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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

When persons from different societal backgrounds come in contact with each other, problems are likely to arise because of uncertainties over what to do with or about each other. Often such encounters seem to have unsatisfactory consequences for one or more of the participants. Apart from anecdotal accounts, however, we still know very little about how relationships are established and maintained in "cross-cultural" encounters. We may assume that if contact is to be maintained in these encounters, some kind of prior and common understanding must have had to be reached between the participants. This, in turn, assumes that participants in these cross-cultural encounters are able to comprehend and accept each others' "cultural views" or, in other words, that they have become to some extent "acculturated." The purpose of this research was to identify a concept of cross-cultural understanding, implying a personal level of attainment which is assumed to mediate this process of acculturation.

To guide inquiry into how "cross-cultural" contacts may be established and maintained, an explanatory observer's schema was constructed. That schema will be described and its heuristic value will be argued: (a) by postulating the existence of "attribute dimensions" on which persons are assumed to vary in kind and amount; (b) by showing how these attribute dimensions, in combination, may allow an observer to identify cross-cultural participants with more and less acculturation.
and (c) by demonstrating how the schema is related to observable responses by one of the participants from two quite disparate cultures.

The schema, which provides the basis for discussion in this paper, itself draws extensively upon the work of other investigators. Relevant information about encounters and communication between persons from manifestly disparate societies is especially pertinent to the central concept of "cross-cultural understanding." After a review and discussion of this background material, the schema and a supporting rationale will be presented. This "cross-cultural understanding" schema, from an observer's view, will be used as a basis for proposing how individuals may change in ways that are especially conducive to the establishment of greater degrees of cross-cultural understanding. Then, results obtained from a systematic inquiry of Anglo subjects based on this schema (Ss) will be presented and discussed.

CULTURE AND SOCIETY

Two concepts are especially important to this paper, namely "culture" and "society." The concept of culture has received much attention in anthropological literature (e.g., Kluckhohn, 1962; Kroeber and Kluckhohn, 1952). There is no widely accepted, explicit definition of culture. In general, the term connotes patterned ways for coping with life's problems that are, as a group of patterns, relatively unique to a particular society. For example, Linton (1945) says, "A culture is the configuration of learned behavior and results of behavior whose component elements are shared and transmitted by the members of particular society (p. 32)."

The term "society" implies a group of people who live in relatively close proximity and have opportunity to interact. Linton (1945)
considers societies to have four main characteristics: (1) the society is the "significant unit in our species struggle for survival," (2) a society "normally persist(s) far beyond the life span of any one individual," (3) "societies are functional, operative units...they work as wholes" and (4) "in every society the activities necessary to the survival of the whole are divided and apportioned to the various members (pp. 15-17)." Linton's definition of society is acceptable for the purposes of this paper, but a special definition of "culture," provided by Wallace (1961) will be used:

Culture, as seen from this viewpoint, becomes not so much a superorganic thing sui generis, but policy, tacitly and gradually concocted by groups of people for the furtherance of their interests; also contract, established by practice, between and among individuals to organize their strivings into mutually facilitating equivalence structures...that have their orderly relationships guaranteed not by the sharing of uniformity, but by their capacities for mutual prediction (p. 28);(as reported in Pepinsky and Patton, 1971, p. 13.)

When interacting with people from a different cultural background, one's responses appear to be largely influenced by one's cultural heritage. These "cultural assumptions" seem to be largely unstated. As Pepinsky and Patton (1971), in reference to Wallace's definition of culture cited above, point out: "Matters of policy and contract--presumed to underlie the performance of conjoint routines--will be more often than not unstated and implicit (p. 13)." Many problems that
people have in a cross-cultural interaction arise because they take for granted that they share common referents for their verbal and non-verbal behavior. Hall (1959) proposes that we recognize the important part our unstated cultural assumptions play in cross-cultural interactions. As an anthropologist working in several societies, Hall has had ample occasion to document the effects one's culture has on cross-cultural interactions. He contends that culture "talks." In Arizona and New Mexico, for example, tribal outsiders identified as "Anglos" may consider the native Navajos' use of time as cavalier, to say the least. An appointment made by a Navajo may be kept earlier than the time "agreed" upon, later or not at all. If the appointment is not kept as agreed upon, the Anglo is apt to feel rejected, confused and frustrated. He is accustomed to behaving and to anticipating others' behavior in relation to "time" according to his cultural norms. When the Navajo's behavior does not conform to these, the Anglo is likely to interpret this behavior in terms of what it would mean for other Anglos to behave in that fashion. Therefore, he is likely to "misunderstand" the Navajo's behavior. From personal experience, I can testify to this kind of response by an Anglo in the early stages of his learning about Navajo culture.

COMMUNICATION IN ANTHROPOLOGY

An important point made by Hall (1959) is that communication has both verbal and non-verbal components. The importance of this point is made evident by his book title, *The Silent Language*. In considering a cross-cultural interaction, Hall (1959) says, "The significant components of a communication on the level of culture are characterized by their
brevity as compared with other types of communication (p. 94)." And, "The fact that communication can be effected in so brief a time on the cultural level is often responsible for the confusion which so often occurs in cross-cultural exchanges (p. 95)."

Hall makes the following assumptions: (1) cultural understanding depends on a communication of information that is self-evidently received and assigned the same meaning by the recipient as assigned by the sender; (2) culture-bound communications, which occur throughout an interaction, occur most rapidly at the beginning of an interaction; and (3) a participant is often both unaware of his communication and of what that communication may mean to the other participant in the interaction.

A similar point is made by Watzlawick, Beavin and Jackson (1967), who assert that "one cannot not communicate (p. 51)." Although their ideas derive primarily from the study of pathological interactional patterns, these authors contend that communication is often non-verbal and occurs without awareness on the part of the communicating person. The result is often either misunderstanding or non-understanding. In consequence, the novice in a strange society can get into much trouble through misinterpretation of gestural and other para-linguistic cues.

Another theorist whose work is relevant to my schema of cross-cultural understanding is Garfinkel. Garfinkel (1967) has defined "common understanding":

As "product," a common understanding is thought to consist of a shared agreement on substantive matters; as "process," it consists of various methods whereby something that a
Garfinkel's definition emphasizes "common understanding" as a process or a product that is jointly managed by two or more persons. In confrontations between persons with different cultural backgrounds, contributions to such understanding by individual participants become especially noteworthy.

Early recognition of the impact that such personal contributions may have upon contacts between persons from different societies is exhibited in the ethnographic classic, The Navaho*, by Kluckhohn and Leighton (1946). Although the book provides a general description of Navajo life and culture, a major reason for writing it was to explain why the Federal Government's stock reduction program had turned out to be a miserable failure. As the authors state the matter:

The central hypothesis of this book is that the incomplete success of the program has been due in an important degree to lack of understanding of certain human factors. It was necessary to know the physical needs of The People, to discover means of conserving their land and of improving their techniques of agriculture and livestock care. This knowledge was imperative, but it was not enough. Consideration of the human needs of the Navaho and comprehension of the problems of human relations were wanting in an

* Previously, the Navajo Tribe preferred the spelling, "Navaho." Presently they prefer "Navajo," and that spelling will be used in this paper.
important measure. Also lacking was an understanding that Navaho psychological processes and assumptions differ from those of the white men on which the administrators unconsciously based all their plans. Hence these plans often failed because of intangible factors which, being largely unknown to the administrators, were unpredictable (p. 26).

The authors contend that if the administrators of the Government's programs had been aware of a variety of patterns in Navajo culture, they would have been more effective in putting the programs across. We may infer that Kluckhohn's own extensive experience with Navajo culture, which he had acquired prior to writing this book enabled him to draw upon personal knowledge that he does not make explicit to his reader.

CROSS-CULTURAL UNDERSTANDING

Recognizing the need for research in the area of "cross-cultural understanding," an organization named "The Bridge" was founded in 1966. A stated goal of "The Bridge" is the development of programs to promote better understanding among persons from different cultures. In conjunction with other projects, this organization also publishes "occasional papers" by presumably authoritative persons. Two of these (Alisjahbana, 1969; Hall, 1970) will be reviewed here.

Alisjahbana (1969) contends that "The root of most human conflict is misunderstanding, usually the result of insufficient knowledge" and that "Understanding between people takes place on many levels (p. 1)." His levels or "layers" of understanding between people of different cultural background include (1) an understanding of each other's
language; (2) a knowledge of each other's personality and the order of his thinking, feeling and aims; (3) a knowledge of the values and norms of each other's society and culture; (4) feelings of good will, sympathy and solidarity toward and with each other; and (5) a religious aspect. This last "level," as he describes it, consists of a common appreciation for the unity of the world and the solidarity of mankind if it is "considered sub specie aeternitatis (p. 6)." The most comprehensive understanding that can exist between participants in cross-cultural interactions would encompass all the attributes and knowledge outlined in these five levels. Alisjahbana, like Garfinkel (1967), assumes that both parties to a cross-cultural interaction must work to establish common understanding. Although his conception of "cross-cultural understanding" in terms of levels of accomplishment is suggestive, his description at each level is unhelpfully vague. Thus, it is not possible to establish either the construct or predictive validity of his descriptions.

In a second "Occasional Paper," Hall (1970) discusses some cultural differences in listening behavior and the implications of listening behavior on the development of cross-cultural understanding. As a result of discussing his work with people of different cultural background, Hall comments:

My foreign friends soon began to talk about how hard it was to know whether Americans were "tuned in" or not. When sufficiently at ease to talk freely, they said that Americans were rude. I slowly learned that how one indicates that one is paying attention is different for
each culture. The entire process of being an interlocutor in a conversation is highly stereotyped, culturally patterned, and regulated by rules that are seldom, if ever, spelled out. Nevertheless—like language, this complex process is learned—the language of "Yes I'm listening." It is experienced as so natural that few people know it is like a language and also like language can be both understood and misunderstood (1970, p. 2; underlining not in original).

Since these rules are not spelled out, the member of a particular culture typically experiences difficulty in describing the correct way to "listen" in his society. For example, "Children are carefully coached...how to listen properly in widely varied contexts (Hall, 1970, p. 2)." Nevertheless, the adult, when asked, has difficulty in verbalizing what this "coaching" consists of.

Hall's remarks also imply levels of common understanding among those adapting themselves to requirements of a new culture. As a person manifests higher and higher levels of cross-cultural understanding, it should be necessary for him to have become increasingly aware of otherwise unstated rules and of an extended repertoire of behaviors, spoken and written language included, which can be both understood and misunderstood.

The formation of an organization such as "The Bridge" and the research sponsored by it emphasize current concern over problems arising from cross-cultural misunderstanding. Hall (1970) voices this concern:
"It is the conviction of the author that until man learns not only to accept, but to capitalize on cultural differences that everything from minor classroom tragedies to world wars will continue to plague us (p. 7)." Also, Pepinsky and Patton (1971) contend: "...the search for added enlightenment about common understanding may be expected to continue. Its contretemps, lack of understanding or misunderstanding, remains very much with us a human problem to be solved (pp. 17-18)."

However, there is need for more detailed conceptualization of the problem. Pepinsky (1970) provides a further step in that direction. Excerpts from his work will be presented next.

COMMON UNDERSTANDING

A beginning conceptualization of "common understanding" has been achieved as part of an interdisciplinary program of research on "Information Exchange as Cross-Cultural Activity" (Pepinsky, 1971, 1972; Pepinsky and Patton, 1971). Pepinsky (1970) has defined common understanding as follows:

"Common understanding"...implies an aggregate of necessary cognitions that participants must have if they are able to achieve for themselves a sense of stable and concerted actions. This state-of-affairs can be postulated to include things that they can take for granted as real and valid about "the world" and about each other in it. Common understanding in this sense may be postulated to imply the existence of such components as mutually possessed "common sense," knowledge or comprehension; agreement; or acceptance of each other. These components
need never be made explicit for all participants to know and to share; for concerted actions to occur it is simply necessary for participants to signal to each other that common understanding does exist and that its ingredients could be explicitly made known to participants. Signaling of this sort, by which the presence of common understanding is indicated, defines participant's inputs that can be identified as "informative displays." Common understanding, then, is postulated to mediate a relationship between participants' informative displays toward each other, on the one hand, and their managing of conjoint activities, on the other. This restatement of common understanding from a spectator's viewpoint implies that someone other than participants can observe and draw his own inferences about what is going on (pp. 3-4).

Pepinsky goes on to devise a spectator's schema (see Figure 1) in which there are three major components: "informative displays," "common understandings," and "conjoint activities." At an empirical level these components are defined as (a) behaviors identified as "signaling activity"; (b) behavioral measures of relevant attributes, e.g., attitudes, values, opinions, and beliefs; and (c) jointly managed activities that may also be classified as "organizing" vs. "disorganized" or e.g., as "routine" vs. "unusual-sporadic."

