

1967

Foreign and American Students Opinions of Social, Political and Religious Attitudes in the American Culture

Robert K. Luther

Eastern Illinois University

This research is a product of the graduate program in [Educational Psychology and Guidance](#) at Eastern Illinois University. [Find out more](#) about the program.

Recommended Citation

Luther, Robert K., "Foreign and American Students Opinions of Social, Political and Religious Attitudes in the American Culture" (1967). *Masters Theses*. 4139.

<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/4139>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

PAPER CERTIFICATE #3

To: Graduate Degree Candidates who have written formal theses.

Subject: Permission to reproduce theses.

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

Please sign one of the following statements.

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

4-20-68
Date

Author

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis be reproduced because _____

Date

Author

Foreign and American Students Opinions
of Social, Political and Religious
Attitudes in the American Culture

(TITLE)

BY

Robert K. Luther

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Masters of Science in Education

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1967

YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

4-18-68
DATE

ADVISER

4-18-68
DATE

DEPARTMENT HEAD

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to acknowledge the help of the following colleagues at Wayne State University for their stimulating discussions and criticisms: Mr. John E. Bates, Jr., Counselor of Men's Activities; Dr. Edward C. Cieslak, Director of Special Projects, Graduate Division; Dr. Marion Edman, Professor of Education; Dr. Harland L. Hagman, Dean of Administration; and Dr. Virgil R. Lougheed, Foreign Student Advisor.

The writer wishes also to express gratitude to the staff of the Foreign Student Office for their assistance in providing secretarial help.

Finally, the writer wishes to acknowledge his debt to the foreign students at Wayne State University who gave willingly of their time.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		
I	INTRODUCTION	
	Statement of the Problem	
	Background and Significance of the Study	
	Need for the Study	
	Purposes of the Study	
	Scope of the Study and Limitations of the Study	
	Definition of Terms	
II	REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH	31
III	DESIGN OF THE STUDY	56
	Description of the Subjects	
	Construction and Description of the Instrument	
	Procedures Used	
IV	PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	78
V	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, PROBLEMS FOR FURTHER STUDY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	107
	Conclusions and Problems for Further Study	
	PUBLIC DOCUMENTS	113
	BOOKS	114
	ARTICLES AND PERIODICALS	113
	REPORTS	121

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

PAMPHLETS 122

UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL 123

APPENDIXES

A.	Coding Sheet for Computing and Data Processing and Geographic Areas	124
B.	The Questionnaire	132
C.	List of Student Organizations	138
D.	Breakdown by Country of Foreign Students Enrolled at Wayne State University . . .	143
E.	Instructions for Administering the Questionnaire	152
F.	Letter Sent to Pilot Group and Letter Sent to Jury Members	153
G.	Jury Members Mean Scores Letter from Foreign Student Adviser	155

LIST OF TABLES

Tables

1.	Foreign Student Population for Selected Years	2
2.	Foreign Student Population for the Years 1954-1955 and 1965-1966	3
3.	Agreement of Perception in America	53
4.	Distribution of Geographic Area of 468 Foreign and American Students Surveyed at Wayne State University	57
5.	Distribution by Age Range of 468 Foreign and American Students Surveyed at Wayne State University	60
6.	Distribution by Age Range According to Geographic Areas of 468 Foreign and American Students Surveyed at Wayne State University	60
7.	Percentage of Age Range According to Geographic Areas of 468 Foreign and American Students Surveyed at Wayne State University	61
8.	Distribution by Status in University of 468 Foreign and American Students Surveyed at Wayne State University	62.
9.	Distribution by Status in University According to Geographic Areas of 468 Foreign and American Students Surveyed at Wayne State University	62

LIST OF TABLES
(Continued)

Tables

10.	Distribution by Sex of 468 Foreign and American Students Surveyed at Wayne State University	63
11.	Distribution by Sex According to Geographic Areas of 468 Foreign and American Students Surveyed at Wayne State University	64
12.	Distribution by Marital Status of 468 Foreign and American Students Surveyed at Wayne State University	65
13.	Distribution by Marital Status According to Geographic Areas of 468 Foreign and American Students Surveyed at Wayne State University	66
14.	Distribution by Length of Time in the United States of 468 Foreign and American Students Surveyed at Wayne State University	67
15.	Distribution by Length of Time in the United States According to Geographic Areas of 468 Foreign and American Students surveyed at Wayne State University	68
16.	Percentage of Length of Time in the United States According to Geographic Areas of 468 Foreign and American Students Surveyed at Wayne State University	69
17.	Students' Responses to Special Question 1. Personal Observation	83
18.	Students' Responses to Special Question 2. Reading Books, Magazines or Newspapers Printed in the United States . . .	84
19.	Students' Responses to Special Question 3. Listening to Television or Radio Programs in the United States.	85

LIST OF TABLES
(Continued)

Tables

20.	Students' Responses to Special Question 4. Visiting American Homes	86
21.	Students' Responses to Special Question 5. Talking with American Students or Friends	87
22.	Students' Responses to Special Question 6. Reading Official Government Documents or Papers from your Own Country.	88
23.	Students' Responses to Special Question 7. Listening to your Friends or Fellow Students in your own Country.	89
24.	Students' Responses to Special Question 8. Listening to Members of your own Family Speak About the United States.	90
25.	Students' Responses to Special Question 9. Reading Books, Magazines or Newspapers, Printed in your own Country.	91
26.	Students' Responses to Special Question 10. Listening to Television or Radio Programs in your own Country.	92
27.	Students' Responses to Special Question 17. Personal Experiences Which Have Prejudiced your Objectivity in Viewing the United States.	93

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The problems of this study were: (1) to discover the perceptions, regarding characteristics of people living in the United States, of foreign students attending Wayne State University in Detroit, Michigan; (2) to identify possible reasons for these perceptions; (3) to increase the awareness and understanding of the means by which these perceptions were formed; (4) to increase the knowledge of professional foreign student counselors with regard to foreign students' perceptions of the United States; and (5) to develop an instrument that would be useful in advising and counseling foreign students.

Background and significance of the study

During 1965-1966 there were 82,709 foreign students attending colleges and universities in the United States. One hundred fifty-eight countries and ten territories were represented by these students, and twenty-three of these countries each sent over 1,000 students.¹ These

¹Institute of International Education, Open Doors, 1956: Report on International Exchange (New York: Institute of International Education, 1966), p. 4.

figures represented a slight increase over the 1963-1964 totals, but more significantly, however, they represented a substantial increase over the pre-World War I figures when 3,673 foreign students were enrolled.¹ The enrollment figures since 1924 by selected years are shown in Tables 1 and 2. With the exception of 1930-1931, these figures showed that there was little increase in foreign students until 1946 at which time the number significantly increased and has continued to increase to the present time.

TABLE I

**FOREIGN STUDENT POPULATION
FOR SELECTED YEARS^a**

Year	Number of Foreign Students
1923-1924	6,739
1930-1931	9,643
1934-1935	5,701
1939-1940	6,154
1944-1945	6,954
1946-1947	14,942
1947-1948	17,214
1948-1949	26,759
1950-1951	29,813
1951-1952	31,100

^aIssac L. Kandel, United States Activities In International Cultural Relations, American Council on Educational Studies, Series I, quoted in Edward C. Cieslak, Foreign Students in American Colleges, (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1955), p. 8.

¹W. Reginald Wheeler, Henry H. King, and Alexander B. Davidson,

There are a diversity of reasons given for students from abroad coming to the United States to study. Most of these reasons, however, can be categorized under four major headings: (1) reasons expressed by foreign students; (2) reasons expressed by the government of the United States; (3) reasons expressed by the educational world; and (4) reasons expressed by the American public.

TABLE 2

**FOREIGN STUDENT POPULATION FOR THE YEARS
1954-1955 and 1965-1966**

Year	Number of Foreign Students
1954-1955	34,232 ^a
1965-1966	82,709 ^b

^aInstitute of International Education, Open Doors: A Report on Three Surveys, 1954-1955 (New York: Institute of International Education, 1955), p. 43.

^bInstitute of International Education, Open Doors, 1965: Report on International Exchange (New York: Institute of International Education, 1966), p. 4.

