am from Japan and like all the schools in Japan, we are not supposed to say our opinion. We just listen to the teacher and take the notes....if I raise my hand and say 'I am against you' to teacher, oh my God, I would be kicked out of school. So like....I don't know maybe it could be I'm still in Japanese culture, like I can't say my opinion when it's different from others' opinions, because I'm afraid that many people are against it....and for this, it could also be Japanese culture....The Japanese tend to believe everything. We can trust each other like, you know, even though when we first meet someone.....We never are suspicious about someone unless they look really bad, or something. So I also believe for people's opinion take it as advice in a good way."

Another woman, however, seemed to be able to overcome this conditioning and preferred the new way instead, "I'm not quite, like, outspoken, vocal type of person, so I kind of feel intimidated what I think, you know. I also think that comes from my cultural background, because in Korea people usually do not argue in class, and then students just get the information from instructors. Then if they say something like against, you now, from the professor's idea, it's kind of, you know, awkward, you know? I like here, the American Education System, because I can tell my ideas clearly and you know I can argue whenever I feel like it."

Although some women have been able to overcome the conditioning that has kept them silent, for others (as was the case with one of the Separate men) the language barrier poses a peculiar problem. One woman remarked, "If I'm in class then it might be hard (to argue) because I am not a native speaker, so I have to be careful and I may not always have the words."

These students, who have either been silenced by their conditioning, their own self-doubt and lack of empowerment, or difficulty with the language, are unable to
participate in the classroom debate, which has been one of the hallmarks of the American higher education system for over three centuries, starting with the disputation at Harvard College in the 17th Century (Cremin, 1997).

**Connected Men (SWH).** It's very intriguing that the Connected men did not face the same difficulties as the Connected women, nor did they associate any difficulty in arguing. None of the men, however small a group they may have been (three), felt that it was difficult to argue. Only one said sometimes and the reason given was a matter of him sometimes lacking confidence in his ability to determine what is “right,” “I get the feeling of this might be wrong but you cannot exactly say where it is wrong, or what is wrong, then I just try not to give up that until I really know what I really wanted to say, or what I really know where is wrong with it.” There is no fear of retribution or rejection as was the case with the women. The language these two groups use is often starkly different. For the three men it is optimistic and probing; whereas the women share self-doubt, frustration and they struggle for a voice.

*When/where/with whom would you not use the Separate style? (SWN)*

The Separate style of knowing as a means of confronting difference is not always the strategy employed by the students interviewed for this study. For all four groups there were occasions, locations, and people with whom they would not use the Separate style. Interestingly, either not all of the participants were asked this questions or not all of them answered it; however, the responses were still telling.
Separate Women (SWN). For several of the separate women much of their motivation for not using the S style was to maintain harmony between themselves and others. A little more than half (four out of seven) of the Separate women answered the question, “When would you not use the (Separate knowing style)? One woman answered that she would not necessarily argue if would hurt someone. In this instance she would be more apt to sit and listen to the person, although she might think of the opposite of what was proposed or said. Another woman shared that she would refrain from using the S style “when the situation is already very, very bad,” presumably in order not to make it worse. Another would not want to upset people who had opinions about their own lives and preferences.

These answers are consistent with the responses given by five out of seven of the separate women as to the people with whom they would not use the S style and where that might be. Overwhelmingly these women would not use it with people who they either respected or feared. The most common answer was a professor or teacher in a school. Four out of the five would do it mostly out of respect for the professor’s status, authority and expertise. One woman, however, commented that she would not argue out of fear of being penalized with a low grade for having argued. As was demonstrated above, for many of these student such opposition in the classroom would be punished by teachers in their home countries.

Two women said they would not use it with their supervisor or boss in the workplace. One woman’s reason was out of wanting to avoid conflict (maintaining harmony) and the other would show deference to those who had power over her, possibly
out of a similar fear to the wrath of an authority figure. One woman commented that she would not use the style with a very dominant person such as this, “If he is extremely dominant, you can never change his or her thought... I would just follow what he thinks and never question him. Because if you question it, it just makes the situation so complicated, and I don’t want to deal with such kind of thing.”

There were several other answers that grew out of a desire to demonstrate respect to people in either public or formal situations. One woman would not use it with friend’s parents, who she respected and did not want to upset. Two others would not use it with strangers, because it would show no manners. Interestingly, another woman commented that she would not use the S style with people she does not know or doesn’t care about talking with. This type of “stranger” is not one to be treated with respect, but out of indifference and disinterest, if anything.

One woman would also not use it with someone she admired, partly out of respect, but more because she would adopt that person’s standpoint as her own, absorbing their thoughts into hers, “I will just naturally, um, change my own ideas (to those of someone I admire).” The people she admires most are those who have accomplished something that was very difficult to accomplish.

Maintaining harmony seemed to be a major motivation for refraining from using the S style. One woman added that she would not use the S style when it involved other people’s lives or preferences. She wanted to respect their particular desires and needs. The last woman gave a more obvious answer, but still one to note. Her response was not to use the S style if she didn’t think the person was wrong or if she were in a good mood.
This woman, in particular, had remarked earlier that she would use the S style if she were in a bad mood, so this comment is consistent.

Separate Men (SWN). The Separate men echoed many of the same concerns and reasons as their female counterparts. In fact, one man also commented that he would not use the S style if he were in what he termed a “normal” mood, “Usually if I am in a normal mood, uh psycholo...I mean, uh, if I, uh, if I am not very overwhelmed with something that make me very nervous, then I will not do this.” One other man seemed to be responding to the Separate woman who had commented that she would not use it if things were bad. For him it would be “useless to argue” if a “person is not reasonable.”

Instead of responding to a threatening adversary, one man simply stated that he would not argue or try to find a different train of logic “on a topic I don’t know,” if he is not paying attention, or if he doesn’t care about what is being said. Unfortunately the opportunity to follow-up on this thought was not taken, but we might be able to presume that in situations in which this individual feels invested or interested he would employ the S strategy naturally.

Separate men would also not use the S style with people who they respected. Interestingly, not one single man of this group commented that he would not use it with a professor or teacher, as was so common with the Separate women. This could be explained in part by the fact that the majority of them shared earlier that they would use the S style in the academic arena, either the classroom or research laboratory. Only one man commented that he would not do it in the school lecture, but his reason was that “it
would take too much work,” meaning that it would take too much effort to argue in a lecture hall of 300 people.

Instead, three out of the five men would not use it with their parents. One man explained that he would always listen when his mother gave advice to him. He commented that she had always given good advice in the past, “My mother says something, I will agree with what she says is true. I will always believe what she says.” Another man will not use the S style with his father when he is arguing. This may be partly out of respect and partly out of fear, “I don’t probably (argue) if my father said something not too bad, not too wrong. I won’t stand up and oppose him. I won’t do that.” It’s possible that this student would be apt to argue, even with his father, if he felt strongly about something, but his answer was not further probed.

Separate men also commented that they would not use the S style with close friends or people they liked. One man commented that he would not always “correct” his close friends, even if he disagreed with them. Another commented that he would not use the S style if he thought the person was believable. In such a situation he would take what they said for granted. One other man added that he would not argue with someone who is nice or someone with whom he is interested, i.e., “with a girl that I want to pursue.”

As was the case with the Separate women, one man also remarked that he would not use the S style with someone he either did not like, or did not care about. Such a parallel between the groups is one to note since it implies that Separate knowers would be more apt to use their preferred style with people who are familiar and who they like.
**Connected Women (SWN).** Connected knowers did not share the same fondness for the Separate knowing style, as was demonstrated earlier; however, many of their reasons for not using the S style were similar to those given by the Separate knowers, especially the women. Reasons for not using the S style revolved almost entirely around the desire to maintain harmony and show respect. Exactly half of the women (five out of ten) would not use the S style, especially arguing and pointing out the contrary, to those who they respected or feared. As was the case with the Separate women, the most common people who would be shown this deference were professors or teacher (three of the five). One woman commented that she would not argue with the professor because of his expertise in his field, “because he’s smart.”

The higher social status of a professor was the motivation behind the decision of one woman (similar to the SW), “someone official like a professor, then maybe I wouldn’t (use the S style).... Maybe because our relationship is not equal like with my grandmother... we’re in a more equal positions to say something to her.” Possibly it seems acceptable for this student to present the contrary to her grandmother because she is also a woman in a patriarchal society. One woman also commented that she would not argue with a professor she did not know well (a stranger of sorts), “if I’ve never taken his/her class before.” No reason, however, is given. It could be out of fear or respect, but this unfortunately is not clear.

Other people who were deserving of respect included those in the workplace and family at home, both consistent with the Separate knowers. One woman commented that she would not be inclined to argue with her supervisor at work because of not wanting to
bother and involve other people. As was the case with a Separate male, one student commented that she would always listen when her mother gave her advice, something she valued and appreciated. Another woman appreciated the advice of her brothers, who she felt always had her best interests in mind. However, as was the case with the SW, motivation for not arguing might be out of fear. This was the case for one woman who would sit quietly and listen when her father was giving advice.

Other people with whom these students would not argue were either older people or friends. One woman would not argue with older people, because "(she) would not want to hurt them." Such a fear of hurting someone was also demonstrated by one of the SW above. One student commented that she would not use the Separate knowing style in "daily life," as opposed to "classroom (academic) life." One woman commented that she would not use it with friends in conversation, and another added that she would not argue with "nice people," even if their opinion is totally wrong. Although rather judgmental, this comment also demonstrates a desire for harmony and respect, which was consistently the case for the Connected women.

**Connected Men (SWN).** The Connected men also answered consistently (three out of three: 100%) that they would not argue the contrary with people out of either respect or deference to their higher social status, due to greater knowledge and expertise. Two commented that professors are more intelligent and have more ideas, "Someone with more experience in a certain field....People with more reputation, with more experience tend to be in higher position." This greater expertise can also be present in a peer. One man shared that he would not necessarily argue with a peer who is presenting a
paper, "I'm not going to give out an opinion while (someone) is presenting (a paper, for example). I'm just going to simply agree with what he's done because he knows more about it (than me)." As was the case for the other three groups, the other people with whom these men would not use the S style were either people at work, especially a supervisor, and with an older person who is respected.

**Summary.** Interestingly, the Separate men were the only group who was not motivated not to use the S style out of fear of punishment. Both groups of women were very clear on that as a factor. For some of the Separate women it was fear of punishment from a professor or teacher, and for the Connected women, fear a male parent. Even the one Separate man who had been fearful of his father implied that he would argue if he felt strongly about something. Could this fear that the women felt, regardless of their particular knowing style, be due to behavior that is indicative of the S style, such as arguing and taking the contrary view, in females being frowned upon in the students' cultures? This will be investigated more at length in the next chapter.

*Have there been people who have used the Separate style with you? How did you feel about that? (SFA)*

The next question that was asked of all participants concerned if they had ever had the Separate knowing style, as defined by the quote in the Interview protocol (See Appendix A), used by someone else towards them and how they felt about it. Answers varied; however, by and large everyone had experienced someone having used that style with them. Responses ranged from the very positive to the very negative, depending on
the circumstances of the situation, the ways in which the S style was used, and the student’s own feelings towards the S strategy.

**Separate Women (SFA).** All of the Separate women had had the S style used with them. This had happened in a variety of places, but mainly in the academic setting or at home. One woman had had her project partner present the opposite view and had appreciated the helpful feedback, “If I am doing a project and I need some like people’s opinion, then I will really love this kind of person to discuss and they always give me a new ideas, everything.” One other woman commented, “I think that (style) made me see things differently...sometimes, yeah.”

In the home, for many of these women the S style was not associated with the same endeavor of inquiry and discovery as was the case for these students with their project partners; instead, the S style seemed to be more associated with fighting for a voice and self-agency when women felt controlled, mostly by their parents/guardians and boyfriends/husbands (no mention of other partners). Interestingly, they especially associated such struggles with growing up as teen-agers when their parents wanted them to behave in precriptive ways that were contrary to the desires and wishes of the students interviewed. One student spoke of how she got “mad about it (and)...felt uneasy” when someone argued about a topic about which she felt strongly, i.e., whether or not she should date. One woman reacted, “I hate it,” especially when the other person argues for the sake of disagreeing without listening to her side.

Some women would react to being treated this way by arguing and yelling at their parents. This was illustrated by several students. One, however, had learned that
such a way of handling the situation was not best. Her quote is excellent in
demonstrating how these women as they have grown older have re-shaped some of their
inclinations in order to avoid conflict and treat people more as they would want to be
treated: “I used to feel really bad...and whenever people treat me like this, I will treat
them back. But then I feel it’s so stupid to do the same things to them. I mean, must
invokes many emotions and just too long a situation, so I learned to make compromises
as I got older.”

The Separate women did not always react negatively to opposing views or
arguments; however, it was important for this to be done out of caring and respect, rather
than the person being demanding, offensive, or loud. One woman puts it like this, “If
(my parents) have some good reason (for their disagreement with me), yeah, probably I
will say...I will not say I just accept them, but I will listen to their reason...why and
compare with mine....And make a compromise, maybe.”

**Separate Men (SFA)**. Separate men also had had a variety of positive and
negative experiences in people using the S style with them. Four out of the five men
answered that they had been treated that way, with the one outlier having not been asked
the question. Positive responses seemed to revolve entirely around academic pursuits.
The two men who responded positively felt that it the S style was necessary for research.
One remarked, “If one always takes someone else says for granted, then he cannot
actually gain some new insight into things. I think the most important point in doing
scientific research is to always, uh, try to argue with other people’s opinion. Doing
Scientific research, if you don’t learn that, then you cannot actually...do any contribution
to the field, I think." Another man echoed this sentiment in saying, "I enjoy it....You can learn a lot from people like (that)."

The remainder of SM had had negative experiences either with family or roommates. One student illustrated how his roommate back in China had used this style and had made him feel. It is worth quoting the entire passage in order to put it into its cultural context, as well.

"Back in my country—in China, uh, the word ‘roommate’ is still in its original meaning.—that is ‘living in the same room.’ Here in America, ‘roommate’ is already living separately. It’s rather ‘apartment mate,’ not ‘roommate.’ But in China, in college, we have one room and, uh, six people live in China in one room....OK, uh, it is, uh, the...the...the usual size of...of a bedroom—a little bigger than that to pack three double-level beds...together....So it was very bad and, uh, especially what happened to me among my five roommates. Two of them, uh, were this type (S style), so they made me feel very, very bad....I just felt very disgust with them, so I didn’t have a good relationship with them. For the other two people I had a very good relationship, but of the other three people—those two people—I tended to, uh, shut away from them, although living in the same room....I tended to avoid any deep talk, uh, with them. Avoid any discussion in that...because I did not want to go into something in depth that would be severe dispute."

This student, who has been permanently changed by this experience, associates the S style with conflict, dispute and difficulty in communicating and living together with his roommates—a very negative experience for him. One other man, who had had the style used against him at home, was "not happy about that" style because it had excluded so many different opinions. To him, it was important to have the different opinions within the family heard.

Connected Women (SFA). Almost all of the Connected women (nine out of ten) had had someone use the S style with them. Only one woman commented, "I don’t think (someone has used it with me)." The majority of these women (seven out of nine) had
had an even more negative experience of people using the S style with, and/or against, them than the Separate women and men. By and large these women felt undervalued and unheard. They often felt that others thought their opinions were wrong. This made three of the seven women very angry, “It doesn’t work well. I think it make the other person angry.” This was especially true of controlling men, such as one woman’s father, who wouldn’t listen to her side, “I feel like my opinion is wrong,” and another woman’s boyfriend, who had ignored her in a crisis situation that was very important to her (i.e., the same example of the boyfriend who would not break up with his ex-girlfriend, as given above), “Whatever I was saying didn’t mean anything.”

Interestingly, seven out of the ten women also commented that they had had more positive experiences with friends presenting opposite views to them. In all of these situations they seemed never to feel forced to adopt the belief of a friend, nor did they feel undervalued. Several of these women took this as advice from their friends. One commented, “I am not a self-centered person, so I can accept everything very easily.” Other women might have friends argue with them, but they didn’t seem to associate it in such a negative way, as long as it was done out of caring (as was mentioned above).

It’s important to note that these friends were almost entirely women; whereas the majority of the men who were close in their lives were more domineering and controlling and associated more negatively when using the S style. One woman, in particular, shared a way to deal with the discomfort and frustration she felt in such situations. She expresses to the person that others might not like being told the contrary. She seems to use this as an opportunity to teach others how not to hurt people.
Only two women associated the S style with having been done with them in the classroom. Their interpretation was more of it as a procedure of inquiry. For one woman, mentioned earlier, she had learned and come to appreciate the S style in an Ethics course. She now commonly used it in Communications classes, her major.

**Connected Men (SFA).** Unlike the Connected women, 100% of the Connected men (three out of three) relay only positive feelings towards others who have used the S style with them. Two students commented that they could learn a lot from such people. Even in the home, when someone, especially a parent, offered the contrary view or argued the opposite of what they were saying, it was not taken in a hurtful way. One student put it like this, “(with parents) I really going to listen really hard, really carefully of what they are say, because they are more experienced with that, with about a career, or for college or for higher education. So I just listen carefully.” One student who had had a very argumentative roommate back in China, similar to the Separate man quoted above, seemed to enjoy the process of debate that they regularly engaged in (unlike his Separate counterpart above).

Although the Connected men had positive things to say about the S style in relationship to others using it with them, one student was very insightful in recognizing that it might be difficult for someone to be criticized or questioned. Taking criticism had become easier for him with age, “Sometimes critiques or arguments are a hard pill to swallow at the moment. When you go back, you get out of a situation for awhile, you take time to think about it you may not be totally right. The other person may not be totally wrong. The next time we meet I will probably tell the person what I think. I think
this idea grows with age and that this idea changes over time. When I am younger I may be angry and I may not think about it, but when you think about it and as you interact with more people your thoughts change."

Use of Separate Knowing style (SUse)

The Separate knowing style for all four groups is interpreted in a variety of ways. Thus far we have investigated in depth the situations in which both men and women of separate and connected knowing styles would or would not use the S style, the people with whom they would or would not use it, and the places in which this would occur. We have also looked at their perceptions of the S style in relationship to themselves. At this point it would be very useful to organize the patterns of S Use for each of the two major groups, Separate or Connected knowers and females or males, in order to appreciate how its members construct and practice the Separate knowing style in their own lives.