Common understanding, it is thus assumed, makes it possible for two or more persons to engage in conjoint activity and assumes that relevant prior information has been acquired by them. In a cross-cultural
Figure 1. A Spectator's Schema of Participant Activities (Pepinsky, 1970, p. 5).
interaction, the problem of discovering what particular information is acquired, and perhaps even how it is acquired, is made particularly difficult since, as Pepinsky points out, what is otherwise signaled "need never be made explicit."

**SOCIOLOGICAL ISSUES**

In identifying a concept of cross-cultural understanding, we need to consider the related work of several other investigators. In a situation where both sets of participants share a similar culture, for instance, Goffman (1963a) construes their society as having a social order that is the "consequence of any set of moral norms that regulates the way in which persons pursue objectives (p. 8)." Moral norms include law, ethics, and etiquette. These norms constrain the individual and determine the ways in which the "ritual interaction" will be maintained by the participants. In a single culture, different settings and situations may entail the same normative assumptions regarding conduct. Knowing this, at some level, the participant must convey certain social information that will help to manage the "rightfulness" and stability of the setting. He shows himself to be situationally law-abiding by a disciplined management of personal appearance.

The individual intends to be interpreted in a certain way, and it can be assumed that he will (albeit unknowingly) direct his behavior toward creating particular impressions. What then is to be expected when one encounters a member of a different culture and discovers that the rules of impression management in everyday social life no longer hold? Although Goffman does not speak directly to this point, he does talk about stigmatized individuals (Goffman, 1963b). In brief,
stigmatized individuals are situation conscious and are alert to the contingencies of acceptance and disclosure. They are "alive" to aspects of the social situation which others do not attend to. The stigmatized, who engage in "passing," must be especially adroit at impression management and more precisely aware than the "normal" of his "informative displays." Thus, in some ways, a stigmatized-normal interaction is comparable to participants in a more obvious cross-cultural interaction.

Garfinkel (1967), is another sociological theorist whose ideas, though addressed to intrasocietal interactions in everyday life, may be fruitfully extended to include cross-cultural interactions between members of disparate societies. His ethnomethodology dictates that "practical activities of everyday life are to be sought out and examined for the production, origins, recognition, and representation of rational practices (1967, p. 33)," whereby the appearance of structure is accomplished and made reportable. Thus, for Garfinkel, both interaction within a "culture" and that across "cultures" would be comparable, since in any case it is the participants' practices that create the existence of a common understanding between them. A "cross-cultural" interaction is thus made evident when what one participant does or says, according to his cultural rules, goes unrecognized or may be misinterpreted by another.

In a situation where members of one culture, from an outsider's view are able to interact without seeming to make trouble for each other, there is a shared agreement on substantive matters, which exists by virtue of "taking for granted that what is said will be made out in accordance with methods that need not be specified...(Garfinkel, 1967,
It thus becomes self-evident that when members of two "cultures" attempt to interact, it is not initially possible for them to take each other's ideas and intentions for granted. Some activity is necessary, one infers, to make explicit the participants' assumptions, rules and methods. With persons to whom the participant can respond as sharing his own culture, presumably, these things would not need to be specified. Although it might be desirable for both participants to acquire information about each other's "rules" and differing cultural expectations, this is not mandatory. According to my definition of "cross-cultural understanding," at least, I assume it is only necessary for one of the actors to engage in some activity to acquire information about the "other's" culture and to base his "informative displays" on such knowledge.

One concept that seems pertinent to cross-cultural interactions is that of "role," here defined as a "cluster of related meanings and values that guide and direct an individual's behavior in a given social setting (Rose, 1967, p. 10)." Participants' behavior, the information they display, or the impression they attempt to "manage," may also be partly determined not only by their role but also by the perceived role of the other participant (see Adams, 1963). It seems likely that a "novice" or "stranger" in a new society will initially be unable to perceive status and role differences in the new society. As his sensitivity to the nuances of status and role increases, by my previous argument, the newcomer should also have attained to a higher level of cross-cultural understanding.
An important concept that needs to be introduced here is that of "acculturation." When cross-cultural interaction is evident to an observer, the participants are assumed to be the "carriers" of a substantive portion of their respective cultures. Therefore, opportunity is present for the initiation of acculturation, which has been variously defined. For example, acculturation is defined as "The process by which culture is transmitted through continuous first hand contact of groups with different cultures... (Dictionary of Anthropology, 1966, p. 12). Acculturation has also been defined to include the adoption or borrowing of others' values, parts of their language and some aspects of their material culture. A definition of this kind is implicit in the following statement by Adams (1963), especially germane to my research since it deals with Navajo-Anglo interactions.

Shonto's inhabitants become acculturated, in the sense of acquiring Anglo-American values, mostly through school experience. Inevitably, there is a very high correlation between acceptance of such values and the ability to speak English... The correlation, besides pointing up the superordinate role of boarding schools in value change, suggests also that most Anglo-American values are not understandable in the Navaho linguistic context—that knowledge of English is necessary for their acceptance (p. 91).

Since this research centers on the Anglo's potential influence on the Navajo-Anglo interaction, it is assumed that Anglos will become differentially acculturated such that they, in varying degrees acquire Navajo values and some skill in the use of the Navajo language. In
other words, progression through the levels of cross-cultural understanding to be proposed in my schema will mediate the Anglo's degree of "acculturation" to Navajo ways. In addition to these attributes of acculturation, I shall extend the definition to include the adoption and use by an Anglo of psychomotor behavior more typically exhibited by Navajos.

COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT CONCEPTS

The person's beliefs and attitudes about himself and about members of a "foreign" culture are also definitive of his cross-cultural understanding. For instance, it appears that a "child-like" quality is likely to be exhibited by one who discovers himself to be in a new culture. A plausible reason for anticipating behavior of this sort, when uncertainty about routine transactions exists, has been provided by students of cognitive development. Crockett (1965) says:

...increase in differentiation and hierarchic organization

is found not only in development from childhood to adulthood,
but also in the development of new knowledge in a mature
individual. Thus, an adult, being exposed to a content area
that was initially foreign to him would proceed through the
same stages as development in the maturing child, though
the process would probably be completed more rapidly than in
the child (pp. 49-50).

In Piaget's theory, "egocentrism is likely to increase whenever, as
development proceeds, the child begins to cope with a new and untried
field of cognitive action, i.e., whenever he enters a new plane of
cognitive functioning. This burst of egocentrism slowly subsides as
the child progressively masters the new field... (Flavell, 1963, p. 224)." Flavell (1963) goes on to say that the child initially finds it difficult to observe his own thought processes. This difficulty seems to be due to an unreflective egocentrism. The mechanism by which the child frees himself from the "grip of egocentrism" is social interaction. This situation appears to be highly similar to that of the "stranger" attempting to enter a new society. As Flavell (1963) remarks:

In the course of his contacts (and especially, his conflicts and arguments) with other children, the child increasingly finds himself forced to reexamine his own percepts and concepts in the light of those of others, and by so doing gradually rids himself of cognitive egocentrism (p. 299).

In his cross-cultural transactions, then, one would expect the "stranger" to be initially unreflective, and only later to begin examining his egocentric ethnocentrism "in the light of those (values, beliefs, customs) of others (Flavell, 1963, p. 229, parenthetical inclusion not in original)." Or as Hora (1959) puts it, "To understand himself man needs to be understood by another. To be understood by another he needs to understand the other (p. 237)." And this process can occur both verbally (in speaking and writing) and nonverbally. Haslerud (1961), in reviewing a publication by the cognitive developmental theorist, Jerome Bruner, makes an even more pertinent comment: "This admonitory essay of Bruner's...is built upon the theory that intellectual activity is the same for the expert and the novice when either is at the frontier of a new problem (p. 356)."
It is important to note that in discussing the work of cognitive development theorists and in using, as was done previously, the term "child-like," an "identity relation" or "isomorphism" is not being postulated between the actions of a maturing child and the behavior of a stranger in a different culture. Rather, there seems to be sufficient correspondence between the two to warrant examination of cross-cultural behavior in light of what developmental theorists have said. Their assertions about how persons develop, presumably within their own societies, suggest comparable readjustments to be made by adults when unfamiliar situations are encountered. For the novice in a foreign society, therefore, a kind of egocentric ethnocentrism may be anticipated. For him, it is assumed that there will be an initial increase in viewing the "world" as he has been accustomed to treating it when interacting with others. And it is assumed that changes of this sort will occur in him as he acquires increased understanding of his new milieu. Accordingly, there may be a decrease in his ethnocentric thinking over time if interactions with the members of the new culture are continued. However, continued interaction over time is assumed to be a necessary but not sufficient condition for a progression through higher levels of cross-cultural accomplishment. Hence, in my view it is possible for the person to continue interacting with little or no change, or even an increase in his ethnocentric beliefs. Flavell (1963) also assumes that when the person encounters unfamiliar behavior in others, there must be increased "self-reflection" if he himself is to change.
TRUST AND SELF-DISCLOSURE

Some comments by Schutz (1944) also are pertinent to the concept of cross-cultural understanding. He talks about the "stranger," by which he means an individual who "attempt(s) to interpret the cultural pattern of a social group which he approaches and to orient himself within it ...(more particularly,) an adult individual of our times and civilization who tries to be permanently accepted or at least tolerated by the group which he approaches (p. 499)."

Hence the stranger's lack of feeling for distance, his oscillating between remoteness and intimacy, his hesitation and uncertainty, and his distrust in every matter which seems to be so simple and uncomplicated to those who rely on the efficiency of unquestioned recipes which have just to be followed but not understood (p. 506).

Schutz' comments on intimacy and distrust, especially, are germane to still another attribute of cross-cultural understanding: viz., the amount of "trust" that can be established between the participants.

In the native "Anglo culture" that I seem to share with others, one way of making a sense of intimacy self-evident is by "self-disclosure." Illustratively, I was intrigued and perplexed when, in my initial interactions with Navajos, I found myself disclosing things about myself to them in a way that would be considered inappropriate in our culture. My behavior in this cross-cultural context can be interpreted in light of Jourard's (1964) ideas about self-disclosure. Although he seems to be concerned with the ramifications of self-disclosure in an "Anglo" culture,
several of Jourard's contentions may be applied to the area of cross-cultural understanding. He says that people who reveal themselves honestly are sometimes seen as childish; purpose and meaning in life evolve in part from man's relationships with others and fuller health and functioning can be attained by engaging in sufficient trust of another to reveal yourself to him; the consequences of self-disclosure include learning how you and another are similar and different in relation to thoughts, feelings, values and hopes; and lastly Jourard says you cannot collaborate with another in some conjoint activity unless you know him and in order to "know" each other it is necessary to have engaged in enough mutual self-disclosure to know how the other will react.

Let us consider Jourard's assumptions in reference to what has already been said about cross-cultural encounters. First, in our initial cross-cultural contacts, we may appear, to others or to ourselves, as childlike. Self-disclosure, interpreted as a kind of "childish" behavior, may be regarded as another manifestation of this state. Second, it may be that we are attempting to lose our "strangeness" through self-disclosure. In this connection, Jourard comments on "values" and "meaning" in life and how they are related to a feeling of estrangement. As we become aware of values, goals and objectives held by others, our own may well become increasingly questionable. Self-disclosure may help to resolve this conflict. In this sense, self-disclosure may not be so much an "informative display" for the other as it is a method whereby we can "bring to light" our own value system in order to examine it better. If this is so, self-disclosure assists the process of self-reflection that accompanies a shift away from an initial culturally
egocentric thinking. And lastly, the consequences of self-disclosure could operate to enhance the development of cross-cultural understanding, especially if it were mutually engaged in.

All the concepts in this section constitute the background out of which a schema of cross-cultural understanding will be developed. How these ideas are incorporated will be described in the next chapter.
A SCHEMA OF CROSS-CULTURAL UNDERSTANDING

Let me briefly restate the problem. It centers on a dyadic interaction, in which one of the participants is assumed to have one kind of cultural background, that of "Anglo," and the other member to have another, that of "Navajo." If these two persons are in face-to-face contact over a period of time, with particular actions or outcomes desired by one or both of them, then we may anticipate specifiable consequences. An immediate achievement may be that of increased "cross-cultural understanding" by one or both of the participants. Cross-cultural understanding is thought to mediate between the "informative displays" of the participants and their subsequent conjoint actions. Moreover, it is proposed that a participant will exhibit subsequent informative displays to indicate that he has achieved a particular level of cross-cultural understanding. Two necessary but not sufficient conditions for the cultural novice to progress from a lower to a higher level are assumed: (1) his frequent and prolonged contact with members of the new culture, which, based on what they have displayed to him, provides him with new information; and (2) his increasing awareness of the importance or meaning that his own behavior has for persons from the new culture.

