

AN EXPLORATORY AND DESCRIPTIVE STUDY
OF THE OVERSEAS AND REENTRY EXPERIENCES OF
RETURNED CANADIAN VOLUNTEERS AND
ITS INFLUENCE ON THEIR PRESENT LIFESTYLE

CENTRE FOR NEWFOUNDLAND STUDIES

**TOTAL OF 10 PAGES ONLY
MAY BE XEROXED**

(Without Author's Permission)

DEBBIE M. WILLIAMS, B.SW.



AN EXPLORATORY AND DESCRIPTIVE STUDY
OF THE OVERSEAS AND REENTRY EXPERIENCES OF
RETURNED CANADIAN VOLUNTEERS AND
ITS INFLUENCE ON THEIR PRESENT LIFESTYLE

by

© Debbie M. Williams, B.SW.

A thesis submitted to the School of Graduate
Studies in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Education

Department of Educational Psychology
Memorial University of Newfoundland

August 1991

St. John's

Newfoundland



National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-68257-4

Canada

Acknowledgements

To Mildred Cahill for her expertise, patience and encouragement which will be forever appreciated--thank you.

To Michelle Shapter who went beyond the call of duty to assist me with the data--thank you.

To Cynthia Peckham and Linda Waterton for their professional word processing services--thank you.

To my parents and my sister who have always been generous with their love and support--thank you.

To my husband, Terence Harvey, for his unfailing support and encouragement and when all other motivators failed, his promises of sojourns to exotic places--thank you.

To returned volunteers Holly Smith and Linda Ross for their generous assistance with the questionnaire and to all the other returned volunteers who participated in this study--thank you.

Abstract

This is an exploratory and descriptive study of the overseas and reentry experiences of Canadian returned volunteers and its influence on their present lifestyles.

Ninety-one CUSO and 24 Canadian Crossroads International (CCI) returned volunteers responded to a mailed questionnaire. Over half of the respondents returned to Canada less than 10 years ago; 45% have been home for 10 years or more.

Returned volunteers answered questions regarding many aspects of their overseas assignment. They were also asked to respond to questions regarding re-orientation, advice to returning volunteers and the impact of the experience on their lives. Respondents were encouraged to give their opinions and to discuss their responses.

Frequency distributions, percentages, cross-tabulations and a t-test were used to analyze data. Results showed that volunteers were generally young, single, and well-educated. At the time of their assignment, although most volunteers experienced some degree of cultural shock, respondents generally felt positive about the experience overall.

Reentry shock or reverse culture shock seemed a common phenomena. A number of factors that appear to be associated with reentry shock include age, gender, desire to return home, feelings upon initial reentry, and the commitment to change aspects of one's lifestyle upon return home.

Those respondents who recall having the most difficulty upon return were younger, single and most were female. Compared to those reporting no reentry stress, the group experiencing difficulty appeared less ready to return home and less positive upon reentry. They were also more inclined to make a decision to change their lifestyle.

Nearly all respondents (86%) felt that their present lifestyle was highly and moderately affected by the experience and report positive and growthful influences. Yet, a small number of respondents made comments suggesting that they still have unresolved issues connected to the overseas and reentry experiences. Respondents also expressed significantly less satisfaction with Canadian society (and how it works) upon return to Canada compared to their degree of satisfaction with Canadian society before leaving for the assignment.

Recommendations are made to sponsoring agencies regarding reorientation. Recommendations were also made for further research.

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgements	ii
Abstract	iii
List of Tables	ix
 CHAPTER	
I	INTRODUCTION
	1
	Purpose
	1
	Significance and Rationale
	1
	Summary
	8
	Research Questions
	9
	Definition of Terms
	10
	Limitations of Study
	11
 II	 REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE
	13
	Theoretical Models of Reentry
	13
	Circular Model
	13
	Curves of Adjustment
	14
	Modified Curvilinear Model
	15
	Styles or Types of Reentry
	16
	Stress and Reentry
	18
	Intercultural Communication Approach
	to Reentry
	21
	Reentry as Cultural Learning
	22
	Summary
	23

CHAPTER		Page
	Proposed Factors Contributing to	
	Reentry Problems	23
	Psychological/Internal Factors	24
	Ignorance/Lack of Awareness	24
	Poor Preparation for Return/Poor	
	Adjustment to the Foreign Culture	25
	Attitudinal/Identity Changes	26
	New Perceptions of the Home Culture	28
	Changes in Time Perception/Pace of Life	29
	Feelings of Alienation/Meaninglessness	30
	Situational Factors	31
	Indifference of Significant Others	31
	Loss of Freedom From Interference	32
	Changes in the Home Country	32
	Other Situational Factors	33
	Others Factors Affecting Reentry	33
	Summary	34
III	METHODOLOGY	36
	Descriptions of Sample	36
	Procedure	36
	Instrument	37
	Description of CUSO and CCI	40
	CUSO	40
	Canadian Crossroads International (CCI)	42

CHAPTER		Page
	Summary	43
	Preparation for Analysis	43
	Methods of Analysis	44
IV	ANALYSIS OF THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS	45
	Research Question #1	45
	Findings	45
	Research Question #2	56
	Findings	56
	Research Question #3	64
	Findings	64
	Research Question #4	66
	Findings	66
	Research Question #5	69
	Findings	69
	Summary	72
	Research Question #6	75
	Findings	75
	Research Question #7(a)	78
	Findings	78
	Research Question #7(b)	79
	Findings	79
	Comments	80
	First Impression of the Host Country	80
	Orientation	81

CHAPTER		Page
	Concerns in the Host Country	82
	Culture Shock	83
	Return and Reentry	84
	Reorientation	86
	Changes in Self/Lifestyle Attributed to the Experience	88
	Advice to Others Returning Home	91
	Other Comments/Impressions	93
	Summary	96
V	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	97
	Conclusions	97
	Recommendations	103
	Recommendations For Sponsoring Agencies	103
	Recommendations for Further Research	106
	Tables	108
	References	177
	Appendix - Overseas's Experience Questionnaire	185

List of Tables

Table	Page
1 Demographic Data of Returned Volunteers	109
2 Highest Education Level of Respondents At the Time of the Assignment	110
3 Number and Percentages of Volunteers With Regard to Course of Study/Training	111
4 Volunteers' Present Occupation	112
5 Overseas Placement of Volunteers by the Sponsoring Agency	113
6 Frequency and Percent of Volunteers With Regard to Overseas Living Arrangements	114
7 Volunteers' Rating of Their Living Arrangements	115
8 Population of the Volunteers' Overseas Community	116
9 Volunteers' Occupation While Overseas	117
10 Volunteers' Rating of the Work Placement	118
11 Volunteers' Rating of Degree of Difficulty With Language Barriers	119
12 The Volunteers' Pre- and Post-Assignment Travel (Outside of Canada)	120
13 Volunteers' Reasons For Applying to Go Overseas	121
14 Volunteers' Method of Preparation For the Overseas Assignment	122

Table	Page
27 Number of Volunteers Who Decided To Change Lifestyle and Degree of Success In Making Changes	136
28 Length of Volunteers' Overseas Assignment in Relation to Original Contract Time	137
29 Volunteers' Rating of Feelings Upon Return Home	138
30 Volunteers' Responses to Statements Related to Feelings Upon Return Home	139
31 Returned Volunteers' Rating of Adjustment and Degree of Stress Felt Upon Return Home	140
32 Length of Time It Took Returned Volunteers to Feel 'At Home' Again	141
33 Number of Volunteers' Involved In Re-orientation Programs, Their Rating of the Program, and Their Feeling Re Changes	142
34 Demographic Data of Volunteers By Sponsoring Agency and Length of Time Since Return	143
35 Volunteers' Area of Overseas Placement By Sponsoring Agency and Time Since Return Home	144
36 Volunteers' Living Arrangements While Overseas By Sponsoring Agency and Time Since Return Home	145

Table	Page
37 Volunteers' Rating of Living Arrangements By Sponsoring Agency and Time Since Return Home	146
38 Volunteers' Rating of Work Placement and Language Barriers By Sponsoring Agency and Length of Time Since Return	147
39 Volunteers' Reasons For Applying To Go Overseas By Sponsoring Agency and Time Since Return	148
40 Volunteers Attending Orientation and Rating of Orientation By Sponsoring Agency and Time Since Return Home	149
41 Volunteers' Rating of Degree and Duration of Culture Shock Upon Entry to the Host Country By Sponsoring Agency and Time Since Return	150
42 Percent of Volunteers Expressing Some Frequency of Identified Feelings While Overseas and Upon Return By Sponsoring Agency and Time Since Return	151
43 Volunteer's Rating of Degree of Immersion Into the Foreign Culture By Sponsoring Agency and Time Since Return	153

Table	Page
44 Volunteers' Ratings on Statements As They Related to Their Overseas Situation By Sponsoring Agency and Time Since Return Home	154
45 Volunteer's Overall Rating of the Overseas Program By Sponsoring Agency and Time Since Return	155
46 Volunteers' Feelings About Return Home By Sponsoring Agency and Time Since Return	156
47 Volunteers' Initial Feelings Upon Return Home By Sponsoring Agency and Time Since Return	157
48 Volunteers' Response to Statements Related to Feeling Upon Return Home By Sponsoring Agency and Time Since Return	158
49 Returned Volunteers' Rating of Stress By Sponsoring Agency and Time Since Return	159
50 Returned Volunteers' Rating of Adjustment By Sponsoring Agency and Time Since Return	160
51 Volunteers' Readjustment Time By Sponsoring Agency and Time Since Return	161
52 Demographic Data of Group A (High Reentry Shock) and Group B (Low Reentry Shock)	162
53 Length of Time Since Return of Group A (High Reentry Shock) and Group B (Low Reentry Shock)	163

Table	Page
54 Rating of Living Arrangements and Work Placement of Group A (High Reentry Shock) and Group B (Low Reentry Shock)	164
55 Rating of Orientation Program of Group A (High Reentry Shock) and Group B (Low Reentry Shock)	165
56 Degree and Length of Culture Shock of Group A (High Reentry Shock) and Group B (Low Reentry Shock)	166
57 Ratings of Specific Feelings While Overseas and Upon Return By Group A (High Reentry Shock) and Group B (Low Reentry Shock)	167
58 Rating of Degree of Immersion in the Foreign Culture By Group A (High Reentry Shock) and Group B (Low Reentry Shock)	169
59 Rating of Statements Relating to the Overseas Situation By Group A (High Reentry Shock) and Group B (Low Reentry Shock)	170
60 Overall Rating of the Overseas Experience By Group A (High Reentry Shock) and Group B (Low Reentry Shock)	171
61 Feeling About Return Home and Upon Initial Reentry of Group A (High Reentry Shock) and Group B (Low Reentry Shock)	172

Table	Page
62 Number and Percentage of Group A (High Reentry Shock) and Group B (Low Reentry Shock) Who Made A Decision to Change Their Lifestyle and Ratings of Success in Implementing Changes	173
63 Responses to Statements Related to Feelings Upon Return Home By Group A (High Reentry Shock) and Group B (Low Reentry Shock)	174
64 Length of Readjustment Time for Group A (High Reentry Shock) and Group B (Low Reentry Shock)	175
65 Rating of Satisfaction With Canadian Society At Different Times During the Overseas Assignment for Group A and Group B	176

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Research indicates that many individuals experience difficulties in the transition from a foreign culture back into their own culture. Possibly because return is equated with all the pleasant connotations of "coming home," the subject of reentry has been somewhat ignored by researchers.

Purpose

This is an exploratory and descriptive study of the overseas and reentry experiences of Canadian returned volunteers (R.V.s).

The main purpose of this study is to explore the nature of the overseas experience and the reentry process. It will also investigate the impact of these experiences on the present lifestyles of the respondents.

The findings of this study may assist returned volunteers and their sponsoring agencies as they attempt to understand and cope more effectively with the realities of returning home.

Significance and Rationale

Agencies involved in sending North Americans overseas have identified a need to provide orientation programs to those individuals in an attempt to lessen the degree of

culture shock they experience upon entering a foreign environment. These programs are designed to minimize the stress of culture shock by attempting to ensure that the sojourner (to some degree) knows what to expect and how to cope in the foreign environment.

According to Dr. Bruce La Brack (1985) in his article State of the Art Research on Reentry, "It has been demonstrated beyond a reasonable doubt that while orientation programs may not prevent culture shock, a competent training curriculum can at least help a person recognize the symptoms and lessen the negative impact" (p. 11).

Unfortunately, many agencies that invest a great deal in orientation programs fail to place the same emphasis on re-orientation and experience poor attendance at re-orientation sessions when they are provided.

La Brack (1985) supports the need for re-orientation programs and suggests that "any experience which is sufficiently out-of-the-ordinary as to require serious advance planning and orientation is, by definition, sufficiently worthy of an equal period of debriefing and serious reflection" (p. 21). For the most part, however, the assumption is often made that since individuals are returning home, they should experience little stress or difficulty. Whereas the idea of culture shock is accepted as a normal aspect of entry into a foreign culture, reentry problems are often attributed to the individual. La Brack suggests that this prejudice is

still with us and explains partially why reentry or readjustment studies were seldom taken seriously (p. 6).

Studies completed on reentry suggest, however, that reentry into the original culture can be just as difficult as was the move to the foreign culture (Brislin & Van Buren, 1974; Cormack, 1967; Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1963; Harrison & Hopkins, 1967; Howard, 1980; La Brack, 1985; Martin, 1984; Torbiorn, 1982). Some studies even present reentry as being more traumatic than entry into the foreign country (P. Adler, 1972; N. Adler, 1980, 1981; Hogan, 1983; Martin, 1984; Werkman, 1980). In fact Hogan (1983) suggests that many executives are reluctant to accept overseas assignments because of the perceived personal and professional reentry difficulties (p. 10).

Some of the earliest contributions in the field of reentry studies include Gullahorn and Gullahorn (1963) who introduced the U-U Curve (double U) hypothesis to explain the reentry phase of the returnee, comparing it to the entry process experienced in the foreign culture.

This w- model suggests that reentry into the home culture, like initial entry to the foreign culture, begins with a "spectator phase" of initial elation and excitement followed by feelings of confusion and depression as the individual encounters difficulties. It is only when the individual begins to resolve those difficulties encountered during the critical period that he/she will emerge from the

plateau to the status of adjustment.

Adler (1981), in applying this Gullahorn and Gullahorn (1963) hypothesis to her research on returning overseas executives, found reentry to be more difficult a transition than was their move to the foreign culture. She modified the W-Curve model by suggesting that the depressed phase of U-Curve reentry is wider and longer in duration than suggested by Gullahorn and Gullahorn. Also, Adler suggests that the emergence from this plateau is less vertical than detected by the U-Curve model.

Bochner, Lin and McLeod (1980) support Adler's (1981) findings:

Data seems to suggest a flattened U-Curve with the middle section (re-entry period) not rising to the same heights of personal well being as levels that have been alleged to exist during pre-departure and final coming to terms with home culture phases respectively. (p. 270)

Other studies take a different approach to reentry by identifying individual "styles." (Adler, 1981; Bowers, 1952; Brein, 1971) Adler combines both process and style in her research on reentry which forms the basis for a reentry self-help booklet published and distributed by CIDA (1979).

Worth mentioning also are a number of undeveloped but promising conceptual frameworks of reentry as identified by

Martin (1984). They include a cultural learning approach to reentry, intercultural communication, and stress and transition theories. Martin identified those perspectives as "promising" but requiring further research. These theories are discussed further in Chapter II.

To date, research has established that reentry often results in difficulties for returnees and a number of theories have been presented to explain the process or describe the style of reentry of returnees. However, a review of literature reveals that few empirical studies have been conducted for the purpose of identifying the common factors related to reentry problems. In fact, Bochner et al. (1980) in an extensive review of literature between 1950 and 1980 found only 20 articles dealing specifically with the post-sojourn experience.

There is a demand by researchers for more study in this area (Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1963; Hogan, 1985; Jacobson, 1963; Lundstedt, 1963; Smith, 1956; La Brack, 1985; Martin, 1984) but such studies are slow to appear. In fact, it seems that much of the research in the field has been completed under the auspices of corporations who have undertaken such studies for the purpose of improving the utilization of manpower overseas and, upon their return, to the home-based office (Adler, 1981; Cagney, 1975; Howard, 1974, 1980; Kelman, 1965; Useem & Useem, 1967; Torbiorn, 1982)).

These studies and others (Brislin & Van Buren, 1974;

Cormack, 1969; Foreign Services Community Association, 1980; Harrison & Hopkins, 1974; Hinkle, 1975; Hogan, 1983; Jordan, 1980; La Brack, 1985) identify and describe some possible factors that cause reentry problems for the returnee. Some literature emphasize internal/psychological factors while other studies tend to discuss situational/external variables as causing difficulties upon reentry.

The more prevalent psychological factors identified in the literature include the fact that returnees are ill-prepared for their return home and have little awareness of the possible reentry problems. Adler (1981) and Brislin and Van Buren (1974) suggest that when going overseas, the individual tends to expect new and unfamiliar situations whereas they tend not to expect any changes upon return. Also, uncertainty regarding time overseas contributes to a lack of preparation for return (Adler, 1980, 1981; Foreign Services Community Association, 1980; Howard, 1980).

Several other studies suggest that reentry issues occur due to the changes in the returnees perception of his/herself and his/her culture (Brislin & Van Buren, 1974; Brislin, 1974; Cleveland, Mangone & Adams, 1960; Hall, 1959; Harrison & Hopkins, 1967; Kraemer, 1975; Useem & Useem, 1963; Martin, 1984; Stein, 1963). These studies indicate that one's attitudes and outlooks change after being in a foreign culture; a culture that operates contrary to one's expectations forces one to question or identify cultural influences

in one's thinking and to label them as rules rather than human nature.

Cormack (1969) and Hinkle (1972) suggest that an individual may encounter "culture crisis" or dissatisfaction with both home and host cultures upon return home. Howard (1980) and to a large degree, Hull (1959) suggest that one's immersion into a foreign culture evokes changes in one's philosophy of time which is difficult to integrate upon reentry.

Another factor causing reentry problems is the possibility that new learning and new experiences may not be acknowledged by significant others (Adler, 1980, 1981; Brislin & Van Buren, 1974; Gleason, 1969). As well as the fact that returnees may not know how to integrate new learning into home life (Stein, 1965). This appears to be connected to the feelings of meaninglessness and alienation often experienced by the returnee (Adler, 1980, 1981; Foreign Services Community Association, 1980; Harrison & Hopkins, 1967; Useem & Useem, 1967; La Brack, 1985).

Jordan (1982) and Adler (1981) also identify the lack of realistic goals for one's life upon return home as causing problems for the returnee; also, studies focusing upon returning migrants see "unrealistic expectations" as contributing to reentry stress (Gmelch, 1980; Prez-Ariago & Guendelman, 1989).

Other factors that have been identified as creating reentry problems, but have been studied less extensively

include the degree of desire to return home, success in adjusting overseas, age of the returnee, amount of travel experience, and degree of immersion into the foreign culture.

Just as there are factors that may be labelled psychologically-oriented, there are other variables theoretically contributing to reentry problems that can be categorized as situationally-oriented or external factors. Some of these external or situation-based factors include the changes that have occurred in many aspects of the home country during the individual's absence (Brislin & Van Buren, 1974; Hall, 1959; Howard, 1980), the inflation and high cost of living at home, the loss of higher social status and the higher standard of living enjoyed in the foreign country (Canadian Foreign Services Association, 1980; Howard, 1980; Torbiorn, 1982) as well as the loss of freedom from interference by significant others at home (Adler, 1981; Brislin & Van Buren, 1974).

Summary

Only a small number of studies have focused upon the reentry of returnees; of the small number, few are of an empirical nature. Others focus on psychological factors alone while some investigate situational/external influences. It would seem that reentry is influenced by a combination of psychological and situational factors and it is difficult to comprehend reentry without identifying these variables influencing the process. It would also seem logical to

suggest as did Adler (1980, 1981) that the experience may be a "growthful" or a learning experience for the individual and have a positive impact on their lives.

Consequently, this study will attempt to (a) explore the nature of the overseas experience, (b) identify variables related to reentry, and (c) investigate the impact of the experience on one's lifestyle.

Research Questions

1. What are the salient characteristics of the Canadian returned volunteers with regard to various aspects of the overseas experience?

2. How does the CCI volunteer differ from the CUSO volunteer?

3. How do returned volunteers who have been home for 10 years or more (earlier returnees) differ from volunteers who have returned in the past 10 years (recent returnees)?

4. To what degree does the returned volunteers' attitude toward Canadian society and how it works differ at different times during the overseas experience?

5. What are the salient characteristics of those respondents who reported the most difficulty with reentry (reentry shock) and how do they differ from those respondents who reported no reentry stress?

6. How would returned volunteers advise its agency and other returning volunteers regarding reentry or reorientation?

7a. How did the overseas experience influence the present lifestyle of returned volunteers?

7b. Do returned volunteers see their overseas experience as a "growthful" experience?

Definition of Terms

Home Country: The country to which the individual identifies himself. psychologically and legally, as a member.

Home Culture/Original Culture: The culture into which the individual was initially socialized and to which he/she is considered a member.

Foreign Culture: A country where the way of life of the people is blatantly and/or subtly different from one's home culture in behaviors, attitudes, and material things.

Sponsoring Agency: The Agency which arranged for an individual, as a member of their organization, to live in another country.

Overseas Volunteer: An individual who volunteered to live and work in another country for a period of time, under the auspices of a sponsoring agency.

Overseas Assignment: The placement of an individual to a host country by a sponsoring agency.

Host Country: The country in which the individual was placed by his/her sponsoring agency.

Reentry: The transition from a foreign country back into one's original culture. It is the experience of facing

previously familiar surroundings after living in a different (foreign) environment (Adler, 1980, 1981).

Re-adjustment/Reentry Adjustment: The degree of success of a returnee in resolving problems which confront him/her upon reentry.

Returnee/R.V.: Returned volunteers or individuals who have lived in a host country for a period of time under the auspices of a non-government organization (NGO).

Cooperant: Another term used particularly by CUSO to describe a volunteer/returned volunteer.