Separate Knowers (SUse). Nearly half of the Separate knowers (three out of seven women and two out of five men) use the Separate knowing style internally, but do not express it externally. The majority of these students do not wish to upset harmony between themselves and others through conflict and arguing. One example of this particular style was articulated by a Korean man, who said that he might not take what others say for granted; however, he would not choose to challenge them publicly for fear of upsetting them or damaging his relationship with them.

Both a Separate woman and a Separate man spoke of being inclined only to use the S style with Chinese friends, because they struggle with the English language in the
U.S. The woman shared, “I think due to my culture (US students) might have a different view from mine so I don’t want to alarm (them).” She seems to wish for everything to go smoothly in her host culture.

The Separate knowing style may also be used by the Separate knowers in academic settings. Several of the men and women use the S style in order to learn more and expand their knowledge in the classroom and research lab; however, many feel that it is inappropriate to use the S style in a social or personal setting. One male student, as has been said, had an indelible negative impression made on him because of a pair of Chinese roommates who had constantly challenged him. Interestingly, he was the only male (separate or connected) to liken the S style to something negative. Hence, the males by and large associated the Separate knowing style with something positive. The separate women, on the other hand, did not always feel the same way, nor did the connected women (which we will explore shortly). One S woman enjoyed it as a means of sharing ideas and thought, but she didn’t like when people argued for the sake of arguing. This woman, in particular, as well as another Separate man, very much liked to challenge people and make them think.

It is important to note that some of both Separate men and women were critical of the wording of the Separate knowing quote in relationship to their own way of using the S style. In all instances the words seemed too strong for them. One woman did not like or really understand the phrase “play the devil’s advocate.” She likened it to “playing the devil,” which was a problem for her since she very strongly identified herself as Christian, a religious tradition very much opposed to the Devil as a figure of evil, rather
than a "devil's advocate," or one who takes the opposite stand and argues it. She thinks that it is important to challenge people, but not to just argue the opposite: "Society sometimes needs some different thoughts, different thoughts than here—'thinking of a different train of logic.' Actually...I like people to have a different thinking, that makes it interesting....the basic idea of doing this is not to show other people that you are just so good at arguing and you can just win all the time, or something like that." This student does not like arguing, but she does enjoy the process of learning and challenging in order to learn. Being hurtful or arguing for the sake of argument is unacceptable, though.

One of the Separate men is critical of some of the severity of the language in the quote, "The description of (the S quote) is too strong, 'I just never...I just tend to...' So it is too strong, I think. So, I would like to behave in a...more modest mind. Only for academic affairs, not for social context. I think it is very destructive to social context, but...it may bring up some creativity...as far as academics is concerned." For this student, as well as others, there are appropriate places to use the S style outwardly and there are inappropriate places. This seems also to be motivated in part by the desire to maintain harmony.

Connected Knowers (SUse). The Connected knowers also wished to maintain harmony; however, as has been noted the men by and large had very few, if any, negative comments about the Separate knowing style. They, as well as two of the women, used the S style as a procedure to develop more knowledge and learn from those around them. None of the men, however, seemed to take it personally or harshly when people used it with them. Some of the Connected women, on the other hand, seemed to have had a
variety of negative experiences with people who had sought to control them, especially men in their lives (such as fathers and partners). One woman associated the S style with “fighting” with others, especially people she doesn’t like. Although she often disagrees with people, especially those who are dominant, she often keeps quiet.

Connected men and women illustrate their use of the S style in more of a Connected way; for example, four out of the ten women prefer to share their opinions with friends and people who are close to them, rather than necessarily debating and/or arguing with them. One woman expressed her pride when a friend came to her for advice. She may offer the opposite of what the friend is thinking, but it is out of care and the desire to help the friend “look on the brighter side.”

One of the Connected men illustrates a similar example, but in the academic setting instead. He too likes to share and compare ideas in order to come up with the “best” solution; however, it is never done to be hurtful or competitive:

“It’s better to look at the other side...and if there something that may be portion of what the person said is different from what I think, then I may be able to give them what I feel, and it may be good or it may be that he also disagree with it.....When you’re trying to compare the difference of thinking, or...try to come up with ideas, this is a good way to do it....(This must be done in a caring way, not just) try to keep on giving the opposite without caring or anything, then that’s unacceptable....just try to figure out the opposite is just trying not understand and feel like I’m trying to understand what their opinion is.”

One man responds in a very similar way, but shares instead the importance of taking into account the particular cultural issues one brings into sharing their opinion and thoughts, etc.

“The way I see arguing is to exchange ideas, not to just disagree with what you said. I will give you a reason (for my opinion).....(I might bring up a different logic in order to explore cultural assumptions made, for example, and come to a compromise) People from different backgrounds probably have different...they have different opinions because of their religion, whatever they have been taught, whatever environment they have been in.
That may not be acceptable to others but it is what they have been taught. To be understood by other people, like understanding their thinking."

The Separate knowing style can also be used as a procedure learned in a given setting. For one Separate woman, the style learned in an Ethics class has affected the way she functions in the academic setting. She now feels comfortable in using debate in class, "I took Ethics class...and we argue about, like, different topics, like, one was about like abortion, like, you know, two different points. So that time, when I was taking that class, I think, like, we were divided into two teams and we had to support our, you know, our positions and try to attack, you know, the other, you know, team’s position. In that class I think I had to argue a lot.” One woman explained that she would sometimes use a similar style outside of the classroom, i.e., pointing out the differences and “possibly backing them up with some proof (something she had experienced or heard).”

Interestingly, two of the ten Connected women said that they would think of the opposite but would not express it, as was said earlier of the Separate women and men. “I think (of the opposite), but I accept most opinions.” One woman put it this way, “In my mind maybe I will see the contrary,” but she will not argue with someone.

It is very interesting to note that out of the four groups, women of both knowing styles seem to be struggling the most for a voice and a way to express their natural knowing style. As has been noted, this can be in part due to a cultural press that is not supportive of the Separate knowing women. One of these women, however, recognizes that her Separate style is a part of her that is innate in who she is, even though her husband and his friends sometimes make her feel awkward about it. Her cultural conditioning has been to dissuade her from using this, especially in arguing the opposite
of what others are saying. She has experienced ridicule because of it, especially since her husband, who is older than she, told that it was inappropriate to act that way. Her natural preference has not been validated; rather, she has had to fight to keep it and maintain a voice. Because of that, she will not always use the style unless she thinks that a decision will have a negative effect on someone about whom she cares. To this student, however, she has been “made” this way. Below is a wonderful quote about how she feels that the S style is something innate within her:

“I think this is the true me and (the C style) is the social me....If I don’t have any education, or if I am still a person and you put me back in some forest or some wild environment, don’t let me interact with the civilized society and don’t interact with human beings, with people, and not be involved in any relationships, I think I would do (the S style). Yeah, but my education, what I learned from the books, from the classroom lessons taught me that (the C style) will keep you from getting hurt.”

The men, on the other hand, seemed to struggle much less with having their natural preferences validated. Only the Connected men, who had had a negative experience with argumentative roommates in China, attributed negative characteristics to the S style. Missing entirely was the fight for a voice that seemed to be a serious struggle for many of the women, Separate and Connected alike. The men felt instead free to express their own preference, whether that be a separate or connected orientation. Interestingly, however, both groups valued harmony and understood that the S style could be used in a hurtful way.
Connected Knowing

“When I have an idea about something, and it differs from the way another person is thinking about it, I’ll usually try to look at it from that person’s point of view, see how they could say that, why they think that they’re right, and why it makes sense.”

As was the case with the Separate knowing quote, all participants were asked to reflect on the ways in which they would or would not use the above strategy. For the purpose of this section, the answers of the Connected women and men will be presented followed by those of the Separate women and men. Overwhelmingly all four groups, regardless of gender or knowing style, perceived Connected knowing as a strategy in far more positive terms than the Separate knowing quote.

How does the Connected knowing quote strike you? (CS)

Connected Women (CS). The first question asked of the participants was how the quote “struck” them, or how it made them feel. There were 100% (ten out of ten) of the Connected women who viewed it as positive, either as something to aspire to or, more likely, something that was natural to them. There were six out ten of the women who reacted emphatically, “This is me!” or “I often do this.” One student summed up the thoughts and feelings of her peers in saying, “Yeah, I will, you know, stand at (someone’s) position to look at this thing. And I think that I can feel better.” Two of the other women commented that this particular style was “not aggressive (like the S style).” Such a “person is very reasonable” in their opinions.
The remaining two women explained that they tried to live according to this style, but sometimes fell short. One woman put it plainly, "I try to do this." But, she appreciates that she does not always succeed. In stark contrast to the negative attributes given to the Separate knowing quote, all of these women felt very comfortable with, and liked, what the Connected knowing quote represented to them.

Connected Men (CS). Connected men reacted almost identically to their female counterparts. Two of the three men reacted, "this is me;" however, interestingly they qualified this by adding that they do this "90% of the time" and "98% of the time," respectively. The other man commented, "I think this is a good idea." The only thing of note is that these men seem to be making more of an evaluation than a personal reaction, as was immediately apparent with the women.

Separate Women (CS). For female Separate knowers the Connected knowing quote was seen almost entirely as positive and something they would do, or like to do. There were four out of the seven women who commented either that this is something they do or something they would like to do. One woman remarked, "I try to be it all the time." One other woman commented that "this is a good habit."

Although many of the women wished to behave this way, one woman recognized that she does not use it, even though it is the way she has been taught, "I always been taught this way...this is a good habit, but I don’t feel that I have enough time to stand on the other person’s view and ask them why they think this way. It’s very bad. I know it’s very bad, but I just don’t do it." Another woman commented, as was said above, that her first inclination was to question someone, but she would not necessarily articulate it out.
loud. This could be in part due to the desire to show respect and maintain harmony, as was explored above.

Interestingly, the Connected knowing style, which was seen as “more optimistic” and “more gentle” than the Separate style, was likened by some women to something that an older and presumably more wise person might be apt to do. One student commented that she herself has begun to adopt this style as she gets older, “As I am getting older now I am learning this thing at first time.”

Separate Men (CS). The Separate men reacted in much the same way as their female counterparts. Four out of five men commented that they either usually use, or would like to use, this type of strategy. One man felt that this strategy made “more sense” to him. Another man, however, recognized that he did not always achieve this ideal, “That is something I would like to have, but I cannot, uh, behave like it constantly (consistently).”

The Connected knowing style, according to the Interview quote, was also viewed as a good way to treat people. One man shared, “I think that’s a good way...to cope with somebody.” In a similar way to the Separate women, another added that as he is getting older he is trying to put himself “in others’ shoes” more. This is seen as “a good habit” by several of these men. Someone who used the C style was seen as someone who would be popular and well-liked by others, “I think...people like this would be very popular...would be very considerate, and uh...they will have a lot of friends because they can understand other people better.” Therefore, for these Separate men the Connected
knowing style may not necessarily be natural, but as they get older they are learning to use it more and more, especially in social situations.

Only one negative comment was made in relation to this quote, which related it to something more common in children than wiser adults. Instead of being seen as a way to treat people and be well-liked, it was seen as indicative of someone who was overly dependent on others. This is an interesting contrast to the above quotes, “Usually I will...make decision only by myself. I wouldn’t consider others’ suggestions....(I) probably (did this) when I was young, probably, I am pretty concerned with my parents’ opinion if I do something, because usually when I was young they would control my behavior, sometimes. But now I think, uh, I am a really great student, so usually I don’t mind so much that I away from my parents.” This style is seen as a weak trait by someone who prides himself on his independence. Of all of the participants, only this student had anything negative to say about the Connected knowing style.

When/where/with whom would you use the Connected knowing style? (CW)

**Connected Women (CW).** All participants were next asked the circumstances in which they would use the C style, where that would be, and with whom. There were five out of ten of the Connected women who either implied or stated explicitly that they would do this all of the time or “almost all of the time.” Three of them specified that it would be when “talking with friends (in a conversation)” about a variety of topics. Some examples given were when talking about marriage and finding a good partner, or in order to, in general, understand a friend’s opinion.
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There were three students who also remarked that they would use the Connected knowing style in class or another academic setting. Another said that she would use it as a Teaching Assistant for a class she instructs. As a student, four out of the ten women commented that they would use it in a discussion group. One woman added that she would use the C style in order to understand and appreciate a classmate’s point of view, i.e., in a debate the merits of Affirmative Action in a Philosophy class. One other woman felt that using it would help her to understand why a professor had given her a certain grade on an examination. One other student shared that she would use the C style when she and another person thought differently about a given topic, “I think I will use the (C style)...I think it’s easier to do.”

By and large the Connected women were most apt to use the Connected knowing style in both informal situations with friends and formal settings, such as the classroom or recitation. It was, however, most common for them to do it with people who were close to them, such as good friends, “who are important for (them),” in relationships with either a boyfriend or husband, or with family such as one’s mother or sister.

**Connected Men (CW).** Connected men demonstrated almost identical patterns in their answers. These men seemed to use the C style the majority of the time, but they too do it mostly with people they knew well. There were two of the three men who commented that they used the style with “everybody.” One specified that he would use it mostly with close friends and two others added when doing research with either a classmate or a professor, or in a discussion group. Both men said they learned from the other person by listening and trying to understand where she or he was coming from.
One of these men, who was a Human Resources major, was adopting this strategy in a Human Resources classroom, which was made up almost entirely of females.

**Separate Women (CW).** The Separate knowers appear to use the C style in a different way from their Connected counterparts. Rather than necessarily seeking to understand the other person’s point of view, as was the case for both Connected women and men, the Separate women mostly used the C style to avoid conflict or avoid hurting someone’s feelings. The natural inclination was to use the S style; however, the C style was portrayed on the outside in order to maintain harmony with others. Three of the seven women said that they used the C style “whenever I argue with someone.” One woman said she did it in order to understand the other person’s argument. One possible reason for this was offered by another woman who commented that it was important to “think from (the other person’s) point of view.” As was said above, the third woman used the C style in order not to hurt the other person’s feelings. She recognized how arguing the opposite could be taken as an attack and hurt the other person, so she remains quiet although she may still think the opposite.

Four out of the seven women use the C style in the workplace for a variety of reasons. For one woman it is to in order to avoid conflict and tension between she and her colleagues. Another student, who works in a lab, shared that she did it when doing research, in order to appreciate the opinion and view of a peer or research partner, a very similar response as given by the Connected women and men above.

Other answers varied. Interestingly, as said by the majority of Connected knowers, two of the seven women either implied or stated explicitly that they would use
the C style “everywhere.” One woman commented that it’s “just the attitude for life.” Interestingly, she was rated consistently as a Separate knower nonetheless. One other woman shared that she would use the C style when talking with friends if the subject matter being discussed would not have a big impact on the other person. If it would she would offer her opinion out of caring for the person. As was the case with one of the Connected women, one Separate woman said she would use it during a debate in class, presumably in order to understand the opposing side.

Other circumstances in which a Separate woman would use the C style was shared by two different women. One commented that she “will try to do it if the anger is not taking over (her).” She adds that she will use the style if she has the conscience to talk herself through the anger. The S style is likened in this case to something in reaction to anger. This may in fact be consistent with the pattern noted in the women of a struggle for voice and legitimacy in the eyes of controlling men. Following this same pattern, another woman commented that she would use the C style when she is not confident in herself. Confidence, to this student, implies the ability to defend one’s position to the opposition. Very interesting, indeed.

Separate Men (CW). Separate men demonstrated a very similar pattern to the Separate females. They too were more inclined to use the C style in a separate way. Interestingly, unlike the other three groups, the C style was used as the means to some end, rather than an end unto itself, as is so apparent, especially with the Connected women and men. There are several examples of this distinction in the data. Two of the five men commented that they would use the C style in order to please their boss, or do
what is expected of them, by listening carefully and trying to look from his or her point of view. Another example was offered by another man who illustrated how he would use the C style in order to do well on an exam, "When I was going to take some exam I would consider how the professor would be concerned how to answer problems."

Not all of the men were necessarily this self-serving. Two men commented that they would use the C style in order to understand a close friend or spouse’s opinion or feelings about a particular topic. This was a means of maintaining harmony within the relationship, rather than bringing in conflict through argumentation. This was also illustrated with family members, such as a parent or sibling. One other student said that he would use the C style if he were interested in someone and wanted to get to know them better. This seems to imply that arguing with them might turn them off when the relationship began. Interestingly, as was noted above in the discussion of the Separate knowing style, some of the Separate knowing men were more inclined to use their own Separate knowing style with close friends rather than strangers. This might explain in part why this student would associate the S style with possibly turning off someone he was just beginning to get to know.

The final place in which Separate men would use the C style was in an argument or dispute. One man remarked, “With all of the people that have dispute or quite different opinion with me...I think at some point I would come to this state, but not naturally....for example, I always meet and we always have a dispute, I would like to think of this concern.”
For all of these men the C style does not seem to come naturally, although they recognize it as a tool that can be used for a variety of reasons, as was demonstrated above. One other man would use the C style if he shared a common logic with the other person. To him, this included that person showing no prejudice, “That person should be in a logical manner that we something in common—that is logic!”

What is the purpose of using the Connected style? (CP)

Connected Women (CP). The purpose of using the C style was explained in part by the second question of this section, but participants were asked more directly to reflect on the purpose for using the Connected style of knowing. Connected women used it by and large to understand the perspective of other people. There were four out of ten who explained that this would be out of respect in order to understand and/or accept the other person’s point of view because she or he may see things differently. The other reason given by three of the four was in order to determine if they agreed or disagreed with the person, or to determine if they might want to share an idea, “so maybe if I could see what they’re saying, I can give them my idea.” There were four out of ten who commented that the C style allowed them to learn from others, which would help them to make better choices of what to do in a given situation. One other student remarked that it would help her not to make a mistake.

Maintaining harmony and acting with kindness were the final motivations offered by the Connected women. Two women commented that using the C style would help them to feel better, or more comfortable with what they were doing. One of these
student, as well as two others reasoned that using such a style would show that they are kind and good people, who are considerate of others. One remarked, “You can talk to person without making them feel like they don’t count.” Such respect was particularly important for two other students who would use it with close family members, a spouse, or with friends, in order to show respect and not cause conflict.