First, what is meant by a person's "level" of cross-cultural understanding will be defined. As the term is used here, "level" means the person's position on a scale or dimension of something postulated to
exist in amount and that can be measured. When a person is "measured" on several dimensions, constructed in such a manner that all dimensions are allocated the same number of steps, e.g., in terms of scalar judgments or ratings made on an ordinal scale from 1 to 9, then he might be assigned a comparable position, e.g., Level 2, on each of the several dimensions. The person is thus said to be at "Level 2." In other words, a person may be accorded a general level of achievement on the basis of the particular ratings he has received. In Chapter I, previous reference to "levels" of cross-cultural understanding was cited, along with ideas of what might be important dimensions along which to measure such understanding: (1) communication, both verbal and non-verbal; (2) changing values in cross-cultural encounters and the interaction of language and values; (3) self-reflection in relation to "egocentric" ethnocentrism; (4) interpersonal trust evoked by and in a new society; and (5) knowledge and the management of personal appearance in the new society.

Thus, a schema of cross-cultural understanding could be developed (see Table 1) to include the concept of "levels" one may attain on these five "Personal Attribute Dimensions." Previous researchers' and my own observations had led me to assume that people (Anglos) who have previously been "invisible" (Level 1) in their own culture may pass through levels of cross-cultural understanding to the point of becoming so acculturated that, eventually, they might be "invisible" in the new culture. These Personal Attribute Dimensions (PADs) will now be outlined, and then incorporated into the description of a hypothetical Anglo at each level of cross-cultural understanding.
Table 1
A Schema of Cross-Cultural Understanding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONAL ATTRIBUTE DIMENSIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEVELES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communication (C), is considered to be the process of comprehending and producing meaningful informative displays. Both verbal and non-verbal behavior are included in the Communication PAD. Inclusion of the latter stems from the belief that one's interactions with other members of his culture are partially dependent on his ability to take for granted that his non-verbal informative displays "mean" the same to other participants in the interaction. One's progress toward higher cross-cultural understanding is assumed to be partially dependent on his awareness (1) that his earlier non-verbal informative displays may have either failed to inform or misinformed persons in the new culture, and (2) that non-verbal behavior by the member of the new culture must be carefully assessed for its "meaning" within that other culture.

Language is one of the most important means we have of communicating with each other. Where one's cross-cultural interactions expose him to persons whose native tongue is different from his own, he has an additional problem to solve--if he wishes to understand and be understood. This is because, in addition to the acquisition of additional words, one's increasing fluency in the use of another's language also seems to demand the acquisition of new concepts and modes of thinking about them. With increased ability to make use of the new language in one's daily routines, it is assumed that there is increased understanding of things people in the new culture talk about and how they do so.

The second component of the Communication dimension is non-verbal. On the one hand, as stated earlier, people seem to be largely unaware of their own non-verbal communications. On the other hand, people will
be made aware of a stranger's non-verbal informative displays if they are unusual or strikingly different. Therefore, it is assumed that progression to higher levels of cross-cultural understanding is attended by increased knowledge of non-verbal informative displays and their "meaning" in the new culture.

Ethnocentrism (E), as it is used in the schema of cross-cultural understanding, is defined as taking a view of the world that is determined by the society in which one has been enculturated. This definition implies (a) that a person "knows" rules for appropriate social interaction in his society, and (b) the attribution of "rightness" to one's own society's values, rules, origin myth and overall perception of "reality." When confronted with alternative ideas about what is real, a person may resist acquiring or acknowledging information that contradicts his previous acquired beliefs. This resistance may manifest itself in deprecatory, paternalistic or prejudical statements about members of another society with a different culture.

Introductory remarks about ethnocentrism (E) related it to the concept of "egocentrism," here defined as a cognitive inability to take another's point of view, rather than one predominantly centered in oneself. In terms of advancement through levels, a progressive "erosion" or loosening up of cognitive inflexibility is assumed to occur. As Schutz (1944) describes what is here called ethnocentric egocentrism, one "looks at the world as grouped around himself who stands at its center (p. 505)." As one starts to "enter" a new society, "He is...no longer permitted to consider himself as the center of his social environment, and this
Another aspect of E has to do with the disparate values that different cultures emphasize. "Value," here implies less one's personal goals or interests and more his ideas of moral imperatives. Values are assumed to be central to one's categories of experience and to be resistant to change (see Kluckhohn and Strodbeck, 1961). As one progresses from Level 1 to Level 5, therefore, he should find it less necessary to view the world ethnocentrically, and should be increasingly able to accept as legitimate and valid another culture's construction of reality.

**Self-Reflection (SR)** is the process of examining cognitively one's own feelings, thoughts and percepts. Assumptions about the initial need and/or usefulness of SR derive from the previously mentioned assertions of Flavell (1963), Haslerud (1961) and Garfinkel (1967): e.g., "common understanding consists of an inner-temporal course of interpretive work (Garfinkel, 1967, p. 25)."

Presumably, man is alone among the animals in his ability to reflect on his past, present and future actions. This capacity to reflect upon things, if used, is also thought to permit greater adaptability by man. It seems, though, that the ability or desire to engage in self-reflection is differentially exhibited among men. In the schema, this is treated as an important aspect of progression from lower to higher levels of cross-cultural understanding. Williams (1967), in referring to the necessity for a cultural anthropologist in the field to be accepting of events previously responded to as "shocking" or "disgusting," seems to be calling for self-reflective adaptiveness in the development of
greater cross-cultural understanding. He goes so far as to recommend for the field worker, a "series of extensive psychoanalytic sessions (p. 50)." SR, then, may be inferred to include components of personality and feelings more aptly described as "cross-cultural neurosis." In cross-cultural interactions, as cross-cultural understanding develops, typical stages of thinking and behaving may be expected to develop. For example, if there is an initial rise and eventual diminution in one's feelings of suspiciousness about the motives of the "others" with whom one is associating across cultures, self-reflection should be most necessary at lower levels in order to enhance one's ability to "handle" cross-cultural interactions. Hence, considering the progression from Level 1 through Level 5, then, a person should not be initially self-reflective, but his self-reflection would become markedly evident at Level 2, followed by a diminution through higher Levels until, at Level 5, it would be virtually unnecessary. It is assumed that the "peak" of SR should occur at Level 2 because it is at this level that one has new information and experiences to reflect upon that he did not have previously. As one goes on to Levels 3, 4 and 5 he re-experiences the world of the cultural other and therefore has less need to engage in self-reflection about experiences and behaviors which are now familiar.

Trust (T) or its absence, is probably involved in most human interactions. In cross-cultural interactions, however, trust may take on special significance. In this context, Trust is the confident expectation that one person can be assumed to have fair intentions toward another. At a higher level, the person may share potentially damaging personal information with the "other," and be secure in the belief he
Assumptions about Trust and its relation to progression through the levels of cross-cultural understanding are as follows: initially there should be no basis for trust. As Gearing (1970) points out, members having two different cultural backgrounds would be "estranged" from one another. In his description of his own "movement" and increased knowledge of the Fox Indians, Gearing speaks of a continuum, with "estrangement" at one end and "finding them 'believable'" at the other. In terms of the proposed levels of Trust, it is assumed that one person may start by not trusting another. At Level 2, there should be a vacillation between an inappropriate indiscriminate trusting of all of the members of the other society to a total distrust of them. From Level 3 through Level 5, I assume that the "credibility" of the others should increase, and a person should become increasingly discriminating about whom he trusts and with what kinds of personal information. The vacillation in trust exhibited by a person at Level 2 stems from Schutz's comments about the "stranger" and my own observations of myself and others as strangers attempting to "enter" a new society.

Appearance (A) is the percept of another's outward visible condition, e.g., clothing, facial features and gestures, that the person may acquire when interacting with and observing others. This percept is assumed to be dependent upon what the person attends to or to what degree another's "displays" are "informative." At lower levels, one's percept should be stereotyped, and variation in appearance should pass unnoticed. As he progresses to higher levels, his percepts should both change and increase in their complexity. In other words, from Level 1 to Level 5, one should
be increasingly able to (1) distinguish more differences among others and (2) assign new meanings to these now perceived displays. Subsumed under Appearance are the concepts of "role" and "status." In "Anglo culture" we are able to make some judgments about another's role and status based on his appearance. Granted that our judgments often may be wrong, these judgments are made; our subsequent interactions with each other may be based wholly or partly upon them.

In this section, five Personality Attribute Dimensions (Communication, Ethnocentrism, Self-Reflection, Trust and Appearance) have been described and assumptions underlying their relevance to the cross-cultural understanding schema were stated. Next a description based on my observations will be presented in order to illustrate how the dimensions are manifested in Anglos at Levels 1-4 who have had opportunity to interact with Navajos. A description of an Anglo at Level 5 will be omitted. Although it is assumed to be hypothetically possible for a person to become so acculturated that he becomes "invisible" in the new society, enough information is not possessed at this stage of inquiry to describe him.

**ILLUSTRATIVE DESCRIPTIONS**

Level 1--An Anglo at this level can only speak and understand several Navajo "words" or expressions such as a standardized greeting. He is largely unaware that non-verbal rules of deportment are different for persons in the two cultures. If knowledge of one or two such behaviors is expressed, this statement of awareness is accompanied by statements implying pity, condescension or the notion that Navajos' behavior is strange or unusual and therefore not "right." He expresses
Anglo value orientations and rejects the Navajo way of life. There is no perceived need to engage in self-reflection about his interactions with Navajos because, he contends, if any reflection or change is needed, it is "right" for Navajos to change. The Anglo at this level does not trust Navajos. Out of his limited contacts with them, he is able to relate accounts of situations in which Navajos proved untrustworthy and will be extremely unlikely to engage in self-disclosure, especially, as he views it, to "inferiors." He owns some Navajo jewelry and rugs but is largely unaware of their "meaning" within Navajo culture. He is insensitive to the nuances of Navajo role and status and in addition he does not recognize when aspects of his own appearance may be considered rude or offensive to Navajos.

Level 2—An Anglo at this level can speak and understand short phrases in the Navajo language. He is aware of several strikingly different non-verbal behaviors that Navajos exhibit. His attitude about these behaviors is one of "overvaluing" these informative displays as he attempts to make evident for himself and others that the Navajo way is the better way. This individual experiences the most psychic stress of Anglos at the four levels of cross-cultural understanding because he is trying to give up previously held Anglo values, behaviors and beliefs and substitute Navajo ones in their place. Self-reflection is used by this person as a defense mechanism to reduce the anxiety created by the conflict he is experiencing.
in attempting to choose between Anglo "ways" and Navajo "ways."
Overvaluing of Navajo ways also helps to reduce this stress.
A Level 2 Anglo vacillates between trust and distrust in his encounters with Navajos but he actively wants to trust them.
In his appearance, he shows a conscious and somewhat ostentatious display and adoption of aspects of Navajos' personal appearance. Only gross discriminations of Navajo status and role are made by a person at this level. He also shows a careful concern to conform in his own dress and mannerisms in keeping with his limited knowledge of whatever might possibly be considered offensive by Navajos.

Level 3--At this level, an Anglo possesses sufficient skill in the Navajo language to enable him to engage in "rudimentary" conversations with Navajos. He is aware of a wider range of Navajo-specific non-verbal behavior and has, somewhat unself-consciously, adopted several Navajo mannerisms in his own repertoire of non-verbal informative displays. He demonstrates awareness of Navajo ways-of-life and has rejected some Anglo values for Navajo values. At this level, in contrast to Level 2, an Anglo is less apt to "overvalue" the Navajo way of life. He has resolved the conflict between value systems which created the psychic stress he previously experienced. He feels comfortable in his interactions with most Navajos. He does not experience much need to reflect on his encounters with them since he is no longer a "stranger" and in many aspects of his interactions with Navajos he can take for granted...
that he is acting appropriately. He trusts more Navajos than he previously did. In his appearance he manifests no ostentatious display or copying of Navajo appearance. He feels free to violate certain rules of conduct or personal appearance, if these rules run counter to his own wishes, based on his knowledge of the severity of proscription for a certain behavior within Navajo culture. His awareness of subtleties of Navajo status and role is increased in contrast to an Anglo at Level 2.