Sojourn: The travel to another country.

Sojourner: An individual who travels to another country/culture.

Limitations of Study

1. This study will focus upon Canadian Crossroads International and CUSO returnees and any generalizations of the findings to other groups must be cautioned.

2. Due to the "State of the Art" of previous research conducted in this area, an exploratory approach will be taken in this study. However, further studies of the variables identified in the literature as possible factors affecting reentry are necessary.

3. Due to the nature of this study, findings will be based on self-reports and self-ratings of subjects. The fact that the respondent received a questionnaire, implying an

interest in their experience, may have changed the perceptio..s of the respondents and created a Hawthorne effect.

4. Any recommendations for re-orientation programs based on the findings of this study should be evaluated for effectiveness in meeting the goal of enhancing the returned volunteers' reentry to the home country.

CHAPTER II

Review of Related Literature

Theoretical Models of Reentry

A review of the available literature suggests that there are a number of different approaches to describe the experiences of individuals who have lived in a foreign culture and returned home.

Church (1982) arranged research on sojourner adjustment into four distinct categories while Martin (1984) incorporated those four categories in her description of both entry and reentry research. In the following section, eight categories are used to describe the existing conceptual approaches to reentry.

Circular Model

Jacobson (1963) has identified a nine phase model for use in describing the sojourn experience. These nine phases have been labelled as (a) pre-departure preparation; (b) art of learning; (c) enroute; (d) entry into the area of the sojourn; (e) post-arrival orientation; (f) exploration; (g) tentative commitment; (h) ultimate commitment; and (i) decisions about further travel. Jacobson theorizes that when the sojourner decides to continue further travel, including travel back to one's home country, the nine phase sequence begins again.

Jacobson's (1963) theory connects entry and reentry in a

circular motion. His theory suggests that the phase or reentry into one's home culture follows the same pattern as one's entry into the foreign culture.

Curves of Adjustment

Gullahorn and Gullahorn (1963) also suggest similarities between the entry of people into a foreign culture and their reentry into the home culture. However, their model differs from Jacobsons' (1963) in that rather than a circular approach, they suggest a process of entry and reentry that takes the overall generalized form of a curvilinear trend. Although support for the u-curve hypothesis is weak and inconclusive (Church, 1983, p. 542), Gullahorn and Gullahorn admit to the apparent limited validity of the u-curve while recommending an extension of the single u-curve; the double-u curve also describes the reentry process that occurs when the individual returns home.

According to Gullahorn and Gullahorn (1963), the typical adjustment and re-adjustment patterns of individuals as represented by the double-u curve (or w-curve) occurs in three main stages. In the first stage, or "spectator" stage, the individual experiences the initial elation and optimism associated with positive expectations upon entry to the foreign culture or, upon return, to the home culture.

Stage two of the model represents the individuals involvement in entry, or re-involvement upon return home.

This stage suggests that as the individual becomes more involved in the foreign culture or, upon return, re-involved in the home culture; they encounter frustration and thus become confused and depressed in trying to achieve their goals.

The third stage of the w-curve model begins when the individual is able to start resolving these difficulties. This final stage involves movement toward effective adjustment/readjustment.

Orientation programs have become very popular in recent years and are thought to lessen the intensity of culture shock. As mentioned by Martin (1984) in her review of reentry literature, it is not clear whether this model accurately represents most sojourner experiences.

Modified Curvilinear Model

More recent research conducted by Nancy Adler (1981) on the reentry process of 200 corporate and government employees also questions the Gullahorn and Gullahorn (1963) theory that reentry follows a u-shaped curve. Adler's research indicates that returnees follow a "flattened" u-shaped curve in which the initial high period during reentry is very short and the low period much longer than depicted by the Gullahorn and Gullahorn curve of reentry.

In Adler's (1981) study of reentry over a six month period, most returnees experienced a "high" upon return home

that lasted for less than a month. According to this study, the low period of the u-curve model begins earlier and lasts longer than indicated by Gullahorn and Gullahorn (1963). Also, after six months of being home, returnees still reported feeling only "average," which accounts for the slightly raised but still depressed end of Adler's modified u-curve model.

Adler's (1981) theory is supported by Bochner's (1980) study of reentry and also, indirectly, by studies that suggest that readjustment to one's home culture may be more difficult than adjusting to a foreign culture (Adler, 1975; Brislin & Van Buren, 1974; Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1963; Martin, 1984; Westwood, Lawrence & Paul, 1986).

Styles or Types of Reentry

Some researchers have identified a variety of coping styles utilized by returnees during the process of reentry. Adler (1981) presents four different styles of coping with reentry. The "resocialized" mode of reentry describes returnees who tend to remove themselves from the foreign experience and not recognize or use any of their cross-culturally acquired skills. Although they respond positively to the home environment, they are characterized as readjusting but not "growing" from the experience.

Unlike the resocialized returnees, "alienated" returnees' style of reentry shows neither readjustment nor growth. They are characterized as tending to dissociate themselves from

home life while failing to recognize or use skills acquired during their cross-cultural experience.

The "rebellious" mode of coping describes returnees who, like alienated returnees, reject the home environment but differs from the alienated returnee in that they are aware of the skills developed during the overseas experience; rebellious returnees also display aggression in an attempt to control the home environment.

The "proactive" style of reentry is described by Adler (1981) as the mode of coping which shows the most growth; in this case, returnees use their cross-culturally acquired skills and knowledge to a greater extent and tends to integrate their foreign and home country experiences.

The proactive returnee displays growth, a factor that Adler (1981) considers an important aspect of reentry generally ignored by research. Earlier studies by Gleason (1969), Stein (1963) and P. Adler (1975) supports Adler's research by suggesting that growth and self-awareness are an important part of not only reentry, but the cross-cultural experience as a whole.

Although Foust, Fieg, Koester, Sarbaagh & Wendinger (1981, cited in Hogan, 1983) does not mention the term "growth" in their description of three styles of reentry adjustment, they do imply growth of an individual when describing the optimum style of reentry as one in which returnees use the return home as an opportunity for learning

and change (p. 5). Foust et al. labels this style of reentry adjustment as "integration" and it is comparable to Adler's (1981) proactive style. At the opposite extreme, Foust et al.'s "reversion" style characterizes a returnee who rejects all changes practised abroad, similar to Adler's resocialized returnee.

The third style of reentry described by Foust et al. is that of alienation whereby returnees carry a negative attitude toward the home country and never return home psychologically. This corresponds generally to Adler's (1981) alienated returnees.

A number of early studies have identified the stages of adjustment following culture shock in a foreign country (Church, 1982; P. Adler, 1975; Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1963; Guthrie, 1966), yet few researchers have made an empirical study of reentry styles of coping. Consequently, it is difficult to determine whether all returnees fit into one of these categories and if the returnee's coping style remains consistent.

Hogan (1983) raises some valid concerns regarding the categorization of reentry with his statements regarding returnees who reported a vacillation between all the different coping styles identified by Foust et al. (p. 9).

Stress and Reentry

Stress can be identified as the complex psychological,

physiological, and behavioral reactions of a situation that approach or exceed a person's self-perceived ability to cope with that situation (Burton-Adams, 1989, p. 4).

The curvilinear models presented by Gullahorn and Gullahorn (1963) and Adler (1981) can be viewed as representations of the stress response which occurs when individuals experience reentry. Foust et al. (1981, cited in Hogan, 1983) and Adler's (1981) styles of reentry may also be interpreted as a means of labelling the coping methods of returnees who are faced with stress attributed to returning home. Spradley and Philips (1972) suggest that change and stress go together and state that "a radical change in one's cultural environment" is considered by many social scientists as a "stressor" and stress is a consequence of these situations (p. 520).

Researchers have identified three aspects of change that contribute to reentry stress:

1. **Magnitude of Change:** Upabor (n.d., cited in Martin, 1984) states that the severity of reentry shock is related to the magnitude of change in either the home environment or within the individual and his circumstances (p. 123).

2. **Unexpected Nature of Change:** According to CIDA's (1979) Handbook of Reentry, persons expect change when going abroad but assume that reentry will hold few surprises. This failure to expect change creates stress in the individual when he/she is faced with changes in self and/or the home environment upon reentry. This is supported by Martin's (1984)

theory that reentry stress intensifies when neither the individual nor the social system is prepared for difficulties of reentry adjustment (p. 123). Similarly, Gmelch (1980), in a study of returned migrants concludes that false or unrealistic expectations create the most stress for these returnees.

3. **Confrontation With the Changed Self:** In adjusting to the foreign culture, the individual experiences changes in his/her self at the onset (Hogan, 1983, p. 123). However, people change almost imperceptively and, while overseas, many individuals incorporate some of the practices, beliefs, and values of the foreign culture into their personality upon return home, these changes, and one's growing awareness of these changes, can cause stress for the returnee (CIDA, 1979, p. 7).

As mentioned previously, change and stress appear to be interconnected. Research has identified some aspects of change that contribute to reentry stress. According to a study on stress by Burton-Adams (1989), how a person responds to the changes confronting him/her is crucial to and is dependent on two main variables:

1. **The degree of threat perceived by the individual:** If a person regards a particular event as being inherently stressful, in effect it will be stressful simply because the individual perceives it to be so (p. 59).

2. **The perception of one's own coping abilities:** A person's response to change is also dependant on how he/she

rates his/her own coping abilities (p. 68). The suggestion is that a person who believes that he/she can significantly influence events in his/her life, will cope better than the individual who feels that most circumstances are outside his/her control (p. 73).

This discussion of the interaction of change, stress, and peoples' response to change supports the notion that orientation and re-orientation programs may be able to change peoples' perceptions of events and, consequently, minimize the degree of stress they experience at different times during the process. Research in this area raises a number of questions regarding the content/structure of re-orientation services and how they might positively influence the coping styles and curve of reentry of returnees.

Intercultural Communication Approach to Reentry

Martin's (1984) investigation of the literature regarding entry and reentry describes a unique perspective of the reentry process as proposed by Koester (1983). According to Martin, Koester proposes this communication perspective as a way for returnees to understand their experiences at several levels. Martin presents Koester's approach as having three steps:

Step 1--Host Country Communication: This first step suggests that returnees will better understand the impact of their intercultural experience if they examine their communi-

cation experiences in the host country.

Step 2--Home Country Communication Upon Reentry:

According to Koester (1983), when sojourners return home, they bring with them new interpretations of old symbols; thus, old predictable patterns of interaction are no longer predictable (p. 122). Consequently, Koester suggests that returnees examine their interpersonal communication after return home.

Step 3--Reexamination Upon Return of Messages at the Macro Level--Both Politically and Socially: This stage involves the returnees re-examination of the messages from the social system which were heretofore taken for granted (Martin, 1984, p. 122).

This approach to reentry does not attempt to explain the phenomenon per se, but prescribes a method of coping with the stress of reentry; Martin (1984) suggests further research and development of this "promising" perspective (p. 122).

Reentry as Cultural Learning

Martin (1984) admits that "no research to date has conceptualized reentry as cultural learning" (p. 121). However, she suggests that this approach has potential in terms of assisting returnees in readjusting to the home environment.

Martin (1984) theorizes that returnees may find reentry less difficult if they viewed the home culture as new culture where they need to develop new reinforcers, just as they did

upon entering the foreign culture (p. 121). She further suggests that such an approach to reentry would allow the returnee to incorporate the best of both cultures into his/her lifestyle.

This conceptual approach to reentry is very similar to the formation of a "third culture" theory developed by Useem, Useem and Donoghue (1963). They described the third culture as a means by which individuals of western and non-western cultures can interact meaningfully. Studies are needed to support the cultural learning approach to reentry and any similarities it may have to the third culture theory.

Summary

A review of literature on reentry shows that although a number of conceptual approaches apply to reentry, only a few are related directly to the process by empirical data. These theories that have empirical support have typically been based on small samples or single national groups which create problems when generalizing to other populations.

Proposed Factors Contributing to Reentry Problems

According to Martin (1984), one useful approach in understanding the reentry process is to examine critical variables which influence the reentry experience (p. 123). La Brack (1985) suggests that "perhaps because what little attention there has been regarding reentry was directed to the

unique personal level of returnee adjustment, the commonality and patterning of the process as a social event has been largely overlooked" (p. 3). He suggests that although a number of key variables have been identified in reentry research, at this time "we lack a sufficient data base" to do sophisticated analysis (p. 15). Consequently, it is necessary to examine the critical variables influencing reentry. A review of literature on reentry suggests that most variables identified as affecting reentry can be labelled as either psychological/internal factors or situational/external factors.

Psychological/Internal Factors

Ignorance/lack of awareness.

As previously mentioned, although few studies have investigated the problems experienced by returnees upon reentry to their home culture, nearly all research in this area has identified reentry as being just as, or more difficult, than entry into the foreign culture (Adler, 1981; Brein & David, 1971; Brislin & Van Buren, 1974; Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1963; Hogan, 1981; Howard, 1980; Jacobson, 1963; Jordan, 1982; La Brack, 1985; Locke & Feinsod, 1982; Martin, 1985; Stein, 1963; Westwood et al., 1986).

Adler (1981), Brislin and Van Buren (1974) and La Brack (1985) suggest that individuals are even less prepared and less aware of the possible problems of reentry. Adler states

that when going overseas, the individual tends to expect new and unfamiliar situations whereas they tend not to expect any problems upon return (p. 350). Her exploratory study used questionnaires and interviews to examine the reentry process of 200 corporate and government employees returning to Canada after working abroad for an average of two years. Although her research appears to have been conducted to help organizations benefit more fully from its investment in employees assigned overseas, Adler's study has added some valuable empirical data to the study of the reentry experience. However, it is questionable as to how far one can generalize the findings from this business-oriented group to other groups who are involved in working overseas for reasons other than filling a company position.

Poor preparation for return/poor adjustment to the foreign culture.

Brislin and Van Buren (1974) support Adler's (1981) findings by suggesting that an individual's poor preparation for return creates problems on reentry. Citing an unpublished study by Bochner (1973), they also suggest that "a person who is most successful at adjusting to a new culture is often the worst at readjusting to his/her old culture" (p. 19). Adler's findings, however, do not support this suggestion. In fact, Adler's study suggested that "successful overseas adapters" had more success with reentry (p. 352).

Although The Study Aboard Advisor On Campus: An Expanding Role by Michielli (1969) does not actually support the claim of Brislin and Van Buren (1974), Michielli does state that many criticisms directed at the overseas program need to be modified or ignored as they stem from the fact that the reporting student has not adapted well overseas (p. 52). This implies that overseas adjustment may indeed have some effect on reentry; Michielli's statement, however, is based upon his subjective conclusions of the experiences and perceptions of student returnees.

Attitudinal/identity changes.

Brislin and Van Buren (1974) also state that reentry problems occur for a returnee because of changes in a person's attitudes. They suggest that when a person lives in a culture other than his/her own for a significant length of time, his/her attitudes and outlook changes. Their assumptions are based on research conducted by Cleveland (1960) and Useem and Useem (1955, 1967). However, neither Cleveland nor Useem and Useem suggest that this attitudinal change will actually cause problems for the individual upon return home. In fact, their research focuses on the experiences of Americans only while in the foreign culture.

Those and many other factors identified by Brislin and Van Buren (1974) are often inferences based on research of others and the many letters and reports sent to them by

students who had encountered problems upon return. Consequently, many of their conclusions regarding reentry have a lack of empirical support.

A study by Hinkel (1972) supports the theory presented by Brislin and Van Buren (1974) that changes in a person's attitude and perceptions while in a foreign culture may cause problems upon reentry. He cites the conclusions of social scientist Poole (1970) who philosophizes that foreign travel is a "profound psychological experience" and a means of testing one's identity against alternative ways of life. Poole viewed overseas travel as a means of experimentation with different roles and life styles and a testing environment for self-identity (Hinkle). Poole, however, is theorizing about travelling not the process of living and working in a foreign country for an extended period of time.

His theory is similar to that of Stein (1963) who based his conclusions on the longitudinal study of peace corps volunteers in Columbia and their return home. Stein suggested that programs such as the peace corps provide individuals with a "psychological motivation" similar to that described by Erik Erickson. Stein describes it as an opportunity for individuals to temporarily withdraw from the lives they have been living, an opportunity to experience new and adventurous kinds of stimulation which allows them to re-evaluate their lives (p. 238).

New perceptions of the home culture.

Closely connected to this theory of attitudinal change is the theory that the sojourners develop new perspectives of their own culture. Hall (1959) states that culture is a mold in which we are all cast and it controls our daily lives in many ways (p. 52). He states further that we have a tendency to believe that common behaviors are human nature and not just learned behavior common to the culture. Hall suggests that in order to realize this fact, the individual must be exposed to, and have an understanding of, a different culture.

Kraemer (1975) supports Hall's (1959) theory stating that we implicitly assume that the other person's ideas and thought processes are similar to what ours would be in particular situation and a culture that operates contrary to our expectations forces us to identify cultural influences in our own thinking (p. 13). This awareness, then, may result in the individual choosing roles and lifestyles different from his home culture (Poole, 1970, cited in Hinkle, 1972; Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1963; Gleason, 1969).

Although this theory presented by Hall (1959) and Kraemer (1975) is logically sound, there is little empirical support. Also, they fail to extend the theory to the reentry experiences of returnees. Uehara's (1986) more recent study of returned American students provides empirical support to this theory by concluding that the greater the change in basic values of the returnee, the greater the reentry shock (p.

427). This exploratory study by Uehara also showed that returnees had learned about themselves and their home culture and the majority of them reported long-lasting changes in their perceptions of global issues (p. 433).

Changes in time perception/pace of life.

Howard (1980) identifies a number of factors that create problems for the returnee upon reentry to the home culture. His study is based upon the responses of 81 former expatriate managers of multinational corporations upon their return to the United States.

Although this is one of the few empirical studies that attempts to identify reentry concerns of returnees, the generalizability of this study to other populations is cautioned. La Brack (1985) questions the generalizability of such findings to other populations, stating that "the special nature of the corporate overseas worker with their task-orientation, status, and relatively isolated level of contact with host national make it doubtful that these results can be extrapolated to other cohorts ..." (p. 13).

One factor identified by Howard (1980) and somewhat supported by Hall (1959) and Jordan (1982) indicates that returnees have difficulties adapting to the fast pace of life upon return home; this supports the possibility of a change in time perception of the returnee and relates to Hall's theory of time as a cultural phenomenon. Hall states that people of

the Western World tend to think of time as a fixed entity of nature whereas the perception of time in some other cultures differs drastically from this Western perception. Hall extends his theory by suggesting that immersion into another culture forces one to measure time differently and this new perception of time would be difficult to integrate back into one's home life, especially if the returnee has internalized this alternative measurement of time.

Feelings of alienation/meaninglessness.

One fact that is discussed a great deal by the Foreign Services Association (1980) is the identification by returnees of feelings of alienation upon return home. Studies by Howard (1980) and Gullahorn and Gullahorn (1963) also relate feelings of alienation to reentry. In fact, Gullahorn and Gullahorn suggest that returnees who had not yet "found themselves" in their home culture were more prone to feelings of alienation. These findings of alienation are similar to the reports of meaninglessness and the difficulty of integrating new learning experiences into one's lifestyle upon return home (Adler, 1981; Gleason, 1969; Harrison & Hopkins, 1967; Hogan, 1963; Jordan, 1982; La Brack, 1985).

In his study of overseas experienced American youth, Gleason (1969) identifies the need for these returnees to make their experience meaningful. Similarly, Harrison and Hopkins (1967), in studying returned peace corps volunteers, hypothe-

sized that learning had occurred but lies dormant, waiting for some conceptual framework into which it may be fitted in a coherent way (p. 446). They conclude that many "veterans" have been unable to turn their overseas experiences into real learning.

La Brack (1985) adds his support to these findings by suggesting that even upon return home, individuals are still struggling with the need to make sense of the foreign culture (p. 11); Koester (1983) suggests that returnees need to understand both the home and host culture upon return and proposes a communicative perspective as the means of making the intercultural experience meaningful. As mentioned earlier however, further research is needed to support this theory (Martin, 1984, p. 122).

Situational Factors

Indifference of significant others.

Adler's (1981) study of returned corporate and governmental employees supports the idea that returnees are often unsure as to how to integrate new learning into their lives and work upon return home. In fact, Adler's findings suggest that companies tend to discourage the returnee's utilization of knowledge and skills acquired overseas (p. 348).

This indifference to the intercultural experience demonstrated by cooperations is, according to Brislin and Van Buren (1974), also obvious in the attitude of the family and

friends of the returnee. As well, La Brack (1985) and Gleason's (1969) more empirical study suggests that this lack of interest by significant others has a negative effect on the reentry experience of returnees. La Brack explains that family and friends are ignorant of the possible impact of reentry on the returnee and, therefore, do not realize that their display of disinterest in the overseas experience deters growth and learning in the returnee (p. 18).

Loss of freedom from interference.

Paradoxically, a few studies have indicated that reentry is also negatively affected by the fact that returnees feel a loss of freedom from the interference and expectations of family and peers--both professionally and socially--that they enjoyed in the foreign culture (Adler, 1981; Brislin & Van Buren, 1974).

Adler (1981) claims that employees overseas have more freedom to act independently of their superiors. This may explain why some individuals who adjusted well overseas experience difficulties upon reentry to the home culture/home-based office (p. 346).

Changes in the home country.

Adler (1981) also suggests that returnees are faced with changes in many aspects of the home country that may have resulted from gradual adaptations, only subtly noticeable to

those at home. Such subtle, gradual changes would be difficult to explain to the overseas individual. Hall (1959) and Howard (1980) agree that such changes seem drastic to the returnee.

Other situational factors.

Howard (1980) identifies a number of other situational factors that affect the individual upon reentry. He found that returnees are faced with inflation and a higher cost of living upon reentry combined with job insecurity, loss of status, and a loss of the higher standard of living enjoyed in the foreign country.

A number of these variables are also mentioned by Torbjorn (1982) in his study of Swedish businessmen and their families (p. 41-42). He concludes though that the faster pace of life, a factor mentioned earlier, was not a problem for his population, at least as it pertained to business. The Canadian Foreign Services Association (1980) documented the responses of a number of returned foreign services personnel and their families; although they admit that the study is "not a professional, sociological research study," their findings are similar to those of Howard (1980).