By and large the Connected women felt that the C style was the most “effective way for (them) to communicate with other people.” One woman, however, used the C style because she was afraid to share her opinion since others might think it was stupid. In this instance, the student does not use the C style because it is her natural inclination and one about which she feels good, instead she uses it because she does not have a voice, and she feels insecure in using it. As was mentioned earlier, this is a recurring problem for many of the women in this study, but especially those who were classified as Connected knowers.

Connected Men (CP). Everything but this insecurity was echoed by the Connected men. There were two of the men who remarked that the Connected knowing style served the purpose of not judging and remaining open-minded. One man said that he did “not want to make a quick judgment in the first place.” The reason for another was, “I don’t want to be hard-headed, try to think of a way and find out that it’s wrong at the end.” He instead wants to “try to make (his) idea 100% (right).” This may be due in part to insecurity, but it is more likely, due to the tone of his interview, that this student appreciates his own limitations in a healthy way. He gives one illustration that is telling. If he were to buy new hardware and install it in his computer without asking for help, he
would surely destroy it. This student wishes instead to learn from others so that he can do things better. Another example which illustrates his desire to learn new things is the following, "I’m reading books, but my (research) partner reading books also, and you know he maybe getting more ideas from it than I am, or vice versa....Any time I ask somebody for opinion...I want to do this." Another student explains that it helps to "broaden your knowledge base, you learn more."

As was the case with the Connected women, three of the men wished either to show respect or work to maintain harmony. One man wanted to "respect what other people say and thinking about some other people, about their point of view, why did they say that and how did they say that." He, as well as another man, wants "to avoid unnecessary argument." This is one way to do that.

**Separate Women (CP).** The Separate women also wished to keep harmony in their relationships, and they employed the connected style as a strategy to do this. As in the case of the Connected women, the majority (four of the seven women) wanted to avoid conflict an tension. One woman summed up this desire when she said, "You want to get along with (a friend) well, so you try to think what people say, things like that." Another woman added, "(it) makes everything go smoothly. There were three of the seven women who recognized that they other person might see things differently from her. To them, using the C style would help to better understand their peer’s view. An excellent illustration is the following, "I would notice something is wrong and I will try to talk to (my roommate) about it. We always have good understanding of each other afterwards, after we explain, because a lot of times that the reason that she told me was
totally different from what I thought it was.” Although their opinions were not
necessarily different, this student was able through listending to appreciate the way her
roommate was perceiving the circumstances of that situation. One woman reiterated this
when she pointed out that “(you) need to force yourself to listen to others, and not be one-
sided.”

This style was also recognized as a way to treat people nicely and with respect, as
was the case for both Connected women and men, but the women especially. These
women also did not want anyone to get hurt. One woman emphasized that others could
get hurt; interestingly, however, another woman recognized how she could get hurt by
arguing. She pointed out that her education had taught her that.

Finally, the Connected style was also used in more of a Separate way, as was
noted above. One woman in particular used the C style to understand the other person’s
position and how they made sense of it, in order to decide if she agreed or not. She
explained that she would argue if she disagreed, or if she wished to share an idea she
would.

**Separate Men (CP).** Separate men responded in almost identical way to the other
three groups. First and foremost, three out of five men used the C style in order to
understand someone’s point of view better. As was the case with the Separate women,
this was sometimes done in a more Separate way. One man summed up this sentiment
when he said, “We should understand at least first what they think…and believe before
we judge them.” This style may also help these men to learn new things. Interestingly,
the emphasis for two of these men was on being able to tell right from wrong, rather than
the trend of the Separate women in which they could expand their understanding. One man remarked that he used it “(to) find something wrong with your previous judgment so that you can correct yourself. If you always stick to your own stand, then things may become worse, or no better....If you open your mind, you can always get more information, you can meet more new people, more new ideas, stuff like that.”

There were two of the five Separate men who also used the C style to treat people nicely. One man wished to be thoughtful towards his wife, “My wife always want me to make some difficulty or want to do something very complicated. I just prefer something very simple. But sometimes I will think from her angle. I think it will improve the quality of her life. I think it’s somewhat good but I don’t want to do that so complicated so I change my angle to think from her angle.” He realized that by validating his wife’s needs the quality of her would be improved, as would the quality of their relationship. The same seemed to be true for many of the women interviewed. If they, too, had their opinions validated, they would feel better about their own abilities and their intrinsic value as individuals. One man very wisely expressed this when he said, “(The C style) is constructive to...a better life, it is constructive to more friendship, it is constructive to bring more happiness to others.” (The S style) is to do completely the contrary.” Even this man, who prefers the S style, recognizes how it can be damaging to relationships. Another man adds “I think the best approach to avoid a...worse relationship or a more severe dispute, is to understand the other person better.” This is consistent with the other three groups, who recognize the usefulness of the C style in avoiding conflict and maintaining and fostering harmony.
Summary (CP). It is very interesting and important to note that all four groups used the Connected knowing style for much of the same purposes. Firstly, it was used to expand their understanding of the other person’s point of view so to help them to better appreciate where they were coming from. For some of the Separate knowers this was done for a Separate purpose in order to help them to determine if they should agree or disagree with the other person’s side, and to find flaws in their positions. The C style was also used to help people to feel better and treat them nicely. It was recognized by all the groups as an integral part of fostering and maintaining harmony in relationships. By and large, all of the participants of the study used the C style out of altruistic purposes, such as validating the needs of a spouse or working to better understand the needs of a friend.

Is it hard to use the Connected knowing style, why or why not? (CWH)

Connected Women (CWH). As the next question addressed, for some of these students using the C style was difficult. For others it was not. This differed according to the four groups. Even for the Connected women, the Connected knowing style was not necessarily an easy thing to do. Four out of ten of the women said it was in some ways hard to do the C style. One reason was that it has been hard for one of these women to empathize with Americans, in that US cultural values are so different from Chinese values. She has “to think a lot of very lot of combinations.” It is not always easy for this student to understand where someone is coming from. Two other women reiterated this when they spoke of having great difficulty in really be in the other person’s position: “I
have to hold on to my opinion, right? For me to think about other person, it’s so difficult.”

In much the same vein another woman commented that it’s hard for her to move on to the next topic of conversation if she can’t express herself. For this student she feels isolated because she is afraid to talk. Another woman recognizes that it might take time to really understand where another person is coming from in their opinion or idea.

**Connected Men (CWH).** Only two women said that the C style was easy for them. Their answers were simple, “It’s natural.” “I’m not that strong headed.” All three (100%) of the men answered with the same response, that either it was natural or they weren’t hard headed. One man added, “I care for people...that makes me comfortable because I know people’s opinion.” This is who he is, that simple.

Although none of the men said that it was hard to do the C style, one recognized that it could at times be difficult. His reason was one not yet explored, “Sometimes it hurts...I get hurt when I find it is hard for me to accept the other person. I guess it is when arguments come into play....It is (also) hard to cross the gap.” The gap to which this student refers is one defined by cultural, religious and family difference. This student very astutely realizes that truly understanding another person’s position might be very difficult and painful at times. When he can’t accept them, it makes him feel hurt because he wants to. Very interesting, indeed.

**Separate Women (CWH).** The Separate knowers definitely recognize that the C style can sometimes be difficult. There were three of the seven separate women who gave a variety of reasons. One says that she cannot understand the other person because
she has not yet lived his or her life. They have different experiences, so it is not
something she can understand. For this young woman, knowledge is defined as that
which has been personally experienced:

"It’s very hard (to take the other person’s position)...it’s really hard to know why people
do this, or, you know, why they say this from their own opinion because it never
happened to you....Sometimes when you stand on other’s point of view, you can’t try to
imagine it because you are not him or her. Some values you didn’t receive in your life.
It’s really hard to understand it, but just, maybe, think about it makes you can accept it.”

At this point in this student’s life she may be in the transition from conceiving of
knowledge as something strictly subjective, and recognizing that even she who has not
necessarily experienced the same life as another person, can still reach a level of empathy
in a connected way. Very interesting that this student was rated as separate, although she
begun to develop this level of sophistication.

Two women, instead of struggling with truly understanding another person, had
difficulty in changing their own minds. One student remarked, “It’s just really hard to
change your thoughts, your position of a lot of things....I don’t feel that I have enough
time to stand on the other person’s view and ask them why they think this way.” To this
student it is just too much work sometimes to use the Connected knowing style.

Although the majority of Separate women felt that it was hard to use the C style,
two women said that it was easy. One woman remarked that she doesn’t want to have an
argument and cause conflict with another person, especially if she knows and cares about
the person. In such a circumstance, the C style comes naturally. Both women say that “it
come easily,” i.e., compromising and listening to others. One other woman qualifies this
by saying that it is easy if she is in a good mood, but hard if she is not.
Separate Men (CWH). Three of the five Separate men also had difficult in using the Connected style consistently. As was the case with the Separate women, it was hard for all three to correctly imagine someone else’s way of thinking or their motivation behind doing something. One man remarked, “It is hard to, uh, correctly... imagine the other person’s, uh, stand... You cannot guarantee understanding about his stand is correct, then maybe a wrong starting point.” This is further compounded according to this student if the person is “offending” his interests, “If the other party’s stand is quite distant from you, and if it is something offending your interest. If it is something offending your dignity, then it will be very difficult to do this.” Interestingly, as was the case for one Separate woman, one Separate man also complained that there was not enough time to really appreciate where someone was coming from. Another man remarked that it because easier as he got to know the other person better.

Interestingly, none of these five men answered that it was easy to do the Connected knowing style, but unfortunately two men did not answer this question: one, because he did not use the C style and the other because it was not asked by the interviewer.

When/where/with whom would you not use the Connected style? (CWN)

Participants were next asked when/where/with whom they would not used the Connected style, as defined according to the quote given above. Members of all four groups consistently chose not to use the Connected style with people who were either unfamiliar, people they did not like or care to know, or people with bad attitudes.
Connected Women (CWN). The Connected women as a group implied or said clearly that they would use the Connected knowing style almost all of the time, so there was no mention of locations where this would not place, only some instances. The most common response for the Connected women was not to use it with people who are not close. Three of the ten women either stated explicitly or implied that they would not be inclined to talk about their personal life, feelings and/or thoughts with unfamiliar people. Although this response is not directly related to their use of the Connected knowing style, per se, it may be indicative of these women’s preference to empathize with others through sharing their own life histories.

Of all the responses given by the Connected women, the above was the most benign. The others would not use the C style in more negative confrontational situations. Two remarked that they would not do it with someone who was either hard to talk to, or who was “hard-headed,” defined as “someone who thinks he or she is the only right person in the world.” Two others shared that they would not do it when they had a strong opinion about something, or if they felt something was really wrong.

One woman mentioned that she would not do it, “when I am in a bad mood.” As has been note, this is a recurring theme for several of the groups. It appears that the people who identify this pattern are more apt to argue when they are in a “bad mood,” and more apt to listen when they are in a good one. One other woman explained how she often argued with her husband, which meant that she did not use the Connected style with him, although she would have liked more often to use it. She spoke of often getting
frustrated and not being able to control her temper. In such situations she had a tendency to argue.

**Connected Men (CWN).** The Connected men also shared that they most often used the Connected knowing style; therefore, they had no response to the questions of where and with whom they would not use the style. One man summed up the feeling of this small group: “I can hardly find a situation when I don’t do that with somebody.” Only one man could think of a situation where he would not, which was when he didn’t want to talk to anyone. He associated not using the C style with not communicating and having time alone. Neither he nor the others could think of instances in interaction with others when they had not that style. Unfortunately, however, they were not probed very deeply, so this could explain part of the pattern.

**Separate Women (CWN).** The responses of the Separate women were almost identical to their Connected counterparts. The most common response was when they had a strong opinion about something or felt that it was very wrong. The response was most common in relation to mention of people not close to them, or people they did not care to know. One woman shared, “When the things involve me really deeply….If I feel strongly about it, it will be so hard (to use the C style). Like the value you have been told since you were a kid, I think would be hard.” This student indicated that if her values were either questioned or offended she would not be able to empathize with another person through using the Connected knowing style.

An even more extreme illustration was given by another woman in the group, “If someone’s idea is abnormal, I won’t use the (C style). Obviously his idea is not right….It
cannot benefit the people or the society, or the human beings....For example, the
criminals, they commit some crimes, but they will say, 'I did it because I had my own
reason.' I won't think that your reasons are right or you can justify your crimes.”

Separate Men (CWN). The Separate men also responded similarly to the other
groups. There was one of the five who also mentioned that he would not use the C style
when he was in a bad mood. Another said he would not do this with his “enemy,” a
much stronger response in relation to people one does not care about. The other
responses, however, were unique to this group.

One man talked about not being able to use the C style with someone who did not
share a common logic with him, “If that person is touching things with...some
prejudice—like whatever you say he will propose the contrary, then that is no logic.
Then it...it's impossible to apply the (C style) to them, because they do not have a
common logic.” It is very interesting to note that the behavior this student calls negative,
i.e. proposing the contrary, which he labels as “prejudice,” is indicative of the Separate
knowing style, which he had been rated as preferring. As was mentioned earlier,
however, since this student had had very argumentative roommates in China, he
associated this type of behavior with very negative experiences.

There were several other responses that were unique to this group. For one
student, if he doesn’t understand what somebody is saying, then he will not use the
Connected style, “if it was completely nonsense—it don’t make sense to me.” The most
intriguing answer, and one which may point to potential disadvantages of the Connected
knowing style, was from a man who pointed out that by using the C style he may not be
able to see the contrary when something is very important and crucial. His reason for this is, "I don’t want to look back and regret."

Of all the groups, only one person said that he would not use the Connected style. This man was a member of the Separate knowing males.

Have there been people who have used the Connected style with you? How have you felt about that? (CFA)

As was the case with the Separate knowing quote, all participants were asked to reflect on the quote and answer if that strategy had been used with them and how they felt about that. Overwhelmingly the responses were positive. 100% of all the participants appreciated being treated in a Connected way. For this section, answers will be organized according to themes rather than group affiliation.

One Connected woman summed up the feelings of many of the students in saying, "I feel great, because that means...they care about me and like how I am coming from. So I think they are good friends of mine." One of the Connected men further explained, "they actually know how I’ll feel. They including my idea in their own idea. That tell me...they’re trying to cope with me, or trying to understand how I feel, instead of trying to disagree with me, or trying to not to listen to what I am saying, and trying to keep on with their idea."

One Connected woman who seemed to be struggling for a voice explained that being treated in this way "made (me) feel...like my ideas are important." This student, who needed so badly to feel validated and valued by those around her, especially men,
responded positively to this means of communication. One Connected man mentioned that such a style would make him more apt to share his thoughts with the other person, an important part of developing a personal voice, “I will be more than happy to discuss more about the matter (when someone uses this style).”

Sadly, the one student who was not inclined to use the Connected style had not really had an experience of someone using it with him, although he wished for it, “I rarely have...had any close friends that, uh, have this nature. They may be, uh, sort of like me—just do it occasionally, but not naturally. Probably...I think there are some people like this, but, uh, I haven’t met them. I haven’t met those people that can do this constantly—or rather, can do this usually, not constantly, but rather usually. I haven’t met these kind of people, but, uh, I would like to meet them.”

People who would use the Connected style with the students varied. One Connected woman and one Connected man said that most people, most of the time used the C style with them. Five CW, one CM and two SW spoke of good friends using it with them. One Connected male also spoke of having his research partner do it with him when are generating ideas. This free flow of thought in a discussion helped him to learn best.

Another common response was teachers or professors. One CW, one CM and two SW mentioned this. One of the Separate women put it this way, “Teachers...in my undergraduate college, in my high school, in my middle school, most teachers....I just feel like their job. It’s very normal for them to do this, because they are our advisers, our
teachers. They should (listen)...'cause they work with students, they try to solve problems for students. If I were one of them, I would do that."

The most oft-mentioned group, however, was family. Two CW, two CM, three SW and two SM mentioned their parents as having used the Connected style with them. One SW and one SM included either a boyfriend or spouse as someone, as well.

Use of Connected knowing style (CUse)

Throughout the interviews the participants spoke of using the Connected knowing styles in a variety of ways. The most common categories under which these uses fell were: (1) in broadening one’s perspective; (2) in appreciating other ideas or views in order to judge them (a more Separate use); (3) in seeking to appreciate the unique circumstances of others, especially in terms of environmental and life circumstances; (4) in keeping with cultural conditioning; (5) in maintaining harmony within relationships; and (6) in trying an alternative method when the separate style did not work. These patterns will be investigated across groups in the above order.

Broadening one’s perspective. The most widespread use of the Connected knowing style was in broadening one’s understanding, or in finding a better way to handle a given situation. Those who used the C style in this way were one CW, four SW and one SM. The Connected woman and two of the Separate women will use the C style to broaden their perspective, then they will adopt the other’s view if it is “better” or more “right,” or presumably more adequate for a given situation than theirs. The Connected woman sums this up well.
“I try to think of it from my position, my point of view first, then think of it from other person’s point of view....I also try to think, you know, other, from other person’s point of view, because that way, like, I kind of see, like, see the balance and then try to come up with the best idea. If I think about an issue, like to solve the problem, from my point of view sometimes I don’t, like, get the best result. So I try to see the other person’s view, what other people think about an issue. I see theirs is better than mine, I try to take their idea.”

Sometimes this style can be done begrudgingly, as was the case for one Separate woman, “I really don’t like listening to other people, but I think that it’s important, you know.” For others it comes more naturally, as was the case for one Separate woman who shared “I think that I am still very understanding, I mean, tolerant of different ideas. I will try to stand in (the other person’s) shoes.” Sometimes this “standing in the other’s shoes” may work and sometimes it may not, as was the case for the Separate man. He believes that he should at first learn what the other person is thinking and believing before judging them.

In order to judge (for a “separate” purpose). For many of the participants in this study, the C style was used for more of a S purpose, as just mentioned. The Separate man mentioned above, two SW and five Connected women would listen and work to understand the other person’s perspective in order to appreciate if they agreed or disagreed with them, and to formulate counter-arguments if they disagreed. Interestingly, none of the connected men alluded to this; however, as had been repeatedly reminded, that group was made up of only three people. One Connected woman explains this use clearly in saying, “I think about (the other person’s) position also and if it is not, I mean, suitable to my position I tend to not take the idea.” It is important to note that all four Connected women shared similar thoughts, but none of them would argue with the
person, even if they disagreed. Instead, they would simply do what they thought was best anyway. One of the Separate women, however, was more inclined to argue if she thought differently from the other person, as is indicative of the Separate knowing style in which one points out the contrary and other forms of logic.