Level 4—An Anglo at this level is able to engage in a wide variety of conversations spoken in Navajo. He exhibits an extended knowledge of rules of non-verbal deportment and situation-specific constraints on particular behaviors. At this level of cross-cultural understanding, an Anglo has resolved the discrepancy between Anglo and Navajo values. His reflections about himself and Navajos increase, in contrast to a Level 3 Anglo, but these reflections are more "philosophic." For example, in lower levels self-reflection pertained more to specific interactions he had with Navajos. At Level 4, an Anglo's reflections center on how his interactions with Navajos exemplify Navajo-Anglo encounters in general and what the consequences of these interactions might be for the two societies as societies rather than as individuals. He feels free to trust and distrust Navajos. But he shows an awareness that "distrust" must be considered from the Navajos' frame of reference. In other words, he says "As an Anglo, I do not
trust him, but I know that this Navajo, from his point of view, has not been untrustworthy." In his appearance, an Anglo at Level 4 is not manifestly different from one at Level 3. But he is more sensitive than one at Level 3 to the nuances of Navajo status and role.
CHAPTER III
THE METHOD

In this research, it is assumed that levels of cross-cultural understanding may be inferred from "informative displays" which participants exhibit during cross-cultural interactions. These displays, or signals, are in the form of behavior, both verbal and non-verbal, of which a participant may be either aware or unaware. It is further assumed that a person's capabilities for cross-cultural interaction are evidenced by pertinent attributes that he exhibits outside of the interaction itself. His relative position on specified Personal Attribute Dimensions (PADs) thus defines his level of cross-cultural understanding. Information from the research may be used to predict levels of observable accomplishment by participants in cross-cultural encounters. For this research, five levels of cross-cultural understanding, as defined by the person's positions on the five PADs, are postulated to exist. These were described in Chapter II.

The procedure used in this research consisted of (1) my own exposure, as resident "stranger," to Navajos and their way of life; (2) the identification of Anglos who, by reputation and observation, seemed to possess the attributes of Levels 1-4; (3) a systematic inquiry in depth of four persons presumed a priori to be at each of Levels 1-4; and (4) an examination of information received from these 16 "subjects" (Ss) in order to determine the degree to which they possessed the
attributes that were assumed in Chapter II to typify an Anglo at each of the levels.

RESEARCH SETTING

The Navajo are a population of approximately 130,000 persons spread over 16,000,000 acres—an area comparable in size to the state of West Virginia. The land is largely an arid highland situated in the eastern half of northern Arizona with a small part of the reservation in northwestern New Mexico and southern Utah. From July 1970 to September 1971 my wife, two year old son and I resided in Ganado, a Navajo community comprised of approximately 500 Navajo families and some 50-75 Anglo families. In the Ganado community there is a 12 grade public school with 1200 students; three trading posts; three gasoline service stations; a general hospital; "missionaries" of several denominations (Presbyterian, Baptist, Mormon, Catholic); a post office; Hubbell's trading post which is a National Historic Site; and a two year community college started in the fall of 1970. This community has long been an arena of Navajo-Anglo interactions. The Hubbell trading post was established in the 1870s. The Presbyterian Mission was begun in the first decade of the 20th century and developed a mission school (first graduating a High School class in 1930). This school is no longer extant, and the facilities now comprise the Ganado Community College. Sage Memorial Hospital, originally developed as a part of the mission, is presently operated by Project Hope.

SUBJECT SELECTION

During our 14 months in Ganado, I became acquainted with and was able to observe a variety of Navajos and Anglos. Interviews were conducted
with 50 Anglos who actually lived in Ganado, and several who resided at some short distance away but had reason to interact with people in Ganado. From among these, the 16 Ss, who seemed to exemplify Anglos at each of the four levels of cross-cultural understanding, were selected for intensive analysis.

PROCEDURE

A systematic inquiry in depth (see Appendix A) of these 16 persons was conducted in the summer of 1971. Information obtained from these structured interviews, plus observations and interactions with the Ss throughout the 14 month period, constitute the "data" that will be used in the next chapter in describing these individuals and in determining the degree to which they satisfied the assumptions about persons at the four levels of cross-cultural understanding.

In interviewing the Ss I asked questions that pertained to each of the five Personal Attribute Dimensions (PADs). Some examples will be given here, but for a detailed inspection the questionnaire is provided in Appendix A.

For the Communication PAD, the intent was to inquire into the S's knowledge of the Navajo language and his comprehension of Navajo non-verbal ways of communicating. Therefore, Ss were asked to give the Navajo names of several objects and their English equivalents. They were also asked to translate several Navajo words and phrases, e.g., "Shi beeso adin"--"I have no money." In the non-verbal section, Ss were asked "open-ended" questions and were encouraged to respond freely and at some length. For example, "First, tell me about your general impression of Navajos. How would you describe them? What has stood
out for you?—What can you tell me about the Navajo way of shaking hands and how it differs from that of the Anglo?" The Ss' responses were written down by the interviewer (I).

In the Ethnocentrism PAD, inquiry was directed at assessing Ss' "Value Orientations" (see Kluckhohn and Strodbeck, 1961) and their comprehension of Navajo vs. Anglo ways of life. Ss were asked questions selected from the work of Kluckhohn and Strodbeck (1961) in order to determine their preference of alternatives for a given Value Orientation. For example, in the Time Value Orientation did the S prefer the Present, Past or Future? Ss were also asked to respond to several pictures depicting Navajos in various situations in order to determine the Ss' knowledge of and attitudes toward Navajo vs. Anglo ways of doing things.

Self-Reflection was an attribute assumed to be variously engaged in by Anglos at the different levels of cross-cultural understanding. Questions were asked concerning the amount of time Ss spent thinking about Navajos; their "expectations" in their interactions with Navajos and of how, with self-reflection, these expectations might change over time; and how they felt about their interactions with Navajos. For example, "Do your reflections, in so far as you do reflect, seem to be of any help in your interactions with Navajos, and if they do, could you give me an example?"

Because Trust seems to be involved to some degree in most human interactions, and is assumed here to be especially important in cross-cultural interactions, several questions were asked related to this PAD. Illustratively: "Let's assume, as we go up a scale from 1 to 9, that there is involved a greater intimacy and trust between you and a
Navajo. Has your trust ever been misplaced? If so, can you give me an example and describe the circumstances?"

In the Appearance PAD, Ss' awareness of the "dress" of Navajos and its significance for them was inquired into. For example, "I would like to ask you some questions now about your observations regarding the appearance of Navajos, yourself and other Anglos. Do Anglos have any way of dressing, hair style, etc., that Navajos don't care for or dislike seeing them wearing?" "In Anglo society we have certain means of finding out about another Anglo's status and role. In other words, we get some idea of what a person does by how he appears or what he is doing in a particular setting. Is it possible for you to make similar distinctions among the Navajo and, if so, on what do you base your judgment?"

The average interview lasted approximately 3 hours and was conducted in a place of convenience to the S; e.g., in my home, his home or place of "business." The results of these interviews and my other observations of the Ss will now be presented.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter includes (1) brief descriptions of the 16 Ss and (2) comparisons (a) between the attributes assumed for Anglos at the different levels and the responses given by the Ss and (b) among Ss at the different levels. In descriptions of the 16 Ss, to preserve their anonymity, fictitious names have been employed and non-essential (to cross-cultural understanding) attributes have been added or deleted.

DESCRIPTIVE SKETCHES

Level I Ss

Bernice was a housewife in her late forties, with two years of college. At the time of the interview, she had been on the reservation less than one year. She had had little necessity to interact with Navajos in the conduct of her daily affairs. Her contacts with them were on superficial social occasions, and there were no Navajos whom she would identify as friends. She was a pleasing, if rather passive woman and was undemonstrative in her interactions with Anglos.

Faith was a housewife, over 50 years old and with a high school degree. She had lived on the reservation over 30 years and had interacted with many Navajos in a variety of situations during these years. She had held several responsible positions both before and after her marriage to her present husband. She seemed "stilted" and somewhat rigid in her interactions with Anglos and seemed not to seek out the companionship of others.
Don was an affable married man in his late thirties, who had been on and about the reservation for over 10 years. He had obtained post-high school college credit. He was employed in a technical capacity in a technical position, which entailed his almost daily interaction with Navajos. In his contacts with Anglos, he was demonstrative, fun-loving and somewhat boisterous.

Elaine, in her early 50s, was a teacher on the reservation. She had a college degree. Her husband was also employed in the school system on the reservation. She had been teaching Navajo children for approximately 9 years. She seemed to be a capable person if somewhat insensitive to nuances of interpersonal behavior among other Anglos.

Level 2 Ss

Monique was a housewife in her 30s, who had a college degree. She had been on the reservation slightly less than 5 years. Her husband was a teacher in the public school system. She was a pleasantly extroverted and active person. She appeared to seek out interactions with Navajos although there was no necessity for her to do this. In her interactions with Anglos, she seemed intelligent, curious and companionable.

Morris was an M.D., employed as a surgeon on the reservation. He was in his late 30s and a widower. In his work, he saw Navajo patients daily and had co-workers (nurses, aids, etc.) who were also Navajos. He had been on the reservation less than three years. He seemed conscientious, if somewhat abrasive, in his concern for the welfare of his patients. In his dealings with Anglos, he appeared as a dedicated professional with little time to spare for social amenities.
Diane was an unmarried nurse in her early 30s, who had been employed by the Public Health Service, Indian Division, on the reservation less than one year. She was an attractive and pleasant woman who worked with Navajo colleagues and patients daily, as part of her job. She seemed to have high professional standards and a sense of dedication to her work. With other Anglos, she was gay and vibrant but not unappealingly so.

Charles was a young, unmarried missionary in his late 20s. He had a high school degree. He had been on the reservation less than a year. Although he had a sense of commitment to his task (converting Navajos to a Protestant faith), he was not "stuffy" about it. Personally, he was quiet and unassuming but with a restrained sense of humor, which made him a delightful companion when he interacted with Anglos.

Level 3 Ss

Theresa was a married schoolteacher in her early 20s with a master's degree. Her husband worked in a trading post. She had been on the reservation over two years. As a schoolteacher in a Bureau of Indian Affairs boarding school, she saw Navajo students and co-workers daily. She was thoughtful and considerate in her interactions with other Anglos.

Roselle was a housewife in her late 30s, with a college degree. She had been employed on the reservation in several capacities both prior to and after her marriage to her husband, who was a mechanic at a local gasoline station. She was an active interactant with Navajos and sought out their companionship although her position did not dictate this behavior. Interpersonally, with other Anglos, she had a very pleasing relaxed manner, and persons seemed more important to her
than "positions."

Fred was an unmarried missionary in his late 50s, who had obtained a master's degree. He had been on the reservation over 25 years. As a result of his chosen profession, he interacted with Navajos almost daily. He seemed to emphasize the pragmatic in his outlook on life and in addition seemed to enjoy what he was doing. When with other Anglos, he was fatherly in his demeanor, and was never observed, nor reputed to be lacking in congeniality or solicitous concern for his neighbor.

Karl was a married man with a college degree. He was in his late 40s and was employed on the reservation in a managerial position. He had been on the reservation approximately 5 years. In his position, he interacted daily with Navajos. Interpersonally, when with other Anglos, he appeared to be a sensitive and insightful person, who tended to be philosophic about the world and his place in it.

**Level 4 Ss**

Martha was a childless housewife in her late 20s, with a master's degree. Her husband traveled frequently in his employment as a manufacturer's representative for a national firm. She was inquisitive and contemplative, and sought out many experiences of various kinds with Navajos. She had been on the reservation about two years. She could be spontaneous and open, while generally exhibiting a quiet reserve in her interactions with Anglos. She seemed to feel no need to dissemble, nor was she known to be pretentious.

Jake was a married man in his early 50s, who had a college degree and was presently employed as a consultant for a national concern which had interests involving the Navajo nation. In his job, he interacted
daily with Navajos. He had been on and about the reservation over 30 years. In demeanor, he manifested a studious reflection about life. He was known, in his quiet way, to be helpful to those Anglos with whom he dealt, without in any way being coercive.

Daniel was married, had a college education and was in his late 30s. His wife was a schoolteacher. He had been on the reservation about 20 years. His position made him responsible for making a directed inquiry into the history of the Navajo. Although this position necessitated only intermittent contact with Navajos, he sought out opportunities for interaction with them. He was pleasant and unassuming in his interactions with Anglos, but was known to stand up firmly for his convictions without being boistrous or abrasive.

Bob was a married man in his late 60s, did not have a high school degree and had been on the reservation over 40 years. He was self-employed as a trader and, as such, dealt with Navajos daily. He was in good health and exuded a zest for life. He was known to be considerate and tolerant when with other Anglos. He was also knowledgeable about the practical activities of everyday life and was willing to share his advice if it was sought.