Other Factors Affecting Reentry

Other factors only briefly identified in the literature but possibly affecting the reentry experiences of individuals

include such variables as degree of immersion (Hogan, 1983; Howard, 1980; La Brack, 1985; Martin, 1984); gender (Gama & Pederson, 1977; Gleason, 1969; Martin, 1984); age (Gleason, 1969; Gullahorn and Gullahorn, 1963; La Brack, 1985) marital status (Foreign Services Association, 1980) degree of desire to return home (Adler, 1980, 1981; Martin, 1984); degree of similarity between home and host country (La Brack, 1985; Perez-Ariago & Guendelman, 1989); number of geographical relocations (Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1963; Martin, 1984); academic level (Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1963; Martin, 1984); nationality (Martin, 1984); location and duration of sojourn (Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1963; Martin, 1984; Torbiorn, 1982); and degree of immersion into the foreign culture (Brislin & Van Buren, 1974; Martin, 1984).

Summary

From a review of the literature, one can conclude that reentry research is still in the infancy stages. Bochner et al.'s (1980) review of literature between 1950 and 1980 unveiled only 20 articles dealing directly with this topic; since 1980 there appears to be an increase in the amount of interest shown in the area of reentry research although La Brack, as recent as 1985 states:

It is only in the last decade that enough reported research has been available to make any kind of general assessment of the field of returnee studies

meaningful particularly since the number of studies in which the original thrust of the research concentrated directly on returnee adjustment are still rather limited. (p. 6)

Sussman's (1986) review of relevant reentry literature also forces her to conclude; "One difficulty, reflecting the newness and perhaps marginality of the research topic, is the large number of fugitive studies e.g.: thesis, dissertations, and other studies not easily retrievable" (p. 241).

Fewer and even less retrievable are studies of the overseas and reentry experiences of Canadians. Consequently, this is an exploratory and descriptive study of the nature of the overseas experience and the reentry process of Returned Canadian Volunteers.

Like Adler's (1980, 1981) study of 200 returned Canadian corporate and governmental employees, this study will attempt to identify any positive or "growthful" outcomes of the whole process.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

Description of Sample

The sample for this study consisted of 347 "cooperants" or returned volunteers (R.V.s) from CUSO or Canadian Cross-roads International (CCI) who are, according to the mailing lists of those international agencies, residing in one of the four Atlantic Provinces and had been living overseas under the auspices of one of those sponsoring agencies at some point in the agency's existence.

Of the 347, 115 returned completed questionnaires. Three of the questionnaires were returned by relatives stating that the R.V. was no longer living in Canada. Three of the subjects were deceased. Five questionnaires were returned too late to be included in this study.

Procedure

Questionnaires were mailed to 347 returned volunteers living in the Atlantic Provinces according to their agency's mailing lists. The questionnaires were accompanied by a covering letter explaining the nature of this research and included a return stamped and addressed envelope.

This population was selected for the following reasons:

1. **Intensity of foreign experience**--cooperates have relatively intense interactions with the foreign culture as

they tend not to stay strictly within the international overseas community.

2. **Motivation**--Their motivation is not strictly for financial or religious reasons.

3. **Activity**--Cooperants are neither strictly tourists or students.

4. **Orientation**--They typically receive some orientation prior to the assignment.

5. **Language**--They all speak English (Adler, 1980, p. 68).

Instrument

This is an exploratory and descriptive study in which the overseas experience and the reentry process are naturally occurring phenomena, and thus not experimentally manipulated. Therefore, a self-reporting questionnaire was used as it enabled the returnee to express his/her own impressions of each phase of the experience (Adler, 1980).

The questionnaire consisted of 39 questions divided into six sections in an attempt to elicit information regarding all aspects of the overseas experience. Due to the dearth of information in this area, the questionnaire covered all aspects of the R.V.'s overseas experience including the pre- and post-project phenomenon. Several authors have discussed the need to explore reentry as, "part of the whole process including exploration of the phases prior to reentry"

(Koester, 1984; Martin, 1986; Sussman, 1986).

Section I of the questionnaire (Items 1-14) were included to gather general data on the R.V. and his placement.

Section II (Items 13-14) focused on the orientation program and preparation of the individual for the assignment.

Section III (Items 15-21) investigates the individual's host country experiences including their perceived degree of culture shock and degree of immersion into the foreign culture.

Section IV (Items 22-25) was designed to gather information on the R.V.'s preparation for their return home whereas Section V (Items 26-34) focused on the subject's feelings and perceptions upon reentry to Canada as well as the impact of the experience on the individual's lifestyle.

The final Section (Items 35-39) looked at the re-orientation programs offered to the individual, including their advice to those about to return home from an overseas assignment.

The 39 items were constructed from a number of sources:

1. The literature review provided the framework for the overall structure of the questionnaire
2. Some items were based on questionnaire items used in other study's of reentry (Adler, 1981; Jordan, 1982; Raschio, 1987; Smith, Brewster, Janes, Ozekiel & Roth, 1963; Uehara, 1986).
3. Items included to evaluate stress levels were

designed in consultation with a stress management counsellor and a medical doctor.

Questionnaire items included were of a variety of types. Some items involved a Likert Scale, others required yes/no responses, while others were open-ended questions with room for comments so the R.V. could freely elaborate on any aspect of his experience. It was felt that the open-ended questions and commentary sections, while sometimes difficult to analyze and code, would be invaluable in providing insight into the experience of R.V.s and particularly the reentry process of those individuals.

The actual design of the questionnaire took place over several months and involved a number of revisions following the initial draft.

The original draft was examined by a number of individuals regarding content and design. The second draft incorporated those changes suggested by the examiners and was field tested on eight R.V.s who volunteered to complete the questionnaire.

After reviewing their comments and suggestions, further modifications were made. This modified questionnaire was examined by interviewing two of the original eight volunteers; as a result, minor changes were made to improve readability and this final version was printed for use.

Description of CUSO and CCI

Both CUSO and Canadian Crossroads International (CCI) are Canadian non-government agencies formed in the 1960s. Both organizations sponsor Canadians to developing Countries. Of the 115 respondents in this study, 79.1% travelled overseas with CUSO, 20.9% with Canadian Crossroads International (CCI).

CUSO.

CUSO was established in 1961 with a mandate to send skilled, qualified Canadians to the third world to share their skills. CUSO does not cater to students, but recruits only those who have degrees/diploma and/or many years experience in their field.

The organization has changed over the years and is, besides individual placements, now involved in linking Canadian and like-minded third-world groups in a partnership program. More recently CUSO has also become involved with some third world projects (some involving millions of dollars) implemented for Canadian International Development Association (CIDA).

According to their communications officer, CUSO is also making fewer technical assistant placements and more community development/solidarity placements "which provide Canadians with an opportunity to do development education within their own communities once they return to Canada" (CUSO Bulletin, 1991).

Like CCI, CUSO is a non-government organization with 76% of its funding from CIDA and the remaining 24% being raised from such sources as individuals, corporations, foundations, etc. Some agencies also provide funds to CUSO to operate overseas projects.

Presently, CUSO has seven regional offices across the country plus 11 local committees and 10 community representatives. These local offices are generally run by a part-time staff and volunteer assistance. In total, CUSO has 140 paid staff employees.

CUSO does offer an orientation program to "cooperants." This program operates from the Ottawa office and has an average length of nine days. However, this Ottawa orientation is supplemented by pre-orientation sessions from the local committees plus readings and language self-study packages. However, CUSO has not established a formal reentry program for its returned volunteers to date although if there is a problem or "if cooperants return early, there is a formal debriefing in Ottawa" (CUSO Bulletin, 1991). At the local level, committees may hold "Welcome-Back" events but no comprehensive re-orientation is in place.

CUSO's mission statement reads, "CUSO is a Canadian organization which supports alliances for global social justice. We work with people striving for freedom, self-determination, gender equality, and cultural survival" (CUSO Bulletin, 1991).

Approximately 10,000 Canadians have been placed in developing countries since CUSO was founded 30 years ago.

Canadian crossroads international (CCI).

Canadian Crossroads International (CCI) was established in 1968. It is a voluntary association that provides cross-cultural learning experiences for the purpose of creating mutual understanding, cooperation, and respect among people.

CCI was formed:

1. To enable Canadians to gain an understanding of development, both national and internationally in a historical and social context.
2. To involve people in activities that relates Canada to the developing world.
3. To stimulate public support for international development through public education at the community level.
4. To encourage the reallocation of the world resources to the greater benefit of the developing countries (from CCI: In Brief).

Similar to CUSO, the majority of funding for CCI comes from CIDA (77%) with the remaining supplied by a variety of sources including local committees, volunteers, (20% of cost of placements must be fund-raised by volunteer and/or local committee), donations, and so on. CCI has a staff of 19 that offer administrative support to the 500 active volunteers, who, according to CCI's National Office, donate two to five

hours per week to the CCI organization.

CCI offers relatively brief orientation and re-orientation programs (one to two weekends). According to the national office, "when we have group of returnees who 'need' a re-orientation, one is organized through the national office for them. Also the local office may provide informal or formal debriefings, as needed" (CCI, 1991).

Since its beginning in 1968, CCI has sent approximately 2,000 Canadians overseas through their individual programs.

Summary.

Between these two non-government organizations (NGO's), approximately 12,000 Canadian's have been placed in a variety of developing countries. The average CCI placement is four to six months, whereas CUSO provides one to two year contracts.

CCI placements are primarily for the purpose of providing Canadians with Cross-cultural learning experiences to share with other Canadians whereas CUSO focuses more on the provision of skilled personnel to the developing world.

Preparation for Analysis

Coding of responses for computer analysis involved the assignment of a number to each and every response (e.g., Male--1; Female--2). In case of open-ended items, similar responses were categorized and assigned a numerical value. However, lengthy comments presented a unique problem as they

were nearly impossible to categorize and code. Therefore, a section of Chapter IV is devoted to comments and suggestions of respondents.

Methods of Analysis

Percentages, frequency distributions, and cross-tabulations were used in analyzing the data in this exploratory and descriptive study. The identification of significant differences for one research question was obtained through a t-test analysis. All statistical analysis was completed with the aid of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSSX).

CHAPTER IV

Analysis of the Research Questions

In this chapter each research question will be examined by analyzing the responses of returned volunteers (R.V.s) to pertinent questionnaire items. The very large volume of data accumulated from the questionnaire posed an editorial problem. Also, many of the tables were used to illustrate findings for more than one research question. Therefore, it was necessary to place all supporting data together at the end of Chapter V. Those tables that illustrate findings for specific research questions are noted throughout this chapter. A section of this chapter is also devoted to the comments of many returned volunteers who provide invaluable information regarding their perceptions of the many aspects of their overseas experience and its meaning in their lives.

Research Question #1

What are the salient characteristics of the Canadian Returned Volunteer with regard to various aspects of the overseas experience?

Findings.

This sample consisted of 115 respondents; the majority (79.1%) had travelled overseas with CUSO while the remaining (20.9%) were CCI volunteers. Most of the R.V.s were between

the ages of 20-25 at the time of their assignment (64.3%). This sample consisted of 65 males (56.5%) and 50 females (43.5%), most of who were single at the time of their assignment. Only 20.9% were married before their assignment with three being involved in a common law relationship and three being divorced. Of the 115 respondents, 63 (53.8%) had returned from their assignment less than 10 years ago whereas 52 (45.2%) had been back in Canada for 10 years or more (Table 1). Canadian Crossroads (CCI) volunteers were placed overseas for an average of five months; the average length of CUSO assignments was two years.

Education/Occupation. Nearly all of the R.V.s had some post-secondary education (94.8%) while 80.7% were university graduates: seven of those had two degrees (Table 2). This group were scattered into 31 different field of study. Those different fields were grouped into 11 categories (eg: chemistry and biology were in a category called "sciences") 22.7% of R.V.s reported a major in the sciences, 19.1% in the arts, and 13.6% in the field of health. The next largest group were in the business field (6.1%). The other 12 respondents were scattered in six remaining categories (Table 3).

The single largest group was that of education (27.3%) with a total of 31.8% having some teacher training.

Similar to the questions regarding field of study were responses regarding present occupation. Again, answers were categorized with the majority falling into the category of

education (43.8%) (Table 4).

Job Placement. Although only 31.8% of R.V.s had any teacher training at the time of their assignment, 69 or 61.1% of all respondents stated that they worked as teachers while overseas. This suggests that 29.3% acted as teachers/instructors while overseas without the benefit of any formal teacher training. The other 44 respondents worked in 19 different types of job placements from medical officer to hotel manager to construction worker (Table 9).

Although many volunteers did not work specifically in their field, 87.6% of all respondents expressed satisfaction with their work placement; 60.2% of those described it as "very satisfactory." However, 20 volunteers acknowledged some degree of problems and frustrations on the job. Five of the 51 volunteers who commented on their job placement stated that they were given a great deal more responsibility than they would have had in Canada at that point in their lives; those five were all CUSO volunteers (Table 10).

Language Barriers. For most volunteers (53.9%), language did not present a real problem; only 10 R.V.s stated that language was 'always' or 'frequently' problematic. Many respondents explained their response by stating either: (a) "Most people spoke English"; (b) "I learned enough of the local language to get by"; or (c) "I had the assistance of an interpreter when necessary." (Table 11).

Host Country/Living Accommodations. The majority of respondents had been placed in a rural setting (<50,000) while overseas (64.8%) and most were placed on the Continent of Africa (56.1%) with the remaining in the Caribbean (10.5%), South America (4.4%), Central America (1.8%), Asia (12.3%) and the South Pacific (14.9%) (Table 5).

Only 33 volunteers (28.7%) stated that they lived alone the whole time while overseas. Most had a roommate at some point during their stay. Twenty-four respondents lived with their spouse/family (20.9%) 26 of the remaining 57 volunteers who had a roommates(s) stated that during their stay their living arrangements changed a number of times. Consequently, it was difficult to get an accurate picture of the living arrangements of this group. However, 81 volunteers (71.1%) stated that they had (at some point) lived with someone of the same/similar cultural background; 28% of those having a roommate(s) also stated that at least one roommate was from the host country (Table 6).

Most volunteers found their living arrangements to be satisfactory (85.8%) while 12.4% labelled their living arrangements as 'tolerable'; 1.8% found them 'somewhat' or 'very' unsatisfactory (Table 7).

Travel Experiences. Although the majority of respondents were only in their twenties, at the time of their overseas assignment, most had some travel experience outside of Canada before accepting the assignment (83%). Of this number, 71.8%

of them had travelled in Europe, 16.6% in the Caribbean, 5.2% in Africa, 3.1% in Asia and/or the South Pacific, 2% in Central and/or South America, and one person had travelled in the U.S.S.R.

Most sojourners had labelled their travel as 'vacationing' (62.5%) with the most frequent travel time being three weeks or less. However, 16.7% stated that they had lived outside of Canada with their family (6.7%) or to work (10%) previous to their assignment.

Since their assignment, most R.V.s have travelled outside of Canada (83.5%); of the 96, 62 (64.5%) had sojourned in Europe, 45 (47%) in North America, 33 (34.3%) in Asia and the South Pacific, 25 (26%) in the Caribbean, 12 (12.5%) in Central/ South America, nine (9.3%) to Africa, four (4.1%) in Eastern Europe, and two (2%) in the Middle East (Table 12).

According to comments, it seems that much of this post-assignment travel occurred on the way home from the host country which may account for the increased travel in Asia and the South Pacific.

Again, the majority of sojourners named 'vacationing' as their main reason for travel and the most frequent travel time was three weeks or less.

Reasons For Applying to CUSO/CCI. There were 12 different responses to the question regarding reasons for applying to go overseas and many respondents gave more than one reason for their decision. However, 70% of respondents named one of

the following as reasons for going overseas: (a) to experience a different culture (42%); (b) to seek adventure or a challenge (35%); and (c) to travel (23%) or for altruistic reasons (22%) (Table 13).

When asked "what did you want to do while overseas at that time?," most respondents referred to their reasons for applying while 26 (22.6%) also added 'to pursue my career.'

Preparation For the Assignment. Volunteers prepared themselves for their assignment in a variety of ways although the majority of the 102 R.V.s responding to this question identified: (a) 'reading material related to the assignment/country' (53.9%); (b) 'raising/ saving money' (39.2%); and (c) 'attending lectures/meetings with returned volunteers' (55.8%) as the most popular methods of preparation (Table 14). It appears that the sponsoring agency was usually involved in assisting volunteers in preparation (90.9%). Only 9% of respondents stated that their sponsoring agency was 'rarely' and 'never' involved in this preparation (Table 15).

Although only 36 volunteers chose to comment on their preparation, most of those comments were of a positive nature; only five volunteers provided negative comments regarding the organization of leadership of their agency.

Formal Orientation Programs. Both CCI and CUSO have been providing orientation programs for their volunteers actually since they established and thus, it follows that the over-

whelming majority of volunteers were involved in a formal orientation program (94.6%) (Table 16).

Only one person stated that there was no orientation offered to him. This volunteer went on to explain that he was "recruited at the last minute" and therefore had no time for orientation.

Seventy percent of volunteers stated that their orientation program lasted for three weeks or less and consisted of one or two blocks of time. One volunteer stated that they were involved in eight different sessions focusing an orientation throughout a two year period. It would appear that, for some, orientation was seen to begin from the time they were accepted for an assignment until they left to go overseas and thus this question was open to interpretation (Table 17).

Regardless of the time devoted to orientation, most volunteers gave their agency's program a positive rating. 65.2% said their orientation was 'excellent' or 'very good;' 21% rated it as 'good.' Only 13.8% of those volunteers who responded to this question rated the orientation as fair (11.9%) or poor (1.8%) (Table 18).

Culture Shock. Although most volunteers had been involved in an orientation program, the majority (94.7%) did experience some degree of culture shock during their stay in the host country. 27.2% rated their degree of culture shock as 'very high' or 'high;' 38.6% described it as 'moderate' while 28.9% labelled it as 'low'. Six volunteers felt that

they experienced no culture shock at all (5.3%). The length of time in culture shock ranged from 1 to 156 weeks with 58.5% placing the time at eight weeks or less (Table 19).

Guthrie (1966), Brein and David (1971), Stolley (1965), Church (1983), Bochner et al. (1980), Higginbotham (1979), and Burton-Adams (1989) all refer to stress or the stress of culture shock/reentry shock as sometimes producing emotional and/or physical symptoms. Higginbotham (1979) talks of stress symptoms of stomach upsets, headaches, pain, and so on. (p. 54).

Bochner et al. (1986) includes stomach complaints, headaches, diarrhea (p. 242). Guthrie (1966) and Brein and David (1971) mention cultural fatigue and its effects on the body. Church (1983) discusses problems in adjustment as manifested in physical ailments (p. 550).

Thirty-three factors were presented to respondents to gather more information on their emotional/physical status while overseas and upon return home. The responses are best understood by viewing the frequencies and percentages outlined in Table 20. Some factors however, invite further discussion.

Most of volunteers (97.2%) felt some degree of personal well-being while overseas and upon return home (89.1%).

Although 60.9% of volunteers reported some feelings of euphoria while overseas, only 40.7% responded in this manner upon return home.

A number of volunteers stated that they felt some

frequency of disillusionment while overseas (59.8%). Surprisingly, nearly the same number (55.4%) also felt some disillusionment upon return to Canada. This is similar to the frequency of feelings of aloneness (55%) while overseas and upon return (47.7%). Volunteers sometimes felt misunderstood in the host country. However, 49.1% of R.V.s sometimes felt misunderstood when they returned to their home country also.

Feelings of anxiety were also common to a number of respondents while living in their host country (46%). Forty-two point three percent of R.V.s also had to contend with feelings of anxiety when they returned home. Sixteen percent of R.V.s also commented that malaria was a major problem for them in the host country.

Degree of Immersion in the Foreign Culture. Nearly half of the volunteers felt they had a 'very high' (19.3%) or 'high' (29.3%) degree of immersion into the foreign culture. Thirty-six percent described their degree of immersion as 'moderate' while 14.9% described it as 'low' (Table 21). Nearly all respondents had contact with the local people at work with 76.3% stating that they 'always' had contact with locals at work. Only 22.1% of respondents stated that they 'always' had contact with locals socially. Nine volunteers said they rarely or never had social contact with the local people.

Most volunteers had frequent contact socially with people of the same/similar culture (51.8%) but had less contact with

them in the work place (41.4%). Most volunteers kept correspondence with friends/family at home while overseas (75.5%) and only a few (9.7%) experienced homesickness to a great extent (Table 22).

Feelings Re: Overseas Experience. The overall feelings of most volunteers with regard to their overseas experience were positive with 77.5% feeling 'very happy' with the assignment. An overwhelming majority stated that they would make the same decision again if they were to start over (97.3%) (Table 23). This compares to Stein's (1963) findings whereby 91% of his peace corps volunteers stated, that looking back, they would make the same decision to join the peace corp.

Preparation For Return Home. Most volunteers made some type of preparation for returning home. Their responses were categorized into three broad categories of professional preparation (97.4%), financial preparations (93.9%) and personal preparations (91.8%) (Table 25). Unlike their preparation to go overseas, however, the sponsoring agency was less involved; only 23.9% of respondent reporting that their sponsoring agency was 'always' or 'frequently' involved as compared to the 70.8% who reported agency assistance with entry preparations (Table 26).

Most people were happy with the idea of returning home (63.7%) although 23% felt ambivalent and 13.2% felt 'somewhat'

or 'very' unhappy about their return (Table 24). Somewhat surprising were the reports regarding initial feelings upon reentry. A smaller number expressed 'very' or 'somewhat' happy feelings (54.8%) while a greater number expressed initial feelings of unhappiness (22.1%) (Table 29). This appears to be similar to Adler's (1980) findings that many returnees report initial 'high' feelings upon reentry lasting for only a few hours and the 'low' period beginning earlier in the reentry cycle than in the cross-cultural entry cycle (p. 275).