Cieslak found that the reasons expressed by his sample of 344 foreign students for coming to the United States to study could be placed under the following categories:

The Foreign Student in America (New York: Association Press), p. 11,
quoted in Edward C. Cieslak, Foreign Students in American Colleges
(Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1955), p. 8.

1. To travel, or to see the U. S. A.
2. The U.S. offers modern education in the field of study.
3. For technical education.
4. Because the U. S. A. is the most advanced and is the world leader.
5. To learn English.
6. Received a scholarship.
7. Education desired not offered back home.
8. Relatives or friends are in the U. S. A.
9. Parents' or relatives decision.
10. Homeland conditions not conducive to study.
11. Can work while studying.
12. To attend a Christian college.
13. Be on my own.
14. Shorter college program in the U.S.
15. Come with father, who is a government official.
16. For health reasons.
17. Better chance to get into college.
18. The climate is better.
19. Only choice at the time.
20. Study comparative education.
21. English is my only foreign language. ¹

Two other studies pointed out reasons which were similar to those found by Cieslak. The United States Advisory Commission on International Education and Cultural Affairs in their survey of 1,486 foreign students attending universities in the United States discovered that the foreign students whom they interviewed expressed the following reasons:

The belief that superior education was available here was described by over half (55 per cent) as their reason for coming. General interest in the United States was the principle motivation of 28 per cent and 17 per cent stated

¹ These are arranged according to frequency of mention and frequency of first mention. Edward C. Cieslak, Foreign Students in American Colleges (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1955), p. 22.

that they were attracted chiefly by the availability of scholarship funds.¹

Similarly three specific reasons for foreign students coming to the United States for further study were delineated in a study by Melby:

More specifically the foreign student comes here for three reasons: In the first place, he believes he can get the type of training that will enhance his professional status at home. Secondly, all except the completely self-centered individuals believe this training will be of direct benefit to their countries. Thirdly, although this motive may be present only in the sub-conscious of many, they come to learn about, and hopefully, to understand the United States.²

Although the personal reasons of foreign students for coming to the United States to study are important to examine and evaluate, the increasing "motivating force putting large numbers of foreign students in American Universities is the force of national governments..."³

The United States government's belief in educational exchange as a tool for assisting other nations was reflected, for example, in President Lyndon B. Johnson's commitment to international education by his proposal for an International Education Act and the legislation which was

¹U.S., Department of State, Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, Operations and Policy Research, Inc., *Foreign Students in the United States*, Vol. I, 1965, p. 5.

²John F. Melby, "The Foreign Student in America," *Orbis*, Vol. III, Spring 1964 quoted in U.S., Congress, House, Committee on Education, *International Education Past, Present, Problems and Prospects*, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, H. Report 527, 1966, pp. 319-326.

³August G. Benson, *Foreign Students in U.S. Higher Education*, Foreign Student Office, Michigan State University (East Lansing: by the author, 1966), p. 24.

introduced. In his message to the Congress of the United States on February 2, 1966, President Johnson stressed the following reasons for a national interest in foreign students and in international education:

- (1) to strengthen our capacity for international education cooperation.
- (2) to stimulate exchange with students and teachers of other lands.
- (3) to assist the progress of education in developing nations.
- (4) to build new bridges of international understanding.¹

Two basic reasons for Western Nations such as the United States to emphasize study in their country and to provide services to foreign students were pointed out by Benson in a report concerned with foreign students in United States higher education:

- (1) to create a favorable image of the Western country.
- (2) a humanitarian desire to help the foreign student.²

The educational world too often has a variety of goals and purposes for desiring that foreign students come to the United States to study. These reasons may be quite different from the reasons expressed by either the foreign students themselves or the government of the United States. The objectives of the college administrator may be: (1) to broaden the scope of the American students; (2) to improve the image of the United States abroad; or (3) to expand his institution's enrollment.³

¹"The President's Message," Saturday Review, August 20, 1966, p. 55.

²Benson, p. 18

³Cora Dubois, Foreign Students and Higher Education In the U. S. A. (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1956), pp. 12-13.

Benson listed four objectives of colleges and universities for accenting cross-cultural education and foreign student populations:

"(1) the acquisition and diffusion of knowledge, (2) the complementing of the process of higher education, (3) the development of mutual understanding and good will on the international levels, (4) the implementation of certain aspects of foreign policy."¹

The Committee of Educational Interchange Policy of the Institute of International Education found five reasons to be prevalent in the American-supported exchange programs:

- (1) to promote international understanding and good will among the peoples of the world as a contribution to peace.
- (2) to develop friends and supporters for the United States by giving persons from other countries a better understanding of the life and culture of the United States.
- (3) to contribute to the economic, social, or political development of other countries.
- (4) to aid in the educational or professional development of outstanding individuals.
- (5) to advance knowledge throughout the world for the general welfare of mankind.²

In a study by the Educational and World Affairs Committee, which appeared in the United States House of Representatives' Education

¹Benson, p. 6.

²Committee on Educational Interchange Policy, The Goals of Student Exchange: An Analysis of Goals of Programs for Foreign Students (New York: Institute of International Education, 1955) quoted in William H. Sewell and Olaf M. Davidsen, Scandinavian Students on American Campus (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1961), p. 4.

and Labor committee's report on international education, the committee found that educational leaders supported the continued admission of foreign students. Their arguments fell into one or more of the following four groups:

- (1) cold war cultural diplomacy. --- This approach involves the belief that training foreign students is a way of making friends for the United States in the cold war . . .
- (2) education of the most promising individuals in the world community. --- According to this approach, resources for higher education should be devoted to providing opportunities for education and professional development to the most promising individuals regardless of their country or origin . . .
- (3) U. S. responsibility to assist the underdeveloped areas. --- This approach is based upon humanitarian and political considerations . . .
- (4) cultural interaction. --- This approach stresses the value for American students of cultural interaction with foreign students . . .¹

The views held by United States public for encouraging foreign students to come to the United States are closely related to the views held by the other three groups: (1) foreign students, (2) the United States government, and (3) the educational world. Cora Dubois believed that the United States public is primarily interested that the students who come to the United States will leave with a more appreciative feeling of the nation. She felt that the public regards educational exchange as a

¹Education and World Affairs, The Foreign Student: Whom Shall We Welcome? (New York: Education and World Affairs, 1964) quoted U.S., Congress, House, Committee on Education, International Education Past, Present, Problems and Prospects, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, H. Report 527, 1966, pp. 335-347.

propaganda technique designed for the national interest. "To many American citizens," she said, "the goals of foreign student exchange may be no more clearly defined than 'international understanding' with the associated hope for peace . . ."¹

The public of the United States, therefore, has acknowledged that a connection exists between international education and the welfare of their nation, as well as the future of mankind. The ultimate concern of United States' citizens for students studying in the United States is a hope for ties of lasting friendship.²

Putman summarized the goals for foreign student exchange of the United States government, of the United States citizenry, and of the community in which the foreign student lives. According to Putman, these objectives are:

1. To foster understanding of a friendship for the United States, and thereby contribute to world peace.
2. To educate the foreign student so that he can return to his own country to make a contribution towards its development.
3. To develop outstanding leaders in their professions and their countries.
4. To enjoy a touch of the exotic--native costumes, songs, dance, and the like.
5. To meet needs for trained personnel in this country, even on a temporary basis.

¹Dubois, pp. 12-14.

²John Regan, Culture Shock: An Exploration in Observation, A report of an exploratory study in international understanding. Sponsored by Phi Delta Kappa (Alberta, Canada: University of Alberta, 1966, p. i.

6. To contribute to the advancement of knowledge throughout the world for the general benefit of mankind.
7. To make converts and develop missionaries abroad for our political, economic, and/or religious philosophy.
8. To provide helpful contacts for U.S. business abroad.¹

As evidenced by the reasons stated for the continuance of foreign students in United States' colleges and universities by the foreign students, by the United States government, by the educational world, and by the United States public, it is almost certain that, unless the United States becomes involved in another major war, the number of foreign students will steadily increase in the next several years. It would seem reasonable, therefore, that research should be conducted to investigate whether the objectives stated for educational exchange are being accomplished. The main objectives, which were expressed by every group but the foreign students themselves, were: (1) to create a favorable image of the United States; (2) to develop friends and allies for the United States; and (3) to make lasting ties of mutual understanding. This, then, is the significance of this study.