In seeking to appreciate the environmental circumstances of someone else. The third category of Connected use was in an appreciation that environmental and life circumstances can affect other’s points of view and their behavior. For these students this recognition helps them to more fully accept the other person. Of the six people who offered this particular style, five were Connected knowers: three women and two men, and one was a Separate man. One woman offered, “Of course, I can’t understand everybody. Logic is not very easy for me, or anybody, or everybody. So, but some person that you can see that maybe from you... from my point of view he’s a very selfish person, or something like that. But I think that’s because the environment, maybe, the... stress he met in the life, or that changed him or her. So, I just, you know, I can accept.” Although this student may appear rather judgmental of the other person, sometimes realizing in retrospect that someone was wrongly judged can help a student to develop a more real empathy for others. One student spoke of having learned a lot by listening to the situation of a student after having wrongly judged her. It helped her to appreciate where the other person was coming, “although (the person’s) attitude is not good, I need to think about her situation.” The Separate man added, “I believe there is always a reason behind everything, even when it’s the stupidest reason.”
This appreciation of life circumstances and environmental conditioning can also help students to be more culturally aware and able to more fully empathize with others. One connected man appreciated how cultural differences could also be misunderstood, thereby leading to conflict or lack of respect. He offers an excellent example of the Connected use for the means of appreciating others, “So I think for certain kind of issue, people’s point of view about that issue differs depending when or where they are from. For example, let’s say India. They eat by using their hands. Other countries they might be a variety of things to do but it depends on where they are from…..I will probably learn how they do it and appreciate how they do it.”

In keeping with cultural conditioning. Another category of use of the Connected knowing style stemmed from cultural conditioning in the students’ home countries. It is important to note that the two students who explained their motivation as based on conditioning were both women, one Connect-ed and one Separate. The Separate woman explains, “My education, what I learned from books, from classroom lessons, taught me that (it) will keep you from getting hurt.” To this student who is inclined to use the S style, she will most often outwardly display the attentiveness and openness indicative of the C style because of the way she had been taught. The Connected woman further addresses the unique pattern in which she, and presumably others, had been raised, especially in their schooling.

“I am from Japan and like all the schools in Japan, we are not supposed to say our opinion. We just listen to the teacher and take notes….If I raise my hand and say, ‘I am against you’ to the teacher, Oh my God, I would be kicked out of school….So for this…I don’t know maybe it could be I’m still in Japanese culture, like I can’t say my opinion when it’s different from others’ opinions, because I am afraid that people are against
it... and for this, it could also be Japanese culture. The Japanese tend to believe everything. We can trust each other like... we never are suspicious about someone unless they look really bad or something. So I also believe for people opinion, take it as advice is a good way.”

Part of the reason why this student uses the Connected knowing style is her struggle for voice, which happens both in the classroom and in her personal relationships, especially with her boyfriend who would not validate and appreciate her needs (as has been repeatedly mentioned). The other part of her reason comes from her interpretation of the Japanese culture in teaching people to believe others. Believing others naturally is an important part of the Connected knowing style, which is often likened to the “Believing Game,” of Peter Elbow (1973). This will be further explored in the following chapter.

In maintaining harmony in relationships. The Connected knowing style is also used in order to maintain harmony in relationships. This is a purpose that was mentioned earlier in the section on purpose for the Connected knowing style; however, it deserves reiteration since it is mentioned by at least one student of every group. One CW, one CM, two SF (respect) and two SF (harmony) and one SM. For these students “respect” seems to be a major component of maintaining harmony in relationships. This respect can be manifest in not projecting one’s own beliefs on to others, even if one does not choose the course of action suggested by another. This was especially apparent in the comments above. One Connected male spoke of thinking the opposite of what someone was thinking (possibly more of a Separate inclination), but he would not say anything out-loud. If he were to do this publicly, it might embarrass the other person or put them on the defensive, thereby possibly leading to conflict. The majority of the students appear to
want to avoid conflict. Even for the Separate knowers, the exercise of debate and
“arguing” is not something done in a confrontational way but as more of a challenge or
exercise, at times.

Two of the Connected knowers, one woman and one man, spoke of the need to
listen to a friend and offer helpful advice. This is not done in a Separate way, in which
the friend might be questioned or probed or challenged, but more out of caring and
empathy in the paradigm of discussion. These students wished to help their friends as
best they could, and some other students, as has been mentioned, felt great pride when
friends came to see them. The Connected man shared his experience:

“Most of the time, I just try to figure out what they’re saying first, try to
understand... what are they thinking that way. Then if I agree with it, then I’ll say, ‘Yeah,
that’s a good idea.’ If I come up with an additional idea, then I’ll say, ‘Oh yeah, this is a
good idea. How about... if you add this to this?’ Or if I actually find some partial part of
the idea that can be looked at in this other way, then I may give out that opinion.”

Many of the students seemed to struggle with remaining connected without judging the
other person. Although the students recognized that it was important for them to respect
the other person and show them courtesy, many would often come to a judgment
prematurely. As was mentioned above, some of these students recognized this potentially
problematic pattern; however, one of the Separate men put it best when he said:

“When you think too much you make more assumption. Like what might people say,
how might people react about what you say or what are people going to think. But at the
same time, when you make an assumption the negative of the assumption is later on when
you two or a group is discussing this matter you probably are not listening to what they
say...It is kind of weird, though, because I have some idea about something and
someone is thinking about the same matter I tend to think of mine, think of theirs, how
they will react and what they will say. And finally I don’t listen to them because that is
my assumption. That is what I think, how they will react. That is frustrating.”
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Interestingly for the Separate knowers, in particular, the Connected knowing style was sometimes adopted when the Separate style had not worked. Two Separate women and two separate men mention this. Sometimes for these students they realized in retrospect, when they were alone or after a conflict, that they should have used the Connected style during the heat of the situation. One student spoke of how he would go back to try to “patch things up” afterwards, “if I was angry at the time, then I will just argue for myself. But afterwards, when I look back, sometimes I will go back to the person and I will talk about it and...tell them what went wrong.”

Connected knowing may also be adopted if the adequacy of the Separate style is called into question. One Separate woman related a story of how she used the C style when the S style was hurting someone and she was unable to get her point across, “At first...if (my husband’s) idea was different from mine, I was very upset and tried to correct his idea. Um...but...this came up and happened many times. I actually decided that he didn’t change....so I thought maybe this doesn’t work, maybe it’s better to try to think from his angle.” Another Separate man spoke of thinking to “stand in the other person’s shoes” after “going too far in misunderstanding people or in having (a) dispute with them.” But, it is hard for this student as well as others to empathize right away. They usually come to it later, sometimes after someone has been hurt.

**Broadening one’s approach**

The final question asked in the Interview for Knowing style was how participants would broaden their current approaches, according to the Separate and Connected
knowing quotes. The majority of students struggled with the word “broaden;” however, even once it was explained, most of them did not have much to add. Those answers that were given are organized below, starting with the Connected knowing women and men, followed by the Separate knowers.

Connected Women.

The Connected women (six out of ten who answered the question) all spoke of broadening their approaches by adopting a more Separate style more often. One woman shared, “(the Separate style) is definitely needed from time to time, I think.” For two of the women this was very difficult because they did not feel independent enough to express their opinions. This seemed to go along with their individual struggles for a voice and a sense of self-agency. One woman remarked, “I want to broaden my approach, but it’s very hard. I don’t have any strong point of my own, so I want to... be more flexible. But I don’t know how to do that. You know, I am a person who is, who has little experience—not experienced enough.”

As has been mentioned, this feeling of not having a voice can be further compounded by lack of confidence in one’s ability to express one’s thoughts in a foreign language. One student added that she would like to be able to argue and point out when something is wrong in English, her second language and one in which she does not yet feel confident. For most of these women, others can help them to broaden their approaches by accepting them and making them feel comfortable, something one women, in particular, mentioned as important.
Connected Men.

All three Connected men answered the question of how they might broaden their approaches. One man said that he thought he was where he needed to be, “I think I'm already trying my best to combine these two… I can’t think of a better way to broaden this strategy.” One man said that he would not be open and broaden his approach if he were getting hurt. If he feels threatened then he will put up his defenses and not be open to the other person. This does not really directly address the question. Only one student really answered the question, and his answer was to broaden his already connected nature. His wish was to be able to listen better to the other person without getting caught up in what he was going to say next. He says doing this is a bad habit since he might miss someone’s ideas and be more hard-headed, rather than being open-minded.

Separate Women.

The responses of the Separate women were similar to the Connected groups. As was the case with one of the Connected men, one Separate woman felt that her current approach was the best way for her to deal with her daily life and work. Interestingly she qualified this in saying that were she the First Lady of Taiwan she would probably need to broaden her approach. Obviously, since she is not, then it was not an issue for her. Another Separate woman mentioned that she would like to become more articulate in English in order to communicate more clearly and fully in her second language, “It’s hard or me to describe exactly… what I mean (in English).”
Other needs that Separate women mentioned were in honing mostly separate skills. One woman wished to be more confident in using the Separate style in order to help students as a Teaching Assistant to “reach more academic progress.” For this student, the Separate knowing style is an important academic tool that her students should be able to use. Another woman wanted to find some good friends in the US so to be able to express her opinion more outwardly. With very few close friends in the US this student did not feel close enough to many people to be able to express her deepest thoughts and wishes. This may have been indicative of this student’s introverted orientation to the world, as defined by her tendency to share her deepest thoughts in only the closest of friendships, which take a long time to develop.

One student very wisely shared how one could broaden their approach in order to integrate the Separate and Connected knowing styles. It is interesting to note that her proposal is similar to the way in which some of the Connected knowers construct their own style (as mentioned above). This student’s words indicate a desire to develop a balance in her own life, “I think you can combine both of these (styles), you can try to understand the other, and you can maybe express your thoughts of it, just not arguing and try to get people down like that way.”

Separate Men.

The Separate men had little to say about broadening their approaches. One man said that he could not imagine using the Separate style any more than he currently does; whereas another commented that he would use a better approach if he knew one. He
could, not, however, think of one during the interview. One of the Separate men was very insightful in recognizing the strengths of both styles, i.e. that the Separate style allowed one to be curious and probing, but that the Connected style kept one sensitive to the needs of other people:

“Well... (the Separate style) you have a fresh mind, you are not a boring person, not like every time when you see certain things you act the same, you know what I mean? So if you, let’s say, curious mind, your life will be much more fun. And so you... I think you need to have a fresh mind—curious about everything, not everything, but... you know. And (the Connected style) is if you put yourself in other person’s shoes you will be a more thoughtful person and less selfish. And I think really a great thing to have—to care about people and looking their eyes and put yourself into their shoes.”

Additional Findings

It appears that the interview itself helped to sensitize some students to their particular ways of using the Separate and Connected strategies and how they might alter those ways to be more sensitive to the needs of others. One Connected woman remarked that the interview helped her to think more about the advantages and positive aspects of using the Separate style, so she was hoping to work in the future to broaden her approach towards that end. Some other students struggled with finding a relationship between the two strategies. One Connected woman remarked, “I think they’re two different quotes. It’s like one or the other.” A Separate male, however, recognized that those quotes were illustrating opposite poles and that the majority of people actually used a combination of both.

The interview itself helped to increase awareness of this process for all of the students. This same Separate male appreciated the sequencing of the interview and mentioned that it was better to start with a “bad” quote (Separate knowing) and end with
a “good” one (Connected knowing) than vice versa. It left him feeling good. It’s ironic, however, that he was rated unanimously as Separate, even though he had such negative feelings towards the Separate knowing quote.

All of the participants in the study were asked to indicate which of the two quotes they most often used. There were twelve out of seventeen women (71%) and five out of eight men (63%) who indicated that they preferred to use the same style for which they were rated; for example, a Separate man explained that he more often used a Separate knowing style and was later rated by the two experts as being a Separate knower. As is evident, there were eight exceptions to this. These students identified with the opposite quote from how they were rated. All eight of the students who fit this exception (100%) had identified themselves as preferring Connected knowing, according to the quote, but were instead rated as Separate knowers. Not one student who identified him or herself as having preferred the Separate knowing quote was later rated as being a Connected knower.

This finding may indicate several patterns. Firstly, it would seem that the Connected knowing style is more attractive to all of the students. This is evidenced by the overwhelmingly positive responses that were given when students were asked to reflect on others having used the Connected style with them. As was said earlier, 100% answered that it made them feel good, validated, valued, etc. Secondly, some of the Separate knowers (as rated) do not necessarily voice their opposition, which is more indicative of the Separate knowing style. Instead, in order to maintain harmony and show respect for the other person, they take on a more “connected” outward appearance of
listening and seeming open to the person, although inside they may be thinking of the opposite and other trains of logic that can be pursued. This pattern was apparent in much of the data explored above. Thirdly, as was the case for the Separate woman who felt so strongly that it was in her nature to question, challenge and find the contrary, her cultural conditioning had encouraged the opposite, so she often had to suppress that desire or was “punished” when she expressed it outwardly. This punishment was in the form of ridicule from her older husband and his friends. It is possible that some of these students are struggling against the “press” of their socio-cultural conditioning, especially those women who are Separate knowers.
CHAPTER FIVE

QUALITATIVE RESULTS ON THE INFLUENCE OF CULTURE AND DISCUSSION

Discussion Quantitative Results

As had been discussed in the previous chapter, there were not enough data to run a Log-Linear analysis in order to test the significance of the quantitative data correlating psychological type and knowing style. This would have required an equal number of participants in each of the four cells: thinking women, thinking men, feeling women and feeling men: and at least five exceptions in each cell. Nevertheless, there was still strong support of Rodgers and colleagues’ (1998) and Rodgers’ (2000) findings, as well as Ullman-Petrash (2000), that regardless of gender, thinking types preferred a separate knowing style and feeling types, a connected one. Of the nine thinking types in this study, eight (89%) were rated as separate in their knowing style; and of the 16 feeling types, 12 (75%) were connected.

Although Rodgers (2000) had a much larger sample of 120, he, too, could not run the statistical test in order to determine the significance of his findings. Even after sampling 120 college students, with 30 participants in each of the four cells, there were
only two thinking type male exceptions who were connected in their knowing style, thereby making it impossible to use Log-Linear Analysis. Rodgers did, however, find overwhelming evidence that there is a strong relationship between knowing style and psychological type as Ullman-Petras (1993) and Rodgers et al. (1998) had originally hypothesized. Rodgers found that of 60 thinking types, 53 (88%) were separate in their knowing style, and of 60 feeling types, 48 (80%) were connected. See Table 6 for the results from the Rodgers study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowing Style</th>
<th>Thinking Type</th>
<th>Feeling Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connected</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1

Type and Knowing Style for Rodgers (2000)

Instead of utilizing the Log-linear Analysis technique to test the significance of her data, Ullman-Petras (2000) employed a descriptive statistical comparison using a matching test, which is similar to a directional chi-square with the test statistic as the number of matches (Edgington, 1987). The probability that the number of observed matches would be greater than or equal to 16 out of 21 matches, if no association existed.
between a thinking type preference and a separate knowing style and between a feeling type preference and a connected knowing style, was less than or equal to .02 (Ullman-Petresh, 2000, p.39). Ullman-Petresh also found a strong relationship between psychological type and connected knowing. Of ten thinking type women, eight were separate knowers (80%) and of eleven feeling type women, eight were connected (73%).

**The Construction of Separate and Connected Knowing Styles**

All three of these studies: Rodgers (2000), Ullman-Petresh (2000) and the current one, demonstrate a relationship between psychological type and knowing style; however, each study has come to that conclusion using very different participants. Rodgers (2000) worked with 120 eighteen to twenty-five year old US college women and men from a variety of different racial and ethnic backgrounds. Ullman-Petresh studied 21 Canadian college women from a variety of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds, including seven who were born internationally (as discussed in Chapter 2). Her sample had a much wider age range of 20-48 years; however, her mean was consistent with the other two studies, 23 years. Ullman-Petresh’s study was the only one which used women only. The current study studied 25 eighteen to twenty six year old international college women and men from China, Taiwan, Korea and Japan.

Although similar in their findings, each of these studies demonstrated qualitative differences in the ways in which their participants constructed both their own and the opposite knowing style. For the sake of this discussion, and in keeping with the order of the questions on the Interview protocol (See Appendix A), we will first look at all four
groups’ (Separate and Connected women and men) perception of the Separate knowing style, followed by their perception of the Connected one. Please note that the Ullman-Petrash study provided very little qualitative data; therefore, it will only be addressed peripherally. In relationship to the ways in which Separate knowers constructed their own and the other knowing style Ullman-Petrash said almost nothing.

Separate knowing style

Separate women in both Rodgers (2000) and the current study responded similarly in their initial reaction to the Separate knowing quote (See Appendix A for the Interview Protocol), “That’s me” or “That’s natural.” One Separate woman from the current study, earlier quoted in Chapter four, summed up this sentiment in saying, “It feels like me...I just do it without thinking.” The US sample in Rodgers study were more apt to use the Separate (S) knowing style in a variety of places, including the classroom and with friends where they commented that it was interesting and fun to do. The Asian students in this study, on the other hand, indicated that they would use the S style in the classroom or when conducting research, but not with most friends.

The Separate Asian women would by and large not argue with their friends, or take the contrary view, because of a fear of disturbing the harmony in their relationships. As a result, approximately one third of the group (two out of seven) indicated that they might think of the opposite, but they would not necessarily articulate it out loud. When talking with friends they tended to discuss a particular issue, rather than argue about it.
This did not seem the case for the US women, who felt more comfortable in voicing their opposition out loud.

Reasons for using the S style were similar across the two samples. Both groups spoke of how the S style helped people to see and think about the other side to an argument. For the Asian students, this was particularly important since they found themselves defending others against attack or misrepresentation; for example, one Chinese woman would stand up to and question others when she felt that they were wrong, especially in the case when her husband and his friends were mistakenly (she claimed) arguing that Chinese women's status was equal to that of men.