Amount of Time Spent Overseas. Fifty-seven percent of volunteers had been overseas for the length of their contract. However, 28.9% had stayed beyond the length of the contract and 14% had shortened the length of their stay (Table 28). Although only 28 volunteers commented in the length of time spent overseas, 16 of those stated that they would have liked to stay longer. Seven of the 16 who returned before their contact time was completed stated that illness had shortened their stay; two of the respondents were sent home due to political turmoil in the host country.

Research Question #2

How does the CCI volunteer differ from the CUSO volunteer?

Findings.

Twenty-four (20.9%) of the R.V.s in this sample travelled overseas with Canadian Crossroads International (CCI) while 91 (79.1%) of the respondents were CUSO cooperants or, as they are called in this study, CUSO volunteers. Cross-tab analysis was used with each questionnaire item to determine the difference in the responses of the two groups. For the most part, CCI and CUSO volunteers showed many similarities in their responses to questionnaire items; however, there are some differences in the responses of the two groups to a number of the questions.

Living Arrangements. Eighteen of the 24 CCI volunteers (75%) lived with others at some point during their stay in the host country as did 63 of the CUSO volunteers (69%). CUSO volunteers, however, were more likely to have a roommate of the same/similar cultural background (78%) than were the CCI volunteers (39%). CCI volunteers were more likely to live with a person from the host country; nearly half of the CCI volunteers (45.8%) lived with a host national as compared to only 14% of the CUSO respondents (Table 36). However, CCI volunteers were less satisfied with their living arrangements. Thirty-three point four percent of Crossroaders labelled their

living arrangements as either 'tolerable' or 'unsatisfactory'; one CCI volunteer stated that his/her living arrangements were 'very unsatisfactory' (Table 37).

Work Placement. The majority of both CUSO (64%) and CCI (50%) volunteers were employed as teachers while overseas and most volunteers were satisfied with their work. However, CUSO volunteers tended to express more satisfaction with their placement with 66.3% of them being 'very satisfied' as compared to 37.5% of Crossroaders (Table 38).

It is important to remember that CUSO volunteers typically spent two years in their position overseas whereas CCI sends volunteers overseas for approximately five months and unlike CUSO, the work placement is not CCI's main purpose in sending Canadians overseas. The shorter amount of time available to familiarize oneself with the work environment and the secondary importance of the work placement may account for this lower rating by Crossroaders.

Language Barriers. It is interesting to note that although the majority of respondents had little trouble with language (54%), Crossroaders were less inclined than CUSO volunteers to rate language barriers as problematic. It is possible that since nearly half of the Crossroaders lived with local(s), their host(s) may have assisted as interpreters and made communication easier (Table 38).

Reasons For Applying to Go Overseas. CUSO and CCI

volunteers gave a similar list of reasons for applying for an overseas assignment. Crossroaders, however, were more inclined to mention 'the desire to experience another culture' as one explanation for their application (62.1%) while 40% of CUSO volunteers gave this explanation. Of the 25 respondents who mentioned 'altruism' as one of their reasons in applying to go overseas, only two of them were Crossroads volunteers. This difference may again be related to the different mandate of each agency in placing Canadians overseas (Table 39).

Preparation for the Assignment/Orientation. Crossroads requires its volunteers to publicly raise a small portion of the cost involved in sending them overseas; this fundraising appears to be part of the CCI public awareness program. Consequently, 62.5% of Crossroaders report raising or saving money as one way they prepared for the assignment compared to only 29.1% of CUSO volunteers.

All 24 of the CCI volunteers (100%) acknowledged their sponsoring agency's involvement (to some degree) in their preparation for overseas compared to 83.5% of the CUSO volunteers.

As mentioned previously, nearly all volunteers were involved in a formal orientation (94.6%). It seems that the CUSO orientation is usually longer than that offered by CCI. 94% of CCI volunteers reported that their orientation program lasted for a total of two weeks or less; 68% of CUSO volunteers stated that their orientation lasted longer than two

weeks with 30% reporting orientation time as being greater than three weeks.

Compared to CUSO volunteers, Crossroaders tended to give their agency a high rating with regard to the orientation program (Table 40).

Culture Shock. Most respondents, whether CCI or CUSO volunteers, experienced some degree of culture shock in the host country. However, Crossroaders perceived themselves as experiencing culture shock for a shorter period of time. Eight-four percent of CCI volunteers stated that their culture shock lasted for two months or less compared to 52% of CUSO volunteers. Approximately 16% of Crossroaders and 48% of CUSO volunteers felt in culture shock for more than two months (Table 41).

Although most Crossroaders felt that their experience with culture shock lasted less than two months, they rated themselves somewhat higher with regard to feelings of confusion, helplessness, insecurity, disorientation, aloneness, incompetence, appetite changes, and weakness/dizziness. On the other hand, more CUSO volunteers ranked themselves as more frequently experiencing fatigue, depression, and increases in alcohol/smoking. Although more CUSO volunteers report a longer period of time in culture shock, they also report more frequent feelings of helpfulness and personal well-being (Table 42).

Crossroaders higher ratings of helplessness, confusion,

and incompetence might possibly be related to the fact that they were less satisfied with their work situation. Their more frequent changes in appetite might be explained by the fact that Crossroaders often live with the local people and may therefore have less control over their diet.

Degree of Immersion. CUSO and CCI volunteers differ somewhat in their perceptions of their immersion into the foreign culture. Sixty-six point seven percent of all Crossroaders felt their degree of immersion was 'very high' or 'high' as compared to 44.4% of CUSO volunteers (Table 43). Crossroaders also experienced less contact with other expatriates of the same/similar cultural background. Only 17.4% of CCI volunteers as compared to 60.7% of CUSO respondents answered 'always' or 'often' when questioned on their degree of social contact with persons of same/similar culture (Table 44).

Less contact with others of a same/similar culture suggests less opportunity to be "totally Canadian" which might also have contributed to the more frequent feelings of aloneness, confusion, disorientation, and homesickness.

Although many volunteers had to contend with a degree of stress while overseas, all of the CCI volunteers (100%) and 85 of the 91 CUSO volunteers (93.4%) felt they had made the right decision to take on that assignment and expressed satisfaction with the experience (Table 45).

Return/Reentry. Although nearly all volunteers made some preparations for their return to Canada, 50% of Crossroaders and 44.8% of CUSO volunteers felt that, unlike entry preparation, they 'rarely' or 'never' received assistance from their sponsoring agency with the reentry plans.

With regard to how they felt about the return home, 60.7% of CUSO and 75% of CCI volunteers expressed feeling 'very happy' or 'happy' about their return to Canada; 39.3% of CUSO volunteers and 25% of Crossroaders were ambivalent or unhappy with the impending return (Table 46).

Forty-one respondents in this study were unsure or unhappy with the idea of returning home (37.4%).

Upon reentry, CUSO volunteers tended to find the pace of life too fast and were more likely to feel unable to use the new skills developed overseas. Both CUSO and CCI volunteers felt the lack of interest of others regarding their experiences and nearly everyone (91.9%) felt that their fellow Canadians were ignorant of the developing world and development issues (Tables 30 and 48).

Table 42 further illustrates the responses of CCI and CUSO volunteers with regard to feelings upon returning home. It is interesting to note that although ratings are lower than host country responses, returnees identify feelings of anxiety, confusion, disorientation, aloneness, and feelings of being misunderstood upon return to their own country.

Nearly all returnees felt some degree of stress upon

return to Canada (92.8%). Only eight returnees (all CUSO volunteers) reported feeling no stress at all. Although most respondents rated their stress as 'moderate' to 'low', 29.5% of returnees felt a 'very high' or 'high' degree of stress on reentry (Table 31). Most returnees felt that they had adjusted well to the return home although 20.8% of CCI volunteer gave themselves a 'fair' or 'poor' rating. Over half of the CUSO returnees (58.2%) stated that it took them longer than six months to 'feel at home' again. The majority of CCI returnees (62.5%) felt 'at home' after the first six months (Tables 50 and 51).

Effects of the Experience on Lifestyle. Nearly all respondents (97.3%) who addressed the question, "Do you feel your present lifestyle was influenced by your overseas experience?" felt that their lifestyle was affected to some degree by their overseas experience.

Although Crossroaders usually spend a shorter period of time in their host country, only one Crossroads volunteer felt that his/her lifestyle was just mildly affected by the experience. In fact, 35.7% of all volunteers (35.2% CUSO, 37.5% CCI) felt their lifestyle had been highly affected by the overseas assignment.

Seventeen R.V.s report making career changes as a result of their time overseas; 79.2% of Crossroaders and 65.9% of the CUSO R.V.s stated that their present involvement and/or contributions to development issues/organizations is a result

of their overseas experiences. These findings are discussed further in Research Question #7.

Reorientation. A little more than half (54.2%) of Crossroads returnees participated in a re-orientation program compared to only 13.5% of CUSO returnees.

CUSO admits to not having an established program for returned volunteers. CCI, however, states that it has always had some form of orientation available to its returnees and has had a more formal program in place for the past 10 years. It appears that many returned volunteers are unaware of CCI's re-orientation policy as 16.6% of Crossroaders felt no re-orientation was offered and/or reported being unaware of any re-orientation program.

Re-orientation programs received a less enthusiastic rating by returnees from both CCI and CUSO. Although only a small number participated in a re-orientation program, the participants were almost equally split between positive and negative ratings.

Only 54 respondents (41%) chose to answer the question "Would you like to see changes in the re-orientation plan offered to returned volunteers?" Sixty-four point eight percent of those responding wanted to see changes in reorientation. Only 13 CCI returned volunteers responded to this question (54.1%). Seven of them wanted changes in re-orientation, six felt that no changes were necessary (Table 33). The changes suggested by respondents are outlined in

Research Question #6.

Research Question #3

How do returned volunteers who have been home for 10 years or more (earlier returnees) differ from volunteers who have returned in the past 10 years (recent returnees)?

Findings.

It has been less than 10 years since 54.8% of the respondents returned to Canada from their overseas assignment. The remaining 45.2% have been home for 10 years or more. The earlier returnees (≥ 10 years) tended to be a little older at the time of their assignment; they were more likely to have lived alone (57.1%) and found their living arrangements less satisfying. Sixty-six point seven percent of the early volunteers (≥ 10 years) were Crossroaders and 39.6% were CUSO volunteers. Most of those placed in the Caribbean and Asia were recent volunteers (< 10 years) (Tables 34 to 37).

Preparation For the Overseas Assignment. Regardless of the time of the assignment, volunteers prepared in a similar manner and usually had support from their sponsoring agency in those preparations. Ninety-four point two percent of the earlier group (≥ 10 years) and 95% of the recent returnees attended an orientation. Of the 15 respondents who rated their orientation program as only 'fair' or 'poor', 66.7% of them have been home for less than 10 years (Table 40).

Culture Shock. Both groups seem to have had their share of culture chock and there are no striking differences in the ratings of intensity. Sixty point eight percent of the recent returnees (<10 years) and 55.8% of the early returnees (≥10 years) experienced some degree of culture shock for two months or less (Table 41).

Table 42 shows the ratings of feelings of recent returnees (<10 years) and earlier returns (≥10 years) while overseas and upon return home. It is somewhat interesting to find that earlier returnees tended to report more frequent feelings of crying, fatigue and changes in appetite and sleeping patterns upon return.

As these are the more "physical" factors of those listed, it is possible that this group who have been home for 10 years or more simply found it easier to recall physical 'ailments' as compared to the emotional impact of the experience.

Return/Reentry. Sixty-six point seven percent of the respondents who felt a 'very high' or 'high' degree of stress upon return home were recent returnees (<10 years). However, 92.2% of the earlier returnees recall some degree of reentry stress and half of those reported that it took six months or more to feel 'at home' again (Tables 49 to 51).

Regardless of the time of the assignment, most returnees felt that it had influenced their present lifestyle with 75.4% of recent returnees (<10 years) and 78.4% of earlier returnees (≥10 years) reporting a 'high' or 'moderate' degree of

influence. Only 7.8% of early returnees and 4.9% of recent returnees said that their overseas experience had little or no effect on their present lifestyle.

When one considers the fact that many returnees are referring to an experience that 'happened' 8, 10 or 12 years ago, it is remarkable how their present lifestyle is still influenced by that episode of their lives; it appears to have had a lasting impact. (See Research Question 7)

Reorientation. Of the 25 returnees involved in a re-orientation program, 64% of them have been home for 10 years or more and it has been at least 10 years since their participation in the reorientation. Of the 14 respondents who rated the reorientations as 'good' or 'very good', 10 of them were earlier returnees (≥ 10 years).

Of the 25 respondents who felt changes should be made to the re-orientation programs offered by their agency, 17 were recent returnees (< 10 years) and 18 have been home for 10 years or more.

Research Question #4

To what degree does the returned volunteers' attitude toward Canadian society and how it works differ at different times during the overseas experience?

Findings.

As indicated through a t-test analysis, upon return home

the mean satisfaction of respondents with regard to Canadian society and how it works was significantly lower than before they left to go overseas ($T = -4.13$; $df = 107$; $p = .000$). T-test analysis also shows a significant difference in the present attitude of returned volunteers. The mean satisfaction of returned volunteers with Canadian society and how it works at the present time is still significantly lower than before they left for the assignment ($T = -6.39$; $df = 106$; $p = .000$).

While the respondents were in the host country, their mean satisfaction with Canadian society remained more positive than it was upon return or at the present time. The t-test analysis shows that although their mean satisfaction with Canadian society was lower while overseas than before they left, the difference was not significant.

At present, returned volunteers recorded a still lower mean satisfaction with Canadian society and how it works than upon initial reentry. T-test analysis illustrates a significant difference in present and initial reentry mean satisfaction with Canadian society ($T = -2.43$; $df = 107$; $p = .017$).

The present ratings of R.V.s may simply be a reflection of the current political and economic discontent of Canadians (according to recent polls) and may not be related to the overseas experience at all. However, as respondents in this study returned at different times, their degree of satisfaction with Canadian society and how it works upon initial

reentry is more likely related to their overseas and reentry experiences.

It seems that the volunteers' attitudes toward their society has changed as a result of their experience; they are significantly less satisfied with the way their society works than they were before their exposure and immersion into another culture (Table 65).

Many of the returned volunteers' comments of how they have changed reflect a new interest in Canada's political affairs and an increased involvement in global development issues. R.V.s, upon return home, seem less inclined to accept the 'Canadian way' as always the best way.

It is possible that the exposure to another culture and thus another way of life, forces the volunteer to evaluate the operations of Canadian society and the status quo; a number of respondents report a tendency to question the status quo while identifying a new awareness of different perspectives/life-styles.

Stein (1963), in his study of Peace Corps volunteers upon return to the United States, reports a similar finding stating that 43% of the returned volunteers were more negative toward their country upon return. Uehara (1986) also found that a number of his respondents (32.9%) became somewhat more critical of their own culture.

Research Question #5

What are the salient characteristics of those respondents who reported the most difficulty with reentry (reentry shock) and how do they differ from those respondents who experienced no reentry stress?

Findings.

Ninety-six (83.5%) of the 115 respondents in this study reported poor adjustment, 33 (28.7%) reported being under high stress upon reentry, and 62 (53.9%) stated that it took them longer than six months to feel 'at home' again. In order to identify those R.V.s who reported the most difficulty with reentry, a cross-tab analysis was used to isolate those respondents who had high reentry stress, poor adjustment, and a longer readjustment period (>6 months).

Although the group appears to differ from other respondents, it is necessary to remember that only a small number of respondents fell into all three categories and they make up a small percentage of the total sample. Therefore, the following conclusions were based on the responses of this small number of returnees.

Only seven respondents fell into all three categories (6.1%). Six of those seven respondents were female and four of them had been home for 10 years or more. Six of the respondents who reported the most reentry difficulties were between the ages of 20 and 25 at the time of their assignment.

Six of the seven were also single at the time (Tables 52 and 53). Of those seven respondents, five were CUSO volunteers and two were Crossroaders. Most of them were 'very satisfied' with their work placement and felt that language was 'rarely' or 'never' a problem (Table 54). All seven had done some travelling outside of Canada before the assignment and six of the seven had some post-assignment travel experience.

All seven had made some preparations for their overseas assignment and had participated in an orientation program. Six of the seven rated their orientation as 'excellent' or 'very good' (Table 55).

Culture Shock/Immersion. Six of the seven respondents who reported extensive reentry problems felt only a moderate or low degree of culture shock, although the length of time in culture shock ranged from two weeks to nearly a year (11 months) for one respondent (Table 56). Four of the seven volunteers reported a high degree of immersion while three regarded their immersion as 'moderate' or 'low' (Table 58).

All seven felt that if they were to start over, they would make the same decision to enrol in the overseas program. All seven felt happy with the overall experience while six reported being 'very happy' with it (Table 60).

Return. Only two returnees who had major readjustment difficulties recalled feeling happy with the idea of returning home. One person reported feeling ambivalent, two were

'somewhat unhappy', and two were 'very unhappy'. Of the four who commented upon their decision to return home, one stated that they felt obligated to return for professional reasons, one stated that illness forced them to return, while two respondents stated that they were involved in a relationship in the host country that they were reluctant to end (Table 61).

All seven had made some financial, professional, and personal preparation plans for return. Of the six who commented, four felt that their sponsoring agency was 'rarely' or 'never' involved in their return preparation plans.

Six of the seven respondents had made a decision to change their lifestyle upon their return home. All six felt relatively successful in their efforts to change, while five of the six rating their efforts to change as being 'highly successful' (Table 62).

Reentry. Most of those who reported reentry difficulties felt 'somewhat' or 'very' unhappy upon reentry (Table 61). They all reported some degree of feeling out of touch and having some financial concerns. Most felt that the pace of life was too fast and there was too much emphasis on the schedules. They also felt that other Canadians were not interested in their experiences and displayed an ignorance of development issues. Five of the seven experienced pressure from family/friends upon reentry and also complained that they were unable to use the new skills developed overseas (Table

63). For the most part, they rated themselves high with regard to the 33 feelings pertaining to reentry stress (Table 57).

Changes in Attitudes/Lifestyles. Most of the returnees who experienced great difficulty upon return had a 'high' or 'very high' degree of satisfaction with Canadian society before leaving the country. Five of the seven also held this high view of Canada during their time overseas. Upon return home however, only one person felt very satisfied with their society and how it works, while five rated their satisfaction as 'low' or 'very low' upon reentry. Four of the seven rated their present satisfaction as 'moderate', two as 'low/very low' and one expressed a high degree of satisfaction.

All seven felt that their present lifestyle has been influenced by the overseas experience. Five felt that their lifestyle had been highly influenced by the experience and all seven mentioned an interest and involvement in development issues as a result. Only one of the returned volunteers who reported the most difficulty with reentry had been involved in a re-orientation program.

Summary.

In comparison to those who rated themselves as experiencing no reentry stress ($n = 8$), those experiencing reentry difficulties were younger and included more female respondents. They were more inclined to make a conscious decision

to change their lifestyle and expressed less positive feelings regarding their return and initial reentry.

Those eight respondents who reported no reentry stress were less inclined to be highly satisfied with Canadian society before leaving Canada and less inclined to be very dissatisfied with Canadian society upon return. In fact, their attitude toward Canadian society and how it works was less likely to change before, during, and after the assignment.

Those who experienced no reentry stress had more positive feelings upon their initial reentry. In fact, this group seemed to be more accepting of their return upon reentry whereas those with more reentry problems showed a further decrease in their degree of happiness upon return. It seems that readiness to return home has a significant impact on how well the individual copes with reentry; those with more reentry problems may have been less psychologically ready to leave the host country.

The respondents reporting more reentry problems were more likely to make a conscious decision to change their lifestyle upon reentry and they also reported being highly successful in those efforts to implement changes in their lives. This group also felt that they were highly influenced by the overseas experience.

Making major changes in one's lifestyle demands a major commitment and can be highly stressful. In fact, this

magnitude of change may be one of the main reasons why this group had such difficulty with adjustment upon return home.

Another significant difference between those experiencing reentry difficulties and those reporting no reentry stress was perception of adjustment. Those with more reentry difficulties perceived their adjustment to be poor. This could mean that they were less likely to feel capable of coping or less effective in their stress response. Burton-Adams (1989) suggests that those under stress are more inclined to perceive change as more stressful and their ability to cope as less effective. Adler (1991) suggests that changes causes stress (ie., culture shock/reentry shock) and the appropriate response to such stress is to eliminate the stress it causes in an effective and meaningful way (p. 229).

Those respondents that reported the most problems with reentry are similar in many ways to Adler's (1981) rebellious returnees. Like Adler's rebellious returnees, those with reentry difficulties showed a high awareness of change and low external validation (ie., high ratings re pressure-stress for family/friends and lack of interest of others).

Also, like Adler's (1980) group of rebellious returnees, those respondents seemed to try to control their behavior during reentry (ie., desire and commitment to change life-style). Those reporting reentry difficulties also were similar to Adler's rebellious returnees in that most of them seemed reluctant to return to their home country.

Research Question #6

How would returned volunteers advise its agency or other returning volunteers regarding reentry or reorientation?

Findings.

Returnees were asked to respond to two questions on the questionnaire related to this research questions: (a) Would you like to see changes in the re-orientation plan offered to returned volunteers? Explain; and (b) What would you advise a person in the process of returning from an overseas assignment?

Fifty-four returned volunteers responded to the question regarding re-orientation and 35 returnees made suggestions with regard to changes in re-orientation programs. Those suggestions fell into eight main categories:

1. Re-orientation/debriefing sessions need to be set up for returnees (32.7%).
2. Returnees should have contact with other R.V.s (13.5%).
3. The sponsoring agency should do a follow-up to offer support to their returnees (26.9%).
4. Re-orientation should be held before reentry occurs (1.9%).
5. Re-orientation should be available after the returnee has been home for a period of time (21.2%).
6. The sponsoring agency should provide employment

assistance/counselling to the returnee (11.5%).

7. The sponsoring agency should provide financial assistance and/or advise (3.8%).

8. The pre-screening procedures of the agency needs improvement; this would reduce reentry problems (1.9%).

Five of the CCI returned volunteers felt that their agency already offered a useful program for reorientation. Six of the CUSO returnees felt that although their agency does not provide a re-orientation program, CUSO would provide re-orientation assistance upon request.