¹Putman is paraphrasing here from a report by the Committee on Educational Interchange Policy entitled The Goals of Student Exchange (New York: Institute of International Education, 1955, pp. 4-5. Putman's article, The Foreign Student Adviser and His Institution in International Student Exchange (New York: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1965) is cited in U.S., Congress, House, Committee on Education, International Education Past, Present, Problems and Prospects, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, H. Report 527, 1966, pp. 331-334.

Need for the study

Since there is a general agreement among the three main segments of the United States society--the government, the education world, and the general public--that there should be foreign students pursuing advanced studies in the United States and since the main reason for this agreement is because these three groups believe that foreign students' perceptions and opinions of the United States will influence the attitudes of their respective countries, it is important that these opinions be studied.

Scattered through the colleges and universities of the United States are some 32,000 students from virtually every corner of the non-Communist world . . . They come from what we now call the emerging nations of Africa, Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America.

That leaders of governments, industry, technology, education, and science will be drawn from the ranks of these students can hardly be doubted. That their potential audience and credibility is greater than that of the Voice of America is highly probable. That among them are individuals whose feelings and opinions about the United States may some day affect this nation's destiny is easily possible. Congress has formally recognized that the national interest is affected by what happens to these thousands of foreign students.¹

Wedge pointed out that without an understanding of how the foreign student views the United States, it is difficult to interpret the society of the United States to the foreign student.

Perhaps the most important requirement for a meaningful exchange of ideas with a foreigner is to appreciate the picture of the world that he brings with him. If we are able to see his experiences in this country through his eyes, we can do a better

¹Advisory Commission on International Education and Cultural Affairs, p. 1.

job of helping him to interpret them, and we are also more likely to avoid the jagged rocks of misunderstanding.¹

Because the American people wish foreign students to understand and appreciate the United States and its people, it is important that the foreign students' perceptions of the United States be analyzed. "The visitor's knowledge and preconceptions must be assessed if we are to discover the best means of making contact with him."² "It behooves us," said Ithiell de Sola Pool, "to examine what this new generation of international students is actually learning and what it is carrying back home."³ This was the first need of this study.

The second need for this study was, by studying his reactions to the United States, to help the foreign student in his adjustment to the culture of America. "The foreign student," said Ward "needs our support and assistance in helping him adjust to a new and strange country. Further study and research is vitally needed to comprehend and handle the many complex problems facing the foreign student in the United States today."⁴

¹Bryant Wedge, Visitors to the U.S. and How They See Us (Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1965), p. 4.

²Wedge, p. 124

³Ithiell de Sola Pool's comments appear in the introduction to George V. Coelho, Changing Images of America: A Study of Indian Students' Perceptions (Glencoe, Illinois: Glencoe, Illinois Free Press, 1958), p. xv.

⁴Lyle E. Ward, "Some Observations of the Underlying Dynamics of Conflict in Foreign Students," Student Medicine, Vol. 1, No. 6 (April 1962), p. 438.

Sasnett pointed out in her article on foreign students on American campuses that "it seems reasonable to assume along with the growing number of foreign students, it will be of importance for counselors and mental hygienists to expand their knowledge and understanding of the emotional problems experienced by the foreign student and the impact made upon him by the United States."¹

The third need for this study was to increase the knowledge of professional workers, such as foreign student advisers, international activities counselors, and community service personnel, concerning foreign students' views of the United States:

The involvements of this Nation in the affairs of the world put new demands on education. An educational system must today produce citizens who are equipped with the knowledge, sensitivities, and competencies for functioning intelligently in the vital and extensive areas where diverse cultures meet and must accommodate without the biases and misinformation which generate fruitless tensions and devastating conflicts.²

"American hosts to foreign visitors to the United States," said Wedge, "are squarely in the front lines of international relations. As truly as the professional diplomat, they carry real responsibilities for cross-cultural communication."³ For this reason, they should be aware

¹M. T. Sasnett, "Foreign Student Problems on American Campuses," College and University, XXVI (1950), pp. 93-101.

²U.S., Congress, House, Committee on Education, International Education Past, Present, Problems and Prospects, 89th Congress, 2nd Session, H. Report 527, p. xi.

³Wedge, p. vii.

of foreign visitors' reactions to the United States.

Purposes of the study

The central purposes of this study were: (1) to present opinions of foreign students who were attending Wayne State University in Detroit, Michigan, with regard to the American character; (2) to present opinions of American student leaders who were attending Wayne State University with regard to the American character; (3) to compare the opinions of foreign students attending Wayne State University with regard to the American character and the opinions of American student leaders attending Wayne State University with regard to the American character; and (4) to show the relation between country of origin of foreign students attending Wayne State University and their opinions with regard to the American character, as revealed through a questionnaire study.

Scope of the study and limitations of the study

At the time of this study, May, 1967, Wayne State University had 1,246 students from other countries attending classes. Of these students, 613 were in the United States on permanent visas and 633 were on temporary visas. They represented 98 countries. Seventy-two countries were represented by the temporary visas students, and eighty-one countries were represented by the permanent visas students. The figure of 1,246

represented 2.9 per cent of the entire Wayne State University student body. This study was concerned only with the 633 students who were in the United States on temporary visas (See Appendix D for complete description of students).

The largest concentration of temporary visa students were from the countries of Canada, 198; India, 123; China, 56; Greece, 34; Iran, 34; Philippines, 31; Israel, 25; Korea, 24; Japan, 23; and Lebanon, 17. The remainder of the countries had ten or less students.

There were 331 (52.4 percent) undergraduates and 302 (47.6 percent) graduates among the temporary visa students, and these students were enrolled in the colleges of Liberal Arts, Education, Engineering, Pharmacy, Monteith, Nursing, Business Administration, Social Work, and Medicine. The largest number of students were enrolled in the colleges of Liberal Arts, 328, and Engineering, 146. There were also 52 students enrolled in Business Administration, 45 in Education, 25 in Nursing, 18 in Medicine, 15 in Pharmacy, 7 in Social Work, and 2 in Monteith.

Of the temporary visa students, 529 were in the United States on student visas, 74 on exchange visitor visas, 18 on visitor visas, and 4 on diplomatic visas. Five students failed to indicate a visa classification.¹

¹Each visa classification carries with it certain limitations and responsibilities. The student visa or "F-1" visa student is the most common. Students on this visa are allowed to remain in the United States as long as they are pursuing degrees at American universities or engaging

The foreign student population used for purposes of this report was, therefore, the 633 students who were attending Wayne State University at the time of this report and who were classified by the United States government as temporary visa students.

The American student leaders who were asked to participate in this study and who were used as the control group were the current presidents of the recognized student organizations at Wayne State University. This group of leaders did not represent a random sample of American students. Their names were taken from the list of student organizations provided by the Office of the Director of Student Activities (See Appendix C). The president of a campus organization was contacted if his name appeared on the list or if his name did not appear on the list but it was possible to obtain his name through the faculty adviser or the organization. Presidents whose organizations were no longer active or who were non-citizens were not considered. One hundred twenty student presidents were contacted and asked to participate.

in practical training. The practical training period is limited to eighteen months. They may apply for permission to work, transfer universities, or, at the end of their period of studying, make application for permanent resident visas. The exchange visitor or "J-1" visa students are limited to a specific time for completing their course work. They must receive permission from their sponsors before changing programs, and they cannot apply for a permanent resident visa until they return to their homelands for a period of two years. The "J-1" visa students cannot be employed without permission from their sponsors. The "H-1", "H-2", or "H-3", or diplomatic visa students are given all the privileges of special guests. They cannot, however, engage in work and their time in the United States is determined by their own country. The visitor or "B-2" visa students are limited in length of time in the United States and in crossing national boundaries. They cannot be employed.

The university setting at Wayne State was the first important limitation to consider in this study. Generalizations of findings in this report may be biased by the peculiarities of the university, the inhabitants and area surrounding the university, the make-up of the American student body, the counseling services offered to foreign students for making contacts with the American community. For this reason references were avoided that would indicate that the responses given by Wayne State University students would be roughly the same on any campus.