For many of the Separate women in the current study, the separate knowing style was likened to arguing against someone, most often a controlling family member or partner. It was not necessarily a fun exercise, but was instead sometimes a fight to be heard. Of the two groups of women, the Asian one seemed to be struggling most for a voice. This theme of struggling for a voice will be addressed later in this chapter.

Both groups of Separate women would not use the S style indiscriminately. They would not use the style, i.e., pointing out the contrary and other trains of logic, if it was going to hurt the other person. One reason appeared to be that it would stir up emotions. For one of the Asian women this was not something she wanted to deal with, since emotions were hard for her. In her case, she would communicate with friends over the Internet in order in part to maintain a safe distance. The Asian women would also not use the S style with people of a higher social status, or who they respected or admired. This
was unique to the group and may have been in part due to cultural conditioning. This issue will be explored shortly.

**Key differences between Asian and US samples**

In all, there were five key differences between the current study and Rodgers (2000). Firstly, in this study the Separate Asian women tended not to express their separate tendency overtly, except for a couple of exceptions. Instead, these women would think of the contrary and different trains of logic, but would not necessarily articulate it out loud. The main reason cited for this was the need for harmony in their relationships. Secondly and related to the first point, the Separate Asian women did not tend to argue or confront others unless they felt threatened or if they were fighting to be heard. Thirdly, the Separate women’s reaction to others using the S style against them was often a negative experience because of their tendency to liken that knowing style to a controlling and unaccepting personality. Fourthly, the Asian women did not seem to feel free to express their Separate nature through debate and discussion with others. Some commented that they felt most comfortable with close friends and family who could validate them. It was not as safe for the Asian women to express their separate nature as it was for the US women. Lastly, the Asian Separate women spoke of the importance of not using the S style with people in higher social statuses and people who they respected.

The reactions of the two groups of Separate men: US and Asian, were markedly different. Whereas the US Separate men reacted very positively to the Separate knowing quote with such comments as “I love it” or “it’s just fun,” the Asian men had negative
feelings towards it, even more negative than their female Asian counterparts. The majority of these men felt that it was inappropriate to always see the contrary when dealing with people. As was the case with the Asian Separate females, the style was hailed primarily in the research setting, “If it is related to academics...I think it is permitted.” As for personal relationships, they would not use it, “I think it’s very destructive to social context.”

Interestingly, the Asian Separate men did not necessarily find it hard to argue, but they tended not to because of the importance of maintaining harmony (identical to the Asian Separate women). Again, it was important for these men not to use the S style in their personal relationships, although they may have thought of the opposite of what somebody was saying. The US Separate men, on the other hand, enjoyed teasing and having fun with the people they cared about by using the S style and challenging them. It was all fun and not to be taken seriously.

Both groups of men appreciated the benefits of using the S style in an academic setting. The US men spoke about how the S style helped them to think critically about their own and others’ views, how it helped them to see the other side of an argument, and how it helped them to see their own and others’ errors. The Asian men talked about how the S style would help to improve knowledge and advance science. One man talked about how he enjoyed challenging others and making them think.

Similarly to the Asian Separate women, however, two of the five Asian men would not necessarily express their opposition outwardly. They instead would keep it inside in order to show respect and maintain harmony. The only times their US
counterparts would not use the S style was if there was already underlying tension, or if the other person was becoming emotional. As was the case with the Separate women of both groups, the US men would not use the S style if someone was already “hurting.” Nevertheless, the Asian Separate men did not seem willing to let it get to the point where tension existed, or to allow for someone to get hurt. The S style was instead a means of expanding their understanding in a particular context, rather than a way of most often seeing and dealing with the world, as was the case for the Separate US men.

It is important to note that overall the Asian Separate women and men were less apt to engage in the debate and argument indicative of the Separate knowing style which was hailed by their US counterparts. To the Asian students, this was not done in a confrontational way unless otherwise provoked and attacked. In such a case, especially if the students did not like the person involved, both Asian Separate women and men would attack back. However, this seemed very rare.

As has been seen, between the two populations of Separate knowers, there were a variety of marked differences; however, between the two populations of Connected knowers there were many more similarities than not. This was especially true for the Connected women. Connected women in both groups tended not to relate to the Separate quote. One woman from the current study shared, “I’m not that kind of person.” More often than not the Separate style was viewed in a negative light. The US women spoke of the S style as a way to “put (them) down,” as a way of spiting them, disturbing the peace, causing trouble and hurting feelings. The strongest negative issue for them was one of feeling that a person who used the S style would necessarily be one who would assert, or
attempt to assert, power over them. In parallel, the Asian Connected women spoke primarily of having the S style used against them by controlling families and partners. In such circumstances, these women did not feel validated or valued in their opinions or feelings. As a result, both groups felt silenced and afraid. The Asian international women, especially, did not want to confront such opposition for fear of further conflict and strife. Those women who did react often found themselves fighting for survival with raw emotion. One such example was the Japanese woman who threatened to break up with her boyfriend because he refused to end his relationship with his ex-girlfriend (illustrated in Chapter four).

Another interesting parallel between the two populations is in the importance of maintaining harmony. The US women spoke of keeping the "peace," or of the Separate style as "disturbing the peace," whereas the Asian women spoke often of maintaining harmony in relationships and not causing conflict. As a result, both groups seemed to be silenced. This can often be the case in households where young women are raised by controlling parents, especially men (Belenky et al., 1986). This issue of struggling for a voice will be addressed shortly.

Before turning to the Connected men it is important to make one note. The Asian Connected women did respond a little differently from their US counterparts in attributing some positive characteristics to the S style. One woman spoke of how the Separate knowing style was a strong personality, but one she felt she could not have. This woman lacked the confidence and tools to stand up for herself, which she likened to seeing the contrary and being able to argue for a particular position.
The Connected men of both populations did not demonstrate the same feeling of being silenced by powers who wanted to win over and control them, but instead recognized some of the virtues of the Separate style, even though they chose not to engage in it most of the time. It is striking to note that this is in stark contrast to the experiences of their female counterparts. Interestingly, the two groups of men were more apt to use the S style in very different places. The Asian Connected men reacted positively to the Separate quote with such comments as, “I like this statement....I like this kind of person.” However, the group by and large would only use the S style in an academic setting. When doing research they would not necessarily debate and “argue” per se, but instead discuss and share their thoughts openly, even if they were different from a peer’s, i.e., “What if we looked at it this way, or that...?” The US men, on the other hand, reacted mostly in a negative way. They would only use it with people who were close to them through joking, teasing or being affectionate. There was not a mention of the academic setting; instead it was only in personal relationships when it was agreed that they were not bringing up the contrary or arguing in a serious way. To both groups, the S style would have to be used in a caring way, regardless of the particular setting.

For both Asian Connected women and men the Separate knowing quote was viewed in a more positive light than for the US Connected women and men. The benefit of using such a style in the academic setting especially was in expanding one’s own knowledge or knowledge, in general. It is interesting that the Asian students would not use the S style in personal relationships, whereas the US Connected men in particular would only use it in such a circumstance, as long as it was previously agreed that it would
not be done in a serious or hurtful way. As has been discussed, the most striking similarity between the groups was in how the Connected women appeared to struggle the most to express their voices against those who would have them silenced. As has been said, this will be discussed under the theme of “voice” shortly.

**Connected knowing style**

There was strong consensus amongst all four groups in both populations that the Connected knowing style, as defined by the quote in Appendix A, was a good way to have both women and men feel valued and their opinions validated. The two populations, in all four groups, reacted in a positive way to the quote. As is consistent with the structure of the Results section (Chapter Four), the experiences of the Connected women and men will be explored first, followed by the Separate women and men of both populations.

The Connected US and Asian women reacted to the Connected knowing quote with an emphatic, “This is me!” Both groups spoke of how such a style allowed them to be open to, and accepting of, others. Both groups spoke of how the Connected (C) style was respectful and allowed for deeper and more meaningful relationships. This was the way in which others’ feelings and thoughts could be validated, even if one did not necessarily agree with what the other person was saying. By and large, however, Connected women of both groups would not necessarily judge the other person. Ullman-Petrash (2000) commented, in relation to her own study, how she was “profoundly affected by many of the connected knowers’ faith in, and appreciation of, other people’s
thoughts and feelings” (p.39). Blythe Clinchy (1992) spoke of how a fully developed style of connected knowing required that one “affirm” or “confirm” the subjective reality of the other. To her, affirmation is not merely the absence of negative evaluation; it is a positive effortful act. Clinchy had explained earlier that connected knowing is not necessarily something that is easy, even if it comes naturally. One of the Asian Connected women in this study expressed a similar feeling when she said, “I try to do (the Connected style, but I don’t always succeed).”

Not all of the Asian Connected women, however, necessarily always believed what the other was saying. There were five out of ten women (50%) who spoke of using the Connected style in order to appreciate the other person’s idea or view so to be able to judge if they agreed or disagreed with them. In such a case it was an evaluative tool used as a means to an end, rather than an end in and of itself. This may be the less mature connected style that is prior to the acceptance about which Clinchy spoke above.

Interestingly, both populations spoke of how the Connected knowing style was the way in which they learned. As was said in chapter two, Rodgers (1992) found that Connected knowers by and large learned best in a connected learning environment which allowed for discussion and the sharing of thoughts and ideas without judgment. For the women in both Rodgers and this study, such an environment would be highly valued because of an atmosphere of openness that allowed for their feelings to be valued and their opinions to be validated. Although half of the Asian Connected women used the Connected style for an arguably Separate reason, they would not voice their opposition, but accept the others view (even if they disagreed). In such a way these women did not
cause another to struggle to be heard. The very act of having a friend listen without judgment allowed for one Asian Connected woman, in particular, to begin to speak out in ways that she had hitherto been unable.

The Connected US men reacted in much the same way as the Connected US women in Rodgers study. The US men commented that the Connected style was nicer and better, it helped and showed respect for others and it led to better relationships and closer bonds. The importance of maintaining close relationships and harmony within them was reiterated by the Asian Connected men when they spoke of the importance of respecting others and not arguing; however, the Asian Connected men appeared more apt to present opposite opinions, but not necessarily in a confrontational way. Instead, it was done in more of a caring way which allowed communication of one’s ideas openly—a free flow of ideas rather than a debate that may lead to conflict. This is consistent with the Connected knowers tendency to use the paradigm of “conversation” rather than “debate” (Belenky et al., 1986).

Of the Connected knowers, the men, as was said earlier, appeared more confident than the Connected women in using and expressing their voice. They talked about knowing how to argue, but choosing not to out of a desire to maintain harmony and treat others with respect. Many of the Connected women, on the other hand, lacked the skills and tools to argue if they wanted or needed to.

The Separate knowing women of both groups also reacted positively to the Connected knowing quote; however, instead of necessarily being something natural to them, both groups spoke more about how it was something to strive for. A quote
indicative of this feeling was given by one of the Asian women, “I try to be it all the time.” However, she and others recognize that they often fall short. It is still for many an ideal for which to strive. For one of the Asian Separate women, this ideal was something particularly difficult for her to do, and something she sometimes did with reluctance, “I really don’t like listening to other people, but I think that it’s important, you know.” Both groups of women, US and Asian, explained that the C style showed respect and helped to maintain relationships. Some of the US Separate women relayed how empathy was important for personal relationships.

As was the case for half of the Asian Connected women, many of the US and Asian Separate women used the Connected style for arguably Separate purposes. Members of both groups spoke of listening attentively to another person in order to appreciate their point of view, understand where they are coming from, and point out how they might be wrong or what they should do instead. Instead of arguing, however, this is given as advice, motivated by care and concern for the other person.

Of all 39 women (32 in Rodgers sample and seven in the current one), only two reacted negatively to the Connected knowing style. Two SW saw it as a weakness rather than as a strength towards which to strive, or a tool to apply. Interestingly, of all the Connected men, only one Asian man had anything negative to say about the C style. He likened it to the behavior of a child who is overly dependent on others’ approval. This will be further discussed in the section on Cultural factors.

Finally, the US and Asian Separate men also reacted similarly to each other, and to the Separate women of both populations. They, too, by and large spoke positively
about the C style; however, as was the case with the Separate women, they struggled in consistently using it. One Asian Separate man shared insightfully, "Sometimes I have found that, uh, I'm going too far in misunderstanding people or in having dispute with other people...this idea may occur to me that, uh, it's time for you to stand in the other person's (shoes) and...think that sentence like that (the C quote). But this cannot naturally occur to me at the very beginning of...a dispute. So, I would like to have this quality, but is not yet mine." Both groups also recognized that the C style would help to build and maintain relationships better.

As was the case with the Separate women, the Separate men also often employed the Connected knowing style for seemingly separate purposes. For example, one Asian man shared, "I try to benefit from the other person's point of view and I try to understand. Sometimes it works and sometimes it doesn't....We should understand at least what they think...and believe before we judge them." The Asian Separate men, however, would not necessarily then confront someone and argue with them, but they would be more apt to "share" another view. The US men, on the other hand, spoke of how they might then argue back successfully and win the dispute. Although the Asian men would think of the opposite, it was still very important for them to maintain harmony in their relationships.

Summary of Connected Knowing style

In relationship to the Connected knowing quote, all four groups of both studies reacted in very similar ways. The Connected knowing women reacted the most positively
to the quote, speaking about how it helped others to feel valued and accepted. It is interesting also to see how two of the Asian Connected women and many of the US and Asian Separate women and men used the C style for S purposes in appreciating the flaws in someone's argument, rather than necessarily working to understand, or better yet, "experience," the other (Clinchy, 1992, p.227).

This experiencing of the other, Clinchy argues is a process of engagement that is intentional and complete in which the "it" becomes a "thou" and one enters into relationship with the other, rather than in opposition or disconnection from him or her (p.221). Daloz, Keen, Keen and Daloz Parks (1996), in their discussion of commitment and citizenship, explain that "through dialogue and constructive engagement with others, young people grow more able to sense, and to construct at least roughly, how the world may actually look and feel through the eyes of another. Such perspective-taking is fundamentally an act of imagination" (p. 111). This, Clinchy would argue, is mature connected knowing, in which the other may not only be people but also works of literature, music, etc. One fully engages with the other rather than looking at it as something outside of oneself.

None of the students interviewed in either the Rodgers study or the current one were at this level of understanding, or they could not yet articulate it. Instead many were at a simplistic understanding of connected knowing which was seen as a good way to get along with people and keep harmony in relationships. It is possible in fact that some of the students who had been rated as connected in their knowing were not yet at the level of engagement which is indicative of this procedural way of knowing. Clinchy (1992)
argues that connected and separate knowing are both procedures for evaluating and assessing how something "hangs together" rather than an unquestioning acceptance without reflection or seeing other through self (p. 238). Such total relativism in which one cannot make an assessment or evaluation is what Belenky et al. (1986) called Subjective knowing, similar to the Idiosyncratic thinking of William Perry's Stage 4 "Multiplicity Correlate," in which everyone has a right to his or her own opinion and no one can judge him or her right or wrong (Perry, 1970, p. 107). It is possible then that some of the women and men who were rated as connected in their knowing style were in fact subjective, which is a less sophisticated way of making meaning that does not appreciate any procedure for knowing. Having to rate participants as either separate or connected may have forced both studies (Rodgers and the current one) into an "either or" mentality, against which Clinchy warns researchers. This is something to note for future studies which seek to understand and appreciate how people construct theirs and the others' knowing style.

Cultural Conditioning and its effect on Knowing Styles

The most striking deviations of the current study from that of Rodgers (2000) were in the overwhelming need of students from all four groups, Separate women and men and Connected women and men, to maintain harmony in their relationships and to show respect to those with a higher social status. Although it was important for many of Rodgers' participants to "keep the peace," especially the Connected knowers, this trend was nowhere as apparent as in the current study.
Such a need led to Separate women and men alike refraining from articulating their contrary thoughts, and as a result many of them identified more strongly with the Connected knowing quote than the Separate one. Even though they may have thought of the contrary of what one was saying, they would not necessarily articulate it out-loud. What seems to be at work in this pattern is strong cultural conditioning in terms of role behavior. According to Markus and Kitayama (1991), in many Non-Western cultures, especially those of Asia, one’s conception of self cannot necessarily be divorced from one’s relationship to others. This may in fact be the “connectedness” with which many of the Separate knowers were relating. “Seeing oneself as part of an encompassing social relationship and recognizing that one’s behavior is determined, contingent on, and, to a large extent organized by what the actor perceives to be the thoughts, feelings, and actions of others in the relationship” (p. 227). What this means is that it is particularly important to take into account one’s place in a relationship both in terms of one’s effect on others and in terms of one’s place within a given hierarchy.

In the Confucian social structure, which lies at the foundation of the Chinese Cultures of China and Taiwan, as well as Korea and Japan, role relationships define all social interaction. The Five Cardinal Relations of the Confucian tradition consist of the sovereign and subject, father and son, elder brother and younger brother (filial piety), husband and wife, and friend and friend (Ho, 1986, p.10). This social conception is meant to create a series of relationships that guide one’s behavior and interaction with others, and when synchronized create harmony.
A possible reason why many of the Asian women and men used in this study would not necessarily articulate their thoughts if they were contrary to the opinions of others was the strong role conditioning they had received. Markus and Kitayama (1991) explain very clearly what may be at work in such a situation: "in many domains of social life, one’s opinions, abilities, and characteristics are assigned only secondary roles—they must instead be constantly controlled and regulated to come to terms with the primary task of interdependence" (p.227). Therefore, the needs of the individual are subordinated to the needs of the relationship of the individual with others.

It is fascinating to reflect on the instances in which the students interviewed spoke of strife in their lives and in their relationships. Often the most difficult times for them, especially for women, were when the demands of their families or partners went against their individual needs. In those instances, harmony was upset when one did not fulfill the obligation that was expected by the other. For example, one connected woman spoke of the difficulty she had in getting her father to appreciate her needs; however, the father might have felt that such appreciation from a parent was seemingly unnecessary because of the precedence his demands took over his daughter’s needs.