Eighty-six returnees also commented on how they would advise others who are in the process of return home. There were 18 different comments with many respondents giving more than one suggestion to prospective returnees. These suggestions were:

1. Talk with other R.V.s and find a support system (25.6%).

2. Plan to return to a structured situation (ie., plan to go back to school, find a job, and so on) (20.9%).

3. Expect reentry shock; expect to need time to readjust to Canada (17.4%).

4. Try to update yourself on what has happened at home in your absence; expect changes (12.8%).

5. Be prepared for the apathy and disinterest of other Canadians (10.5%).

6. Travelling on the way back home helps one ease back

into Canada (10.5%).

7. Be tolerant/flexible/open-minded (8.1%).

8. Keep in contact with your friends in the host country (5.8%).

9. Reentry preparation and readjustment is an individual matter and each individual must find his/her own way to readjust (5.8%).

10. Contemplate your overseas experiences (5.8%).

11. Be aware of changes in yourself (5.8%).

12. Plan to return to a similar overseas assignment or don't return home at all (3.5%).

13. Try to find a way to ease financial concerns (3.5%).

14. Read about your culture (1.6%).

15. Choose a simpler lifestyle (1.6%).

16. Prepare for a loss of self-esteem (1.6%).

17. Prepare for return before you leave to go overseas (1.6%).

18. Try to pick up the same lifestyle as when you left (1.6%).

Not only do these comments provide insight into reentry for future returnees, they also reflect the individual experiences of these respondents. The comments section of this chapter includes comments of many returned volunteers regarding their reentry experience and their advice to others.

Research Question #7(a)

How did the overseas experience influence the present lifestyles of returned volunteers?

Findings.

In order to evaluate the impact of the overseas experience on the lives of returned volunteers, it was necessary to analyze the responses to the following questionnaire items: (a) If you noticed any differences in yourself, how would you describe them?; and (b) Please identify any interests, activities, or organizational involvements which you feel are a result of your overseas experience.

Responses to these two questionnaire items varied and some of the comments regarding changes to one's lifestyle have been included in the comments section of this chapter. Although they varied, responses can be categorized in two ways. The first type of change can be described as personal or self-oriented. They include comments such as increase in maturity (10.5%), assertiveness (5.8%), self-reliance (10.5%), introspection (4.7%), self-confidence (11.6%), self-awareness (12.8%), and change in personal values (23.3%). The second type involved changes in attitudes/behavior as a member of society which include increased awareness of different lifestyles (12.8%), criticism of the status quo (23.3%), less materialistic (13.2%), career changes (20.3%), involvement in development issues/organizations (82.6%), greater interest in

Canada's international affairs (26.7%), and openness to other cultures (17.4%). A small number (8.1%) mentioned a change in their marital status while overseas although this study did not provide an opportunity for returned volunteers to specifically identify any changes in marital status.

Research Question #7(b)

Do returned volunteers see their overseas experience as a growthful experience?

Findings.

Only seven (6.3%) of all returned volunteers felt that the overseas experience had little or no influence on their present lifestyle. Eighty-six percent of R.V.s felt their present lifestyle was 'highly' or 'moderately' affected by the whole experience. It seems that the process of leaving one's own country to live in a foreign culture for a period of time created a lasting change in the attitudes and lifestyles of returned volunteers.

The comments of R.V.s point to growth in personal development and a greater awareness and concern for the world beyond the boundaries of their own society. Although the term 'growthful' is open to some interpretation, it appears that the experience was growthful if growth is measured in terms of increased global awareness and personal development.

Comments

The comments of respondents gave an insight into various aspects of the experience and its effect on their life upon return that cannot be understood or appreciated through statistics alone. This section simply shares some of the comments of many R.V.s who generously took the time to explain their responses, despite a somewhat lengthy questionnaire.

First impression of the host country.

It was like dying and then awakening in Heaven
.... (Asia, 1962-1964)

I remember thinking, my God! Where did all the people, animals, machines, etc. come from? I was overwhelmed with the heat and with the numbers of people I saw in the Capital. (Africa, 1980-1982)

After an all night flight, we arrived to see armed soldiers along the runway. We drove a few hours in a bus to a large secondary school. The food portions were small and not very good; our room had lizards on the walls--a rough beginning. (Africa, 1970-1972)

Warm and friendly; struck by the people's naive belief in their government and lack of exposure to the outside world ie., no foreign press. (Africa, 1988-89)

It was as if I were on another planet. We

landed and it was very dark and very hot
(Africa, 1984-1986)

Semi-shock, like landing on another planet. The heat and lower standard of cleanliness plus of course being one of the few whites among many blacks, and speaking another language, was an intense experience. (South Pacific, 1984-1986)

I still remember the drive from the airport and the beautiful feeling of peace/calm that put me into a trance-like state; watching the sunset as people carried their possessions home from work and market. The sight, smells, haze, sunset are unforgettable. A wonderful first impression! (Africa, 1982-1984)

Confusing and unreal. Our first night ... we partied up a storm. Only later did we realize or admit that we were hiding our fear--and doing it very well. (Africa, 1980-1982)

Orientation.

CUSO assisted (in preparation) as much as they could--nothing could completely prepare you.
(Africa, 1982-1984, CUSO)

CUSO was excellent (nearly always) in providing us with what we needed. We referred to it as 'mother CUSO'. (Asia, 1986, CUSO)

Orientation consisted of discussions, role plays, one week in Ottawa and one week in--country covering professional, culture, and health; we were under no illusions. (Africa, 1979-1981, CUSO)

Crossroads provided excellent information before my departure--an involved orientation ending with others who were going away or had returned, ... meetings involved cultural encounters, preparations, things to avoid, things to bring, etc. (Central America, 1987, CCI)

CUSO was very poor with medical advice and we had many problems (South Pacific, 1983, CUSO)

Concerns in the host country.

Feelings of lack of privacy and frustration in not accepting how things were during my first year made me nearly quit the program. (Africa, 1980-1983)

I worked with the government civil services, so it could get frustrating--but no worse than my present position with the (provincial) government. (Asia, 1984-1987)

I was concerned about my children. Also, we were there during a black/white confrontation ... We really felt the effects of being a minority. (Caribbean, 1972-1975)

Concerns with skin disorders and constipation plus depression in my first year--my second and third years were so blissful (South Pacific, 1974-1977)

... I was ill at one point (Malaria) but was well cared for; I was also homesick once in awhile (Africa, 1966-1968)

I realized I have become too old. I was forced to return early because of complications of an accident I had before going to (Caribbean, 1990-1991)

Culture shock.

I felt I had settled in fairly quickly but months later certain things would still amaze me. (Africa, 1980-1982)

Over the two years the feelings of living in a different culture actually increased. It was not discomfort nor shock so much as recognition of basic differences despite surface cultural similarities. (Caribbean, 1969-1972)

For the first couple of days, it was pretty high ... Anyway after two days in ...] and a lot of sleep, I decided 'wow,' you are really here Let's enjoy it! (Asia, 1984-1987)

Culture shock did not occur at time of entry but

rather 3-4 months later. (South America, 1967-1973)

None. I felt at home as soon as the plane landed. However, I felt my wife did not adjust to life in Africa. The marriage went down hill when she became pregnant there. (Africa, 1963-1965)

No matter what people can tell you about a culture--seeing for the first time yourself can cause some 'shock.' Even as my two years progressed, I was still 'seeing' new things (Africa, 1982-1984)

I never experienced culture shock until about after one month in the country and I had bouts of this for about three months; depression and crying went together with my experience with culture shock. Drinking increased as I became more integrated into the community. It seemed to be the #1 pastime; it stopped when I returned home. (Africa, 1982-1985)

Return and reentry.

If I had some way of knowing before hand how 'out of it' I would feel, perhaps I would not have felt so alone (Africa, 1969-1971)

I was very disoriented--I was not prepared. I was concerned about not adjusting to the faster

pace and not having a job. It was harder coming back than adjusting to (Africa, 1982-1984)

On one hand, everything had changed while I was away, and on the other hand, nothing had changed. (Africa, 1980-1982)

I was married five months before returning home to an (African) co-worker and became pregnant before return I had a lot of changes to prepare for--new baby, new job, my husband coming to Canada ... the adjustments have been difficult for my husband (Africa, 1983-1985)

Sometimes I feel caught in the rat race of a sick society (South Pacific, 1983-1985)

I think there was more culture shock upon reentry than entering ... for the first time. There was a feeling of aloneness, very much so ... there was the insecurity of not having a job of course, but the feeling of separateness and aloneness were the hardest (Africa, 1984-1986)

Coming back is sort of like going overseas without the excitement and newness (Asia, 1987)

As a nurse, I felt that I was unable to use the skills and the level of responsibility that I had gained. I was never really able to adjust to nursing in Canada again ... perhaps if I had been

aware that a readjustment was 'normal,' I would have felt better. (Africa, 1966-1968)

I experienced a withdrawal and a lack of ability to focus and participate in everyday activities. This lasted for 1 1/2 years. (Africa, 1987)

The inability of people in Canada to understand or relate to our experience overseas left us with a real sense of not being understood. The return culture shock was not expected by us. We felt that we knew what to expect back home, but when we found that what we expected was not there, the culture shock was all the greater. (Caribbean, 1968-1970)

I returned to Canada with my new wife I felt I had made a big mistake the first few hours in Toronto airport I lost the toe-hold I had on my field after returning to Canada. Jobs I had worked at now required a masters ... This is one R.V. who's sorry he ever returned. (South Pacific, 1980-1982)

Returning home is easy and the adjustment is easy compared to going over. (Africa, 1979-1981)

Re-orientation.

The agency could offer debriefing sessions, contact with other R.V.s and a check periodically to see if we had survived. (Asia, 1962-1964, CUSO)

More re-orientation is needed, but still one just has to learn how to readjust. (Africa, 1982-1984, CUSO)

As I understand it, a weekend is offered for those who have returned in the past year to discuss their issues and problems. This is a good time lapse as it allows for euphoria to subside and you can take a good look at the situation. (South Pacific, 1985-1987, CUSO)

I was quite disillusioned and the only thing that was offered was a stopover in Ottawa to speak with a nurse. It was a waste of time and money. Nobody even phoned or followed up after that. I could have a breakdown or worse and they would never know. However, I had strong family and friendship support. I would be concerned about the lack of agency programs for these who do not have such assistance (Asia, 1979, CCI)

I'm not sure a re-orientation is needed. In my experience the reentry shock was very minimal if not nil. I find it difficult to believe a person could be shocked by his own culture after being away for 2-3 years. Ten years, maybe (Africa, 1982-1985, CUSO)

I was in no way prepared. Anything would have been a help. I was warned and prepared for culture

shock when I went, but not at all when I came back.
(Asia, 1968-1970, CUSO)

I thought that the one I attended was quite useful. (Africa, 1979, CUSO)

I'd suggest a regrouping of orientation groups:
(1) immediately after reentry; (2) in six months;
(3) after two years. It seems a shame not to bring the investment--both ours and our hosts--to maximum fruition. (Asia, 1968-1971, CUSO)

Some re-orientation similar to our orientation program would have helped even if it could not prepare us completely. (Caribbean, 1968-1970, CCI)

... More intense screening and testing of applicants may reduce problems both overseas and on reentry. (South Pacific, 1981-1984, CUSO)

I think there is a need to inform returned volunteers of adjustment problems they might face. Also a follow-up workshop a year later would be recommended. (Africa, 1979-1985, CUSO)

My wife and I needed one badly (Africa, 1978-1985, CUSO)

Changes in self/lifestyle attributed to the experience.

I am more aware of world issues, more mature in my relationships, and more critical of the status quo. Now, I'm not very attached to "things" I am

concerned about the environment and world issues.
(Africa, 1969-1971, Teacher)

The experience helped to focus my interests and confirm certain attitudes re career, politics, etc. I would say it was a maturing experience rather than a factor in radically reorienting my life. I think I grew up a lot in those two years. (Asia, 1962-1964, Civil Engineer)

I am quieter, more realistic about my abilities, more concerned for third world, new spiritual awareness; as a result of the experience I also travel more, and I have a inter-cultural marriage (1961-1963, Business Person)

... More self-confidence, pleased with myself for having done something I wanted to I've more interest and involvement in international/development issues. (Africa, 1979, Physician)

I gained a global perspective, I've become concerned with more than my own life and well being. I'm involved with overseas development (and have) a concern with justice issues at home and abroad. (Africa, 1982-1983, Clergy)

I'm more aware of world situations, less (I hope) complacent about Canada's 'goodness' as a world neighbour. (South America, 1967-1973, Researcher)

... I'm more sensitive towards development...I lived a simpler life for three or four years, but that is no longer the case. (South Pacific, 1976-1978)

I have more confidence and willingness to take risks ... a greater ability to see my own strengths. My experience gave me an opportunity to see more of the world and an opportunity to travel in Africa and India which all added up to be quite influential on my present lifestyle. (Africa, 1980-1983, Consultant, International Development)

I have more awareness of third world issues and problems--and more empathy. (Africa, 1973, Curator)

I'm less optimistic and less impressed by material luxuries, more content with less--I'm more aware of politics, education, the environment--and conscious of my role in improving it. (South Pacific, 1979-1981, Engineering Consultant)

Coming back was the biggest culture shock. It was only after being back that we realized we were not the same people who went overseas ... we no longer aspire to the same things we did before we went. We are conscious of our purchases and food-stuffs, as to whether they are produced by a multinational that exploits the third world. Before

going overseas we were not politically conscious of anything--now we are. (South Pacific, 1978-1980, Oxfam Worker)

Advice to others returning home.

If getting a job is a major concern, then getting a good contact for advice re job opportunities and making application well in advance of returning home is very important. (Asia, 1962-1964)

Talk about your hopes and expectations with someone who has experienced the return process. (Africa, 1969-1971)

Don't panic--it takes time to sort out all your thoughts, experiences and put them in perspective. With time, most people settle back into our culture with enriched values and views of the world and the people on it as well as our role in life. (Africa, 1982-1984)

Try to pick up the same lifestyle that you left before going overseas and try to remember that you are back to Canada (Africa, 1983-1985)

... use the R.V. network. (Asia, 1968-1971)

Don't expect people to be able to repeat the name of your host country or know its location. (South Pacific, 1984-1986)

Find people who had similar experiences. (South America, 1987)

Keep in touch with those who shared your experience. That part of your life will always be special and a person never having gone through that will never understand how your 'tour' is different from being a tourist. (Africa, 1976-1978)

Make sure you have a good support system at home. (South Pacific, 1982-1984)

Get prepared for reverse culture shock. (Africa, 1968-1970)

... expect to be 'changed' to some degree. (Africa, 1973)

Take some time to relax and get used to Canada again. (South Pacific, 1983-1984)

Don't be surprised to find that because your attitudes have changed, you will not find life at home the same. (Africa, 1972-1975)

The most potent for me was my new awareness of the world--and how these will affect old relationships in Canada. (Africa, 1982-1984)

There is a whole lot of things which CUSO advises ... but in my experience, few people actually do these things even when encouraged to by CUSO staff. Certainly a discussion of potential problems and feelings with others returning is

ideal at a minimum. (Africa, 1980-1983)

Don't be upset if old friends can't 'relate' or don't want to hear about it. (Africa, 1985-1986)

Do not presume that you will understand your country and slip back into society with ease. At times you will feel like a stranger in your own country. (Caribbean, 1968-1970)

Other comments/impressions.

Our society is seductive with its securities and materialism. I find I play the game while here-- but put me in a different situation and I'm happy with much less.

... When I came back I switched careers--I don't think I would have had the "guts" to switch before (Photographer)

My preference to teach native Canadians is probably a result of my overseas experience. (Teacher)

Not too many days pass that I don't recall living in [] and the people and hope to be able to visit there again. I have a strong desire to work in a developing country in the future. (Student)

I have since my time overseas a sense of well being--the sense of having contributed to the

(alleviating the) problems of the needy and a commitment to return" (Physician)

My wife and I have often considered foreign assignments again but the problems of reentering the Canadian work market always discouraged us. I married an Asian so I guess you could say I brought some of my foreign experiences home with me Things I missed most when I came back:--the smell of rain at the end of the dry season and-- mangos. Things I missed least: dust and cockroaches. (Librarian)

... Living in a different culture than the one I grew up in was a profoundly positive experience. I have never regretted my decision and would make the same one again in a second, if I had my life to live over. (Social Worker)

... Although at times life seemed a little rough--I could give you 'war' stories (car accidents, malaria, trying to get visas, waiting for transport in the hot sun for hours, getting cerebral edema trying to climb Mount Kelomanyao, etc.) there are plenty of positive warm feelings and memories that will stay with me always (Teacher)

In the past 16 years, I've lived in Africa as much as I've lived in Canada. (Economist)

I felt at home after a year but never with the same acceptance of Canada as being the best or most perfect. (Teacher)

... I am also convinced that our time overseas strengthened our relationship as husband and wife. We learned to talk to each other and rely on each other while there and it became the basis for our marriage. (Civil Servant)

The three years with CUSO drastically changed my values and perspectives and greatly influenced the course my life has taken since then. Upon return I terminated my academic career and eventually returned to 'development work.' I had not realized that my values had changed until I returned to academic life and I no longer wanted the degree or the pressure required to obtain it. (Development Worker)

I left a country that was going somewhere despite all its problems and came back to one that had all the breaks and no brains to take it anywhere You even think that perhaps it's not us that bugged up, but perhaps the place we came from and returned to. Perhaps we just had to leave to find out the truth! (Businessman).

Summary

Obviously, many returned volunteers took the opportunity elaborate on their overseas and reentry experiences. Their comments are rich and varied and provide a three-dimensional "picture" of the whole process.

Comments regarding return and reentry are particularly valuable as they help the reader understand more fully the feelings of R.V.s upon return home. Many of these comments suggest that some R.V.s may still have a number of unresolved issues directly related to the experience.

CHAPTER V

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

This study described and explored the nature of the overseas experience, including reentry, and investigated the influence of the experience on the present lifestyles of returned Canadian volunteers.

Volunteers tended to be well educated with the majority having some post-secondary education, usually at the university level. Most volunteers were single and under age 30 at the time of the assignment. They were, for the most part, satisfied with the overseas experience and the majority would make the same decision to enrol if they had the decision to make again.

The sponsoring agency was usually involved in the individual's preparation for the assignment and volunteers typically participated in an orientation program offered by the agency. Most volunteers experienced some degree of culture shock upon entry to the foreign culture although the average length of culture shock (mean = 3.2 months) was shorter than their average time of readjustment (mean = 9.2 months).

While only a small number of respondents in this study reported no reentry stress ($n = 8$), a similar number ($n = 7$) reported high stress, poor adjustment, and a relative long

period of readjustment time (>6 months). Nearly all volunteers, regardless of their reentry experience, reported that the overseas experience had influenced their present lifestyle indicating increased self, cultural, and global awareness as a result.

However, those with the greatest difficulties upon return differed from other returnees in a number of ways. This group seemed to be less ready to return home, reporting feeling relatively unhappy about their impending return and even less happy upon initial reentry to Canada. Although a number of returnees rated their reentry stress as high, those returnees who seemed to have had the most difficulty also rated their readjustment as poor and indicated a longer time before they felt 'at home' again.

One other obvious difference between this group and other volunteers was the fact that those reporting the most reentry difficulty were also more inclined to have made a conscious decision to change their lifestyle upon return home and reported a high degree of success in implementing these changes. Finally, those returnees reporting more reentry difficulties or reentry shock were younger (age 25 or less) and most were female whereas those who reported no stress/good adjustment were usually older and most were male.

The review of literature defined a number of studies that found age to be an important variable affecting reentry (Gleason, 1969; Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1967; La Brack, 1985;

Uehara, 1986). Gender has also been deemed significant by other researchers (Gleason, 1968; Gana & Pederson, 1977; La Brack, 1985; Martin, 1984).

Adler's (1981) study of returned Canadian employees lend support to the conclusion that desire to return home affects reentry. Her study shows that those returnees who were less ready to return had more difficulty upon reentry. Her description of rebellious and alienated returnees were similar in character to those respondents in this study who had the most difficulty upon reentry to Canada.

As in Adler's (1981) study of returned Canadian overseas executives, the results of this study seem to suggest a flattened u-curve of reentry although this study was not designed to determine a curve of reentry. Results, however, suggest that the initial high feelings upon reentry are short-lived for many returnees. Thirteen point two percent of respondents reported feeling unsure/unhappy regarding return; upon initial reentry this number of respondents feeling this way increased to 22.1%. Also, the average time before returnees felt at home again was 9.2 months. This broadly corresponds to Adler's (1981) flattened u-curve reports where after six months returnees were still feeling only 'average' (p. 346).

As mentioned previously, those respondents indicating the most reentry shock not only reported a high degree of reentry stress and longer readjustment time, but also, unlike others,

they labelled their readjustment as poor. This perception of poor adjustment may be understood by examining studies on stress which suggest that an event may be stressful simply because an individual perceives it to be so (Burton-Adams, 1989, p. 59). Therefore, it is possible that while most returnees faced the same/similar realities upon return (employment, financial concerns, lack of interest of others, red tape, frustration, and so on), those experiencing the most difficulty were those who simply interpreted the situation as more stressful. This implies that those who saw the situation as more stressful also "perceived the situation as approaching or exceeding their self-perceived ability to cope with that situation" (Burton-Adams, p. 4). Upobor (n.d.), as cited in Martin (1984), stated that the severity of reentry shock is related to the magnitude of change in either the home environment or within the individual and his/her circumstances (p. 123).

In this study, those respondents who reported the most severe reentry shock were those who were more inclined to make a conscious decision to change their lifestyle upon return home and were highly successful in implementing those changes. According to Spradley and Philips (1972, change and stress go hand in hand (p. 520). Therefore it seems that their strong commitment and determination to make changes may also explain to some degree why this group reported more difficulties upon reentry.

One of the most interesting aspects of this study was the significant changes that occurred in the respondent's ratings of mean satisfaction with Canadian society at different times during the overseas experience.

Respondents who reported no reentry stress/good readjustment were more moderate in their ratings of satisfaction with Canadian society both before and after their assignments. Those respondents who reported high stress/poor readjustment were more inclined to be significantly less satisfied with Canadian society upon return.