RESULTS

Communication

In the Verbal part of the Communication PAD, Sts' skill in speaking and understanding the Navajo language was assessed. Table 2 shows the numerical results of Sts' responses to three language questions asking for Navajo-English translations. In question CV2 (see Appendix A), Sts provided Navajo names of objects and their English equivalents (up
Table 2
Ss Responses to Communication-Verbal (CV) Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>CV2</th>
<th>CV3</th>
<th>CV5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bernice</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monique</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Roselle</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karl</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Jake</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—Numbers in cells show the number of objects (CV2), Navajo words (CV3), and Navajo phrases (CV5) Ss were able to translate into English; and the numerical Total of the three questions for each S and the Total for the four Ss at each Level.
to a maximum of 15 objects). Inspection of results for CV2 indicates that Ss at higher levels name more objects, although there was a reversal for Ss at Levels 2 and 3. In question CV3, Ss were asked to give English equivalents for 10 Navajo words. Again, Ss at higher levels could identify more of the Navajo words, with a slight reversal for Level 2 compared to Level 3 Ss. In question CV5, Ss were given five Navajo phrases to translate. Ss were given a score of 1 if they knew any part of the phrase and a score of 2 if they could translate the entire Navajo phrase into English. Results show the expected numerical increase, without reversal, from Level 1 to Level 4. These "language skill" data were significantly correlated with each other (for CV2 and CV3, rho = .814, p < .001; CV2 and CV5, rho = .699, p < .01; CV3 and CV5, rho = .856, p < .001). These results, when compared with the assumed Navajo language skills acquired by Anglos at the different levels, show that in general there was an increase in language skill corresponding with an increase in level. Although Ss at lower levels may produce and recognize more Navajo words than Ss at higher levels, this reversal does not occur when more difficult Navajo phrases have to be translated.

In the Non-Verbal component of the Communication PAD, an evaluation was made of Ss' responses to nine "open-ended" questions dealing with their range of information and attitude toward Navajo's non-verbal informative displays. Ss' responses were evaluated on a numerical basis of 0, 1, or 2 to indicate the degree of positive or negative (mis)information and degree of positive or negative attitudes expressed. An algebraic sum for each S was obtained, based on an evaluation of his responses to all nine non-verbal questions. A Pearson produce-
Table 3
Comparison of Ss' Level of Cross-Cultural Understanding and Scores Assigned to S's Responses to Non-Verbal Communication Questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bernice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monique</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roselle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jake</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—Numbers in cells show Ss' levels of cross-cultural understanding and algebraic sums derived from analysis of amount of information and attitude about Navajos' non-verbal informative displays.
moment correlation was then obtained between the Ss' cross-cultural understanding level and their sum on the nine questions. This correlation was .916, p < .005 (one-tailed test) thus substantiating the assumption (in Chapter 2) that Anglos at increasingly higher levels of cross-cultural understanding also possess more information, less misinformation and a more positive attitude toward Navajos and their non-verbal communications. Representative examples of Ss' responses for each level show how the scoring system was used.

For example, in response to question CNV2, Don, a Level 1 S says:

The one big thing you'd have to say is strange. I've been in 20 different countries, and this is a country of its own. Their capacity for Roma Wine is amazing. Their morals are highly different from ours. It seems that an Old Buck, when the urge strikes, the time and place are right. I've seen a vast change over the years. I think it's for the better. Teach the Indian something and make him work for what he gets to keep is O.K. Missions shouldn't give them something for 2 hours time and time don't mean nothing to an Indian.

Don was given a +1 for Information because he indicates awareness that Navajos' use of time is different from Anglos. He received a -1 for Information because of his statement about the "Old Buck," which is false. He received a -1 on Attitude because his statement, that Navajo morals are different from those of Anglos, was followed by the remark about the "Old Buck," where he indicates not only that "their" morals are different, but that "ours" are better. Also, the use of the term "Old Buck" is perjorative and contributes to an assessment of Don's attitude toward Navajos as negative.

To contrast the information and attitude expressed in a response from a Level 1 S, the response to CNV2 of a Level 4 S (Daniel) will next be presented and an explanation given of his derived score.
They are dark haired, swarthy, generally conform like most Indians to Mongoloid type. Long dark hair, eye complexion, usually have cradle board flattening. To distinguish them from other local Indians is difficult since there is so much variation. Physique is highly variable. Motor habits help you to distinguish manners of gesturing or speech. Maybe a general restraint or deliberation in their motor habits. There usually is a consideration given prior to movement although their movements are still very graceful.

This illustrative Level 4 response is in marked contrast to that at Level 1. Specifically, this person's response was given a +2 on Information because he appeared to have detailed knowledge, e.g., of "cradle board flattening" of the back of the head. Although statements such as "their movements are still very graceful" seem to reflect a positive Attitude toward Navajos, the positive Attitude was not specifically stated; therefore, it was not scored.

Ethnocentrism

In the Ethnocentrism PAD, Ss were asked to respond to seven scenes, which contrasted various Anglo and Navajo ways of living, by describing what was happening in the picture and what the people were thinking and feeling. Ss' responses were evaluated by the method described above in relation to the nine open-ended non-verbal communication questions. A Pearson r of .909 (p < .005) was obtained between the S's cross-cultural understanding level and the score he received (see Table 4). Thus, again, a global a priori impression (assigned cross-cultural understanding level) is highly correlated with a subsequent more detailed inquiry into the amount of information and kind of attitude Ss have regarding Navajo ways of living.
Table 4
Comparison of Ss' Level of Cross-Cultural Understanding and Scores Assigned to Ss' Stories about Navajo Scenes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bernice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monique</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roselle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jake</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. -- Numbers in cells show Ss' level of cross-cultural understanding and algebraic sums obtained from numerical assessment of amount of information and kind of attitude contained in Ss' descriptions of scenes depicting various Anglo and Navajo ways of living.
Other assumptions about Ss' differing levels on the Ethnocentrism PAD were not supported in the detailed inquiry. For example, no consistent pattern or trend was evident in the Ss' Value Orientations. Nor was there any evidence to support the assumption that as Ss progress to higher levels of cross-cultural understanding there is a cognitive shift toward a more Navajo view of the world.

Self-Reflection

In the Self-Reflection PAD, the overall results of the detailed inquiry indicate that this attribute dimension is not useful in discriminating among Anglos at different levels of cross-cultural understanding. More particularly, Table 5 shows whom Ss expected to change most in a two-person encounter where compromise is necessary. No trend is discernable. Table 6 reveals no useful differentiation among Ss at the different levels in regard to whether or not they experienced surprise in their interactions with Navajos. Also, when Ss were asked to indicate what percent of the time they were satisfied or dissatisfied (see Table 7), the percentages reported did not support the assumption that Ss would report an increasing sense of dissatisfaction as higher levels of cross-cultural understanding were obtained. But there were some supportive trends revealed. For example, the last question in the Self-Reflection PAD encouraged Ss to say anything further they wished about self-reflection. Level 1 Ss essentially reported that they had nothing further to say. One Level 2 S's response (Monique) is particularly revealing of the assumed Level 2 Ss' overvaluing of the new culture and some rejection or censure of one's original culture in addition to the use of self-reflection.
Table 5  
Ss' Expectation of Change in Two-Person Interactions  
Where Compromise is Necessary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Myself</th>
<th>Other Person</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bernice</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Monique</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morris</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roselle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jake</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

Ss' Indications of Whether or Not They Experienced Surprise In Their Interactions with Navajos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bernice</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Monique</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roselle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karl</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jake</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

Ss' Description of the Percent of the Time They were Satisfied or Dissatisfied with Their Navajo Interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Percent Satisfied</th>
<th>Percent Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bernice</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>320</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Monique</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>315</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roselle</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karl</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>295</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jake</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>315</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I think most Anglos do much too little when they are in Navajo country. They are thoughtless, especially tourists. Reservation-town people don't feel uncomfortable if they are rude to Navajos. I don't think you can live on a reservation for long without giving thought to how Navajos feel and think. You have to accept the way they live.

A response from a Level 3 S (Theresa) also reveals the self-reflection expected of a Level 3 person.

I find so often after you get over the hurdle of being quiet it's helpful not to get too introspective or it heightens the paranoia and it cripples genuine response. Navajo are more non-verbal. They get to know each other through sharing. They don't offer the kind of praise and reward we are expecting.

Level 4 Ss' responses are less clear-cut, with two Ss saying that they had nothing more to report and the other two Ss indicating that, on some level of awareness, they feel they are constantly analyzing and introspecting about their relations with Navajos.

Trust

Although the overall results of the detailed inquiry in the Trust PAD do not support the a priori assumptions made about Anglos at the various levels of cross-cultural understanding, it is interesting to observe that: (1) most Ss indicated (see Table 8) they had given Navajos a ride, had loaned them money, had given them gifts, and had invited Navajos to a variety of social gatherings; (2) 1/2 to 3/4 of the Ss at each level said they had in turn been given a ride by a Navajo; (3) 3 out of 4 Ss at Level 1, 2 and 3 said they had not borrowed money from a Navajo while 3 out of the 4 Ss at Level 4 said they had borrowed money from a Navajo; (4) most Ss at all levels said they had been invited by Navajos to a variety of Navajo social gatherings.

My global impression that Anglos at higher levels of cross-cultural understanding would indicate that they knew more Navajos than Anglos at
Table 8
S's Responses Indicating the Type of Interactions Engaged in With Navajos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Rides</th>
<th>Loaned Money</th>
<th>Given Gifts</th>
<th>Social Invitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bernice</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Monique</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roselle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karl</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jake</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
lower levels was supported (see Table 9). Level 1 Ss said they knew a total of 308 Navajos; Level 2 Ss--648; Level 3 Ss--1,487; and Level 4 Ss--5,270. Caution must be exercised in making other than a probabalistic statement about the number of Navajos known by any one S as an indicator of level because a Level 1 S may in fact state that he knows more Navajos than a particular Level 3 S indicates that he knows. How closely the number of Navajos he "actually" knows compares with those he "indicates" knowing is an interesting question, which must await future research for an answer.

Inspection of Ss' responses to question T5 regarding Ss' feelings of having misplaced their trust in one or more Navajos reveals some interesting level differences. One S each at Levels 1, 2 and 3 said that he had never misplaced his trust in a Navajo. All Ss in Level 4 said they had at some time felt they had misplaced their trust in a Navajo. This evidence lends support to Gearing's (1970) idea of a continuum from "estrangement to believable" in terms of how we "view" and behave toward members of a different cultural group. In other words, the better you know a group the more "believable" they become to you as people and the more free you are to like or dislike, trust or distrust them as individuals. The results to this question can be best presented by giving actual examples of the responses for the four levels. Here are illustrative statements:

Level 1--"Some of them you can't trust. Some of them aren't honest. I couldn't trust a lot of them."

Level 2--"I don't think there are any I have trusted and have subsequently found my trust was misplaced. There have been a couple of Navajos I have found I should have trusted more. Basically they are a trustworthy people."
Table 9
*Ss’ Estimate of Number of Navajos Known*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Number of Navajos Known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bernice</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>308</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Monique</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>648</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roselle</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>1190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karl</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1487</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jake</td>
<td>2595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>2675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5682</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Level 3--"Yes. I loaned a Navajo $5 and never got it back and one I loaned $20 and I am still good friends with both."

Level 4--"Yes. I have felt that my Trust has been misplaced but then I realize that that was an inappropriate reaction. For example, there were times when I've promised to take a Navajo family to town. I came at an appointed time and they weren't ready and I had to miss another appointment because of it. But, they aren't violating a Trust. So it wasn't a matter of Trust but rather an inappropriate expectation on my part based on cultural values."

Question T6 entailed 20 of 60 questions included in Jourard's (1964) Self-Disclosure Questionnaire. The results (see Table 10) did not support my global impressions.

**Appearance**

Ss responded in the Appearance PAD to 10 open-ended questions (A3-A12) inquiring about Ss' knowledge of and attitude toward: (1) Navajos; (2) Navajos' appearance; (3) Navajo status and role differences; and (4) Ss' own and other Anglos' appearance. The Ss' responses to these questions were scored, as described earlier, in terms of both the amount and kind of information and attitude displayed. The correlation between Ss cross-cultural understanding level and the total score (an algebraic sum) he received on the 10 questions (see Table 5) was .870 (p < .005). Again, this significant correlation indicates that the higher one's level of cross-cultural understanding the more information and the more positive his attitude is likely to be regarding Navajos. Other questions used to elicit data about the Appearance PAD were not useful in discriminating among Ss at the different levels.
Table 10

Numerical Scoring of Ss' Responses to 20 Self-Disclosure Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Spouse</th>
<th>Navajo Same Sex</th>
<th>Anglo Same Sex</th>
<th>Navajo Other Sex</th>
<th>Anglo Other Sex</th>
<th>Excluding Spouse Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bernice</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Monique</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roselle</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karl</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jake</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note--A score of 0, 1 or 2 was given by the S to indicate the degree to which he had discussed each question with any one person falling in the categories above. Thus scores could range from 0-40.
Table II
Comparison of Ss' Level of Cross-Cultural Understanding and Scores Assigned to Ss' Responses to Questions about Navajo and Anglo Appearance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bernice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monique</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roselle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jake</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note--- Numbers in cells show Ss' level of cross-cultural understanding and algebraic sums derived from analysis of amount of information and kind of attitude regarding Navajos in Ss' responses to 10 open-ended Appearance questions.
SUPPLEMENTAL CASE DESCRIPTIONS

The above data suggests that certain a priori assumptions regarding attributes possessed by Anglos at different levels were supported by the detailed inquiry and that others were not. In concluding this chapter, a supplemental description of one S at each of the four levels will be presented. Then, based on all of the data, a repartitioned schema of cross-cultural understanding will be proposed.