The second limitation of this experiment concerned people. The American subjects who were asked to participate were all leaders and presidents of their respective clubs or organizations. Because of the positions they held, they could not be regarded as typical students. It was not the intent of this study, however, to sample the entire American student body. It was the opinion of the writer that the student leaders were closer to the character and personalities of the foreign students than the average student at Wayne State. Melby pointed out that, "almost all foreign students returning home after studying in America became members of their countries growing elite group."¹ "Leaders of governments, industry, technology, education, and science will be drawn from the ranks of these students."²

¹Melby, pp. 323-324

²Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, p. 1.

The foreign student studying in the United States, therefore, is not the typical student in his own country. For this reason American student leaders were chosen as the control group with which foreign students' opinions of the American character were compared. Throughout the study careful attention was given to the fact that the American student leaders' opinions did not reflect the opinions of all the American students on Wayne State University's campus.

The third limitation in this study was the consideration of geographic areas rather than individual countries. The writer chose to do this because of the wide dispersion of countries represented by the foreign students at Wayne State and the small number of foreign students from many of these countries. The exception to this were the United States and Canadian students who were asked to indicate their country rather than geographic area. The geographic areas considered were: Canada, Latin America, Europe, United States, Middle East, Far East, Africa, and Australia. The Institute of International Education's Index to countries which was contained in their publication, Open Doors 1966, was used as a guide.¹ For purposes of this study changes made in the Institute of International Education's index to countries were: Pakistan was considered within the Far Eastern geographic area rather than the Middle Eastern, and the countries of Algeria, Libya, Morocco, Sudan, Tunisia, and the United Arab Republic were considered within the Middle

¹Institute of International Education, Open Doors, 1966, pp. 16-20.

Eastern geographic area rather than Africa. Pakistan was considered within the Far Eastern geographic area because of the uniqueness of the country. It is split into two parts with East and West Pakistan separated by India. The Arab countries of Africa were considered within the Middle Eastern area because of their close religious and ethnic association with the rest of the Middle East.

The problems peculiar to foreign students was the fourth limitation of this study. Theodore C. Blegen said, "Our experience indicates that students from abroad encounter problems similar to those of American students and, in addition, special problems peculiar to strangers in an unfamiliar culture."¹

Housing is an initial problem faced by the newly entering foreign student. "Housing is such a basic human need that the type and quality of housing can have a significant effect upon living and learning. Where foreign students live are of primary importance in determining and influencing their attitudes and opinions of campus and community life."² Although problems of housing are not definitely peculiar to the foreign student, it probably affects him more directly. Because of financial

¹Theodore C. Blegen, Counseling Foreign Students, (Washington: American Council on Education, 1950, Pamphlet Series VI, No. 15), pp. 3-4.

²Virgil R. Lougheed, Problems of the Foreign Student on Campus, A paper given at the annual meeting of the Michigan College Health Association held on the campus of Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan, p. 1. (Mimeographed)

problems and lack of housing on campus, most foreign students at Wayne State are forced to live in the area surrounding the campus. This area is decaying, and the rooming houses are often not ideal. "The private rooming house seldom meets the requirements of ideal lodging for students. Most householders and apartment owners rent rooms or apartments as a business, and this means that only in a few instances does the student enjoy natural friendly relations with the family."¹

There is a close relationship between the Foreign Student Office and the Housing Office so that reports of troublesome areas or discrimination are quickly investigated. The foreign student, then, is afforded protection by the university from discriminatory landlords; but even though foreign students are provided some protection from discrimination in housing, they may find it existing in other areas of the community. This is especially true for the dark-skinned foreign students.

A lack of knowledge of the English language can also be a real problem to the new foreign student. This is, of course, more true for those students whose primary or secondary national language is not English. If the new foreign student experiences difficulty in communicating with his instructors, fellow students, or other people with whom he might

¹Virgil R. Loughheed, Problems of the Foreign Student on Campus, A Paper given at the annual meeting of the Michigan College Health Association held on the campus of Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan, p. 1. (Mimeographed).

come in contact, a number of other misconceptions can develop. "A low ability in oral, aural, reacting, or writing English is a serious handicap. It may serve to isolate the student from supportive American contacts on both the person and academic levels."¹ Also, if the foreign student encounters academic difficulties because of poor English, a deep feeling of failure might evolve which could hinder him in adjusting successfully to other situations.

The lack of adequate finances is also a problem experienced by all foreign students. There are several reasons for this problem such as: (1) a dollar shortage at home; (2) national emergencies, wars, or catastrophes that affect the whole of the student's home country; (3) an inflation of the dollar; and (4) unexpected changes within the student's family's financial situation. Lougheed, Foreign Student Adviser at Wayne State University, reported:

College and University officials are becoming increasingly aware of the financial difficulties of many foreign students . . .

Data are not available on the sources of financial support for all foreign students in the United States, but some facts are known. For example, nearly one-half of them receive no funds other than those obtained from their personal sources. At Wayne about 75 percent are self-sponsored. About one out of five receives aid from private agencies, and one out of twelve from governmental agencies.

The dilemma of whether to return to his home country or remain in the United States after his studies are completed is another problem

¹Benson, pp. 17-18.

²Lougheed, Problems of Foreign Students on Campus, p. 3.

peculiar to the foreign student. This has more recently been identified as the "brain drain." "This dilemma," said Caglar Keyder, ". . . is even more acute for the foreign student in graduate or professional school. And there has been well-publicized fear recently that more are choosing to stay than to return resulting in a 'brain drain' that siphons off a developing country's most valuable resource, the educated man."¹

Firm facts on the "brain drain" are difficult to obtain. The United States Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service keeps a yearly total of the number of foreign students adjusting their status to permanent resident, but the service does not break this total down by nationality. There has also been very little private research done on this problem. According to John F. Melby, the Immigration and Naturalization Service does acknowledge that "student immigrants are numerous, especially from Asia."² Many other institutions concerned with exchange," he said, "are distressed about the problem but have not given it voice and action."³ Individual countries are beginning to feel the drain of talent to the United States. Melby gave

¹Caglar Keyder, "The Foreign Student at Yale," Yale Alumni Magazine, (March, 1967), p. 54.

²Melby, pp. 348-349.

³Ibid.

the following statistics to point out the concern of countries regarding this difficulty:

Korea--for years one of the top seven providers of students-- has sent, according to a recent American-Korean Foundation report, 'almost 8,000' students to the United States since 1946, of whom an estimated 800 have returned to Korea. Some 2,411 Koreans are listed by the Institute of International Education as still in student status in 1964. Some 4,800 Korean students would thus appear to be non-returnees. Upward of 800 have been 'adjusted' in the last two years. Informal indications show that this low return rate is currently falling still further. Indeed the wholesale importation of the students' families from Korea is now increasing.

Iran, long one of the five or six largest student contributors, with 2,824 students listed by I. I. E., has also suffered severe difficulties. The Embassy of Iran, whose concern had led to the maintenance of a special student office, informally admits that the actual number of its students here is much larger than 2,824--probably twice as many or more. One experimental cultural attache at a New Eastern embassy in Washington said before a recent conference on development: 'of Iran's 6,000 students in the country, only 50 per cent are returning.' A similar percentage of Lebanon's 800 students stay here permanently. The problem has for decades concerned India, second largest foreign student contributor, as well as the Philippines (particularly in regard to medical interns and residents, of which it is the world's largest contributor to U.S. hospitals: 1,687), Pakistan, Egypt, Colombia, Argentina, Ecuador, Greece, Jordan, and to a lesser but still painful degree many others.¹

The foreign student, therefore, may be torn by the pressures from his own country to return home and by his own individual desire to remain permanently in the United States.

The fourth limitation of this study, problems peculiar to foreign students, was an important limitation to consider. These problems, of course, will affect students differently, but they will have an influence on

¹Ibid.

both the students' adjustment while he is in the United States and the students' attitudes toward the United States and its people. Because of the different levels of maturity and tolerance and the different patterns of perceptions of each student, it was impossible for the writer to analyze the affect that each of these special problems has on the individual foreign student. These problems and their solutions, or lack of solution, could, however, prejudice the findings in this study.