With regard to present levels of satisfaction with Canadian society and how it works, most respondents reported being somewhat dissatisfied. However, many of them related their dissatisfaction to the current political situation in Canada. Whereas current political/economic problems might explain the current ratings of returned volunteers, their reentry occurred at different times and often during different political reigns in Canada. Therefore, these lower ratings of satisfaction with Canadian society (and how it works) upon reentry cannot be simply the result of dissatisfaction with one particular situation or political party.

Brislin and Van Buren (1974) concluded that when people live in another culture for a significant length of time, attitudes and outlooks change. Poole (1970), as cited in Hinkle (1972), suggests that foreign travel is a means of testing one's identity against alternative ways of life.

Kraemer (1975) suggests that living in another country forces one to identify cultural influences in one's own thinking and thus gives one a new perception of the home culture. Those returnees who reported the most reentry shock (high stress/poor readjustment) were more inclined to make changes in their lives. They were also more inclined to report a higher degree of satisfaction with Canadian society before leaving to go overseas.

It seems that by living in another culture and being exposed to alternative lifestyles, these respondents not only became more aware of alternative lifestyles and more aware of their own society and culture, but also made a decision to change their lifestyle as a result.

Regardless of reentry experiences, nearly all returned volunteers reported that the overseas experience influenced their present lifestyle to some degree. For the most part, those influences suggest that the experience had a positive impact. Nearly all returnees could identify how the whole experience resulted in learning and growth for them. Yet, among the comments were statements that suggested that although learning has taken place and respondents have grown from the experience, some still have not put closure on the experience. These respondents still seem to indicate some feelings of loss and ambivalence related to their return.

One respondent summed up these conflicting feelings in her final comments. She reported a number of ways in which

the experience affected her life in very positive and growthful ways. Yet, she concludes by stating that, "Although my assignment was many years ago, I realized upon completing this questionnaire that I still have to deal with a number of 'unresolved issues' related to my overseas experience."

Recommendations

Recommendations for sponsoring agencies.

This study supports findings by other researchers that reentry shock or reverse culture shock is as common and as normal as the more established phenomena of culture shock. Yet re-orientation has not received the same attention from sponsoring agencies as orientation. Based upon the results of this study and the research conducted in the area of reentry, the following recommendations are proposed to agencies involved in placing Canadians overseas.

1. Re-orientation as part of the orientation process.

It appears as if both sponsoring agencies like CUSO and CCI and their volunteers benefit a great deal from overseas programs. Most assignments seem to reach a 'successful' end for both the agency and the participant. The returned volunteers often continue to contribute both time and money to development organizations, including their sponsoring agency. It seems only fitting therefore, that the agency should place the same importance on assisting the volunteers in their attempts at a 'successful' return. It seems that although

most volunteers cope with return and reap many benefits from their overseas experience, most could have used some re-orientation and reentry education, particularly those experiencing the greatest reentry shock.

Re-orientation programs held only after volunteers have returned home seem to be impractical as returnees often travel extensively before return or extend their contract. For this reason and others, re-orientation programs have often had poor attendance. Re-orientation, after reentry, might also be "too little too late". Therefore, it would seem more feasible and more effective to begin the re-orientation process of volunteers before they leave Canada. A part of the orientation program should be devoted to educating volunteers about the issues associated with reentry. La Brack (1991), who is actively involved in providing orientation and re-orientation services to American students and is something of an expert in this field, suggests that time be devoted to re-orientation issues before the assignment begins. In a recent unpublished article, La Brack describes a specific program developed at the University of the Pacific (UOP) which links orientation and reorientation. He states that:

... the preparation for reentry can, and should begin during orientation. Groundwork can begin during orientation which provides a basis for valuable and interesting exercises upon their return. Moreover, since those exercises are, in a

sense, created by the students themselves, they are highly individualized and relevant, retaining their saliency for the student regardless of when they return. (p. 4)

2. **Follow-up during assignment.** If orientation could be considered the first stage of the reentry process, a follow-up of information and support a few months prior to anticipated reentry of the volunteer might be a good second phase. Distribution of a variety of ready material pertaining to reentry may provide food for thought for volunteers. A self-help type booklet, such as the one published by CIDA (1979) entitled Reentry: A Guide For Returning Home, can encourage the returnee to begin his/her preparation for reentry.

3. **Support services upon return.** Although both CUSO and CCI have stated that, if contacted, they would be willing to assist any returnee experiencing reentry problems, it seems that most returnees are reluctant to initiate this contact. This may be partly due to the fact that most returnees are uncomfortable with their feelings upon reentry and often think that reentry problems are their unique problem. Therefore, sponsoring agencies should make it known, through their media of newsletters/bulletins, local meetings, announcements, and so on, that they actively encourage returned volunteers to seek support upon reentry to Canada. Since many volunteers return to areas far from the main offices of their sponsoring

agency, counsellors in their community could provide assistance to returnees on behalf of the sponsoring agency. Sponsoring agencies should consider budgeting a small amount of money each year for "out-reach" counselling services. These services should also be extended to older returnees who still have "unresolved issues" related to their overseas and reentry experiences.

4. **Involvement of other R.V.s.** Most returnees have identified the need for a support system upon reentry and contact with other returned volunteers seemed to have been one of the most effective forms of support to those just returning to Canada. As returnees are often reluctant to seek support, the sponsoring agency should actively encourage R.V.s who are still involved with the agency (employees/volunteers) to make contact with newly returned volunteers in their area and give them an opportunity to talk about their experiences overseas and the stress felt upon return home. The local committee should, where possible, act as a support and referral service for returnees on behalf of the national office.

Recommendations for further research.

Based on this study, the following suggestions are made for further research.

1. Because only a small number of respondents showed 'severe' reentry shock (high stress/poor readjustment/long >6 months reentry time), it is recommended that future

researchers further investigate this group with a larger sample.

2. Longitudinal and case study approaches would contribute greatly to the understanding of overseas and reentry experiences of Canadian returnees.

3. Further investigation of the relationship between stress theories and the reentry process is recommended.

Tables

Table 1

Demographic Data of Returned Volunteers

Gender	N	P	Age	N	P	Sponsoring Agency	N	P	Marital Status	N	P	Length of Time Since	
												Return	N
Male	65		20-25	74	84.3	CUSO	91	79.1	Single	85	73.9	<10 years	63
			26-35	31	27.0				Married	24	20.9		
Female	50		36-45	5	4.3	CCI	24	20.9	Divorced	3	2.6	≥10 years	52
			46+	5	4.3				Common				45.2
									Law	3	2.6		
Total	115			115			115			115			115
Number													
Responding													

Table 2

Highest Education Level of Respondents At the Time of the Assignment

Highest Education Level	N	%
Completed Elementary School	1	.9
Completed High School	3	2.6
Completed a Course at Vocational School	4	3.5
Tried Some University Training	10	8.8
Completed a University Degree	92	80.7
Completed a Nursing Program	2	1.8
Completed Two Degrees	7	6.1
Other	2	1.8

Total Number Responding	114	
-------------------------	-----	--

Table 3

Number and Percentages of Volunteers With Regard to Course of Study/Training

Field of Training	N	%
Science	25	22.7
Arts	21	19.1
Education	35	27.3
Business	7	6.4
Health	15	13.5
Human Resources	2	1.8
Theology	1	.9
Electrical	1	.9
Drafting	2	1.8
Forestry	3	2.7
Agriculture	3	2.7
<hr/>		
Total Number Responding	115	
<hr/>		

Table 4

Volunteers' Present Occupation

Field of Work	N	%
Education	49	43.8
Human Resources	14	12.5
Medical	12	10.7
Engineering	2	1.8
Business/Self-Employed	14	12.5
Not Employed For Pay	10	8.9
Labourer	5	4.5
Student	3	2.7
Forestry	2	1.8
Lawyer	1	.9
<hr/>		
Total Number Responding	112	
<hr/>		

Table 5**Overseas Placement of Volunteers by the Sponsoring Agency**

Area of Overseas Placement	N	%
<hr/>		
Africa	64	56.1
Caribbean	12	10.5
South America	5	4.4
Central America	2	1.8
Asia	14	12.3
South Pacific	17	14.9
<hr/>		
Total Number Responding	114	
<hr/>		

Table 6

Frequency and Percent of Volunteers With Regard to Overseas
Living Arrangements

Living Arrangements While Overseas	Number		
	Responding	N	%

Lived Alone	114	33	29.9
Had Roommates	114	81	71.1
Had at Least One Roommate of Same/Similar Culture	107	56	47.9
Had at Least One Roommate Who Was a Native of the Host Country	107	23	21.5

Table 7**Volunteers' Rating of Their Living Arrangements**

Feeling	N	%
<hr/>		
Very Satisfactory	70	61.9
Somewhat Satisfactory	27	23.9
Tolerable	14	12.4
Somewhat Unsatisfactory	1	.9
Very Satisfactory	1	.9
<hr/>		
Total Number Responding	113	
<hr/>		

Table 8

Population of the Volunteers' Overseas Community

Population	N	%
Rural (<50,000)	70	64.8
Urban (≥50,000)	38	35.2
Total Number Responding	108	

Table 9**Volunteers' Occupation While Overseas**

Occupation	N	%
P.R. Officer	1	.9
Teacher	69	61.1
Engineer	2	1.8
Rural Development Worker	9	8.0
Labourer	2	1.8
Fisheries Officer	1	.9
Instructor/Supervisor (Teaching)	5	4.4
Social Worker	2	1.8
Forestry	2	1.8
Hotel Management	1	0.9
Nursing	2	1.8
Medical Officer	7	6.2
Biologist	1	0.9
Journalism	1	0.9
Construction Worker	3	2.7
Laboratory Technologist	1	.9
Dentist	1	.9
Economist	1	.9
Marketing (Business)	1	.9
Archaeological Assistant	1	.9
Total Number Responding	113	

Table 10

Volunteers' Rating of the Work Placement

Rating	N	%
Very Satisfactory	68	60.2
Somewhat Satisfactory	31	27.4
Tolerable	5	4.4
Somewhat Unsatisfactory	4	3.5
Very Unsatisfactory	5	4.4
Total Number Responding	113	

Table 11

Volunteers' Rating of Degree of Difficulty With Language Barriers

Rating	N	%
Always Problematic	1	.9
Frequently Problematic	9	7.8
Sometimes Problematic	43	37.4
Rarely Problematic	47	40.9
Never Problematic	15	13.0
Total Number Responding	115	

Table 12

The Volunteers' Pre- and Post-Assignment Travel (Outside of Canada)

Place of Travel	<u>Pre-</u> <u>Assignment</u>		<u>Post-</u> <u>Assignment</u>	
	N	%	N	%
North America	69	71.8	45	46.9
South and Central America	2	2.1	12	12.5
Europe	56	58.3	62	64.5
Africa	5	5.2	9	9.3
Asia and/or South Pacific	3	3.1	33	34.3
Caribbean	16	16.6	25	26.0
U.S.S.R./Eastern Europe	1	1.0	4	4.2
Middle East	-	-	2	2.1
Total Number Travelling	96		96	

Table 13

Volunteers' Reasons For Applying to Go Overseas

Reasons for Applying To Go Overseas (N = 113)	N (Number of Volunteers Citing Reason)
<hr/>	
Personal Development	13
Seek Adventure/Challenge	40
Altruism	25
Experience A Different Culture	47
Do Something Worthwhile	13
Time to Make Future Plans	2
Career Development	13
Travel	26
For Health Reasons	1
Curiosity	3
Encouraged By Others	1
To Learn About Development	2

Table 14

Volunteers' Method of Preparation For the Overseas Assignment

Method of Preparation For Overseas Assignment (N = 102)	N (Number of Volunteers Citing Reason)
Reading Material Re: Assignment/ Host Country	55
Talked to Returned Volunteers	14
Contact/Correspondence With Host Nationals	5
Finished Post-Secondary Program	8
Raised/Saved Money	38
Studied Language of Host Country	2
Attended Lectures/Workshops	43
Acquired Leave From Job/Quit Job	11
Job Training	4
Got Married	1
Took Care of Family Obligations	6
Travelled Before Leaving	1

Table 15

Volunteers' Rating of Involvement of Sponsoring Agency in
Their Preparations For Overseas

Degree of Involvement of Sponsoring Agency	N	%
Always Involved	36	32.7
Frequently Involved	43	39.1
Sometimes Involved	21	19.1
Rarely Involved	5	4.5
Never Involved	5	4.5
Total Number Responding	110	

Table 16

Number and Percentages of Volunteers Attending An Orientation Program

Response	N	%
<hr/>		
Yes	106	94.6
No	5	4.5
None Offered	1	.9
<hr/>		
Total Number Responding	112	
<hr/>		

Table 17

Length and Number of Orientation Sessions of Volunteers

Length			Number of Sessions		
	N	%		N	%

2 Weeks or Less	53	53.5	One	33	40.2
2 - 3 Weeks	66	66.7	Two	31	37.8
Longer Than 3 Weeks	33	33.3	Three or More	18	22.0

Total Number					
Responding	99			82	

Table 18

Volunteers' Rating of Orientation Program

Rating	N	%
Excellent	27	24.8
Very Good	44	40.4
Good	23	21.1
Fair	13	11.9
Poor	2	1.8
Total Number Responding	109	

Table 19

Volunteers' Rating of Degree and Duration of Culture Shock
Experienced Upon Entry to the Host Country

Rating	N	%	Duration of	N	%
			Culture Shock		
Very High	5	4.4	≤2 Months	55	58.5
High	26	22.8	>2 Months	39	41.5
Moderate	44	38.6			
Low	33	28.9			
None	6	5.3			
Total Number					
Responding	114			94	

Table 20

Volunteers' Frequency of Specific Feelings While Overseas And Upon Return Home

Feeling	Upon Entry		Upon Return Home	
	% Expressing Some Frequency of Specific Feeling	% Expressing Little or No Frequency of Feeling	% Expressing Some Frequency of Feeling	% Expressing Little or No Frequency of Feeling
Disillusionment	59.8	40.2	55.4	44.6
Frustration	83.1	17.0	65.2	34.8
Anxiety	46.0	54.0	42.3	57.7
Irritability	40.5	59.5	40.5	59.5
Confusion	33.5	66.5	31.5	68.5
Distrust	35.7	64.3	17.1	82.9
Withdrawal	22.4	77.6	26.3	73.7
Depression	26.8	73.2	32.8	67.2
Apathy	22.2	77.8	22.1	77.9
Personal Well-Being	97.2	2.8	89.2	10.8
Helpfulness	95.5	4.5	84.3	15.7
Helplessness	44.2	55.8	35.5	64.5
Insecurity	35.7	64.3	31.9	68.1
Disoriented	23.2	76.8	30.9	69.1
Euphoria	60.9	39.1	40.8	59.2
Misunderstood	63.4	30.6	49.1	50.9
Vulnerable	49.6	50.4	30.6	69.4
Aloneness	55.0	45.0	47.7	52.3
Incompetence	49.1	50.9	30.8	69.2
Feelings of Unreality	25.4	74.6	27.9	72.1
Poor Concentration	71.4	28.6	25.5	74.5
Crying	10.7	89.3	14.5	85.5

(table continued)

	Upon Entry		Upon Return Home	
	% Expressing	% Expressing	% Expressing	% Expressing
	Some Frequency	Little or No	Some	Little or No
	of Specific	Frequency	Frequency	Frequency
Feeling	Feeling	of Feeling	of Feeling	of Feeling
Increased Alcohol/ Smoking	22.7	77.3	9.9	90.1
Fatigue	45.1	54.9	27.3	72.7
Changes in Appetite	40.6	59.4	24.3	75.7
Digestive Disorders	30.9	69.1	8.2	91.8
Changes in Sleeping Patterns	22.4	77.6	16.2	83.8
Headaches	9.8	90.2	6.3	93.7
Joint/Back/Muscular Pain	5.4	94.6	10.0	90.0
Skin Disorders	10.0	90.0	2.7	97.3
Diarrhea/Constipation	34.3	65.7	7.2	92.8
Weakness/Dizziness	12.7	87.3	4.7	95.3
Nausea	10.4	89.6	1.9	98.1

Table 21

Volunteers' Rating of Their Degree of Immersion in the Foreign Culture

Rate of Immersion	N	%
<hr/>		
Very High	22	19.3
High	34	29.8
Moderate	41	36.0
Low/None	17	14.9
<hr/>		
Total Number Responding	114	
<hr/>		

Table 22

Volunteers' Ratings on Statements As They Relate to Their Overseas Situation

Statements Relating to Situation Overseas	Ratings				
	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Contact With Local People					
At Work	87	23	3	1	-
Contact With Local People					
Socially	25	52	27	8	1
Contact With People of					
Similar Culture As					
Mine At Work	21	26	27	26	13
Contact With People of					
Similar Culture As					
Mine Socially	9	49	34	20	-
Amount of Correspondence					
With Family/Friends					
At Home	27	59	26	1	1
Frequency of Home Sickness	1	10	25	54	23

Table 23

Number and Percentages of Volunteers Re Decision to Enrol In
An Overseas Program and Rating of Overseas Experience

Response	N	%	Rating	N	%
Yes	109	97.3	Very Happy	86	77.5
No	3	2.7	Happy	21	18.9
			Ambivalent	3	2.7
			Somewhat Unhappy	1	.9
			Very Unhappy	-	-
<hr/>					
Total Number					
Responding	112			111	

Table 24

Volunteers' Feelings About Returning Home

Feeling	N	%
<hr/>		
Very Happy	32	28.3
Somewhat Happy	40	35.4
Ambivalent	26	23.0
Somewhat Unhappy	10	8.8
Very Unhappy	5	4.4
<hr/>		
Total Number Responding	113	
<hr/>		

Table 25

Volunteers' Methods of Preparation for Return

Method of Preparation	N (Number of Volunteers Citing Method)
Financial	109
Professional	111
Personal	108

Table 26

Volunteers' Rating of Sponsoring Agency's Involvement With
Return Preparation

Rating	N	%
Always Involved	5	4.6
Frequently Involved	21	19.3
Sometimes Involved	33	30.3
Rarely Involved	30	27.5
Never Involved	20	18.3
Total Number Responding	109	

Table 27

Number of Volunteers Who Decided To Change Lifestyle and
Degree of Success In Making Changes

Change?	N	Degree of Success	N
Yes	47	Very High/High	33
No	64	Moderate/Low	18
		None	1
Total Number			
Responding	111		52

Table 28

Length of Volunteers' Overseas Assignment in Relation to
Original Contract Time

Length of Time Overseas	N	%
<hr/>		
Longer Than Contract Time	33	28.9
Same Time As Contracted	65	57.0
Shorter Than Contract Time	16	14.0
<hr/>		
Total Number Responding	114	
<hr/>		

Table 29

Volunteers' Rating of Feelings Upon Return Home

Rating	N	%
Very Happy	30	26.5
Somewhat Happy	32	28.3
Ambivalent	26	23.0
Somewhat Unhappy	20	17.7
Very Unhappy	5	4.4
Total Number Responding	113	

Table 30

Volunteers' Responses to Statements Related to Feelings Upon Return Home

Statement of Feelings Upon Return	Number		Number Rarely/ Never Felt	
	Always/Often/ Sometimes		Never Felt	
	Felt This Way	%	This Way	%

Out of Touch	80	72.1	31	27.9
Financial Concerns	71	64.0	40	36.0
Employment Concerns	64	58.7	45	41.3
Housing Problems	27	24.5	83	75.5
Loss of Status	19	17.4	90	82.6
Pace of Life Too Fast	65	59.1	45	40.9
Too Much Emphasis/Schedules	60	54.5	50	45.5
Too Much Red Tape	49	45.0	65	55.0
Lack of Interest of Others	70	63.1	41	36.9
Ignorance of Canadians Re				
Development	102	91.3	9	8.1
Pressure/Stress From Family				
and Friends	42	38.5	67	61.5
Unable to Use New Skills	53	49.1	55	50.9

Table 31

Returned Volunteers' Rating of Adjustment and Degree of Stress
Felt Upon Return Home

Degree of Stress	N	%	Rating of Adjustment	N	%
Very High/High	33	29.5	Very Good/Good	96	88.1
Moderate/Low	71	63.4	Fair/Poor	13	11.9
None	8	9.1			
Total Number					
Responding	112			109	

Table 32

Length of Time It Took Returned Volunteers to Feel 'At Home'
Again

Length of Time	N	%
Six Months or Less	53	46.1
More Than Six Months	62	53.9
Total Number Responding	115	

Table 33

Number of Volunteers Involved in Reorientation Programs, Their Rating of the Program, and Their Feeling Re Changes

Involved?	N	P	Rating	N	P	Changes?	N	P
Yes	25	22.1	Very Good	5	4.9	Yes	35	64.8
No	29	25.7	Good	9	8.7	No	19	35.2
None Offered	38	33.6	Fair	7	6.8			
Unaware of			Poor/Useless	13	12.6			
Program	21	18.6	N/A	69	57.0			
Total Number								
Responding	113			103			54	

Table 34

Demographic Data of Volunteers By Sponsoring Agency and Length of Time Since Return

Demographic Data	Sponsoring Agency				Length of Time Since Return			
	CUSO		CCI		<10 Years		≥10 Years	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<u>Gender</u>								
Male	53	58.2	12	50.0	37	58.7	26	53.8
Female	38	41.8	12	50.0	26	41.3	24	46.2
Total No. Responding	91		24		63		52	
<u>Age</u>								
20 - 25	57	62.6	17	70.8	50	79.4	24	46.2
26 - 35	26	28.6	5	20.8	11	17.5	20	38.5
36 - 45	5	5.5	-	-	-	-	5	9.6
46+	3	3.3	2	8.3	2	3.2	3	5.8
Total No. Responding	91		24		63		52	
<u>Marital Status</u>								
Single	65	71.4	20	83.4	48	76.2	37	71.2
Married	20	22.0	4	16.7	14	22.2	10	19.2
Common Law	3	3.0	-	-	-	-	3	5.8
Divorced	3	3.3	0	-	1	1.6	2	3.8
Total No. Responding	91		24		63		52	
<u>Sponsoring Agency</u>								
CUSO	91	100.0	-	-	55	87.3	36	69.2
CCI	-	-	24	100.0	8	12.7	16	30.8
Total No. Responding	91		24		63		52	
<u>Length of Time Since Return</u>								
<10 Years	55	47.8	8	33.3	63	100.0	-	-
≥10 Years	36	31.3	16	66.7	-	-	52	100.0
Total No. Responding	91		24		63		52	