Level 1

Don was described earlier as an affable married man in his thirties who worked on the reservation in a technical capacity and had occasion to interact with Navajos daily. He was able to give Navajo names and their English equivalents for only three objects; he recognized only three of ten Navajo words; and he did not know any part of the five Navajo phrases. He received a score of -6 on the Non-Verbal component of the Communication PAD, indicating his lack of information about and negative attitude toward Navajos. He revealed his "estrangement" from Navajos:

The one big thing you'd have to say is strange.

He reflected Anglo value orientations:

Their morals are highly different from ours. Teach the Indian something and make him work for what he gets to keep is O.K.

One may infer from his comments that he expected Navajos to change so as to live and behave in the Anglo way. In responding to the scenes depicting Navajo and Anglo ways of life, he said that Navajos should go to a doctor rather than their "Singers" (Navajo medicine men):
In my viewpoint they (Navajos) should live the modern way since it's cleaner and hygenic. Children are made to go to school because of the money their folks get for them going to school.

They ought to go to church. They aren't apt to get in trouble in church.

He did not disclose as much personal information about himself to Navajos as he did to Anglos. In describing how he felt about Navajo jewelry and Navajos' appearance, he said:

My wife has about $300 worth of Navajo jewelry. I think the Zuni jewelry work is much better. They wear levis, slouchy black hat; they are short, pot-bellied with a narrow butt. It's hard to judge their age.

When asked if there were any ways he appeared that Navajos might not like, he said:

Not that I know of.

When asked if there was anything he didn't like about Navajos' appearance, he replied:

I think their dress and style is strange. If they are unclean and smell I don't like it.

When asked about other Anglos appearance, he responded:

If Anglos just wear what they are used to wearing it will pass. It may seem strange to Navajos but it doesn't make that much difference.

In sum, then, comparing Don's comments in the detailed inquiry to the attributes assumed possessed by an Anglo at Level 1, with the exception of self-reflection which he contended he engaged in, his responses substantiated the a priori assumptions.

Level 2

Monique was a housewife in her thirties who sought out interactions with Navajos and appeared to be intelligent, curious and companionable.
In comparing her responses in the detailed inquiry with the attributes assumed possessed by a Level 2 Anglo the following was observed. She could not think of the Navajo names for any objects, knew only one of the 10 Navajo words and none of the Navajo phrases. It was assumed that a Level 2 Anglo would know more of the Navajo language than Monique did.

In describing her general impression of Navajos she replied:

I admire them extremely for their lack of tension. They're not in a hurry. Time doesn't have the significance to them it does to us. The whole family is very important to them, not just the nuclear family.

One infers that Monique values the Navajo way of life more than the Anglo. She knew the Navajo way of shaking hands (a light touching of hands) but did not know that Navajos purse their lips to indicate direction. She also indicated that she attempted to change her behavior to conform to Navajo rules of deportment. For example, when asked about how Navajos use their eyes she replied:

Quite often they don't look at you directly. I would say they don't more often than not. Perhaps that is why I don't notice anything about their lips since when they don't look at me I don't look at them.

She said that she felt Navajos should go to both Navajo Singers and Anglo doctors. In responding to a scene showing Navajos in an "Anglo" situation (picture El7b) she said:

This is part of the tragedy. I think this is where the mistake is. I don't think this is the answer, i.e., putting them in our house. They won't remain Navajo by assuming the facade of our civilization.

In these comments one can infer that Monique values highly the Navajo people and their culture. Although she does not have an extended range of information about them she exhibits a very positive attitude toward
them. In discussing self-reflection she manifested the attributes assumed possessed by an Anglo at Level 2. For example:

I try to think first before I speak or do anything when I'm in direct relationship with them. Their way of thinking is so different I've got to make the effort not to offend them. There is very little they can do in their behavior that will offend me.

Monique trusted Navajos ("Basically they are a trustworthy people.") and also exhibited the psychic stress assumed to be concommitant with a Level 2 Anglo's experience. To wit:

If there are several Navajos and we have been talking in English and then they switch to Navajo and it goes on very long I definitely begin to feel uncomfortable and it's also irritating.

Monique did not use self-disclosure, however, to reduce this stress as it was assumed a Level 2 Anglo would. Also she did not fulfill the expectation that a Level 2 Anglo would not criticize anything about Navajos, e.g., she said:

Their clothes seem awfully dirty to me although I knew they haven't as much water available. Their habits; I object to their spitting. Also the constant runny noses of the kids and the way they don't take care of it. They don't seem to have any concern for trash.

Monique did indicate that she was careful in what she wore in order not to offend any Navajos.

Level 3

Theresa was a married schoolteacher in her early twenties who had been on the reservation two years. She appeared pleasant, thoughtful and considerate. A comparison of her responses in the detailed inquiry with the attributes assumed possessed by an Anglo at Level 3 revealed the following. She was able to give five objects with their Navajo
and English names. She knew three of the 10 Navajo words but she recognized only part of one of the five Navajo phrases. It was assumed that a Level 3 Anglo would have acquired more skill in the Navajo language than Theresa demonstrated. In the questions regarding non-verbal communication Theresa exhibited the range of information expected of a Level 3 and, as was also expected, she did possess misinformation on two of the 9 open-ended non-verbal question. In her responses to these questions she displayed a definite quality of knowledgeable confidence (that was assumed a Level 3 would have) compared to the uncertainty and vacillation manifested by the "eager interactant" at Level 2. Theresa's feeling of competence comes through in the following response to a question asking how Navajos feel about interpersonal non-interference. She said:

Yes, I think that's what it is. It's their business and you bug out. If someone deserves it he will be beat up and no one interferes. Relatives can interfere but outsiders stay out.

Theresa shows the acceptance of Navajo ways when she says that Navajos should have a "Sing" rather than relying on Anglo doctors. This answer was in response to the scene (E16b) showing a Sing taking place in a hogan. Also Theresa recognized that the woman squatting in the scene where a sheep is being butchered (E17a) was making blood stew whereas neither Don (Level 1) nor Monique (Level 2) recognized this. Even though Theresa was a schoolteacher, and by reputation a dedicated one, she was able to respond to a question about what the adolescent boy in scene E18 should do by saying:
If he wants to be in school he should be in school. If he doesn't like school let him wait until he does and herd sheep in the meantime. He may never want school.

Interestingly, contrary to the assumption that an Anglo at Level 3 would engage in less self-disclosure than an Anglo at Level 2 Theresa indicated that she disclosed more to a Navajo woman than Monique did. But, Theresa's responses to the self-disclosure questionnaire (T6) reveal that she disclosed an identical amount to Navajo women as she did to Anglo women thus confirming the expectation that an Anglo at Level 3 feels she can trust Navajos as much as Anglos. While demonstrating a very positive regard of Navajos (she described her general impression of Navajo men with the adjectives powerful, handsome, dignified) she also felt free, as was expected of a Level 3, to violate certain rules of appearance. For example:

They don't like my braids. Too Navajo in your look. I don't know if this is teasing offended or really offended. They don't like opaque colored stockings. This doesn't bother me.

Level 4

Daniel was a married man in his thirties, who had been on the reservation approximately 20 years. He was a quietly competent gentle person and a pleasant companion. A comparison of his responses in the detailed inquiry with the attributes assumed possessed by an Anglo at Level 4 revealed the following. Although Daniel was able to give the Navajo and English designations of 15 objects and recognized 9 out of 10 Navajo words he was only able to translate half of the Navajo phrases correctly. It was assumed a Level 4 Anglo would be more proficient in this area. Of the four Level 4 Ss, only Bob demonstrated the expected skill in the Navajo language. Daniel's knowledge of Navajo non-verbal
communication displays was the most extended of all the Ss interviewed. In his responses to the nine open-ended non-verbal questions he confirmed the expectations for an Anglo at Level 4 that (1) his range of information would be extended; (2) he would exhibit knowledge of certain situation-specific constraints on behavior; and (3) he would have made some permanent acculturative adaptations in his own behaviors which are Navajo in origin. Two of Daniel's responses to two non-verbal questions (CNV6 and CNV9) will be presented to show how these a priori assumptions are made manifest in the detailed inquiry from a Level 4 Anglo.

CNV6--Navajos often will ask disconcertingly direct questions sometimes due to lack of command of the English language and sometimes due to their lack of knowledge of what is personal information for an Anglo. I'm sure they also find Anglos rude in their question asking. I avoid asking questions that I don't need to ask and in the long run you learn as much. Asking a person's name in the old days was certainly impolite but they have resigned themselves to Anglos asking this. I have resorted to the Navajo way and try to learn it from a 3rd party. Navajos might ask you about your personal finances.

CNV9--Properly, when outside the hogan, come up with enough noise so they know you are coming. You can usually tell if someone is home by seeing whether or not the door is locked or if smoke is coming out of the stove-pipe. You should wait in your car for awhile after you drive up. The old way was to not knock on the door but today you knock lightly or the Navajo inside might push it open. I wouldn't intrude so far today to go on in unless invited. Navajos today don't generally invite people in. Through cues you know whether you should go in or not. If you do go in you should sit down without waiting to be asked. Pretty much in a Sing sit quietly on the South side and observe.

When Daniel was asked whether he wished to say anything further regarding general demeanor or non-verbal rules of department he said:
There seems to be a general forcefulness and aggressiveness of manner in which Anglos approach things. To get along with Navajos you should curb this to some degree.

Personal observation reveals that Daniel himself exhibited a gentle strength, non-intrusiveness and respect for the individuality of the other person he interacted with. The a priori assumption regarding self-reflection engaged in by a Level 4 Anglo was that self-reflection will be used more at this level than at Level 3. In response to question S5 asking about the S's use of self-reflection and how much he felt it helped him in his interactions with Navajos Daniel said:

Very very much! The best example recently was when I took an Anglo to interview a Navajo. I modeled my approach as I had seen my interpreter do in approaching other informants and it worked excellently.

In terms of trust Daniel indicated that he had disclosed virtually as much to a Navajo male friend as he had to an Anglo male friend. Also he indicated he felt free to like or dislike, trust or distrust individual Navajos based on his individual assessment of them. Daniel indicated his comprehension of the subtleties of Navajo status and role which had been assumed concommitant with a Level 4 position. In responding to question A10 which inquired into S's ability to make status and role distinctions among the Navajo Daniel said:

Yes, I think it is possible to make these distinctions. Dress is one of the major things you can use. A medicine man or Singer is likely to wear turquoise in his ears, have long hair, head band and he will be more elaborately garbed on ceremonial occasions with additions to his dress such as a concho belt. Dress is also a fair indicator of amount of superficial acculturation. People who have been "sung" over will be wearing beads in their hair knot forever after the ceremony. In certain situations a particular individual will be exercising leadership at formal meetings, etc. Certain of the elderly or members of more prominent families will have greater control in the debate. In a Sing the medicine man's leadership role is quite explicit. These are usually
temporary roles he assumes and then steps out of after the situation. Some of the younger Navajo have positions distinguishable by manner and dress both. Leadership is usually conspicuous.

DISCUSSION

When a comparison is made between attributes assumed for hypothetical Anglos at the different levels and the Ss responses obtained in the detailed inquiry the a priori assumptions were variously substantiated. In the Communication Personal Attribute Dimension (PAD) in general Ss did exhibit the expected increase in their Navajo language ability as higher levels of cross-cultural understanding were obtained. In the Non-Verbal component of the Communication PAD the amount and kind of information and attitude Ss' possess about Navajo non-verbal behaviors is significantly related to their level of cross-cultural understanding.

In the Ethnocentrism PAD the assumption that a shift in Value Orientations from Anglo to Navajo choices would accompany a progression up the cross-cultural understanding levels was clearly not supported. It appears that, although a shift toward viewing the world from the perspective of the cultural other may be a desirable accomplishment, it is not a necessary concomitant of increased cross-cultural understanding. Again, the amount and kind of information and attitude Ss have regarding Navajo ways of living was significantly related to their level of cross-cultural understanding.

In the Self-Reflection PAD, the overall results of the detailed inquiry indicate that this attribute dimension is not useful in discriminating among Anglos at different levels of cross-cultural understanding. Alternative explanations that could be considered are that
(1) the questions were couched such that they elicited "socially desirable" responses from all Ss, and (2) self-reflection is more closely associated with personality factors than with level of cross-cultural understanding and certain personalities may indeed use it as an effective device to progress to higher levels of cross-cultural understanding.

In the Trust PAD, the a priori assumptions were not generally supported. In particular, the results on self-disclosure obtained in the detailed inquiry did not support my global impressions and, again, whether or not and to what degree one engages in self-disclosure may be more a function of personality than of one's level of cross-cultural understanding.