What may be happening in these cultures today is that young people are becoming more assertive of their personal needs. Yang (1991) found that the culture of Taiwan had begun to change from a social orientation (interdependent) to a more individual orientation (independent) because of increased modernization and industrialization. This shift may be further compounded by the socialization that one experiences in receiving either an undergraduate or graduate education in the US. After having lived in the US
culture, in which the ideal of independence over interdependence is constantly sought, it would indeed be difficult for a student to return to his or her home country to an environment where their place was pre-determined and their needs might be subordinated to those of a person in a higher social status. As these students develop a sense of self as independent of others it will become increasingly difficult for them to live according to the roles that are expected of them. A surprising comment from one of the Separate men was that the connected style was more indicative of the behavior of a child who is overly dependent on his parents. This student, who considers himself smart, expresses that he can make his own decisions without the help of others. This complete shift from “other” focus to “self” focus may be a foreshadow of what is to come as more of the cultures which have been governed by the Confucian social system are influenced and shaped by outside pressures from “the Western” world.

Within this data of only 25 students, however, the difficulty people had in going against the expectations of their elders was immediately apparent. The women, especially, had the least support. As was demonstrated in Chapter two, the cultures under study still have a patriarchal social structure in which women’s needs are subordinated and access to education is often limited (Hooper, 1991). In this study, there was one woman who strongly identified herself as a Separate knower and would often voice her opinion in front of her older husband and his friends. As a result, she was ridiculed by her husband for having been out of line and out of her place. Not only was she calling into question older men’s thinking, but she was doing it as a woman. For this student, in particular, the environmental press of her family and social life (Stern, 1970), was not in
the same direction as she wanted to go. This dissonance had created a great deal of
difficulty in her life, especially in her ability to express a voice.

Seeking a voice:

A trend repeatedly cited and discussed in the data of this study has been women’s
difficulty in finding and expressing a voice. For the Separate women it was often because
of a lack of support from others to do what was natural, i.e., question and debate.
Interestingly, the majority of these women expressed feeling most comfortable with other
women who could appreciate, and who would accept, their separate nature. The
Connected women, however, because of their desire for connectedness and harmony,
were unwilling to question or argue; therefore, they would often be silenced by loud and
assertive people, or those who wanted control over them. Often when these women did
articulate their needs it was with raw emotion, in times of desperation.

The development of voice through its various stages was the original path taken
by Women’s ways of knowing, with the sub-title, “the development of self, voice and
mind.” The authors explained that the book was “a roar which lies on the other side of
silence” when ordinary women find their voice and use it to gain control over their lives
(p.4). According to the authors, a woman develops a voice by having her own validated
and valued, first by others and later by herself.

Many of the women in this study, however, had not had many opportunities in
which men had valued or validated their opinions; more often it was women, either
mothers, grandmothers, guardians or friends. Since they had lived primarily in
patriarchal societies, it was the men more often than not who were in the positions of authority and power. Therefore, many of these women had not yet experienced a sense of value from those in authority. When this does happen, as was the case for some women who had helpful and attentive teachers and professors, it can help them to develop a deeper sense of self-efficacy and self-agency. Often, however, those women who were rated as Connected would only articulate their thoughts and voice their opinions when they were angry, felt hurt or felt betrayed. Instead of feeling control in an environment in which they had self-agency, these women felt compelled to react to a hostile situation.

As has been said, for a woman to be able to express her voice, she must feel valued and validated. Both the data from the current study and that of Rodgers (2000) indicated that Connected women learned in connected ways. Belenky et al. (1986) spoke of a connected learning environment as “intimate rather than impersonal, relatively informal and unstructured rather than bound by more or less explicit formal rules” (p. 114). Rodgers (1992) spoke of such a learning environment as collaborative rather than competitive, and as encouraging discussion and sharing rather than finding a “right” answer. Such an environment, therefore, would validate the particular ways in which the Connected people, in general, but the Connected women, in particular, learned. As has been demonstrated in this data, when people feel validated and valued they are more apt to express their voices freely.

The Separate women faced a similar challenge, in that their voices were not valued because they were often in opposition to others, which was against the environmental press (Stern, 1970) of the culture. In order for these women to learn and
develop, they must be allowed to express their opinions freely, even if it is in opposition to another's. Their ability to see the opposite and articulate it is something that should be reinforced rather than ridiculed. If so, these women will also feel more comfortable and valued in their living and learning environments. It is interesting to note how many of the Separate women in this study felt most comfortable with those friends who would accept them for their Separate nature. The same was true of the Connected women who had connected friends who made them feel like they counted.

As instructors, facilitators, supervisors and peers, we must therefore allow for women especially, but people of both genders, to have opportunities to learn in a way that is most natural and conducive to their knowing styles. The higher education classroom has for centuries been guided by the Separate tendency to engage in lecture as a teaching tool, and debate and testing as an evaluative tool. Therefore, in order to include Connected knowers, we must also create opportunities for collaboration, discussion without judgment, and instances in which students can speak without interruption.

"Appreciating the skills of the connected knower and the feeler would ultimately benefit us all" (Ullman-Petrash, 2000, p. 40). In this way, all students, regardless of knowing style or gender, would have the opportunity to be heard, valued and validated. As a result, they would develop the self-esteem to articulate their thoughts and needs and develop the ability to listen to others.
Limitations of the Current Study

What was originally conceived as a quantitative study later became a qualitative one because of a limited sample of only 25 women and men. As a result, little could be concluded for the quantitative hypotheses, although the results appeared to support the findings of other researchers.

According to Ullman-Petrash (2000), the current study still provided support for the construct validity of the thinking-feeling scale of the MBTI, in that 89% of the women and men with a thinking preference also demonstrated a separate way of knowing, and 75% of the women and men with a feeling preference, a connected knowing style. Although a Log Linear Analysis could not be run on the data, this study is the first to use the MBTI Form M to look at the relationship between psychological type and knowing style.

Secondly, the original research design had been to include all study participants in the Workshop on Psychological type (See Appendix B), which would have allowed for an assessment of the accuracy of the instrument type in comparison to "true" type. However, with only eleven of the twenty five having engaged in the workshop, little if anything could be concluded. Although there were three exceptions out of the eleven, in which the instrument type was indicated as thinking but later changed to feeling, there was no way to assess the significance of this finding.

Thirdly, language could have been a problem for many of the participants. The MBTI Form M is filled with idiomatic expressions and unfamiliar or ambiguous vocabulary. The researcher sought to minimize the effect of language barriers on the
participants assessment of their own type, as suggested by Kirby and Barger (1998); however, the extent to which role specific behavior might have affected the answers given by participants could not be measured. Although the MBTI has been found to be successful in Asian cultures in which group social values are important, such as China and Korea, it is not appropriate for all cultures. Kirby and Barger warn that the instrument may not be appropriate for culture which combine the centrality of group identity with the experience of oppression, as is the case for many indigenous peoples (p. 369). At minimum, one who wishes to use the MBTI with non-dominant cultures should at least read this Kirby and Barger article found in the MBTI Form M Manual; preferably one would also engage the literature on the values and norms of the culture of the individuals under investigation.

The Interview protocol (See Appendix A) was also filled with idiomatic expressions and unfamiliar vocabulary for international students. Words such as “strike” and “broaden,” more often than not, required clarification and explanation. Since many of the interviews were conducted by people other than the researcher, the information given to participants could not be standardized. Secondly, and more importantly, the language used in the two quotes was problematic for some students. It appeared that the expression “taking something for granted” was very unfamiliar for students not educated in the US. For some of the students who seemed to struggle with the questions, this phrase seemed to become confusing for them. “Playing the devil’s advocate” was also a value laden expression, especially for students who identified themselves as Christian. One student, in particular, could not divorce from the expression the figure of the “Devil”
or evil. This immediately had negative connotations for her. Lastly, the word “broaden” used in the final question was one that did not make sense to most of the students. “Expand” might have been more appropriate since it has often been taught in a different context.

An additional limitation of the study was in the sampling technique employed. Firstly, it was discovered that the Sampling Frame, which consisted of Asian “international” students between the ages of 18 to 26 years old who had been enrolled at a large Mid-Western US university for three quarters or more, also contained students who had identified themselves as Chinese, Taiwanese, Korean or Japanese, but who had been living in the US for much of their lives. The researcher discovered far into the data collection stage that at least two of the students had spent at least their high school years in the US, in addition to their college years. This inclusion of students, who were still admittedly international students under federal regulations, but who had been exposed for a longer period of time to the US culture, could have skewed the data for the sample, in general. Therefore, one cannot necessarily generalize from this study’s data to any population, in particular. However, the current study has begun the process of investigating how students from outside the US culture construct theirs and others knowing styles.

Admittedly, the sample chosen was purposive and biased, in that they had self-selected. The students in this study all made between a one hour and four hour commitment to participate. The hope was that they would take valuable and helpful information back with them in the form of a manual (See Appendix I) and a bibliography
(See Appendix E), as well as the results of the MBTI Form M. There was no way in which to determine how those who were not interested in the study might have behaved or thought.

**Further areas of research**

The sampling technique employed in this study consisted of sending blind emails to international students, who seemed to already be inundated with emails from the University. The vast majority of emails never received a response, even after all five were sent out. Now that e-mail is the primary source of communication for students, faculty and staff, more needs to be done to investigate its use as a medium for collecting data and soliciting participation in research studies.

Although attempts were made to contact prospective participants through the Presidents of the Chinese Student and Scholar Association, the Korean Student Association, the Taiwanese Student Association and the Japanese Student Association, no participants ever came through. Had such contact been made early on in the data collection phase, rather than as a last resort, a larger sample may have been possible to gather. A more effective technique for gathering a purposive sample for a study such as this one might be to use a “snowball” technique in which the researcher asks for referrals from participants, after having made initial contact with someone within a group (Gay, 1996). The international students in this study all had access to the four Nationality Clubs listed above, with memberships numbering in the hundreds; therefore, such a technique might have yielded a larger sample. More should be done to assess the pros
and cons of utilizing Nationality Clubs and other Student organizations for soliciting participation in research studies.

More should also be done in order to assess how to best attract students to participate in research that involves workshops and instruments that reveal to students elements of their personality and their preferences. The design of the current study assumed that students would choose to take the time to come to the Office of International Education in order to take the MBTI instrument, engage in the workshop and be interviewed. Out of 467 students contacted, only 25 participated. Nothing was done to assess how the majority of these other students might have preferred to participate in such a study as this one. Since the majority of Asian international students from China, Taiwan, Korea and Japan are in the business and science fields, then it would be advantageous to concentrate on attracting those students through their coursework and their professional and personal interests. Future research could involve focus groups and methods that sought to serve the students and their needs by going to them rather than presuming that they will come to us.

Obviously, much more needs to be done to investigate the relationship between Carl Jung’s theory of Psychological type and Belenky et al.’s conception of Separate and Connected knowing styles. All the data collected to date has been in only the past seven years and in only four locations. In order to appreciate the relationship between these two theories and their constructs more needs to be done to work with varying populations and ages in order to appreciate the extent of its relationship. Although the Log-Linear Analysis has been an effective tool in analyzing qualitative data, it has not yet been
utilized in investigating this area of focus. Once enough exceptions are collected for the Rodgers study (2000), such a technique will finally be employed.

Future studies should also investigate alternative wordings for the quotes used in the Interview Protocol (see Appendix A). For the students sampled in this study many words were unfamiliar, as has been noted; however, a more fundamental problem could have been in the inconsistency in the structure of the two knowing style quotes and how the students might have been repelled more from the Separate knowing quote, not by virtue of their own preference, but instead as a result of an avoidable bias. The connected quote described an individual’s internal inclination when faced with differences of opinion, i.e. to look at another person’s idea, see how they could say that, why they think they are right and why it makes sense. The connected quote does not include any description of behavior that one might exhibit in reaction to that difference. That is something that is explored through the interview. The separate quote, on the other hand, does not only describe the internal inclination, i.e., “I never take anything someone says for granted, I just tend to see the contrary,” but also it includes specific behaviors that one would exhibit, “I like playing the Devil’s advocate, arguing the opposite of what somebody is saying, thinking of exceptions, or thinking of a different train of logic.” It is these behaviors that were very unattractive to the students sampled in this study due in large part to their cultural conditioning. A more useful design might include giving participants the first sentence of each quote and allowing them to describe how they would then behave in reaction to it. This would allow for people to explore how they construct the knowing style internally and how they choose to behave externally. It
might also alleviate some of the resistance that the Asian students put up in reaction to words such as “argue” and “play the devil’s advocate.” More importantly, it would make the interview protocol consistent and unbiased.

In order to have reliable data on the thinking and feeling dimension of the MBTI, it is necessary to verify participant’s psychological type through workshops and other educational tools (Myers et al., 1998). This study, as well as Ullman-Petrash (2000), used this technique, but combined there have only been 32 participants thus far that have related such data to knowing styles. The Rodgers studies (1998; 2000) only used the instrument type. More needs to be done to test the validity of the MBTI instrument in determining individual’s conception of a “true” type. Since the MBTI is becoming widely used as an educational and organizational tool, such work would contribute a great deal to those who wish to use the MBTI and theory of Psychological type as a tool.

As has been investigated by Belenky et al. (1986) and Rodgers (1992), more needs to be done to measure how individuals learn according to their particular knowing style. Faculty and administrators must begin to more widely employ connected teaching and learning techniques in order to provide a maximum learning experiences and environments for their students. As computers become more widely used in the educational environment, an interesting question might be to ask how electronic communication and teaching affects the learning of students of both Separate and Connected knowing styles.

Finally, far more needs to be done to investigate qualitatively the ways in which diverse peoples, according to nationality, ethnicity, race, socio-economic status, gender,
sexual orientation, ability, religion and age (to name but a few), construct their knowing styles. As we develop a wider appreciation of the experiences of people throughout the world and throughout different environments, we can appreciate how best to facilitate their growth and development as individuals within diverse groups.

Conclusion

This study sought to allow for voices that had been silent in the literature on psychological type and knowing styles to be heard. It was readily apparent that international students from China, Taiwan, Korea and Japan had unique ways in which they constructed their own and others’ knowing styles. Regardless of knowing styles or psychological type, these groups tended to seek to maintain harmony both in their professional and personal relationships, rather than speaking out and risking upsetting the balance in a given environment. As has been demonstrated, this trend was explained in part by the patterns of socialization in their home cultures. Therefore, for this sample the environmental press according to patterns of cultural conditioning appeared to have strongly influenced outward behavior regardless of psychological type or knowing style.

Internally, however, the two knowing styles were aware of their tendencies. Although separate knowers and thinking types were inclined to question and think of the contrary, they would not do so for fear of showing disrespect and upsetting harmony in their relationships. The most striking differences within the sample were between men and women who had been conditioned differently within the social structure of their particular countries. The majority of the men appeared to be comfortable in expressing
their thoughts and opinions, regardless of their knowing style, whereas the women struggled for a voice and a way to express their own thoughts and preferences.

It seemed to be most difficult for the Separate women, who were naturally inclined to be in conflict with both their conditioning as Chinese, Taiwanese, Korean and Japanese citizens, and their particular place within those societies, according to their gender roles. Those students who had been motivated to break out of their cultural milieu, women especially, found it difficult to be heard and valued, especially by men who did not wish to hear what they had to say unless it was congruent with their own way of making meaning.

This data indicated that knowing styles are real; however, there outward expression may be affected by one's cultural conditioning. Therefore, we as educators ought to be sensitive to the ways in which students express their preferences, according to knowing styles and psychological type. If we listen and are attentive to the particular needs of students in our classrooms and offices, then we as administrators and instructors, may open the doors for women and men to begin to express their own voices, whether that be in connection to others in an interdependent way, or in separation from others in an independent way. Regardless of knowing style, feeling valued and having one's opinion validated is essential for growth in any environment, especially one of higher learning.
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APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL FROM MANSFIELD AND CLINCHY (1992)

SEPARATE KNOWING QUOTE: “I never take anything someone says for granted. I just tend to see the contrary. I like playing the devil’s advocate, arguing the opposite of what somebody is saying, thinking of exceptions, or thinking of a different train of logic.”

(1) How does this strike you? Is this something you would do? When/where/with whom would you do it?

(2) If possible, describe in detail a specific situation where you’re done it.

(3) What’s the purpose of it? Why do you do it?

(4) Some people say they find it hard to argue. Is that true for you? What’s so hard about it?

(5) When/where/with whom would you probably not do it?
(6) Are there people in your life, or have there been people in your life who treated you this way? How do you feel about that?

**CONNECTED KNOWING QUOTE:** “When I have an idea about something, and it differs from the way another person is thinking about it, I’ll usually try to look at it from that person’s point of view, see how they could say that, why they think that they’re right, and why it makes sense.”

(1) How does this strike you? Is this something you would do? When/where/with whom would you do it?

(2) If possible, describe in detail a specific situation where you’re done it.

(3) What’s the purpose of it? Why do you do it?

(4) Do you find this easy to do or hard to do? Why?

(5) When/where/with whom would you probably **not** do it?

(6) Are there people in your life, or have there been people in your life who treated you this way? How do you feel about that?
(7) Which of these are you more likely to use?

(8) How do you use them? (Give specific examples when you have used one or both.)

(9) Can you describe ways in which you might broaden your approach?
# APPENDIX B

## TYPE WORKSHOP DESIGN

**Saturday, 8:30 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>MATERIALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--To set up training room. --Check and organize materials and processes for workshop</td>
<td><strong>1. Facilitator Meeting</strong> --set up room --check all materials --meet and coordinate assignments, roles, and processes to be used in meeting with interviewers and workshop in afternoon --arrange facilitators feedback --set facilitator goals</td>
<td>Ben and Bob</td>
<td><strong>8:30am</strong></td>
<td>All materials for workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--To coordinate roles and responsibilities for staff assistants</td>
<td><strong>2. Meeting with Interviewers/ Interpreters</strong> --coordinate assignments --review roles as either interviewer or interpreter: Interviewer: Each is to meet with one student and record the Clinchy interview with that participant.</td>
<td>All staff</td>
<td><strong>8:50 am</strong></td>
<td>All materials for interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--to learn of participants preference for connected or separate knowing --to close expectation gaps and set the norm of asking questions</td>
<td><strong>3. First Round of Interviews</strong> --each interviewer will take one student (ideally 15 in all) to a private space to conduct Clinchy interview --At interview site: a. Participant will have procedures explained, including the norm to ask questions whenever they may arise b. Record interviews (to be transcribed later) c. Answer questions d. All interviewers should hand in numbered tapes in correspondence with answer sheets and consent forms for each participant to Ben</td>
<td>All staff and half of participants</td>
<td><strong>9:15 am</strong></td>
<td>Clinchy interview sheets, tape recorder, pen, consent form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--To close expectation gaps --To cover goals, nature of training, schedule, norms,</td>
<td><strong>4. Introduction</strong> A. “Who is here?” 1) Asian international students who have been in the United States for more than a year</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td><strong>10:00am</strong></td>
<td>Easel, newsprint, black and blue markers, masking tape, name tags, for each participant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and administrivia

2) Introduce Staff: Ben & Bob

B. "Why are we here?"

GOALS
- To learn about the theory of psychological type and one's natural preference
- To select your type
- To have fun

C. "How will we do business?"
--Overview of the morning and afternoon
Note: Have them write their names on name tags if they have not already done so.