The fifth limitation of this study was the different lengths of time that individual foreign students have been in the United States. Cora Dubois expounded on the importance that the length of time in the United States can have on the foreign students' adjustment and conceptions of the United States:

It is helpful to postulate tentatively certain phases in both the adjustment processes here and in the readjustment upon return to the homeland. That they are roughly analogous to the stages in psychiatric treatment has been suggested. Or, as one perceptive person once remarked, 'If you live in a country three months you love it; if you live in it a year, you hate it; if you live in it two years, you are used to it.'¹

The processes of adjustment, said Dubois, "can be broken down into four phases: the spectator, the adaptive, the 'coming to terms' and the departure."²

According to Ward, the first phase, the students' initial departure from homeland and his arrival in the new and strange country, is the most

¹Dubois, p. 66.

²Ibid., p. 67.

impressionable. He said:

It would seem that regardless of his conscious reasons the student unconsciously experiences leaving home as a rejection or loss of love, as if he has been told by his parents or others: 'We will love you provided you leave home and contribute to our prestige.' In this sense it is immaterial whether the student leaves the homeland of his own accord or whether he feels pressured into leaving. Unconsciously he experiences the leaving as a rejection, a loss of the motherland. Frequently such feelings may result in a regression to an oral infantile level, and the student demands to be gratified and cared for by the new motherland.¹

Recognizing that different lengths of time spent in the United States can have an affect on foreign students' opinions of the United States, the following time spans were used as variables throughout the report of this experiment:

1-30 days
 30 days-6 months
 6 months-1 year
 1 year-2 years
 2 years-above
 Commute daily (for Canadian students)
 Life (for U. S. student leaders)

The social life of foreign students and the contacts made with the American peer group were also important limitations in this study. This was the sixth limitation.

The fear has been expressed that the foreign student comes into contact only with the American student who is on the fringe of his own society. Richard D. Lambert commented on this problem in his book on Indian Students on an American Campus. Lambert said:

¹ Ward, p. 433.

American college students they (Indian students) quickly identified as being a highly unrepresentative group living in a cloistered, artificial atmosphere. They perceived the dilemma of the International House: although it can attract most of the foreign students, it cannot reach a corresponding cross-section of Americans but must be content with an American clientele consisting of those who volunteer to attend. The foreign students are aware that many of the individuals attracted to the International House belong to fringe groups in American society, and often come from a lower social level than the foreign students were accustomed to at home. This unfavorable comparison, they feel holds particularly for the girls who seem to be seeking the exotic or simply the satisfaction of being in demand when they lack the assets to compete in the open market.¹

In recent years Wayne State University has taken considerable steps to provide opportunities for foreign students to socialize with American students. An International Center was set up in the Student Union Building to provide a physical structure; a series of weekly coffee hours were established to provide the environment for dialogue; a number of discussion groups concerned with international problems were initiated, and quarterly "get-acquainted parties" were started for the new arrivals. According to Dr. Virgil R. Lougheed, Wayne State University's Foreign Student Adviser, these steps have not been enough. He felt that more opportunities should be provided for the American and foreign student to associate. He further felt that in the majority of cases the foreign student at Wayne is still meeting those American students who are members of fringe groups.²

¹Richard D. Lambert, Indian Students on an American Campus (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956), pp. 52-53.

²Interview with Virgil R. Lougheed, Foreign Student Adviser at Wayne State University, September, 1966.

The contacts foreign students have with American students can, therefore, bias their opinions of Americans in general.

The seventh limitation of this report was the influence that relationship between governments can have on the opinions of foreign students with regard to the American character. "The formal relationships between national governments," remarked Dubois, "may have dramatic symbolic influence on individual expectation and adjustments. That national stereotype shift over time is well known; popular images of nations are as liable as positions in diplomatic debate."¹ In general, this research project was handicapped because the writer did not have adequate data for assessing the effects that changes in the international political scene has had on the foreign student during his stay in the United States. Much has happened internationally since many foreign students first came to the United States, and in addition, much has happened since this research was begun. The war in the Middle East, for example, came shortly after the questionnaire used in this study was given.

It was the design of this study, therefore, that the questionnaire administered to survey foreign students' opinions of the American character should be re-administered during the foreign students' sojourn in the United States. Possibly more frequent questioning, as well as supplementing the questionnaire with personal interviews, might help to overcome this limitation.

¹Dubois, p. 53.

The eighth limitation of this investigation was whether an "American character" actually exists and, if it exists, whether it can be tested or surveyed. Clearly, there were two opposing positions to the national character approach. There were those who believed that a national character exists and can thus be described and those who believed that a national character does not exist and cannot thus be described.

Commager, for example, was of the opinion that an American character exists. He said in his book on the American mind:

Over a period of two and a half centuries, marked by such adventures as few other people had known, Americans had created an American character and formulated an American philosophy.¹

A position similar to Commager's was taken by Allport. Allport remarked:

Although nations and ethnic groups do not often correspond, still it is possible to slice mankind by nations, as well as by ethnic groups, and ask what differences exist among them. The concept of 'national character' implies that members of a nation, despite the ethnic, racial, religious, or individual differences among them, do resemble one another in certain fundamental patterns of belief and conduct, more than they resemble members of other nations.²

The opposing point of view concerning the existence of an American character was represented by Max Lerner. Lerner felt strongly that there is no definable American character. Lerner stated:

¹Henry Steele Commager, The American Mind (New Haven: Yale Paperback, 1950), p. 3.

²Gordon W. Allport, The Nature of Prejudice (Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books (paperback), 1958), p. 115.

Despite the simplified versions of the 'American character' that fill the commentaries in American life, it is in reality diverse and multiple. This is a product of the geographic variety, the crisscrossing ethnic strains and cultural traditions, and the intermeshing forces and counterforces in a changing American society. The crucial fact is that there is no single pattern that can be called the 'American character,' nor is there a neat set of categories into which the American personality fits.¹

Recognizing that there were strong arguments against the existence of a national American character, the writer was of the opinion that an American character does in fact exist; that it is historically unique; that it transcends ethnic, religious, and individual differences; and that this is what makes people in America see themselves as Americans and act as members of a distinct society.

The purpose of this section then has been to delineate the limitations in this study and to recognize that these limitations might have an effect on the generalizations of findings in this research project. It is impossible to isolate all the limitations, for to do so would require lengthy individual psychological counseling which the writer is not trained to do. Scott expressed this point succinctly. He said:

To isolate the American experience and to explain accurately its effect on personality would probably be an impossible task even for all the resources of a psychological clinic.²

¹Max Lerner, America As a Civilization: Life and Thought in the U. S. Today (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1957), p. 651.

²Franklin D. Scott, The American Experiences of Swedish Students: Retrospect and Aftermath (Minneapolis: Lund Press, 1956), 1. 96.

Definition of Terms

Foreign Students. -- Throughout the report of this investigation, the term "foreign student" was interpreted as meaning those students from countries or territories other than the United States or its territories who at the time of this study were attending Wayne State University in Detroit, Michigan, either full time or part time; who were living in the United States or commuting from Canada; who were in the United States on temporary visas; and who, upon completion of their courses of studies, planned to return to their home lands.

American Student Leaders. -- For purposes of this study, "American student leaders" were defined as those students who were citizens of the United States and who were at the time of this study holding the office of president in one of the active student organizations at Wayne State University. The names of these individuals were taken from the winter quarters, 1966-1967, list of student organizations which was mimeographed by the Office of the Director of Student Activities (See Appendix C).

American Character. -- The term "American character" was interpreted throughout this report as meaning those patterns of belief and conduct, habits, practices, morals, attitudes, ways of life, and kind of sets in approaching the world and people that were formed by experience and environment which the members of the United States of America regardless of racial, religious, ethnic or individual differences have in common.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

Although there has been a large amount written about images of America, only a brief summary of the written work done on this problem which is closely related to this study will be given here.

A valuable study concerned with Indian students' perceptions of Americans was conducted by Richard D. Lambert in 1956.¹ The subjects in Lambert's research were 19 students--16 Indians, 2 Pakistani, and 1 Singhese--who were enrolled at the University of Pennsylvania from July, 1952 through August, 1953. The families of these students were all educated middle class, and all of the subjects were from British schools and were from a background which was strongly nationalistic. The data for Lambert's study was collected by means of a series of individual and group interviews, a written questionnaire, and direct observation. Lambert's thesis for the study was that Indian students' perceptions were determined by their backgrounds in India and that they selected and interpreted their experiences in the United States from this context.