The results obtained in the detailed inquiry related to the Appearance PAD reveal again that a significant relationship exists between (1) information and attitude about Navajos' and Anglos' appearance and (2) level of cross-cultural understanding. More particularly, it should be pointed out that amount of correct information and a positive attitude occur together and misinformation and a negative attitude are related. The evidence suggests that these relationships are manifested in the Communication, Ethnocentrism and Appearance PADs but that Self-Reflection and Trust, as used in the concept of cross-cultural understanding, are more related to personality. In other words, it appears that the five originally proposed PADs would be more heuristically useful if combined into two dimensions: viz., Information and Personal Attributes. Another way of putting it might be to consider that there are cognitive (Information) and affective (attitude,
personality traits, tendency for self-reflection and self-disclosure) determiners of level of cross-cultural understanding. It should be made clear that these two new dimensions were selected after an examination of the data obtained in the detailed inquiry (1) suggested that Information and Attitude, for example, might prove useful in discriminating among Anglos at the different levels and (2) analysis of the Ss' responses did in fact show a significant relationship between amount and kind of information and attitude and Ss' level of cross-cultural understanding.

The revised schema (see Table 12) is comprised, then, of four levels and two dimensions; viz., Information and Personal Attributes. The evidence from this initial descriptive research seems to warrant further inquiry into a concept of cross-cultural understanding as consisting of levels of accomplishment along two major dimensions.
Table 12
Revised Cross-Cultural Understanding Schema

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVELS</th>
<th>INFORMATION</th>
<th>PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY

When persons from different societal backgrounds come in contact with each other, problems are likely to arise because of uncertainties over what to do with or about each other. The research reported here constituted an effort to describe differences among people which account for the differential ease with which individuals interact with members from different cultures and the difficulties others encounter. Based on interactions with Navajos, a schema of cross-cultural understanding was proposed. Cross-cultural understanding refers to a process occurring when members from two disparate cultures (in this research Navajo and Anglo) interact. It is a construct that is assumed to mediate between the participants' informative displays and their conjoint actions.

The proposed schema of cross-cultural understanding consisted of four levels of accomplishment on five Personal Attribute Dimensions: Communication, Ethnocentrism, Self-Reflection, Trust and Appearance. Based on personal observation and their reputation, 16 Anglos who appeared to be at the four levels of cross-cultural understanding were selected from among subjects given an extensive interview. A comparison was made between the information received from the 16 Anglos in a systematic in-depth inquiry and assumed attributes which were based on (1) my own experiences as an Anglo interacting with Navajos; (2) previous research in related areas such as cultural anthropology; and (3) my...
observations of other Anglos interacting with Navajos.

Results of this comparison between the *a priori* assumptions based on global impressions and the detailed inquiry of the subjects suggest that level of cross-cultural understanding and the amount and kind of information and attitude exhibited by the subject are highly correlated. The results from the inquiry relating to the original dimensions of Communication, Ethnocentrism and Appearance were found to be more usefully partitioned into the concepts of information and attitude. The results from the inquiry of the dimensions of Self-Reflection and Trust appear to be more related to personal dispositions. Since attitude is also a more affective or personal attribute, a revised schema of cross-cultural understanding was proposed containing four levels and the two dimensions of Information and Personal Attributes.
Appendix A

CROSS-CULTURAL UNDERSTANDING QUESTIONNAIRE

I PERSONAL INFORMATION: (PI)

P1. Name:
P2. Address:
P3. Birthdate:
P4. Sex:
P5. Marital Status: Single_Married_Divorced_Widowed_Separated_Wife Culture
P6. Educational Background: High School_Years of College_Highest Degree
P7. Present Occupation:
P8. Religion:
P9. Number of years and months in location such as to provide opportunity for contact with Navajo:

A: COMMUNICATION: (Verbal) (CV)

I am going to ask you some questions about the Navajo language now.

CV1. On a scale from 1 to 9, with 1 meaning you speak only 2 or 3 words and 9 meaning you speak the Navajo language as well as a Navajo, where would you place yourself on this scale? (Hand S sheet & pencil).

CV2. Please give me the Navajo names of as many objects as you can and their English equivalents. For example: chidi - car. 1-15.

CV3. O.K. Now I will ask you some Navajo words and you tell me if you can what they mean in English.

1. baah - bread 6. Ei - horse
2. to' - water 7. sik'is - my friend
3. ozee - medicine 8. hola - I don't know
4. bilisana - apples 9. Ndoga - No!
5. bilagana - white man 10. beese - money

CV4. How much of a conversation in Navajo between two Navajos can you understand? One representing nothing and 9 all of it. (Hand S sheet of paper).

CV5. Now I will say something in Navajo and you tell me, if you can what it means in English.

1. Shi beeso adin - I have no money.
2. na'nizhozhigoo deya - I am going to Gallup.
3. ashiih Ta nisin - I want some salt.
4. shika anilyeed - Help me.
5. dine bizaad boohoosh aah - I am learning Navajo.
COMMUNICATION (Non-Verbal) (CNV)

CNV1. Now I am going to ask you some questions about particular ways in which Navajos do things differently from Anglos. In other words, certain things they do as a matter of routine, which they don't seem to notice but which may have stood out for you when you were with them. Before I ask you these questions, would you please show me on a scale from 1-9 where you would rate yourself on the knowledge of these distinctive Navajo ways. (Hand S sheet). With 1 being no knowledge and 9 being as much knowledge as a Navajo has.

CNV2. First tell me about your general impression of Navajos. How would you describe them? What has stood out for you?

CNV3. What can you tell me about the Navajo way of shaking hands and how it differs from that of the Anglo?

CNV4. How about use of the lips?

CNV5. Eyes and looking behavior?

CNV6. Asking questions?

CNV7. Appropriate social distance (Proxemics) closeness when interacting or talking?

CNV8. Non-Interference, interpersonally. "If I were you..." Unsolicited advice giving.

CNV9. Approaching, entering hogan and sitting down?

CNV10. Any other rules, ways of living, or interpersonal taboos that you can think of that we haven't mentioned?

B: ETHNOCENTRISM: (E)

Now I'm going to ask you some questions about how most Anglos or Navajos might do things. There are no "right" answers.

E1. HUMAN NATURE

Some people say all men have a basic human nature, but they don't all agree on what it is. For example, man has been considered to be, when born:

1. basically Evil -
2. basically Neutral -
3. a mixture of Good and Evil -
4. or basically Good -

In addition to these 4 ways of viewing human nature you could consider that each of the 4 ways could be changeable or unchangeable. For example, man is basically blank, but it is possible for him to change or be changed. Or, man is basically blank and nothing can change or alter this basic human nature. Do you see what I mean? O.K. Which of the 4 ways do you think man is? Is this changeable or not? Which kind of man would most Navajos say man is? Which kind of man would most other Anglos say he is?
E2. FACING CONDITIONS

There are different ways of thinking about how God (the gods) is (are) related to man and to weather and all other natural conditions, which make the crops and animals live or die. Here are three possible ways.

1) God (the gods) and people all work together all the time; whether the conditions which make the crops and animals grow are good or bad depends upon whether people themselves are in harmony with their god (gods) and with the forces of nature.

2) God (the gods) does (do) not directly use his (their) power to control all the conditions that affect the growth of crops or animals. It is up to the people themselves to figure out how conditions change and to try hard to find ways of controlling them.

3) Just how God (the gods) will use his (their) power over all the conditions which affect the growth of crops and animals cannot be known by man. And it is useless for people to think they can change conditions very much for very long. The best way is to take conditions as they come and do as well as one can.

Which of the three ways of looking at things do you think is best? __________
Which of the other two ways would be your second choice? __________
Which of the three ways of looking at things would most Navajos think is best? __________
Which of the three ways of looking at things would most other Anglos think is best? __________

E3. WAYS OF LIVING

There were two people talking about how they liked to live. They had different ideas.

1) One said: What I care about most is accomplishing things—getting things done just as well or better than other people do them. I like to see results and think they are worth working for.

2) The other said: What I care most about is to be left alone to think and act in the ways that best suit the way I really am. If I don't always get much done but can enjoy life as I go alone, that is the best way.

Which of these two persons do you think has the better way of living? __________
Which of the two do you think you are more like? __________
Which do you think most Navajos would say had the better way of living? __________
Which do you think most other Anglos would say had the better way of living? __________

E4. WELL ARRANGEMENTS

When a community has to make arrangements for water, such as drill a well, there are three different ways they can decide to arrange things such as location, and who is going to do the work.
There are some communities where it is mainly the older or recognized leaders of the important families who decide the plans. Everyone usually accepts what they say without much discussion since they are the ones who are used to deciding such things and are the ones who have had the most experience.

There are some communities where most people in the group have a part in making the plans. Lots of different people talk, but nothing is done until almost everyone comes to agree as to what is best to be done.

There are some communities where everyone holds to his own opinion, and they decide the matter by vote. They do what the largest number want even though there may still be many people who disagree and object to the action.

Which way do you think is usually best in such cases? _________
Which of the other two ways do you think is better? _________
Which way of all three ways do you think most Navajos would usually think is best? __________
Which way of all three ways do you think most other Anglos would usually think is best? __________

E5. CHILD TRAINING
time: Item T1

Some people were talking about how children should be brought up. Here are three different ideas.

Some people say that children should always be taught well the traditions of the past (the ways of the old people). They believe the old ways are best, and that it is when children do not follow them too much that things go wrong.

Some people say that children should be taught some of the old traditions (ways of the old people), but it is wrong to insist that they stick to these ways. These people believe that it is necessary for children always to learn about and take on whatever of the new ways will best help them get along in the world of today.

Some people do not believe children should be taught much about past traditions (the ways of the old people) at all except as an interesting story of what has gone before. These people believe that the world goes along best when children are taught the things that will make them want to find out for themselves new ways of doing things to replace the old.

Which of these people do you think had the best idea about how children should be taught? _________
Which of the other two people had the better idea? _________
Considering again all three ideas, which would most Navajos say had the best idea? __________
Considering again all three ideas, which would most other Anglos say had the best idea? __________
E6. FAMILY WORK RELATIONS

I'm going to tell you about three different ways in which families can arrange work. These families are related and they live close together.

In some groups (or communities) it is usually expected that each of the separate families (by which we mean just husband, wife and children) will look after its own business separate from all others and not be responsible for the others.

In some groups (or communities) it is usually expected that the close relatives in the families will work together and talk over among themselves how to take care of whatever problems come up. When a boss is needed they usually choose (get) one person, not necessarily the oldest able person, to manage things.

In some groups (or communities) it is usually expected that the families which are closely related to each other will work together and have the oldest able person (such as, mayor or father) be responsible for and take charge of most important things.

Which of these three ways do you think is usually best in most cases? ______
Which of the other two ways do you think is better? ______
Which of all the ways do you think most Navajos would think is usually best? ______
Which of all the ways do you think most other Anglos would think is usually best? ______

E7. HOUSEWORK

There were two women talking about the way they liked to live.

One said that she was willing to work as hard as the average, but that she didn't like to spend a lot of time doing the kind of extra things in her house or taking up extra things outside like yard work. Instead she liked to have time free to enjoy visiting with people—to go on trips—or just to talk with whomever was around.

The other woman said she liked best of all to find extra things to work on which would interest her—for example, sewing children's clothes. She said she was happiest when she was kept busy and was getting lots done.

Which of these ways do you think it is usually better for women to live? ______
Which are you really more like? ______
Which way of life would most Navajos think is better? ______
Which way of life would most other Anglos think is better? ______
E8. CEREMONIAL INNOVATION

Some people in a community like your own say that the
religious ceremonies (the church services) were changing from what they
used to be.

1 Some people were really pleased because of the changes in
religious ceremonies. They felt that new ways are usually better
(Fut) than old ones, and they like to keep everything—even ceremonies—
moving ahead.

2 Some people were unhappy because of the change. They felt
(Past) that religious ceremonies should be kept exactly—in every way—as
they had been in the past.

3 Some people felt that the old ways for religious ceremonies were
(Pres) best but you just can't hang on to them. It makes life easier
just to accept some changes as they come along.

Which of these three said most nearly what you would believe is
right? __________
Which of the other two do you think is more right? ___________
Which of the three would most Navajos say was most right? ____________
Which of the three would most other Anglos say was most right? ___________

E9. BELIEF IN CONTROL

Three men from different areas were talking about the things
that control the weather and other conditions. Here is what they
each said.

One man said: My people have never controlled the rain, wind,
and other natural conditions and probably never will. There
(Subj) have always been good years and bad years. That is the way it
is, and if you are wise you will take it as it comes and do the
1 best you can.

The second man said: My people believe that it is man's job
(Over) to find ways to overcome weather and other conditions just as
they have overcome so many other things. They believe they will
one day succeed in doing this and may even overcome drought and
floods.