Table 35

Volunteers' Area of Overseas Placement By Sponsoring Agency and Time Since Return Home

Area of Overseas Placement	Sponsoring Agency				Length of Time Since Return			
	CUSO		CCI		< 10 Years		≥ 10 Years	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Africa	49	54.4	15	62.5	35	56.5	29	55.8
Caribbean	10	11.1	2	8.3	9	14.5	3	5.8
South America	4	4.2	1	4.2	4	6.5	1	1.9
Central America	1	1.1	1	4.2	-	-	2	3.8
Asia	10	11.1	4	16.7	9	14.5	5	9.6
South Pacific	16	17.8	1	4.2	5	8.1	12	23.1
Total Number Responding	90		24		62		52	

Table 36

Volunteers' Living Arrangements While Overseas By Sponsoring Agency and Time Since Return Home

Living Arrangements	Sponsoring Agency		Length of Time Since Return	
	CUSO	CCI	<10 Years	≥ 10 Years
While Overseas	N	N	N	N
<hr/>				
Had At Least One Roommate	49	7	35	21
of Same/Similar Culture				
Total Number Responding = 56				
<hr/>				
Had At Least One Roommate	12	11	8	15
Who Was a Native Of the				
Host Country				
Total Number Responding = 23				
<hr/>				
Lived Alone	27 (30%)	6 (25%)	16 (28.6%)	15 (28.8%)
Lived With Others	63 (70%)	18 (75%)	44 (69.8%)	37 (71.2%)
Total Number Responding = 114				
<hr/>				

Table 37

Volunteers' Rating of Living Arrangements By Sponsoring Agency and Time Since Return Home

Rating of Living Arrangements	Sponsoring Agency				Length of Time Since Return			
	CUSO		CCI		< 10 Years		≥ 10 Years	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Very Satisfactory	59	66.3	11	45.8	43	70.5	27	51.9
Somewhat Satisfactory	22	24.7	5	20.8	13	21.3	14	26.9
Tolerable	7	7.9	7	29.2	4	6.6	10	19.2
Somewhat Unsatisfactory	1	1.1	-	-	-	-	1	1.9
Very Unsatisfactory	-	-	1	4.2	1	1.6	-	-
Total Number								
Responding = 113	89		24		61		52	

Table 38

Volunteers' Rating of Work Placement and Language Barriers By Sponsoring Agency and Length of Time Since Return

Rating of Work Placement	Sponsoring Agency				Length of Time Since Return			
	CUSO		CCI		<10 Years		≥ 10 Years	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Very Satisfactory	59	66.3	9	37.5	37	59.7	31	60.8
Somewhat Satisfactory	20	22.5	11	45.8	16	25.8	15	29.4
Tolerable	4	4.5	1	4.2	2	3.2	3	5.9
Somewhat Unsatisfactory	3	3.4	1	4.2	3	4.8	1	2.0
Very Unsatisfactory	3	3.4	2	8.3	4	6.5	1	2.0
Total Number								
Responding = 113	89		24		62		51	

Difficulty Re:

Language Barriers

Always Problematic	1	11	-	-	-	-	1	1.9
Frequently Problematic	6	6.6	3	12.5	5	7.9	4	7.7
Sometimes Problematic	38	41.8	5	20.8	24	38.1	19	36.5
Rarely Problematic	37	40.7	10	41.7	26	41.3	21	40.4
Never Problematic	9	9.9	6	25.0	8	12.7	7	13.5
Total Number								
Responding = 115	91		24		63		52	

Table 39

Volunteers' Reasons For Applying To Go Overseas By Sponsoring Agency and Time Since Return

Reasons for Applying To Go Overseas (N = 113)	Sponsoring Agency		Length of Time Since Return	
	CUSO	CCI	< 10 Years	≥ 10 Years
	N	N	N	N
Personal Development	10	3	7	6
Seek Adventure/Challenge	32	8	20	20
Altruism	23	2	15	10
Experience Different Culture	32	15	26	21
Do Something Worthwhile	13	-	8	5
Time to Make Future Plans	2	-	1	1
Career Development	13	-	5	8
Travel	18	8	18	8
Health Reasons	1	-	1	-
Curiosity	3	-	1	2
Encouraged By Others	1	-	1	-
Learn About Development	1	1	1	1

N = Number giving this response as one of their reasons

Table 40

Volunteers Attending Orientation and Rating of Orientation By Sponsoring Agency and Time Since Return Home

Attending Orientation? (N = 112)	Sponsoring Agency				Length of Time Since Return			
	CUSO		CCI		<10 Years		≥ 10 Years	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	83	94.3	23	95.8	57	95.0	49	94.2
No	4	4.5	1	4.2	2	3.3	3	5.8
None Offered	1	1.1	-	-	1	1.7	-	-
Rating of Orientation								
(N = 110)								
Excellent	20	23.3	7	30.4	14	23.3	13	26.5
Very Good	32	37.2	12	52.2	21	35.0	23	46.9
Good	20	23.3	3	13.0	15	25.0	8	16.3
Fair	13	15.1	-	-	9	15.0	4	8.2
Poor	1	1.2	1	4.3	1	1.7	1	2.0

Table 41

Volunteers' Rating of Degree and Duration of Culture Shock Upon Entry to the Host Country By Sponsoring Agency and Time Since Return

Rating Degree of Culture Shock	Sponsoring Agency				Length of Time Since Return			
	CUSO		CCI		<10 Years		≥ 10 Years	
	(N = 91)		(N = 24)		(N = 63)		(N = 52)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Very High	5	5.6	-	-	2	3.2	3	5.8
High	18	20.0	8	33.3	12	19.4	14	26.9
Moderate	37	41.1	7	29.2	26	41.9	18	34.6
Low	24	26.7	9	37.5	20	32.3	13	25.0
None	6	6.7	-	-	2	3.2	4	7.7
Total Number Responding	90		24		62		52	
Duration								
≤2 Months	39	52.0	16	84.2	31	60.7	24	55.8
>2 Months	36	48.0	3	15.8	20	39.2	19	44.2
Total Number Responding	75		19		51		43	

Table 42

Percent of Volunteers Expressing Some Frequency of Identified Feelings While Overseas and Upon Return by Sponsoring Agency and Time Since Return

Feeling	Sponsoring Agency				Length of Time Since Return			
	CUSO		CCI		< 10 Years		≥ 10 Years	
	Upon Entry	Upon Return	Upon Entry	Upon Return	Upon Entry	Upon Return	Upon Entry	Upon Return
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Disillusionment	61.4	52.3	54.0	66.7	56.7	56.7	63.5	53.8
Frustration	81.8	61.4	87.5	79.2	80.0	63.3	86.5	67.3
Anxiety	47.1	40.2	41.7	50.0	42.4	43.3	50.0	41.2
Irritability	40.2	37.9	41.7	50.0	42.4	40.0	38.5	41.2
Confusion	40.2	28.7	45.8	41.7	33.9	33.3	50.0	29.4
Distrust	36.4	18.4	33.3	12.5	38.3	21.7	32.7	11.8
Withdrawal	20.4	24.4	29.1	33.3	21.7	28.3	25.0	24.0
Depression	29.5	33.7	16.6	29.2	25.0	33.3	28.8	32.0
Apathy	20.2	18.6	29.2	37.5	21.2	23.3	23.5	22.0
Personal Well-Being	86.8	87.5	65.2	95.2	94.6	90.7	100.0	87.2
Helpfulness	80.7	85.9	56.7	78.3	98.3	89.8	92.2	77.6
Helplessness	4.4	33.7	20.8	41.7	14.0	36.7	44.2	34.0
Insecurity	31.8	30.2	50.0	37.5	35.0	33.3	36.5	30.0
Disoriented	20.5	29.1	33.3	37.5	16.7	36.7	30.8	24.0
Euphoria	59.3	42.4	66.7	34.8	61.0	41.7	60.8	39.6
Misunderstood	70.5	46.5	62.5	58.3	73.3	53.3	64.7	44.0
Vulnerable	48.9	31.0	50.0	29.2	50.0	30.0	49.8	31.4
Aloneness	51.7	47.1	66.7	50.0	52.5	48.3	57.7	47.1
Incompetence	46.6	29.1	58.4	37.5	48.3	32.2	59.0	29.4
Feelings of Unreality	26.7	26.4	20.8	33.3	22.0	28.3	29.4	27.5
Poor Concentration	12.5	22.1	4.2	37.5	8.3	23.3	13.5	28.0
Crying	11.4	14.0	8.3	16.7	6.7	13.3	15.3	16.0
Increased Alcohol/ Smoking	27.6	9.2	4.3	12.5	25.4	15.0	19.6	3.9
Fatigue	45.9	29.9	41.7	17.4	42.4	23.3	48.1	32.0

(table continued)

Feeling	Sponsoring Agency				Length of Time Since Return			
	CUSO		CCI		< 10 Years		≥ 10 Years	
	Upon Entry	Upon Return	Upon Entry	Upon Return	Upon Entry	Upon Return	Upon Entry	Upon Return
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Changes in Appetite	35.2	20.7	58.3	37.5	35.6	13.3	46.2	37.3
Digestive Disorders	32.2	10.5	26.1	-	30.5	6.8	31.4	9.8
Changes in Sleeping Patterns	20.5	14.9	29.1	20.8	15.0	8.3	30.8	25.5
Headaches	10.2	7.0	8.3	4.2	10.0	5.1	9.6	7.8
Joint/Back/Muscular Pain	5.7	12.8	4.2	-	1.7	3.4	9.6	17.6
Skin Disorders	11.5	3.5	4.3	-	12.0	3.4	7.7	2.0
Diarrhea/Constipation	35.6	8.1	29.2	4.2	32.0	5.1	36.5	9.8
Weakness/Dizziness	10.5	4.8	20.8	4.2	6.9	5.2	19.2	4.0
Nausea	9.8	2.4	12.5	-	10.5	-	10.2	4.0

Table 44

Volunteers' Ratings on Statements As They Related to Their Overseas Situation By Sponsoring Agency and Time Since Return Home

Statement	Agency/Time		Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
	Since Return						
Contact With Local People At Work	CUSO		76.7	18.9	3.3	1.1	-
	CCI		75.0	25.0	-	-	-
	<10 Years		74.2	22.6	1.6	1.6	-
	≥10 Years		78.8	17.3	3.8	-	-
Contact With Local People Social	CUSO		20.0	46.7	24.4	8.9	-
	CCI		30.4	43.5	21.7	-	4.3
	<10 Years		19.4	48.4	24.2	8.1	-
	≥10 Years		25.5	43.1	23.5	5.9	2.0
Contact With People Same/ Similar Culture: Work	CUSO		21.1	24.4	25.6	23.3	5.6
	CCI		8.7	17.4	17.4	21.7	34.8
	<10 Years		24.2	25.8	22.6	22.6	4.8
	≥10 Years		11.8	19.6	25.5	23.5	19.6
Contact With People Same/ Similar Culture: Socially	CUSO		10.1	50.6	30.3	9.0	-
	CCI		-	17.4	30.4	52.2	-
	<10 Years		9.8	50.8	27.9	11.5	-
	≥10 Years		5.9	35.3	33.3	25.5	-
Amount of Correspondence With Family/Friends At Home	CUSO		22.2	53.3	24.4	-	-
	CCI		29.2	45.8	16.7	4.2	4.2
	<10 Years		27.4	56.5	16.1	-	-
	≥10 Years		19.2	46.2	30.8	1.9	1.9
Frequency of Homesickness	CUSO		1.1	5.6	21.1	53.3	18.9
	CCI		-	21.7	26.1	26.1	26.1
	<10 Years		-	11.3	21.0	43.5	24.2
	≥10 Years		2.0	5.9	23.5	52.9	15.7

Table 45

Volunteers' Overall Rating of the Overseas Program By Sponsoring Agency and Time Since Return

Rating	Sponsoring Agency				Length of Time Since Return			
	CUSO		CCI		<10 Years		≥ 10 Years	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Very Happy	70	80.5	16	66.7	49	81.7	37	72.5
Happy	14	16.1	7	29.2	10	16.7	11	21.6
Ambivalent	2	2.3	1	4.2	-	-	3	5.9
Somewhat Unhappy	1	1.1	-	-	1	1.7	-	-
Very Unhappy	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Total Number Responding = 111

Table 46

Volunteers' Feelings About Return Home By Sponsoring Agency and Time Since Return

Feelings About Return	Sponsoring Agency				Length of Time Since Return			
	CUSO		CCI		< 10 Years		≥ 10 Years	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Very Happy	22	24.7	10	41.7	16	26.2	16	30.8
Somewhat Happy	32	36.0	8	33.3	21	34.4	19	36.5
Ambivalent	24	27.0	2	8.3	17	27.9	9	17.3
Somewhat Unhappy	6	6.7	4	16.7	3	4.9	7	13.5
Very Unhappy	5	5.6	-	-	4	6.6	1	1.9

Total Number Responding = 109

Table 47

Volunteers' Initial Feelings Upon Return Home By Sponsoring Agency and Time Since Return

Reentry Rating	Sponsoring Agency				Length of Time Since Return			
	CUSO		CCI		<10 Years		≥10 Years	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Very Happy	21	23.6	9	37.5	10	16.1	20	39.2
Somewhat Happy	25	28.1	7	29.2	15	24.2	17	33.3
Ambivalent	24	27.0	2	8.3	22	35.2	4	7.8
Somewhat Unhappy	16	18.0	4	16.7	12	19.4	8	15.7
Very Unhappy	3	3.4	2	8.3	3	4.8	2	3.9

Total Number Responding = 113

Table 48

Volunteers' Response to Statements Related to Feeling Upon Return Home By Sponsoring Agency and Time Since Return

Statement of Feeling Upon Reentry	Sponsoring Agency		Length of Time Since Return	
	CUSO	CCI	< 10 Years	≥ 10 Years
Out of Touch	73.6	66.7	75.0	68.6
Financial Concerns	65.5	58.3	63.3	64.7
Employment Concerns	58.1	60.9	53.4	64.7
Housing Problems	26.7	16.7	23.7	25.5
Loss of Status	18.4	13.6	20.0	14.3
Pace of Life Too Fast	61.6	50.0	65.0	52.0
Too Much Emphasis/Schedules	54.7	54.2	61.0	47.1
Too Much Red Tape	41.2	58.3	44.1	46.0
Lack of Interest of Others	66.7	50.0	60.0	66.7
Ignorance of Canadians Re Development	93.1	87.5	91.7	92.2
Pressure/Stress From Family and Friends	38.8	37.5	44.1	32.0
Unable to Use New Skills	54.1	30.4	46.7	52.1

Table 49**Returned Volunteers' Rating of Stress By Sponsoring Agency and Time Since Return**

Rating of Stress	Sponsoring Agency				Length of Time Since Return			
	CUSO		CCI		<10 Years		≥ 10 Years	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Very High/High	24	27.3	9	37.5	22	36.1	11	21.6
Moderate/Low	56	63.6	15	62.5	35	57.4	36	70.6
None	8	9.1	-	-	4	6.6	4	7.8

Table 50

Returned Volunteers' Rating of Adjustment to Return By Sponsoring Agency and Time Since Return

Rating of Adjustment	Sponsoring Agency				Length of Time Since Return			
	CUSO		CCI		< 10 Years		≥ 10 Years	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Very Good/Good	77	90.6	19	79.2	53	89.8	43	86.0
Fair/Poor	8	9.4	5	20.8	6	10.2	7	14.0

Total Number Responding = 109

Table 51

Volunteers' Readjustment Time By Sponsoring Agency and Time Since Return

Length of Time	Sponsoring Agency				Length of Time Since Return			
	CUSO		CCI		< 10 Years		≥ 10 Years	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
≤ 6 Months	38	41.8	15	62.5	27	42.9	26	50.0
> 6 Months	53	58.2	9	37.5	36	57.1	26	50.0

Total Number Responding = 115

Table 52

Demographic Data of Group A (High Reentry Shock) and Group B (Low Reentry Shock)

At Time Of Assignment	Group A (N = 7)	Group B (N = 8)
<u>Age</u>		
20 - 25	6	2
26 - 35	1	2
36 - 45	-	1
46+ ₂	-	3
Total Number Responding	7	8
<u>Gender</u>		
Male	1	6
Female	6	2
Total Number Responding	7	8
<u>Marital Status</u>		
Single	6	6
Married	1	1
Common Law	-	1
Divorced	-	-
Total Number Responding	7	8

Group A = High Stress/Poor Adjustment/>6 Months Readjustment

Group B = No Stress/Good Readjustment

Table 53

Length of Time Since Return of Group A (High Reentry Shock)
and Group B (Low Reentry Shock)

Length of Time Since Return	Group A (N = 7)	Group B (N = 8)
<10 Years Since Return	2	
≥10 Years Since Return	5	

Group A = Respondents Reporting High Reentry Shock (High Stress/Poor Readjustment/>6 Months Readjustment Time)

Group B = Respondents Reporting Low Reentry Shock (Low Stress/Good Readjustment)

Table 54

Rating of Living Arrangements and Work Placement of Group A
(High Reentry Shock) and Group B (Low Reentry Shock)

Degree of Satisfaction	Group A	Group B
With Living Arrangements	(N = 7)	(N = 8)
<hr/>		
Very Satisfactory	6	7
Somewhat Satisfactory	1	1
Tolerable	-	-
Somewhat Unsatisfactory	-	-
Very Unsatisfactory	-	-
Total Number Responding	7	8

Rating of Work Placement

Very Satisfactory	5	4
Somewhat Satisfactory	-	1
Tolerable	1	1
Somewhat Unsatisfactory	-	-
Very Unsatisfactory	-	2
Total Number Responding	6	8

Table 55

Rating of Orientation Program of Group A (High Reentry Shock)
and Group B (Low Reentry Shock)

	Group A	Group B
Rating of Orientation	(N = 7)	(N = 8)
Excellent	1	2
Very Good	5	-
Good	-	3
Fair	1	2
Poor	-	-
Total Number Responding	7	7

Table 56

Degree and Length of Culture Shock of Group A (High Reentry Shock) and Group B (Low Reentry Shock)

	Group A	Group B
Degree of Culture Shock	(N = 7)	(N = 8)
Very High/High	1	-
Moderate/Low	6	6
None	-	2
Total Number Responding	7	8
<u>Length of Culture Shock</u>		
≤2 Months	2	6
>2 Months	5	1
Total Number Responding	7	7

Table 57

Ratings of Specific Feelings While Overseas and Upon Return By
Group A (High Reentry Shock) and Group B (Low Reentry Shock)

Feeling	Number Expressing Some Frequency of Feeling			
	<u>Upon Entry</u>		<u>Upon Reentry</u>	
	Group A	Group B	Group A	Group B
Disillusionment	4	5	6	1
Frustration	3	5	7	8
Anxiety	3	2	7	8
Irritability	2	3	7	8
Confusion	2	4	7	8
Distrust	2	2	7	8
Withdrawal	1	1	7	8
Depression	1	3	7	8
Apathy	1	3	7	8
Personal Well-Being	6	7	7	7
Helpfulness	7	7	7	8
Helplessness	2	4	7	8
Insecurity	3	2	7	8
Disoriented	1	1	7	8
Euphoria	4	4	7	8
Misunderstood	4	4	7	8
Vulnerable	4	2	7	8
Aloneness	5	4	7	8
Incompetence	2	2	6	8
Feelings of Unreality	2	2	7	8
Poor Concentration	-	2	7	8
Crying	2	1	7	7

(table continued)

Number Expressing Some Frequency of Feeling				
Feeling	<u>Upon Entry</u>		<u>Upon Reentry</u>	
	Group A	Group B	Group A	Group B
<hr/>				
Increased Alcohol/ Smoking	1	2	7	8
Fatigue	4	4	6	8
Changes in Appetite	4	1	7	8
Digestive Disorders	3	1	7	8
Changes in Sleeping Patterns	2	1	7	8
Headaches	-	1	7	8
Joint/Back/Muscular Pain	-	1	7	8
Skin Disorders	1	-	7	8
Diarrhea/Constipation	5	-	7	8
Weakness/Dizziness	-	1	-	8
Nausea	-	-	-	-

Table 58

Rating of Degree of Immersion in The Foreign Culture By Group
A (High Reentry Shock) and Group B (Low Reentry Shock)

	Group A	Group B
Rating of Immersion	(N = 7)	(N = 8)
<hr/>		
Very High	1	-
High	3	3
Moderate	1	4
Low/None	2	1
<hr/>		
Total Number Responding	7	8
<hr/>		

Table 59

Rating of Statements Relating to the Overseas Situation By Group A (High Reentry Shock)
and Group B (Low Reentry Shock)

Statement	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
<u>Group A Ratings (N = 7)</u>					
Contact With Local People At Work	6	1	-	-	-
Contact With Local People Socially	2	3	2	-	-
Contact With People of Same/ Similar Culture: Work	1	-	4	1	1
Contact With People of Same/ Similar Culture: Socially	1	2	2	2	-
Amount of Correspondence With Family and Friends At Home	4	3	-	-	-
Frequency of Homesickness	-	1	1	4	1
<u>Group B Ratings (N = 8)</u>					
Contact With Local People At Work	8	-	-	-	-
Contact With Local People Socially	1	4	3	-	-
Contact With People of Same/ Similar Culture: Work	1	1	3	3	-
Contact With People of Same/ Similar Culture: Socially	-	3	3	2	-
Amount of Correspondence With Family and Friends At Home	-	6	2	-	-
Frequency of Homesickness	1	-	3	-	4

Table 60

Overall Rating of the Overseas Experience By Group A (High Reentry Shock) and Group B (Low Reentry Shock)

Rating of Experience	Group A (N = 7)	Group B (N = 8)
Very Happy	6	4
Somewhat Happy	1	1
Ambivalent	-	1
Somewhat Unhappy	-	-
Very Unhappy	-	-
Total Number Responding	7	6