NORMS

S – Sensitive to Self and Others
P – Participate in whatever way makes you feel most comfortable
E – Experiment with new skills and behaviors
A – Ask questions if you don’t understand
R – Responsible for one's own learning, not others
O – On time
H – Have fun!

ADMINISTRIVIA:
- Locate vending area
- No smoking except outside
- There will be lunch served after completion of instrument. There will be a break half way through workshop. If you need to use bathroom at other times, you may

--to have participants take instrument so to be able to introduce topic and have data for comparison with self-selected type after workshop

5. Take Myers-Briggs Typology Instrument, Form M

a. Explain procedures for taking the instrument:
   1) Forced choice questions (Must make a choice)
   2) This should not be answered as expected in roles, such as

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:05am</td>
<td>Bob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:10am</td>
<td>Ben, 10:10am; Easel, newsprint, blue and black markers, and masking tape, question booklets, answer sheets, pencils</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| --to explain procedures for taking the instrument | student, etc. If there were no roles to perform, what would you prefer?  
3) If you could choose one way for the rest of your life, without outside demands, what would make you happiest?  
4) Cannot answer questions about meanings of words since it is up to participants' perception. However, participants can look up words in the English dictionary available at the front of the room.  
b. Give all participants as much time as needed to complete the instrument  
c. When finished may go into rm 100 to sit and visit quietly. Please be quiet when others are taking the instrument  
d. Read instructions clearly  
e. Participants take instrument |  
| 10:20am |  

| --to provide food and reward participation in the research | 6. **Lunch/Score Instruments**  
--Participants will take lunch after having completed the instrument  
--Ben and Bob will then score the instruments so to be able to use them in the workshop portion | All staff and participants | 11:00am | giant subway sandwich (meat and vegetarian), soft drinks, napkin, plates, plastic-ware |  

| --to learn more about theory of psychological type --to predict self through lense of theory | 6. **Personality Type**  
*Bob will score last answer sheets while Ben explains theory  
* Participants may continue eating  
a) Handouts given to participants  
b) Introduction and brief background to type and MBTI:  
1) Jung's theory  
2) Use of Psychological Type: One of the most commonly used personality assessment tools in the world  
i) Re-iterate goals of workshop  
c) Predict Self on all four dichotomies (Which best fits the way you prefer to be most of the time?)  
d) Extroversion v. Introversion: explain and predict (use explanations in manual to clarify all four dichotomies)  
e) Sensing v. Intuition: explain and predict  
f) Thinking v. Feeling: explain and predict | Ben | 11:15am | Overhead transparencies, handouts, pencils, easel, newsprint, markers, masking tape, MBTI score reports | 11:25am | 11:40pm |
**To reveal MBTI results**  
**- explain their interpretation and their relationship to the predicted type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>predict</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Judging v. Perceiving: explain and predict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>11:50am</th>
<th>12:00pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>MBTI Results and Interpretation</td>
<td>Bob and Ben</td>
<td>Answer sheets, handout, pencils, newsprint, markers, masking tape, overheads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>MBTI Guidelines:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Individuals should have opportunity to evaluate their own “true type”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>A person’s psychological type should be regarded as a working hypothesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Everyone uses every preference. We favor one over another on the four scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>MBTI scores should not be over-interpreted. Scores indicate clarity of choice, not how much you have of something</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Psychological type can explain some human behavior, not all.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Psychological type should not be used as excuse for doing or not doing something</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Hand out answer sheets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Explain “Slight” (too close to call), “Moderate” (moderate confidence), “Clear” (high confidence), and “Very Clear” (high confidence)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>make sure to be explicit about it interpreting answers rather than person</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ben</th>
<th>Bob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E Clear</td>
<td>E Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Very Clear</td>
<td>N Very Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Slight</td>
<td>F Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Very Clear</td>
<td>P Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Explain how Ben actually chose instead to go with “F” which better fits his own experience (instrument not always the best judge)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>12:35pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Make a judgment about “true” type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*If prediction based upon presentation and MBTI are same, go with it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*If different, read profiles in handout and in notebook on table. Select based upon “best fit” as participant judges it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Hand in MBTI Form containing instrument type, predicted type, and “true” type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--to bring workshop portion to a close</td>
<td>9. <strong>Closing</strong>&lt;br&gt;--reiterate proper use of type&lt;br&gt;--thank participants for hard work during day&lt;br&gt;--provide sources or literature that would further expand understanding of use of type (List on desk)&lt;br&gt;--Keep half who has not done interview for last part&lt;br&gt;--Dismiss group who interviewed earlier in the day</td>
<td>Ben and Bob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--to learn of participants preference for connected or separate knowing --to close expectation gaps</td>
<td>10. <strong>Second Round of Interviews</strong>&lt;br&gt;--each interviewer will take one student (ideally 15 in all) to a private space to conduct Clinchy interview&lt;br&gt;--At interview site:&lt;br&gt;a. Participant will have procedures explained, including the norm to ask questions whenever they may arise&lt;br&gt;b. Record interviews (to be transcribed later)&lt;br&gt;c. Answer questions&lt;br&gt;d. Participants free to leave after completion of interview&lt;br&gt;e. All interviewers should hand in numbered tapes in correspondence with answer sheets and consent forms for each participant to Ben</td>
<td>Staff and second half of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clinchy interview sheets, tape recorder, pen, consent form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--to evaluate the workshop and interviews --to give facilitators feedback on goals --to clean up and close</td>
<td>11. <strong>Final Staff Meeting</strong>&lt;br&gt;--Check that all materials collected: MBTI forms, consent forms and tapes with corresponding numbers&lt;br&gt;--Evaluate the whole workshop, including the interviews&lt;br&gt;--Give facilitators feedback&lt;br&gt;--Clean up</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All materials for workshop, including all question booklets, tapes, consent forms, and MBTI forms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

SCRIPT USED PRIOR TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE M.B.T.I. FORM M

Thank you all for coming this morning. Half of you have already been interviewed in order to determine your knowing style. I hope that it was interesting and rewarding to find out about how you prefer to look at differing opinions. Remember there is no right way, or better way, to think; however, we can learn a lot by looking at our own preferences. I hope that the other half of you enjoy this process, as well.

We are going to continue our morning with exploring other ways of looking at our natural preferences. First, each of you will take the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, Form M, which will give you feedback on your personality preference. This will take between 30 and 45 minutes to complete. When you have finished please help yourselves to brunch. We will return as a group at 11:15 a.m. to talk about the theory of psychological type and how it affects both your personal and professional lives. You will be able to predict your own type and then compare it to the results of the instrument you are about to take. It is important for everyone to realize that there is no right answer, or any type that is better than another. The interesting and wonderful thing about this theory is that it recognizes the importance of having all types of people. This being said, however, recognizing one’s own strengths and potential weaknesses can help us all to more effectively communicate with one another. At the end of the day you will each receive a bibliography of resources on the theory of personality type and its use should you be interested in learning more. Thank you again for your participation in this study. As was said earlier, although the data from this study will be used, your name will not be identified with the knowing style interview or M.B.T.I. It is strictly confidential.

Everyone please pull out a pencil. If you do not have a pencil, please raise your hand and we will give you one. Everyone will be given an answer sheet and a question booklet. Please do not write in the question booklet. We will need each of them back when you have completed taking the instrument. The answer sheet, on the other hand, will be scored and returned to you. It is for you to keep.

On the answer sheet, please write your name, date of birth, and OSU email address. These items will only be used to match your MBTI results with the transcript from your interview. Once this occurs, your name will be removed from both items. This information will in no way harm you or reflect negatively on you. After it is matched your personal information will be destroyed. On the MBTI answer sheet you do not need to fill in all of the bubbles. (Read instructions for administration of the instrument and have students read along. Answer any questions.
APPENDIX D

SELECTION OF PREFERENCES

SELECTION OF PREFERENCES

Name ___________  Gender (circle one): Male  Female

Email address ___________  Time in the U.S. ___ yrs, ___ months

Nationality ___________  Date of Birth ___________

Major/Area of Study ___________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E-I</th>
<th>S-N</th>
<th>T-F</th>
<th>J-P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Self-selected type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>M.B.T.I. type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Best estimate for today</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

171
APPENDIX E

TYPE BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR STUDY PARTICIPANTS

Bibliography of Books on Psychological Type by Category
“Psychological Type: A Workshop for Asian International Students from China, Taiwan, Korea, & Japan”

Note: If held by OSU libraries, call number is included

I. Basic Books on Type and Temperament:


ATI Reserve: Bright Yellow Book

Hirsh & Kummerow. Life Types.
Note: Probably at the Public libraries


ATI Reserve: RC 480.5. K4 1978-B

Kroeger, Otto (1988). Type talk, or, How to determine your personality type and change your life.
EHS: BF 698.3. K76 1988

Montgomery. The Artisan.

Montgomery. The Guardian.


Pearman, Roger R. (1997). I'm not crazy, I'm just not you: The real meaning of the 16 personality types.
EHS: BF 698.3. P43 1997

II. Research-based Books:


III. Organizations/Leadership:

EHS: HD 57.7 B27 1989

Barr, Lee; & Barr, Norma. Leadership Development: Maturity & Power.

BUS: HD 38.2. B46 1991

Bereks. Working Together: A Personality-Centered Approach (2nd ed.)


Fitzgerald, Catherine; & Kirby, Linda K. (Eds.) (1997). Developing Leaders: Research and Applications in Psychological Type and Leadership Development.
EHS: HD 57.7 D497 1997 c.2
BUS: HD 42. H57 1996

Isachsen, Olaf (1996). Joining the Entrepreneurial Elite.
BUS: HB 615. 183 1996


ATI/EHS: BF 698.9. 03. K68 1992

Kummerow, Barger, & Kirby. Work Types.

BUS: BF 637. L4 P43 1998

BUS: HF 5548.8. P76 1992

IV. Children, Teaching, & Learning:

EHS: LB 1027. F 245 1995

ATI: LB1025.2. L38 1993

Murphy, Elizabeth (1992). The developing child: Using Jungian type to understand children.

Provost & Anchors. Applications of the MBTI in Higher Education.

V. Type Development:
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Yabnoff. *Inner Image: A Resource for Type Development.*

**VI. Masculine, Feminine, & Relationships:**

Kroeger & Theusen. *16 Ways to Love Your Lover.*
Note: At the Public Library


**VII. Career:**

BUS: HF 5549.5. C35 N48 1991

Martin. *Looking at Type and Careers.*

Provost. *Work, Play, and Type.*

**VIII. Spirituality:**

Grant, Thompson, & Clarke. *From Image to Likeness.*


Richardson. *Four Spiritualities.*

**IX. Journals Related to Type:**

- The Bulletin of Psychological Type
- Journal of Psychological Type (EHS: BF 698. A1 J67)
- The Type Reporter
APPENDIX F

INITIAL EMAIL SENT TO PARTICIPANTS

Hello,
We are seeking your participation in a research study to examine relationships among gender and preferences for personality types and knowing styles in Asian international students. Please read the following message:

To participate, we ask for three things. First, we want to conduct an interview with you about your knowing style. We will tape and transcribe the interview, which will take about 30 minutes to complete. All transcripts from your interview will remain confidential and will be coded directly after the interview so to protect your identity. Second, we want you to take the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) Form M. This is a personality preference inventory (not a test) that provides feedback on your psychological type preferences for four different dimensions of personality: extroversion v. introversion, sensing v. intuition, thinking v. feeling, and judging v. perceiving. This takes about 30-45 minutes to complete. Third, we would like for you to participate in a workshop which explains the theory of psychological type and the use of the Myers Briggs Type Indicator in understanding yourself, work and personal relationships, and how people tend to behave, in general. Normally such a workshop can cost up to $200; however, it will be offered free to all participants in this research. At the end of the workshop you will select your personality preference both from the instrument results and your knowledge of personality type. This workshop will take an additional two hours and fifteen minutes. All participants will be provided with a bibliography of resources that will provide additional information about the theory and its use. Your transcripts and MBTI results will be strictly confidential. Once your transcript and MBTI results are paired, your name will be removed from both items.

The initial interview, M.B.T.I., and workshop will take approximately four and a half hours in one day. We will conduct our research on three different dates so that everyone can attend: Saturday, January 15th, Saturday, January 29th, and Saturday, February 12th. Interview times will be staggered; therefore, half of the group will arrive at 9:30 a.m. and leave at 1:45 p.m. and the other half of the group will arrive at 10:00 a.m. and leave at 2:15 p.m. Lunch will be provided from 11:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. There will also be snacks for participants during the workshop. In addition, at the end of the workshop there will be a raffle for savings coupons to some local restaurants.
Participation in this research is strictly voluntary. We appreciate your time and assistance in this matter. If you are interested in participating in this research, please respond to this message with the date for which you are available: January 15th, January 29th, or February 12th. If you are not interested, or are unable to participate in this study, please send a brief message stating that. Please respond to this message no later than finals week for Autumn Quarter, the week of December 10th. We will confirm your participation and the expected time of your arrival two weeks prior to the date of the workshop you have indicated. All three sessions will be held in the Office of International Education, Oxley Hall, rm 101A.

If you have any questions at any time prior to, during, or after the research, please contact Benjamin Williams. Thank you for your involvement and support of this research.

Robert F. Rodgers, Ph.D.  Benjamin Williams
Associate Professor  M.A. Candidate
APPENDIX G
SECOND EMAIL

PLEASE DO NOT ERASE WITHOUT RESPONDING FIRST!

EXCITING RESEARCH FREE FOOD GREAT WORKSHOP

Hello everyone,
It's finals week, and I hope that your studies and papers are going well. Please read this message and respond before erasing.

Over the past two weeks each of you has received an email from me on research that will be conducted in January and February. I have not yet heard from you and still need to know if you are interested. Please read the following and respond. Thank you.

THE WORKSHOP:
• Take the M.B.T.I.
• Have fun learning more about yourself and others, both in personal and professional relationships
• Have a FREE LUNCH!
• Maybe win a coupon to a local restaurant, or a tee-shirt
• Contribute to new and exciting research on international students
• Help out a fellow student in his thesis research
• DO THIS ALL FOR FREE!

DATES: Saturday, January 15th, Saturday, January 29th, or Saturday, February 12th from approximately 10:00 a.m. to 2:15 p.m.

If you are interested, more detailed information will be sent to you in the first week of Winter Quarter; if you are not, your name will be removed from the list after you have responded. Thank you for your time and assistance.

I look forward to hearing from each of you! Good luck to all of you!

Sincerely,
Ben Williams, M.A. Candidate
APPENDIX H

EMAIL DESCRIBING MODIFIED DESIGN

Gender Conditioning, Knowing Styles, and Psychological Type
Explanation of Research

I am seeking your participation in a research study to examine relationships among
gender, knowing styles and personality types. The purpose of the study is to examine
whether gender or personality are more associated with different knowing styles.

To participate, I ask for two things. First, you will interviewed about your knowing style.
This interview, which will take no more than thirty minutes to complete, will be taped
and transcribed. Second, you will take the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) Form
M. This is a personality preference inventory (not a test) that takes about 30 minutes to
complete. Knowledge of psychological type is helpful in self-understanding, selecting
careers and improving work and personal relationships.

The initial interview and M.B.T.I. will take approximately one hour to complete. Your
interview transcripts and MBTI results will be strictly confidential. Once your transcript
and MBTI are paired, your name will be removed from both items. In addition, you will
receive the results of your M.B.T.I. instrument, a packet of information on the theory, and
a bibliography of resources to investigate if you wish to learn more.

Should you have any questions at any time prior to, during, or after the research, please
contact me. Thank you for your involvement and support of this research.