The third man said: My people help conditions and keep things
(With) going by working to keep in close touch with all forces which
make the rain, the snow, and other conditions. It is when we
(With) do the right things—live in the proper way—and keep all that
we have—the land, the stock, and the water—in good condition,
that all goes along well.

Which of these three men do you think had the best idea? __________
Of the remaining two men whom do you think had the better idea of
the two? __________
Which of the three men do you think most Navajos would think had the best idea? __________

Which of the three men do you think most other Anglos would think had the best idea? __________

E10. WATER ALLOCATION
The government is going to help a community like yours to get more water by redrilling and cleaning out a community well. The government officials suggest that the community should have a plan for dividing the extra water, but don't say what kind of plan. Since the amount of extra water that may come in is not known, people feel differently about planning.

1. Some say that whatever water comes in should be divided just about as water in the past was always divided.

2. Others want to work out a really good plan ahead of time for dividing whatever water comes in.

3. Still others want just to wait until the water comes in before deciding on how it will be divided.

Which of these three ways do you think is usually best in cases like this? __________

Of the other two ways, which do you think is better? __________

Which of the three ways do you think most Navajos would think best? __________

Which of the three ways do you think most other Anglos would think best? __________

E11. WAGE WORK
There are three ways in which men who do not themselves hire others may work.

1. One way is working on one's own as an individual. In this case a man is pretty much his own boss. He decides most things himself, and how he gets along is his own business. He only has to take care of himself and he doesn't expect others to look out for him.

2. One way is working in a group of men where all the men work together without any one main boss. Every man has something to say in the decisions that are made, and all the men can count on each other.

3. One way is working for an owner, a big boss, or a man who has been running things for a long time (a patron). In this case, the men do not take part in deciding how the business will be run, but they know they can depend on the boss to help them out in many ways.

Which of these three ways do you think is usually best for a man to work? __________

Which of the other two ways is better for a man to work? __________
Which of the three ways do you think most Navajos would think is best? _____
Which of the three ways do you think most other Anglos would think is best? ________

E12. NONWORKING TIME
activity: Item A6
Two men spend their time in different ways when they have no work to do. (This means when they are not actually on the job.)

1 One man spends most of this time learning or trying out things (Doing) that will help him in his work.

2 The other man spends most of this time talking, telling stories, (Being) singing, and so on, with his friends.

Which of these two men do you think has the better way of living? ________
Which of these men do you think you are more like? ________
Which of these men would most Navajos think had the better way of living? _________
Which of these men would most other Anglos think had the better way of living? ________

E13. LENGTH OF LIFE
man-nature: Item MN5
Three men were talking about whether people themselves can do anything to make the lives of men and women longer. Here is what each said.

One said: It is already true that people like doctors and others are finding the way to add many years to the lives of most men by discovering (finding) new medicines, by studying (Over) foods, and doing other such things as vaccinations. If people will pay attention to all these new things they will almost always live longer.

The second one said: I really do not believe that there is much human beings themselves can do to make the lives of men (Subj) and women longer. It is my belief that every person has a set time to live, and when that time comes it just comes.

The third one said: I believe that there is a plan to life (With) which works to keep all living things moving together, and if a man will learn to live his whole life in accordance with that plan, he will live longer than other men.

Which of these three said most nearly what you would think is right? ________
Which of the other two ways is more right? ________
Which of the three would most Navajos say was most right? ________
Which of the three would most other Anglos say was most right? ________

E14. I would like to have you consider the scale from 1 to 9 again. If 1 represents completely the Anglo way of living, believing, and thinking and 9 is the Navajo way, where would you place yourself? (Hand S sheet).
E15. Let's suppose I were to give you a camera and ask you to take a series of pictures such that when you were finished we would have a record showing the life span of a Piñon tree. I would like you to assume I have just placed the camera in your hands and you are going to tell me, picture by picture, what you would do, in one afternoon's time, until you were finished. O.K.? Remember, you tell me when you are through with the filming sequence. Begin.

E16A-E20. I am going to have you look at several pictures now. For each picture I would like to have you tell me a brief story about what the people are thinking and doing in the picture and how the situation will turn out. In other words, if there is a decision that should be made, what will that decision be or what will the ending of your story be.

C. SELF-REFLECTION (S)

S1. When we interact with people, sometimes it becomes obvious that some adjustment is necessary in order for you and the other person to be able to get along or get a job done. When this occurs which of the two of you do you expect to change most?

S2. In thinking about these situations where some change, either in one or both persons, is needed, or would be helpful, how would you compare the change you expect if you are interacting with an Anglo versus the change you expect when you are interacting with a Navajo?

S3. Are you ever surprised about how well or how poorly your interactions with Navajos go?

S4. If Anglos and Navajos gave a lot of thought about each other's way of life and how it affected, if it does, their interactions, do you suppose this process of thinking about their interactions with each other would ever allow an Anglo and a Navajo to get along together as well as either 2 Anglos or 2 Navajos could?

S5. Do your reflections, in so far as you do reflect, seem to be of any help in your interactions with Navajos and if they do could you give me an example?

S6. I would like to have you rate yourself again on a scale from 1 to 9 in terms of, when you are interacting with Navajos, whether or not your goals in the interaction are achieved with 1 representing your goals are never achieved and 9 representing the condition when your goals are always achieved. (Hand S sheet).

S7a. What % of the time do you feel satisfied about your interactions with Navajos?

Satisfactory ____________
Unsatisfactory ____________
Total ____________________

S7b. What is it about your meetings with Navajos that makes you feel dissatisfied? ________(If S hasn't done so, get actual examples of what
he is referring to.)

S8. In your interactions with Navajos have you ever felt uncomfortable, ill at ease, or frustrated and if this occurred, have you ever asked yourself why this came about?

S9a. Can you think of anything else that you could say about what we might call introspection or asking yourself questions about your relations with the Navajo and how you and maybe other Anglos get along with them?

S9b. Do you introspect or analyze about your relations with Navajos more, less or the same now as compared to the past?

S10. Again, on a scale from 1-9, with 1 being "almost never think about my relations with Navajos" and 9 "almost constantly thinking about my interactions with Navajos," where would you place yourself?

S10a. Now?

S10b. At greatest point, if you have reflected more some time in the past, and if so put the # of years at that time.

D. TRUST: (T)

T1. In considering your interactions with Navajos, I would like you to describe how many of the following practices you have engaged in. In addition, please mention whether you have done this in the past, or expect to do it in the future.

Tla. Picking up hitchhikers? Yes, No, or Maybe to each of the following. Past ______ Future ______

Tlb. Lending behavior: Yes, No, or Maybe to the following. Past ______ Future ______ What specifically?

money ______ (amount) ______
food ______
car ______

Tlc. Giving behavior: Yes, No, or Maybe to the following. Past ______ Future ______ Gifts on special occasions ______

Tld. Social gatherings that you have invited Navajos to. Yes, No, or Maybe. Past ______ Future ______

Church ______ wedding ______
party ______ meals ______
home ______ other ______

T2. Have Navajos reciprocated; i.e.:

T2a. Have you been given a ride while hitchhiking? ______

T2b. Have you borrowed money? ______
T2c. Have you received gifts? _____ On what occasions? ______

T2d. Have you been invited to participate in Navajo social gatherings? Yes, No, or Maybe to the following. Past ____ Future ____
  "Sings" ________ wedding ________
  Church _________ meals ________
  party __________ other __________
  home __________

T3. In general, what are your relationships with Navajos like? With 1 representing a complete stranger and 9 representing very intimate or trusting. (Hand ___ sheet).

T4. More specifically, I would now like to have you to place marks on the scale to indicate the variety of relationships you have with Navajos and then show how many Navajo adults you know who fall at the points on the scale you have marked. (Give them example card). (Hand ___ sheet).

T5. Let's assume, as we go up the scale from 1 to 9, that there is involved a greater intimacy and trust between you and a particular Navajo. Has your trust ever been misplaced or, using our scale, have you ever had to back a Navajo down the scale? Yes ____ No ______
If yes, can you give me an example and what were the circumstances?

SELF-DISCLOSURE INSTRUCTIONS

T6. Perhaps we have both had the experience of being on a bus, train or airplane sitting next to a stranger, and of striking up a conversation with him. Many times we tell him of our personal affairs. Except for this kind of situation, we usually are very careful about what we disclose to others about ourselves. I want you to answer some questions now about the sorts of things you have told both Anglos and Navajos.

The answer sheet which you have been given has columns with headings "Spouse," "Navajo Male Friend," "Anglo Male Friend," "Navajo Female Friend," and "Anglo Female Friend." I am going to read you each item on the questionnaire and you indicate on the answer sheet by number the extent that you have talked about that item to each person; that is, the extent to which you have made yourself known to that person. Use the rating scale that you see on the answer sheet to describe the extent that you have talked about each item to each person.

SELF-DISCLOSURE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What you think and feel about religion; your personal religious views.

2. Your personal opinions and feelings about religious groups other than your own, e.g., Protestants, Catholics, Jews, atheists, Native American Church, and Navajo "Sings."

3. Your personal views on drinking alcohol.
4. Your personal views on sexual morality—how you feel that you and others ought to behave in sexual matters.

5. Your feeling about how parents ought to deal with their children.

6. The style of house, and the kinds of furnishings that you like best.

7. Your favorite ways of spending spare time, e.g., hunting, reading, cards, community affairs, sports events, parties, dancing, T.V., etc.

8. How you feel that your work is appreciated by others (e.g., boss, fellow-workers, spouse, etc.)

9. Your ambitions and goals in your work.

10. Your feelings about the salary or other rewards that you get for your work.

11. How much money you make at your work, (If you have had a salaried job.)

12. Whether or not others owe you money: the amount, and who owes it to you.

13. Your total financial worth, including property, savings, bonds, insurance, etc.

14. What feelings, if any, that you have trouble expressing or controlling.

15. The kinds of things that make you just furious and angry.

16. What it takes to get you feeling very depressed or blue.

17. What it takes to get you very worried, anxious and afraid.

18. Whether or not you now have any health problems—e.g., heart condition, allergies, etc.


20. Whether or not you now make special effort to keep fit, healthy and attractive, e.g., calisthenics, diet.

E. APPEARANCE: (A)

I would like to ask you some questions now about your observations regarding the appearance of Navajos, yourself and other Anglos.
A1. First, lets consider some objects that are typically Navajo; e.g., turquoise, silver bracelets, rings, necklaces, and rugs. I would like to have you tell me what in this line you have, and how many of each item.

A1a. Silver jewelry? ____________
A1b. Turquoise? ______________
A1c. Rugs? ______________
A1d. Pottery? ______________
A1e. Other? ______________

A2. Have you had any of these in the past that you have since gotten rid of, traded, quit wearing or displaying? ______________

A3. What do these "crafts" mean to you? (i.e., like or dislike) ______________

A4. When you think of a Navajo man how does he appear in your mind? (i.e., how would you describe him?) ______________

A5. When you think of a Navajo woman, how does she appear? How would you describe her? ______________

A6. Do Anglos have any way of dressing, hair style, etc., that Navajos don't care for--or dislike seeing them wearing? ______________

A7. Are there any ways that you "appear" that might not be liked by Navajos? ______________

A8. Are there any ways that Navajos appear that you don't care for--or dislike? ______________

A9. What about other Anglos' appearance? Say anything you'd like regarding the appropriateness or inappropriateness of other Anglos' appearance among the Navajo.

A10. In Anglo society we have certain means of finding out about another Anglo's status and role. In other words we get some idea of what a person does by how he appears or what he is doing in a particular setting. For example, if we go for a walk in a large urban area we are apt to notice people who appear to be doctors, mechanics, farmers, "hippies," and so on. In addition, in a particular setting we may be able to tell who is the "boss" for example, by what he does. Is it possible for you to make similar distinctions among the Navajo and if so, on what do you base your judgment? ______________

A11. In what ways, if any, does your role and status affect your behavior or affect the manner in which you interact with Navajos? ______________

A12. Have you ever noticed how other Anglos' roles and statuses affect their meetings with Navajo, i.e., in how they behave, how they are received? ______________
A13. I would now like you to rate yourself on a scale from 1 to 9 in terms of how well you can judge the status and role of a Navajo. This would be a Navajo you don't know. For example, if you were at a Squaw Dance or any other gathering of Navajos how well could you discriminate their various statuses and roles in that setting with 1 being an ability to judge and 9 being as good of an ability as a Navajo.

A14. Considering all of your responses to all the questions asked on this questionnaire, and considering all your interactions with Navajos I want you to rate yourself either 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 in general terms of how well you can achieve cross-cultural understanding at the present time with Navajos with 1 being the least and 5 the greatest degree possible of cross-cultural understanding.

A15. Interviewer's rating.
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