Table 61

Feeling About Return Home and Upon Initial Reentry of Group A
(High Reentry Shock) and Group B (Low Reentry Shock)

Rating	<u>Before Reentry</u>		<u>Upon Reentry</u>	
	Group A	Group B	Group A	Group B
	(N = 7)	(N = 8)	(N = 7)	(N = 8)
Very Happy	1	3	-	4
Somewhat Happy	1	1	1	3
Ambivalent	1	1	-	1
Somewhat Unhappy	2	1	3	-
Very Unhappy	2	1	3	-
Total Number				
Responding	7	7	7	8

Table 62

Number and Percentage of Group A (High Reentry Shock) and Group B (Low Reentry Shock) Who Made A Decision to Change Their Lifestyle and Ratings of Success In Implementing Changes

Change?	<u>Group A</u>		<u>Group B</u>	
	(N = 7)		(N = 8)	
	N	%	N	%
Yes	6	85.7	2	28.6
No	1	14.3	5	71.4
Total Number Responding	7		7	

Success of Implementation

Very High/High	5	-
Moderate	1	2
Low	-	-
None	-	1
Total Number Responding	6	3

Table 63

Responses to Statements Related to Feelings Upon Return Home
by Group A (High Reentry Shock) and Group B (Low Reentry
Shock)

Statement	<u>Group A</u>		<u>Group B</u>	
	(Always- Sometimes)	%	(Always- Sometimes)	%
Out of Touch	7	100.0	4	50.0
Financial Concerns	7	100.0	3	37.5
Employment Concerns	4	57.1	3	37.5
Housing Problems	-	00.0	2	25.0
Loss of Status	1	14.3	-	00.0
Pace of Life Too Fast	6	85.7	2	25.0
Too Much Emphasis/ Schedules	7	100.0	2	25.0
Too Much Red Tape	2	28.6	4	50.0
Lack of Interest of Others	7	100.0	4	50.0
Ignorance of Canadians Re Development	7	100.0	5	62.5
Pressure/Stress From Family and Friends	5	71.4	1	12.5
Unable to Use New Skills	5	71.4	2	25.0

Table 64

Length of Readjustment Time For Group A (High Reentry Shock)
and Group B (Low Reentry Shock)

Time	<u>Group A</u>		<u>Group B</u>	
	(N = 7)		(N = 8)	
	N	%	N	%
≤6 Months	0	00.0	5	62.5
>6 Months	7	100.0	3	37.5

Table 65

Rating of Satisfaction With Canadian Society At Different Times During the Overseas Assignment for Group A and Group B

Specific Time	Rating			
	Very High	High	Moderate	Low/Very Low
<u>Group A</u>				
Before Leaving	14.3%(1)	57.1%(4)	14.3%(1)	14.3%(1)
During Assignment	14.3%(1)	57.1%(4)	-	28.6%(2)
Upon Reentry	-	14.3%(1)	14.3%(1)	71.4%(5)
At Present	-	14.3%(1)	57.1%(4)	28.6%(2)
Total Number Responding = 7				
<u>Group B</u>				
Before Leaving	-	33.3%(2)	33.3%(2)	33.3%(2)
During Assignment	-	50.0%(3)	16.7%(1)	33.3%(2)
Upon Return	-	50.0%(3)	16.7%(1)	33.3%(2)
At Present	-	50.0%(3)	-	50.0%(3)
Total Number Responding = 6				

Group A = High Reentry Shock

Group B = Low Reentry Shock

References

- Adler, N.J. (1991). International dimensions of organizational behavior (2nd edition). Boston: PWS-Kent Publishing Co.
- Adler, N.J. (1981). Reentry: Managing cross-cultural transitions. Group and Organizational Studies, 6(3), 341-356.
- Adler, N.J. (1980). Reentry: A study of the dynamic coping processes used by repatriated employees to enhance effectiveness in the organization and personal. PhD. Dissertation, University of California and Los Angeles.
- Adler, P.S. (1975, Fall). The transitional experience: An alternative view of culture shock. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 15(4).
- Adler, N., Theoret, R., Kealey, D., & Hawes, F. (1979). Reentry: A guide for returning home. CIDA.
- Bochner, S., Lin, A., & McLeod, B. (1980). Anticipated role conflicts of returning overseas students. Journal of Social Psychology, 110, 265-272.
- Bowers, D.F. (1952). Foreign influences in American life. New York: Peter Smith.
- Brein, M., & David, K.H. (1971). International communication and the adjustment of the sojourner. Psychological Bulletin, 76(3).

- Brislin, R.W. (1974). The establishment of reentry transition seminar for overseas sojourners. Paper presented at Reentry/Transition Workshop at Wingspread, Racine, Wisconsin.
- Brislin, R.W., & Van Buren, H. (1974, Spring). Can they go home again? International Education and Cultural Exchange, ix(4), 19-24.
- Burton-Adams, K. (1989). The nature and management of teacher stress: A manual for classroom teachers. Unpublished Masters thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland. St. John's, NF.
- Cagney, W.J. (1975, September). Executive reentry: The problems of repatriation. Personnel Journal, pp. 487-488.
- Canadian Foreign Services Community Association. (1980, September). Selected papers on mobility and family in the Canadian foreign service. Ottawa: Foreign Services Community Association.
- CCI: In Brief. (1990). Pamphlet published by CCI.
- Church, A. (1982). Sojourner adjustment. Psychological Bulletin, 91(3), 540-572.
- Cleveland, H., Mangone, G.J., & Adams, J.C. (1960). The overseas American. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Cormack, M. (1969, Fall). Exchange: ----- to what? International Education and Cultural Exchange.
- CUSO Bulletin. (1991). CUSO office.

- Dimarco, N. (1974). Stress and adaptation in cross-cultural transition. Psychological Reports, 35, 279-285.
- Gama, E.M.P., & Pederson, P. (1977, Winter). Readjustment problems of Brazilian returnees from graduate studies in the U.S. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 1(4).
- Gleason, T.P. (1969). Social adjustment patterns and manifestations of world mindedness of overseas-experienced American youth. PhD. Dissertation, Michigan State University.
- Gmelch, G. (1981). The readjustment of returned migrants in western islands. In R. King (Ed.), Return migration and regional economic problems (pp. 152-170). London: Croon Helm.
- Gullahorn, J.T., & Gullahorn, J.E. (1963, July). An extension of the u-curve hypothesis. The Journal of Social Issues, xix(3), 33-47.
- Guthrie, G.M. (1975). A behavior analysis of cultural learning. In R.W. Brislin, S. Bochner and W. Lonner (Eds.), Cross-cultural perspectives on learning (pp. 95-115). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hall, E. (1959). The silent language. New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc.

- Harrison, R., & Hopkins, R. (1967). The design of cross-cultural training: An alternative to the university model. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 3, 431-466.
- Higginbotham, H.N. (1979). Cultural issues in providing psychological services for foreign students in the United States. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 3, 49-85.
- Hinkle, R.J. (1972-73). Have knapsack--will travel. International Education and Cultural Exchange, viii(3).
- Hogan, J.H. (1983, March). Culture shock and reverse culture-shock. Implications for juniors and seniors at home. Huston, Texas: American College Personnel Association.
- Howard, C. (1980, October). The expatriate manager and the role of the MNC. Personnel Journal, 59(1), 838-844.
- Howard, C. (1974). The returning overseas executive: Culture shock in reverse. Human Management, 13(2), 22-26.
- Jacobson, E. (1963). Sojourn research: A definition of the field. Journal of Social Issues, 19(3), 123-129.
- Jordan, K.A. (1982). The adaptation process of third culture dependent youth as they reenter the U.S. and enter college: An exploratory study. Dissertation Abstracts International, 42(8-A), 35-45. Michigan State University.
- Kelman, H.C. (1965). International Behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.

- Koester, J. (1984, July). Communication and the intercultural reentry: A course proposal. Communication Education, 11(3), 251-256.
- Kraemer, A.J. (1975, winter). Cultural self-awareness and communication. International Education and Cultural Exchange, 8(3).
- La Brack, M. (1985, March). State of the art research on reentry. An essay on directions for the future. Paper prepared for delivery to the 26th Annual Convention of the International Studies Association.
- La Brack, B. (1991). The missing link. The process of integrating orientation and reentry. Unpublished article. California: University of the Pacific.
- Locke, S.A., & Feinsod, F.M. (1982, Winter). Psychological preparation for young adults travelling abroad. Adolescence, 17(68), 815-819.
- Lundstedt, S. (1963). An introduction to some evolving problems in cross-cultural research. Journal of Social Issues, 19(3), 1-19.
- Martin, J.N. (1986). Communication in the intercultural reentry: Student sojourners perceptions of change in reentry relationship. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10(1), 1-22.

- Martin, J.N. (1984). The intercultural reentry: Conceptualizations and directions for further research. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 8, pp. 115-134.
- Michielli, J.A. (1969). A study abroad advisor on campus: An expanding role. International Education and Cultural Exchange, 5(1), 49-54.
- Oberg, K. (1960). Culture shock and the problems of adjustment to a new cultural environment. Practical Anthropology, (7), 177-182.
- Perez-Ariago, & Guendelman, S. (1989). Role models and parallel lives: Mexican migrant women return home. In R. Appleyard (Ed.), The impact of international migration in developing countries. Paris: OECD.
- Raschio, R.A. (1987). College student perceptions of reverse culture shock and reentry adjustment. Journal of College Student Personnel, 28(2), 156-162.
- Sell, D.K. (1983). Research on attitude change in U.S. students who participate in foreign study experiences. Past findings and suggestions for further research. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 7, 131-147.
- Smith, M., Brewster, F., Janes, T., Ozeki, R., & Roth, S. (1963, July). A factorial study of morale among peace corps teachers in Ghana. The Journal of Social Issues, xix(3), 10-32.

- Spradley, J.P., & Philips, M. (1972). Culture and stress: A quantitative analysis. American Anthropologist, 74, 518-519.
- Stein, M.I. (1966). Volunteers for peace. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Stolley, R.B. (1965, March). The reentry crisis. Life Magazine, pp. 98-110.
- Sussman, N.M. (1986). Reentry research and training methods and implications. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10, 235-254.
- Torbiorn, I. (1982). Living abroad: Personal adjustment and personnel policy in the overseas setting. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Uehara, A. (1986). The nature of American student reentry adjustment and perceptions of the sojourn experience. Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10, 415-438.
- Useem, J., & Useem, R. (1967). The interface of a third culture: A study of American communication in India. Journal of Social Issues, 2-3, 130-143.
- Useem, J., Useem, R., & Donoghue, J. (1963, Fall). Men in the middle of the third culture. The roles of American and non-western people in cross-cultural administration. Human Organization, 22, 169-179.
- Werkman, S.L. (1983, Spring). Coming home. Adjustment problems of Americans to the U.S. after living abroad. The International Schools Journal, 49-64.

Westwood, M.J., Lawrence, S.W., & Paul, D. (1986). Preparing for returning: A program for the sojourning student. International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling, 2, 221-230.

APPENDIX**Oversea's Experience Questionnaire**

Dear Returned Volunteer:

I am presently conducting a study of the experiences of returned overseas volunteers. I gather from your sponsoring agency that you have been involved in living and working overseas.

Very little research has been completed on the experiences of people returned from overseas assignments. Even fewer studies have focused on Canadian returned volunteers and the effective provision of reentry services.

I would greatly appreciate your assistance in completing this study. I have enclosed a questionnaire that covers many aspects of your overseas assignment; I know that we are all tired of completing questionnaires, but I hope that completing this one will be a somewhat pleasant and useful experience. Please note that all responses are kept confidential.

If you have any questions or comments regarding this study, please feel free to contact me at (709) 463-8873, or you may contact my thesis advisor, Mildred Cahill, at the Department of Educational Psychology, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, NF (709) 737-6980.

Again, thank you for your support!

Yours sincerely,

Debbie Williams
Graduate Student
Department of Educational
Psychology, MUN

OVERSEAS'S EXPERIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

I. General Data

1. Name: _____
2. Age: _____ 3. Gender: Male _____ Female _____
4. a) Time of overseas assignment: Mt _____ Yr _____ to Mt _____ Yr _____
b) Age at that time: _____
5. Indicate your marital status at time of overseas assignment:
i) single _____ iii) common law _____ v) divorced _____
ii) married _____ iv) separated _____ vi) widowed _____
6. a) During your overseas stay did you live mostly:
i) Alone
ii) With others (indicate # of roommates) (circle one)
1 2 3 4 or more
b) How many of your roommates were:
i) of same or similar cultural background as you _____
ii) spoke fluently in your native tongue _____
iii) was a native of the host country _____

Comments: _____

7. How satisfactory were those living arrangements? (circle one)

Very Satisfactory	1
Somewhat Satisfactory	2
Tolerable	3
Somewhat Unsatisfactory	4
Very Unsatisfactory	5
8. a) Indicate your education level at the time of your overseas assignment:

i) completed elementary school	iv) university courses
ii) completed high school	v) university graduate
iii) trade/vocational school	vi) nursing
vii) other (specify) _____	
- b) Please indicate your training or course of study.

- c) If presently employed, what is your present occupation?

9. a) With which agency did you travel overseas?
 i) CUSO ____
 ii) Canadian Crossroads International ____
 iii) Other (specify) ____
- b) To which country were you assigned? _____
- c) Please indicate the approximate population of the community where you lived. _____
- d) What was your job assignment while overseas? _____
- e) Rate your overall satisfaction with this placement:
- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Very Satisfactory | 1 |
| Somewhat Satisfactory | 2 |
| Tolerable | 3 |
| Somewhat Unsatisfactory | 4 |
| Very Unsatisfactory | 5 |
- Explain: _____

10. Rate the degree to which language barriers were problematic for you in this host country:
- | | |
|------------------------|---|
| Always Problematic | 1 |
| Frequently Problematic | 2 |
| Sometimes Problematic | 3 |
| Rarely Problematic | 4 |
| Never Problematic | 5 |
- Comments: _____

11. a) Indicate your travel outside Canada previous to this assignment:
- | <u>Country</u> | <u>Reason For Travel</u> | <u>Length of Visit</u> |
|----------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| _____ | _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ | _____ |
- b) Indicate your travel outside Canada after this assignment:
- | <u>Country</u> | <u>Reason For Travel</u> | <u>Length of Visit</u> |
|----------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| _____ | _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ | _____ |
12. a) Looking back, what were your reasons for applying to go overseas? _____
- b) Briefly, what did you want to do while living overseas at that time? _____

II Orientation

13. a) How did you prepare for your overseas assignment (eg: financially, professionally, personally, etc.?) _____

- b) Rate the involvement of your sponsoring agency in advising you re those preparations:

Always Involved	1
Frequently Involved	2
Sometimes Involved	3
Rarely Involved	4
Never Involved	5

Comments: _____

14. a) Were you involved in a comprehensive orientation program offered by your agency?

i) Yes ____ ii) No ____ iii) None offered ____

- b) If Yes, what was the length and nature of this orientation program? _____

- c) Rate the orientation program with regard to its overall usefulness in preparing you for your assignment:

Excellent	1
Very Good	2
Good	3
Fair	4
Poor	5

III. Host Country Experience

15. a) Rate the degree of culture shock you experienced upon entering the host culture?

Very High	1
High	2
Moderate	3
Low	4
None	5

- b) If you experienced any culture shock, how long did this feeling last? _____

16. How would you describe your first exposure to the host country? _____

17. a) Rate how often you experienced any of the following while in the host country:

	<u>Always</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Never</u>
	(circle one for each description)				
Disillusionment	1	2	3	4	5
Frustration	1	2	3	4	5
Anxiety	1	2	3	4	5
Irritability	1	2	3	4	5
Confusion	1	2	3	4	5
Distrust	1	2	3	4	5
Withdrawal	1	2	3	4	5
Depression	1	2	3	4	5
Apathy	1	2	3	4	5
Personal well-being	1	2	3	4	5
Helpfulness	1	2	3	4	5
Helplessness	1	2	3	4	5
Insecurity	1	2	3	4	5
Disorientation	1	2	3	4	5
Euphoria	1	2	3	4	5
Misunderstood	1	2	3	4	5
Vulnerable	1	2	3	4	5
Aloneness	1	2	3	4	5
Sense of incompetence	1	2	3	4	5
Feelings of unreality	1	2	3	4	5
Poor concentration	1	2	3	4	5
Crying	1	2	3	4	5
Increased alcohol/ smoking	1	2	3	4	5
Fatigue	1	2	3	4	5
Change in appetite	1	2	3	4	5
Digestive disorders	1	2	3	4	5
Change in sleeping patterns	1	2	3	4	5
Headaches	1	2	3	4	5
Joint/back/muscular pain	1	2	3	4	5
Skin disorders	1	2	3	4	5
Diarrhea/constipation	1	2	3	4	5
Weakness/dizziness	1	2	3	4	5
Nausea	1	2	3	4	5
Others (specify) _____					

b) Which of these were of most concern to you? _____

Comments: _____

18. Rate your degree of immersion into the foreign culture:

Very High	1
High	2
Moderate	3
Low	4
None	5

19. Rate yourself on the following statements as they relate to your overseas situation:

	<u>Always</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Never</u>
	(circle one for each description)				
Contact with local people at work	1	2	3	4	5
Contact with local people socially	1	2	3	4	5
Contact with people of similar culture as mine at work	1	2	3	4	5
Contact with those of similar culture as mine socially	1	2	3	4	5
Amount of correspondence with friend/family at home	1	2	3	4	5
Frequency of home sickness	1	2	3	4	5

20. If you were to start over, would you have made the same decision to enroll in an overseas program? _____

Comments: _____

21. Overall, how do you feel about your overseas experience?

Very Happy	1
Somewhat Happy	2
Ambivalent	3
Somewhat Unhappy	4
Very Unhappy	5

Comments: _____

IV. Preparation for Return Home

22. How did you feel about returning home?

Very Happy	1
Somewhat Happy	2
Ambivalent	3
Somewhat Unhappy	4
Very Unhappy	5

Comments: _____

23. a) How did you prepare for returning home during the last phase of your overseas assignment? (eg: financially, professionally, personally, etc.?)

- b) Rate the involvement of your sponsoring agency in advising you regarding those preparations:

Always Involved	1
Frequently Involved	2
Sometimes Involved	3
Rarely Involved	4
Never Involved	5

24. a) Did you make any decisions before leaving the host country to change your lifestyle (behaviour, philosophy, career, politics, etc.) upon return home?

i) Yes ____ ii) No ____

- b) Explain: _____

- c) If so, rate your degree of success in implementing those changes:

Very High	1
High	2
Moderate	3
Low	4
None	5

Comments: _____

25. Was your time spent overseas:

____ a) longer than arrangement by my sponsoring agency.
 ____ b) the same amount of time as arranged by my agency.
 ____ c) shorter than the time arranged by the sponsoring agency.

Comments: _____

V. Re-entry

26. How would you describe your initial feelings regarding your return to home life:

Very Happy	1
Somewhat Happy	2
Ambivalent	3
Somewhat Unhappy	4
Very Unhappy	5

27. Rate how often you felt:

	<u>Always</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Never</u>
	(circle one for each description)				
Out of touch	1	2	3	4	5
Financial concerns	1	2	3	4	5
Employment concerns	1	2	3	4	5
Housing problems	1	2	3	4	5
Loss of status	1	2	3	4	5
Pace of life too fast	1	2	3	4	5
Too much emphasis on time schedules	1	2	3	4	5
Unable to use new skills developed overseas	1	2	3	4	5
Too much red tape	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of interest of others re your experience	1	2	3	4	5
Ignorance of Canadians re developing countries	1	2	3	4	5
Pressure/stress re family/friends	1	2	3	4	5
Others (specify) _____					

28. Rate how often you experienced the following upon return home:

	<u>Always</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Never</u>
	(circle one for each description)				
Disillusionment	1	2	3	4	5
Frustration	1	2	3	4	5
Anxiety	1	2	3	4	5
Irritability	1	2	3	4	5
Confusion	1	2	3	4	5
Distrust	1	2	3	4	5
Withdrawal	1	2	3	4	5
Depression	1	2	3	4	5
Apathy	1	2	3	4	5
Personal well-being	1	2	3	4	5
Helpfulness	1	2	3	4	5
Helplessness	1	2	3	4	5
Insecurity	1	2	3	4	5
Disorientation	1	2	3	4	5

Euphoria	1	2	3	4	5
Misunderstood	1	2	3	4	5
Vulnerable	1	2	3	4	5
Aloneness	1	2	3	4	5
Sense of incompetence	1	2	3	4	5
Feelings of unreality	1	2	3	4	5
Poor concentration	1	2	3	4	5
Crying	1	2	3	4	5
Increased alcohol/ smoking	1	2	3	4	5
Fatigue	1	2	3	4	5
Change in appetite	1	2	3	4	5
Digestive disorders	1	2	3	4	5
Change in sleeping patterns	1	2	3	4	5
Headaches	1	2	3	4	5
Joint/back/muscular pain	1	2	3	4	5
Skin disorders	1	2	3	4	5
Diarrhea/constipation	1	2	3	4	5
Weakness/dizziness	1	2	3	4	5
Nausea	1	2	3	4	5
Others (specify) _____					

Comments: _____

29. Generally, what problems were of the most concern to you? _____

30. If you noticed any differences in yourself, how would you describe them? _____

31. a) Rate the degree of stress you felt upon your return home.

Very High	1
High	2
Moderate	3
Low	4
None	5

b) Looking back, rate your degree of adjustment to returning home:

Excellent	1
Very Good	2
Good	3
Fair	4
Poor	5

37. Would you like to see changes in the re-orientation plan offered to returned volunteers? Yes ____
No ____

Explain: _____

38. How do you think you might have better planned for your return home? _____

39. What would you advise a person in the process of returning from an overseas assignment? _____

Please feel free to attach comments on any aspect of your overseas experience or any section of this questionnaire. Your comments and suggestions for this project are very important. Again a sincere thanks for your help.

Please return to: Debbie Williams
P.O. Box 55
Arnold's Cove, NF
AOB 1A0
(709) 463-8873