Benjamin Williams
M.A. Candidate
APPENDIX I
WORKSHOP MANUAL

See attached.
PSYCHOLOGICAL TYPE:

A WORKSHOP FOR ASIAN INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS FROM CHINA, TAIWAN, KOREA, & JAPAN

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
WINTER QUARTER, 2000

Conducted by:
BENJAMIN M. WILLIAMS
DR. ROBERT F. RODGERS
### Characteristics of Jungian Personality Preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHERE YOU FOCUS YOUR ATTENTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Focused on the outer world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Preference for communication through verbal interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Learns best through discussion or experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Variety of interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Likes to take the initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tends to act first, reflect later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Outgoing and social</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Introversion                  |
| - Focused on the inner world  |
| - Prefers communication through writing |
| - Learns best through reflection |
| - Greater depth of interests but less variety |
| - Let's others take the initiative |
| - Introverted and social      |
| - Tends to reflect before taking action |
| - Private, reserved           |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW YOU ASSIMILATE INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Focuses on what is real</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Prefers practical applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Prefers details and concrete information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is oriented in the present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Prefers information sequentially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Prefers to trust experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Intuition                      |
| - Focusses on possibilities    |
| - Prefers imagination and insight |
| - Prefers the abstract and theoretical |
| - Sees patterns and meaning    |
| - Is oriented in the future   |
| - Prefers overview rather than sequential details |
| - Prefers to trust intuition and vision |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW YOU MAKE DECISIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Analytical and questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Solves problems logically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reasons through cause and effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Values the impractical, objective truth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reasonable and fair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Feeling                        |
| - Sympathetic and sympathetic  |
| - Evaluates the impact on people |
| - Reasons through personal values |
| - Values harmony, trust, support |
| - Compassionate and acceptance |

| Judging                        |
| - Prefers a scheduled and organized approach to life |
| - Systematic and methodical    |
| - Prefers to plan ahead        |
| - Values making decisions and reaching closure |
| - Does not like last-minute stress |
| - Usually on time              |

| Perceiving                     |
| - Prefers a spontaneous and open-ended approach to life |
| - Flexible and adaptable       |
| - Does not like to plan        |
| - Values remaining open to opportunities |
| - Slow to come to closure; will change decision easily if new opportunities or factors occur. |
| - Works well with last minute pressures |
| - Often late or last-minute    |
### EFFECTS OF EACH PREFERENCE IN WORK SITUATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXTRAVERTS</th>
<th>INTROVERTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Like variety and action.</td>
<td>Like quiet for concentration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to be faster, dislike complicated procedures.</td>
<td>Tend to be careful with details, dislike sweeping statements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are often good at greeting people.</td>
<td>Have trouble remembering names and faces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are often-impatient with long slow jobs.</td>
<td>Tend not to mind working on one project for a long time uninterruptedly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are interested in the results of their job, in getting it done and in how other people do it.</td>
<td>Are interested in the idea behind their job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often do not mind the interruption of answering the telephone.</td>
<td>Dislike telephone intrusions and interruptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often act quickly, sometimes without thinking.</td>
<td>Like to think a lot before they act, sometimes without acting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like to have people around.</td>
<td>Work contentedly alone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually communicate freely.</td>
<td>Have some problems communicating.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THINKING TYPES</th>
<th>FEELING TYPES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not show emotion readily and are often uncomfortable dealing with people's feelings.</td>
<td>Tend to be very aware of other people and their feelings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May hurt people's feelings without knowing it.</td>
<td>Enjoy pleasing people, even in unimportant things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like analysis and putting things into logical order. Can get along without harmony.</td>
<td>Like harmony. Efficiency may be badly disturbed by office feuds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to decide impersonally, sometimes paying insufficient attention to people's wishes.</td>
<td>Often let decisions be influenced by their own or other people's personal likes and wishes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to be treated fairly.</td>
<td>Need occasional praise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are able to reprimand people or fire them when necessary.</td>
<td>Dislike telling people unpleasant things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are more analytically oriented—respond more easily to people's thoughts.</td>
<td>Are more people-oriented—respond more easily to people's values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to be firm-minded.</td>
<td>Tend to be sympathetic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EFFECTS OF EACH PREFERENCE IN WORK SITUATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENSING TYPES</th>
<th>INTUITIVE TYPES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dislike new problems unless there are</td>
<td>Like solving new problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standard ways to solve them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like an established way of doing things.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy using skills already learned more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than learning new ones.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work more steadily, with realistic idea of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how long it will take.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually reach a conclusion step by step.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are patient with routine details.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are impatient when the details get com-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plicated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are not often inspired, and rarely trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the inspiration when they are.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom make errors of fact.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to be good at precise work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUDGING TYPES</th>
<th>PERCEPTIVE TYPES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work best when they can plan their work</td>
<td>Adapt well to changing situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and follow the plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like to get things settled and finished.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May decide things too quickly.</td>
<td>Do not mind leaving things open for alter-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May dislike to interrupt the project</td>
<td>tations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they are on for a more urgent one.</td>
<td>May have trouble making decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May not notice new things that need to</td>
<td>May start too many projects and have dif-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be done.</td>
<td>ficulty in finishing them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want only the essentials needed to begin</td>
<td>May postpone unpleasant jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to be satisfied once they reach a</td>
<td>Want to know all about a new job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>judgment on a thing, situation, or per-</td>
<td>Tend to be curious and welcome new light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>son.</td>
<td>on a thing, situation, or person.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTJ</th>
<th>ESFJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assertive, practical, rational, opinionated and decisive, the ESTJ is a take-charge person who brings others into line by assigning tasks and roles, giving clear-cut instructions, following up regularly to check progress and giving formal recognition to those who do as they've been told. The ESTJ prefers to enforce existing policies and procedures, rather than to innovate, revise, or otherwise introduce change into any system. Traditional and conservative, the ESTJ applies a military model to most life situations, preferring linear channels of communication and command and detesting any disorganization or confusion. In business, organizational administration, law enforcement or the military, this type is evident as the no-nonsense leader—often short on feelings and finesse, but obviously gratified by the power and control that come with being in charge.</td>
<td>ESFs are outgoing, sociable, practical and organized. They pride themselves on their reflexive skills to serve, harmonize and entertain others. Warm, friendly and naturally talented in working with people, ESFs make excellent salespeople, nurses, teachers, homemakers and hosts. They work well as club and committee members, and their type numbers conspicuously among volunteer, church, charitable and civic organizations. Traditional, conservative and loyal, ESFs work hard, devoting their time and energy to family and friends. Although they derive personal satisfaction from helping others, ESFs need verbal and tangible strokes of appreciation for their good work. When they do not receive the kind of recognition and reciprocation they feel is due, ESFs may suffer attacks of righteous indignation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISTJ</th>
<th>ISFJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISTJs are quiet, serious, responsible, sensible, patient and steadfast—maintainers of society's time-honored traditions and institutions. This 'Rock of Gibraltar' type needs to be needed and readily takes on a parental role—in their working relationships, as well as in their family. They settle in occupations in law enforcement, teaching, banking and finance, conservative religion, business and administration. ISTJs work well in jobs requiring accurate record keeping of facts and figures. They are the enforcers of law, policy, procedure, schedules and principles, and they exert a stabilizing effect on society. Hard work, honesty, politeness, timeliness, and faithfulness to family, friends and country are foremost among the ISTJ's honored values. ISTJs resist change in all aspects of their lives and see most innovation as disruptive.</td>
<td>ISFs are private, sensitive, organized, sensitive and loyal. Shy, modest and unassuming, this type needs to support and minister to others in order to feel useful. Others count on the ISFJ's steadfast caring and help—so much so that they may become irresponsible. Martyrdom is an occupational hazard for the self-sacrificing ISFJ. Work is life to this conservative type, who puts in long hours at the workplace, as well as at home. Chaos and uncertainty are unnerving to ISFJs. They prefer a well regulated, scheduled life, even if someone else is to control what will happen and when. The ISFJ gravitates toward traditional occupations; they make excellent secretaries, clerks, nurses, preschool and elementary teachers and homemakers. They are happy handling details and routine. Being in the spotlight is unnerving to most ISFJs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTP</td>
<td>ESFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTPs are outgoing, practical thinkers—masters of observation and the analysis of cause-and-effect relationships, free from the biasing influence of tradition or emotion. Action is the ESTPs' middle name: they thrive on it and create it when life gets too boring. Resourceful troubleshooters, entrepreneurs and negotiators, ESTPs apply a common-sense reasoning approach to any problem they tackle: planting a garden, fixing a car, settling an argument, or reorganizing a multibillion dollar corporation. Spontaneous, competitive, generous and team-spirited, ESTPs apply the model of an athletic team to all their relationships. Rarely do they merit a description as romantic, and when life becomes too complex with unpleasant personal entanglements, count on the ESTP to remove himself from the situation.</td>
<td>The ESFP is warm, outgoing, optimistic and caring—someone who’s always ready for a good time and avoids the company of dreary ‘doom and gloom’ people who take themselves too seriously. Count on the cheerful ESFP to settle in an occupation which lets him be a ‘people person’—working in sales, human services, business, nursing, crisis intervention, or the performing arts. Whatever the ESFP's work choice, talking must be part of the job! To be at his best, the ESFP must be around other people—and this type will go to great lengths to avoid solitude and isolation! Charming, clever and open-minded, the witty ESFP is likely to be seen by others as a party person—so much so that this type is ill-at-ease in business fields which expect seriousness, logic, conceptual thinking, organization and punctuality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISTP</th>
<th>ISFP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISTPs are factual, sensible, logical and reflective. They enjoy activity and solitude and may work happily and productively for 40 hours at a stretch. Many excellent craftsmen and production artists are ISTPs, as are professionals in electronics and mechanics and stars in individual athletic competition and team sports. ISTPs are masters at analyzing complex systems and introducing change to improve productivity and efficiency. In business and finance, ISTPs often rise to the top because they combine a no-nonsense facts-and-figures approach with a “why not try it?” openness to strategy. They are competitive and coldly rational in all they do. Those closest to this type often describe the ISTP’s approach to personal relationships as shallow, conditional and utilitarian. The ISTP’s code of ethics may not conform to society’s thinking.</td>
<td>The ISFP is quiet, practical, sensitive and spontaneous. Often shy and retiring, folks of this type are drawn to a complex array of occupations which offer some measure of solitude and allow them to keep a finger on the pulse of life. Forestry, horticulture, farming, scuba diving, construction and working attract ISFPs, as do the hands-on fields of carpentry, woodworking, pottery, weaving and production art. Professional athletics, music and performance also draw a disproportionate number of this type. Sensuous and earthy, many ISFPs make working or playing in the out-of-doors a high priority. The ISFP values his independence strongly and tends to retreat or escape from situations which become too unpleasant, confining or demanding. This free spirit’s natural characteristics rub most business organizations the wrong way, so it’s a rare ISFP who makes his way to the corporate board room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP</td>
<td>ENTJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **ENTP**
Enthusiastic, outgoing, analytic idea people, ENTPs are also described as multi-talented characters interested in nearly everything. Independent, non-conforming and often a little rebellious and confrontational, this type is an inspiration to others who may follow the ENTP guru into uncharted waters—sometimes shark-infested! ENTPs have a hard time dealing with long-range planning, conventional thinking, structured working situations and authority figures. The ENTP can succeed in a variety of careers—and may go from one to another over the course of a lifetime—always seeking new opportunities and retreats from projects which have degenerated to detail work and hum-drum routine. Whatever their chosen field of endeavor, ENTPs always play the role of visionary, promoter and instigator. | **ENTJ**
The ENTJ leads by providing conceptual structure and setting goals, rather than by detailing and enforcing procedures, codes and regulations. This type rises naturally to positions of power and responsibility in all organizational settings (business, military, educational, governmental). Disorganization, confusion, emotion, inefficiency and illogic drive ENTJs to take charge of situations and institutions. Their intuition fuels their vision and defines their goals. They deal with the world boldly, in an assertive, analytical, objective and logical way which makes others salute them and do whatever the ENTJ directs. ENTJs do get things done, both at home and at work, but often at substantial cost in terms of wear and tear on the human spirit, for they may neglect the importance of the personal element in accomplishing their purpose. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTP</th>
<th>INTJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **INTP**
Private, intellectual, analytical, logical and reflective, the INTP values ideas, principles and abstract thinking above all else. This type seeks to understand and explain the universe—not to control it! Higher education holds a particular appeal to this type who tends to acquire degrees and amass knowledge over the entire course of life. Abstract or theoretical subjects are the INTP’s cup of tea, and academic or research careers are attractive to this type. In whatever field they choose, INTPs take on the role of visionary, scientist or architect. The mundane details of life may be the INTP’s undoing, since this type lives in a world guided by intuitive thinking. Often perceived to be arrogant and aloof, the INTP may have to struggle in the personal realm, as well, for feelings are not this type’s natural forte. | **INTJ**
Logical, independent, self-confident, innovative and driven by the inner world of ideas and possibilities, the INTJ is a natural inventor—convinced that reality can be changed and that he can do it! The INTJ’s focused attention to his personal mission may be inspiring or frankly obsessive, depending on your viewpoint or the success of the enterprise. Introspective and somewhat shy, the INTJ relies solely on logical analysis and intuition to guide his thoughts and decisions, justifying his description as cool or chilly by more feeling types. INTJs respect competency and intelligence, but they are unswayed by rank and title alone. Attracted to analytical areas of study, often involving science or mathematics, INTJs succeed in many applied fields, such as engineering, geology, astronomy, architecture, as well as business administration. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ENFP</strong></th>
<th><strong>ENFJ</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENFPs are open-minded, imaginative, caring and outgoing. They thrive on the drama of life by observing everything enthusiastically and associating meaning and human motive with all they survey. To the ENFP, no life event is devoid of significance—a belief which may justify others' perception of them as hypersensitive, overemotional and suspicious at times. Charming, charismatic, communicative and ingenious, ENFPs often are multitalented individuals who may succeed in a number of creative endeavors as long as a strong human element is present. Their characteristically short attention span and diversity of interests may sabotage their accomplishment in careers or enterprises demanding tenacity and single-mindedness. This type's natural gift for inspiring others often is their salvation; the projects ENFPs start may be completed by their followers.</td>
<td>ENFJs are sociable, intuitive, sensitive and organized. These warm and charming folks are influential, and they make charismatic leaders. People often find that they want to do whatever ENFJs want them to do! ENFJs have a natural gift for organizing people to accomplish a goal—whether in politics, business, teaching, sales or therapy. ENFJs work their magic with people by keeping human needs sharply in focus as the number one priority in life. Tenacious, idealistic and opinionated, ENFJs usually prevail by tactful persuasion, but they are willing to do battle with people and institutions they see as wrong-minded or meekly spirited. The ENFJ's characteristic &quot;kinder-than-thou&quot; Righteous indignation may get in this type's way from time to time. Organizations fortunate enough to be headed by competent ENFJs are marked by well-defined missions, teamwork, open communication, appreciation and support for every member.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>INFP</strong></th>
<th><strong>INFJ</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INFPs are quiet, creative, sensitive and perceptive souls who usually strike others as shy, reserved and cool. This type has a rare capacity for deep caring and commitment—both to the people and causes they idealize. INFPs guide their behavior by a strong personal sense of values, rather than by conventional logic and reason. Forced to cope with this facts-and-figures world we inhabit, INFPs may appear to have been imported from another galaxy. They gravitate toward creative or human service careers which allow them to use their instinctive sense of empathy and their remarkable communication skills. Strongly religious, spiritual or philosophical people, INFPs may see the purpose of their lives as an inner journey or personal unfolding. If there seems to be an air of idealism in the INFP's spirit, blame it on this type's longing for the perfect in all things.</td>
<td>INFJs are intuitive, caring, quiet and peace-loving complex people who may seem equally at home dealing with the personal and analytical spheres of life. The inner world of ideas is this type's most comfortable domain. Articulate, empathetic and idealistic, INFJ will tell you they just know things, they know them directly, and they can't tell you how or why! INFJs seem to be able to feel others' feelings and sense the good and evil in situations; an almost psychic ability which may be an asset in many &quot;people professions.&quot; Sensitive and committed, INFJs enjoy being of service to others. Once this type's goals are set and his mind is made up, little can divert the INFJ from his mission or chosen project. Whether this characteristic manifests itself as bull-headed stubbornness or admirable tenacity may determine the individual INFJ's potential for life success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>Quiet, serious, hardworking, dependable, practical, methodical, realistic, and responsible. Devil's advocate who will point out the pitfalls of a project and discuss the obstacles. Tolerates stress by keeping everything organized and on schedule, their work, their home, their life. Value tradition and loyalty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>Quiet, harmonic, creative, and compassionate. Composed and steady in their work, their relationships, and personal concerns. Have a natural way of making everything work and getting along with others. Ideal for implementing new ideas and projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>Seeks understanding and connection in ideas, relationships, and personal concerns. They are enthusiastic and passionate about their work and have a natural way of communicating their vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>Have original ideas and great drive for implementation and achievement. Their ideas and actions are aligned with their personal values and the goals they set for themselves and others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ISTP | Tolerant and flexible, open observers until a problem arises. Quick to act and ready to find workable solutions. Analyse the cause of problems, prioritise tasks, and plan efficiently. |
| ISFP | Quiet, sensitive, and intuitive. Enjoy the present moment, and let others guide their actions and decisions. Value relationships and harmony. |

| ENTP | Quick, ingenious, stimulating, and entertaining. Good at solving problems and finding solutions. |
| ENFP | Warm, enthusiastic, and imaginative. Like to work on their own, and are good at finding solutions. |

| ESTP | Practical, rational, decisive, and logical. They are good at making decisions and implementing plans. |
| ESFP | Warm, enthusiastic, and cooperative. Good at working in teams and building relationships. |

| ENFJ | Warm, enthusiastic, and caring. They are good at building and maintaining relationships. |
| ENTJ | Frank, decisive, assume leadership roles, and are highly effective at solving problems. They are good at making decisions and implementing plans.
CONTRIBUTION MADE BY EACH PREFERENCE TO EACH TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISTJ</th>
<th>ISFJ</th>
<th>INFJ</th>
<th>INTJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I: Depth Of Concentration</td>
<td>I: Depth Of Concentration</td>
<td>I: Depth Of Concentration</td>
<td>I: Depth Of Concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: Logic And Analysis</td>
<td>F: Warmth And Sympathy</td>
<td>F: Warmth And Sympathy</td>
<td>T: Logic And Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISTP</th>
<th>ISFP</th>
<th>INFP</th>
<th>INTP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I: Depth Of Concentration</td>
<td>I: Depth Of Concentration</td>
<td>I: Depth Of Concentration</td>
<td>I: Depth Of Concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: Logic And Analysis</td>
<td>F: Warmth And Sympathy</td>
<td>F: Warmth And Sympathy</td>
<td>T: Logic And Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P: Adaptability</td>
<td>P: Adaptability</td>
<td>P: Adaptability</td>
<td>P: Adaptability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTP</th>
<th>ESFP</th>
<th>ENFP</th>
<th>ENTP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E: Breadth Of Interests</td>
<td>E: Breadth Of Interests</td>
<td>E: Breadth Of Interests</td>
<td>E: Breadth Of Interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: Logic And Analysis</td>
<td>F: Warmth And Sympathy</td>
<td>F: Warmth And Sympathy</td>
<td>T: Logic And Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P: Adaptability</td>
<td>P: Adaptability</td>
<td>P: Adaptability</td>
<td>P: Adaptability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTJ</th>
<th>ESFJ</th>
<th>ENFJ</th>
<th>ENTJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E: Breadth Of Interests</td>
<td>E: Breadth Of Interests</td>
<td>E: Breadth Of Interests</td>
<td>E: Breadth Of Interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: Logic And Analysis</td>
<td>F: Warmth And Sympathy</td>
<td>F: Warmth And Sympathy</td>
<td>T: Logic And Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EACH OF THESE SIXTEEN TYPES IS GIFTED AND VALUABLE
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"TYPE"
IS HELPFUL IN UNDERSTANDING YOURSELF AND OTHER PEOPLE

BUT REMEMBER...

EVERYONE IS AN INDIVIDUAL