¹Lambert, pp. 4-39.

Lambert found that the Indian students thought that professors in the United States had very little knowledge of cultures other than the occidental ones, that American students were disrespectful to their teachers, and that there was a fear within the American classroom to discuss Communism. The Indian students expressed the opinion that there seemed to be very little desire among Americans to mix with them and that the few who did mix belonged to church-oriented organizations. Lambert also discovered that when they first arrived, the Indian students had a much distorted and idealistic view of the United States. Lambert pointed this out vividly in his book. He said:

The nature of this picture formed at distance is illustrated by the preconceptions entertained by Indian Students upon arrival in the United States--a stereotyped, indistinct, and limited image composed of uncorrelated fragments. They had anticipated the United States would be a land endowed with abundant natural resources and wealth, whose inhabitants worked feverishly and constantly to command a whole host of mechanized wonders, whose cities were dominated by skyscrapers, whose ethos was scientific and rationalistic to the neglect of the spiritual, whose relations were marked by casualness, rudeness, and violence . . . whose social system was equalitarian except for discriminatory practices . . . whose labor force contained a disproportionate number of cowboys.¹

Lambert's research stressed the Indian students' interpretations of four areas in American life. These areas were: "family practices, political behavior, race relations, and religion."²

¹Ibid, p. 55.

²Ibid, p. 56

The Indian students perceived the American family life as restricted, less important to its members than personal gratification, lacking real meaning to its members, having no ritual at mealtimes, and characterized by divorce, lack of discipline, and informality. They also thought that women were allowed too much freedom and were distinguishable by sloppiness in dress. They felt that there was an emphasis within the family structure on individuality and lack of moral consciousness. "The Indian students discerned an element of lightheaded frivolity and capriciousness in courtship and family behavior. This view was sometimes expressed in the sternest moralistic terms, like 'embracing and kissing' and these things I take to be just the road for going into debauchery or lack of morals."¹ In foreign affairs the Indian students felt that Americans were ignorant of world happenings and especially of the happenings in India. The students found religion to be important in the lives of Americans, but they also felt that the religious practices were primarily confined to church. Other dominant American values which these students perceived were: desire for material comfort, efficiency and practicability, informality, lack of ceremony, orderliness, friendliness, honesty, and equality, except for the treatment of the American Negro.

Images of Swedish students with regard to the United States were found in a study in 1956 by Franklin D. Scott.² Scott's study was con-

¹Ibid., pp. 60-61.

²Scott, pp. 23-122.

cerned with fifty Swedish students who had studied in the United States and had since returned to Sweden. The criteria he used for the selection of his sample were: time of study, students who studied in the United States prior to and after World War II; duration of stay, nine months and above; sex, equal numbers of female and male students; occupation, persons in both academic and business professions; age; level of study; institutions; marital status; social status; academic status; source of financial support; home country influence; and opinions of the United States. Nineteen of the students who were chosen had studied in the United States between the years of 1920 and 1940, and thirty-one of the students who were chosen studied in the United States after World War II.¹ Further characteristics of the sample were:

Sojourn factors	Sense of achievement
Length of stay	Academic adjustment
6-11 months	Earned American degree
12-17 months	Academic status
18-23 months	Reasons for going home
24 months -above	Financing
Field of interest	Career
Age on going abroad	Family
Community of origin	Residence
Marital status	Post-study trip to United States
Social status	Considered immigration
Distribution	Attitude toward United States
Living conditions	Affect evident in ²

Most of the data for Scott's study was collected through open-ended interviews; these allowed the subjects as much freedom as possible in elaborating on their images. Each interview lasted approximately five

¹Ibid., pp. 24-31

²Ibid.

hours. In addition, Scott supplemented the interviews by talking with relatives, employers, fellow students, and colleagues of the subjects. A questionnaire was also distributed to a number of former scholars and fellows of the Sweden-American Foundation in Stockholm. This gave the writer additional information on thirty-three students whom he could not reach personally; the results of the questions confirmed the data Scott gathered in the interviews. The results of the interviews were further checked by questioning orally 92 other people, 52 returned students, 22 Swedes who had never been to America, and 18 Americans, and Scott's findings were presented through a series of biographical analyses.

The students' impressions during their first period of stay in the United States, a period of about a month, Scott described in the words of one of the Swedish students:

I got a terrific shock when I first came to America. The freer habits and outlook on life, the release from the formalism of Sweden, were startling, though very pleasing.¹

The Swedish students described the Americans they met as frank, open, and very hospitable. This they appeared to enjoy. The students also seemed to enjoy the easiness they experienced in establishing relationships with Americans, but the American friendliness they felt was only superficial.

Scott's study showed that all of the Swedish students expressed

¹Ibid., pp. 5051.

a dislike for American sex mores and customs governing relationships between sexes. The students felt strongly that in matters of morals Americans were puritanical and hypocritical. One Swedish girl, remarking about American fear of sex, said:

In America it seems that if one is to live a normal sex life he has to be married.¹

And another Swedish student commented:

America is fine if one could only have taken along some Swedish girls who were not afraid of sex.²

In matters of religion, Scott found the Swedish students to be quite critical of American religious practices. For example, one student remarked:

Americans are so religious simply because they have not thought things through; they do not want to think things through, or think about serious things as we do--by serious things I mean music, literature.³

This research pointed out that the overall reaction of the Swedish students to the American people was one of friendliness. Such comments as "not only friendly, unbelievably friendly,"⁴ "cannot recall one person being unfriendly to me,"⁵ "Americans even succeeded in

¹Ibid., p. 74

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 84

⁴Ibid., pp. 109-110

⁵Ibid.

giving you the feeling that they were glad to help you,"¹ and "one is overwhelmed,"² were common.

The study also showed that, after returning home, the Swedish student retained an image of the United States as a country with abounding resources and vast areas, and where, if one had a desire to accomplish something, he was hindered only by the lack of his will to do so.

The stress on conformity in American society seemed to puzzle the students. They found the Americans desiring to speak, dress, and think alike. One Swedish boy commented:

What I disliked most was the uniformity of thought . . . I have always thought that Swedes were narrow minded, uninternational, but in many ways the Americans are worse.³

Beals' and Humphrey's work with Mexican students from 1952-1954 added further to the knowledge on foreign students' images of the United States. Their study emphasized the cross-cultural rather than the individual problem.⁴ All of Beals' and Humphrey's sample entered the United States with similar preconceptions. These were: the belief that America was wealthy, and mechanized, that the American living

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Ralph Leon Beals and Norman D. Humphrey, No Frontier to Learning: The Mexican Student in the U. S. (St. Paul, Minnesota: North Central Publishing Company, 1957), pp. 7-139.

standard was high, and that Americans were highly materialistic with little regard for the arts, music or literature. They thought that every person was concerned with gaining money, that the family life was unstructured and lacking in love and discipline, that American men allowed their wives too much freedom and thus did not love them, that American women were sexually immoral, and that the United States was not a religious country.

The sample in the Beals and Humphrey study consisted of a core group of ten full time students enrolled at the University of California at Los Angeles and 74 students who had already returned to Mexico. Because of the small number of students in the United States core group, Beals and Humphrey also collected information from 22 other students attending various colleges in the United States. The Mexican students both in the United States and Mexico were interviewed from four to twenty hours each.

The writers also used several other techniques for obtaining information. A written test consisting of 94 questions on American ideology and beliefs was administered to 38 Mexican students. The students were asked to indicate a reaction to each statement within the questionnaire by marking an "X" if they "(a) personally agreed or disagreed with the statement; (b) thought the majority of Mexicans would agree or disagree with the statement; and (c) thought the majority of

Americans would agree or disagree with the statement."¹ Each student in the total sample was also asked to complete a lengthy background data sheet which asked for information concerning the students "personal history, family relationships, educational background of subject and other family members, occupation, and similar data."² To obtain additional opinions, forty-two Mexican students were given a sentence completion test.

In scoring the "American Ideology and Popular Belief Test",³ the authors employed the following techniques:

Scoring each column of the tests provided measures of the following: personal ideologies of Mexican students, Mexican estimates of American ideology, Mexican estimates of Mexican ideology, personal ideologies of American students, American estimates of American ideologies, and American estimates of Mexican ideology. Two methods of scoring were used. One gave a relationship score which was possible to rank each student as to degree to which his personal ideology agreed or disagreed with his estimates of Mexican and American ideology and the degree to which his estimates of Mexican and American ideology were similar or different. The second was a simple computation or percentages of agreement for each statement which permitted group comparisons of personal ideologies and estimates of American and American ideologies.⁴

In individually interviewing the Mexican students, Beals and Humphrey asked six questions:

¹Ibid., p. 132.

²Ibid., p. 130.

³Ibid., p. 132.

⁴Ibid., pp. 132-134.

- (1) What was the Mexican student like before he came to the United States ?
- (2) What happened to the Mexican student during his period of stay in the United States ?
- (3) In what ways do the Mexican student's experience in the United States affect his life on his return to Mexico ?
- (4) What are the formative socio-cultural influences on the Mexican student before he comes to the United States ?
- (5) What aspects of American culture influenced the Mexican student in the United States ?
- (6) To what extent is United States culture taken back to Mexico, and to what extent does it continue to affect individual behavior or contribute to culture change ?¹

In addition to these questions the researchers asked "what factors in Mexican culture lead to rejection or acceptance of United States culture or to individual conflict situations ?"²

Beals and Humphrey also tested the group of American students on the same questions that were asked the Mexican students. They found that both the Mexican and American students felt that they differed significantly from the ideologies and beliefs of their countrymen, and both groups rejected most of the same aspects in the American culture and ideology. The Mexican students accepted many aspects of business and government in the United States.

The authors found the Mexican students becoming less authoritarian after being in the United States; the students also began to reject many traditional values and beliefs of Mexico such as the status of women and the raising of children, but the Mexican student, Beals and Humphrey discovered, had no disagreement with American education or professors.

¹Ibid., pp. 6-7.

²Ibid.

In the interviewing Beals and Humphrey discerned a feeling of admiration toward the United States political structure. The students like such things as citizen participation in government, campaigns and elections, the transfer of power, and the conduct of the government, but the students expressed a dislike of the United States foreign policy toward Latin America. Most students thought that the United States interfered too much in Latin America and that United States business concerns were imperialistic.

Beals and Humphrey discovered some additional insights by use of the "American Ideology and Popular Beliefs Test" which they administered to 38 Mexican students. The writers again found a close similarity between the ideologies of Mexican and American students. The Mexican students thought that the American people believed that the white race was superior, that children should be given much freedom, and that individuality was important. The American students disagreed somewhat with these views.

A fourth book which presented further insight into foreign students' opinions of American life was Coelho's book, Changing Images of America: A Study of Indian Students' Perceptions. Coelho's book was published in 1958.¹ He stressed the changing images of Indian Students. His work refuted the idea that images remain static and that foreign

¹Coelho, pp. x-103.

students become loyal to the United States because of their sojourn to America. Favorableness toward America and the American people, Coelho found, followed a U or J curve:

An initial favorable attitude toward their American audiences were followed by rapid disillusionment when . . . the Americans proved intractable to the visitors' expectations. After six months or a year these Indian students, who had been brought over here with the pious hope of producing good feeling and cultural understanding, were generally brimming over with critical clichés about American culture. That, however, is but a stage in the process of enlightenment. Gradually, but slowly, greater detachment, greater differentiation, and greater insight set in . . .¹

Coelho's sample consisted of 60 Indian students attending American universities in the Boston area and who represented four different lengths of stay in the United States. The sample was asked to write a composition on India-American relationships. They were also individually interviewed to elicit their attitudes toward the United States. Of the 60 students, fifteen students represented each of the following time spans:

less than one week's sojourn in the new culture
 3 to 9 months sojourn
 18 to 36 months sojourn
 48 to 84 months sojourn²

The experimenter found that the Indian students tended to stereotype the American. The following national traits were attributed

¹Ibid., p. xvii.

²Ibid., p. 21.

<u>Favorable</u>		<u>Unfavorable</u>
curious	helpful	materialistic
trustful	power-loving	arrogant
affectionate	frank	pragmatic
generous	quick	smug
friendly	independent	condescending
informal	self-confident	intolerant
hospitable	industrious	self-righteous
cooperative		frivolous ¹

In phase one, one week in the United States, Coelho discovered that the Indian students perceived Americans as ignorant of India and only superficially interested in hearing about India. In phase two, three to nine months sojourn, the Indian student, Coelho found, no longer desired the American friendliness. This phase was marked by strong criticism of the United States. The third phase, 18-36 months sojourn, was the analysis period. The student re-examined his feelings found in phase 2. In the last phase, 48-84 months sojourn, Coelho found the students again stereotyping Americans.

The experiences of Scandinavian students in America were discussed in an important work by William H. Sewell and Oluf M. Davidsen. The objectives of Sewell's and Davidsen's work were:

1. To obtain information about the academic and social adjustment and success of the visiting students.
2. To obtain information about the conflict and feeling tones of the visiting students' impressions of the United States as well as the changes in these impressions during the sojourn.

¹Ibid., p. 63.

²William H. Sewell and Oluf M. Davidsen, Scandinavian Students on American Campus (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1961), pp. 4-79.

3. To examine the relation between factors in the individuals' background, intellectual and socio-political orientation, personality, and the sojourn situation which together or separately might have a bearing on the students' academic and social adjustment and success, satisfaction with the sojourn, and images and attitudes toward the United States.
4. To discover possible promising leads and hypotheses for further study.
5. On the basis of the findings, to make tentative suggestions for the guidance of student exchange.¹

The data used in Sewell's and Davidsen's study was collected from 40 Scandinavian students who were enrolled during 1952-1954 at the University of Wisconsin. Two-thirds of the students were from middle-class families and one-third from influential families. Most of the students were also from large cities, and the writers used the following as background characteristics for the students:

Nationality
 Age (18-20; 23-28; over 23)
 Sex
 Marital status
 Residential background
 Occupational background (father's)
 Academic success at home
 English language ability
 Academic status at enrollment
 Field of study
 Source of financial support
 Financial support during sojourn
 Previous contacts with United States
 Sojourn purpose²

Sewell and Davidsen collected their data by means of personal interviews, and they developed an interview guide for this purpose. The

¹Ibid., pp. 6-7.

²Ibid., p. 8

guide had four main sections: "arrival experiences and impressions, background information, preconceptions, and subsequent experiences and impressions."¹ The writers interviewed each student twice with a nine months time span between each interview.

To obtain further information on the students, Sewell and Davidsen contacted the students' academic advisers and professors. Each professor was asked to give an evaluation of each student's scholastic and academic adjustment, and each academic adviser was asked to supply information on the type of advise the student sought. In addition, the writers were able to secure a copy of the student's grade reports.

The researchers found that the attitudes of the Scandinavian students toward social relations in the United States followed a set pattern:

- (1) very favorable impressions of American friendliness and hospitality during the first weeks of the sojourn when perhaps Americans were going out of their way to be kind to the visitors;
- (2) a reaction of disappointment and temporary withdrawal after several weeks when the students discovered that American friendliness and hospitality had a somewhat different meaning than similar behavior would have had at home; this disappointment resulted in the feeling that Americans were superficial in their social relations and could carry on best in formally organized groups.
- (3) favorable evaluations of social relations after the students had been here for several months and had more experience

¹Ibid., pp. 9-10.

with their American fellow students and other Americans.¹

The authors analyzed the students' adjustment patterns as follows:

- (1) the visitors' social interaction was at first characterized by many contacts with Americans, followed by a period of less frequent association, and finally by increased interaction with selected American persons and groups. This behavior pattern was usually accompanied by initially favorable impressions of American friendliness and informality, which later turned to perceptions of superficiality and lack of genuineness in social relations here, which in turn became generally favorable actions toward American social-relations norms;
- (2) The Scandinavian students' social adjustment was observed to take, in most cases, on four distinct patterns, distinguishable in extent and nature of social activity--the "enthusiastic participants" . . . the 'detached observers' . . . the 'promoters' . . . the 'settlers;'
- (3) despite their temporary tendency to withdraw from American social life, the students did not seem to experience social adjustment difficulties . . .²

In the interviewing relationships, the Scandinavian students were asked their opinions and impressions of such things as American religion, American art, American family structure, American recreational activities, American politics and economics, and American relations between races. The students' opinions of American life changed considerably during their sojourn in the United States. When they first arrived, the students felt strongly that American family life was marked by divorce and poor child raising habits. After they had been here for some time, the students began to view the American family life less

¹Ibid., p. 35.

²Ibid., p. 38.

critically; they still felt that parents were too permissive, but they began to like the easy relationships between children and parents. The Scandinavian students had unfavorable impressions of recreation in the United States. They considered Americans physically inactive and thought their sports were spectator rather than participator. Sewell and Davidsen discovered that the students were overwhelmed by the economic life and the prosperity of Americans. Religion in America, the students felt, was more sensational and less strict in its demands than religion in their own countries. All of the Scandinavian students had similar ideas concerning American politics. American political life, they thought, was characterized by:

Superficial attention to issues of public concern, exemplified by reading of headlines rather than serious study; lack of independent thought and action as evidenced by the naive means of persuasion used in political campaigns and by rapidly changing public opinion and sentiment, and unpremeditated generosity in aiding others, followed by impatience if the aid is thought to be ineffectively applied.¹

The writers found that the students were extremely critical of America's racial difficulties. The students also had an unfavorable impression of ethnic relationships in America.

The subjects found a number of characteristics to be prevalent among Americans. Among these characteristics were the following:

¹Ibid., pp. 47-48.

Carefree	informal
active	optimistic
happy-go-lucky	enthusiastic
kind	ebullient
fresh	agressive
flippant	self-confident
friendly	hard-working
noisy	sociable
exuberant	practical
immature	inconsiderate
generous	efficient ¹
superficial	

The two characteristics mentioned most by the students were: "friendly informality"² and "conformity."³

An extensive study on foreign visitors' views of the United States was compiled by Bryant M. Wedge and published as a book in 1965.⁴ Wedge and his associates used as their subjects 100 "escort-interpreters"⁵ of the "Interpretation Branch, Language Services Division of the Department of State who assist in Foreign Leader Programs."⁶ These subjects were engaged daily in communicating with foreign visitors and leaders. Some of the subjects were on the permanent staff of the Interpretation Branch while others were part-time employees. The writers also spoke with interpreters in Washington, Philadelphia, and New York City. For supplementing the interviews with these people, Wedge

¹Ibid., p. 50.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Wedge, pp. 8-153.

⁵Ibid., p. 143

⁶Ibid.

talked with "Officials in the Office of Cultural Exchange, the State Department Reception Center in New York City, the USIA, as well as with programming officers of the American Council of Education and the Government Affairs Institute . . ."¹

Each subject was interviewed from one to four hours, and Wedge used an interview guide for this purpose. The guide covered such questions as:

the general area of visitor misunderstanding about the United States; the source of such misunderstanding; experience in communication with visiting leaders; conflicts that the visitor may feel his country has with the United States; specific facts that the interpreter would like to communicate to people of other countries; recommended techniques of communication; and an exploration into the visitor's understanding of specific concepts, as revealed through a study of semantics.²

In order to give specific attention to views of visitors from different countries or geographic areas, the writers subdivided their book into separate chapters which concentrated on a specific geographic area of Africa, Russia, Japan, and Latin America. In assessing African views the authors found that the African visitors had strong conceptions of America as being a segregated nation. The Africans were astonished by the standard of living of the northern Negro. Wedge also found that Africans were puzzled by the attitudes of the American Negro. They felt that the Negro in America considered themselves

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., pp. 151-152.

inferior to the white person. The visitor from Africa thought that the United States government had not enforced its stand on integration and that the President of the United States had no desire to improve the situation of the Negro. Africans expressed the opinion that the American white person strongly disliked the idea of African men associating with white women. Wedge discovered that the African went home with the following opinions:

In general they go home with a diminished concern over our aims in Africa and a realization that we genuinely support self-determination; with a conviction that the American people are generally friendly and hard-working and not just spoiled, pleasure-seeking aristocrats; and with an awareness that Negro-white relationships represent social problems with which white as well as Negro Americans are deeply concerned.¹

Wedge and his associates found that the Russian visitors were interpreting the United States and their experiences in the United States from a strongly affected Soviet point of view. This, Wedge, felt, biased their perceptions of the United States.

Japanese visitors were surprised at the high morals of Americans and the order in American life. Wedge characterized the "Japanese understanding of the United States . . . as wary and puzzled, admiring the fearful, even as unbelieving."² Wedge expressed the feeling that the Japanese visitors were uncomfortable about the informality in America. They were distressed that there were no clear lines of class distinction.

¹Ibid., p. 26.

²Ibid., pp. 43-44.

The Japanese were critical of the United States student exchange and assistance programs. They felt that these programs were "a new imperialism, an American thrust for economic and political domination of other countries."¹

Certain preconceived images of the Latin American visitor toward the United States were discovered by Wedge:

the image of the good neighbor and the neo-colonial power, of the rich uncle and the capitalist exploiter, of the bastion of freedom and a threat to Latin American freedoms.²

The distinct features of Latin American images of the United States were characterized by "ambivalence, ambiguity, and sensitivity . . ."³

The Latin Americans believed that the American people were immoral and that their social customs invited misbehavior. Wedge also discovered that the visitors from Latin America were distressed by the lack of recognition of social position in America. They felt uncomfortable because their social status was not recognized.

With the exception of Russia, the overall impressions of the visitors from other countries were that "the United States and its leaders, and the United Nations as well, are usually described as positive forces, thereby implying that our country . . . is associated with their national aspirations. On the other hand, Khrushchev, Marxism, the

¹Ibid., pp. 49-50.

²Ibid., p. 54

³Ibid.

Soviet Union, and Communist China are all negatively perceived . . . "1

The visitors from abroad all had a misconception of the influence of capitalism on United States policies abroad. The United States was described as "arrogant, free-spending, domineering, and profit-dominated . . . rich, spoiled, selfish, cold, and lacking feeling and compassions."2 The United States society was interpreted as "mechanized, collar-happy, reactionary, and materialistic."3

Morris' book was a monumental work which contained source material on foreign student adjustment and impressions of the United States.4 Morris interviewed 318 foreign students at the University of California at Los Angeles concerning their images of America. The writer asked each student to agree or disagree with twenty-six statements about American life. He then compared the percentage of Europeans agreeing against the percentage of non-Europeans agreeing. His questions and the total percentages of all students agreeing with each statement were:

1Ibid., p. 104.

2Ibid., p. 105.

3Ibid.

4Richard T. Morris, The Two Way Mirror: National Status in Foreign Student Adjustment (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1960), pp. 119-213.

TABLE 3

**AGREEMENT IN PERCEPTION
OF AMERICA^a**

Item No.	Statement about American Life	Per Cent Agreeing
26	Financial success as an objective in life is generally important.	91
21	In economic matters people tend to be ambitious.	89
17	In bringing up their children parents usually allow them much freedom.	88
6	When meeting strangers most are friendly.	84
18	Businessman and manufacturer are considered more important than the artist or philosopher.	83
8	In their everyday relations people treat each other as equals.	82
27	In their outlook toward life people are usually optimistic.	81
2	Student-professor relations are generally informal.	79
7	People's relationships with each other are usually shallow.	71
15	Most free-time activities take place outside the home and family.	71
5	Generally, friendships develop quickly and last for a short time.	68
20	Economic affairs are largely free from government control.	68
16	Obligation to one's family is usually considered less important than one's own wishes.	65
9	The unfortunate in society are well cared for.	62
16	Freedom of speech, thought, and association is limited.	59

TABLE 3
(continued)

Item No.	Statement about American Life	Percent Agreeing
23	Foreign policy toward Russia tends to be aggressive.	54
14	Undemocratic practices seldom occur.	54
19	In sports and recreation people usually actively participate.	52

^aTable #7 cited in Morris' The Two Way Mirror: National Status in Foreign Student Adjustment, p. 120.

Morris' three main themes were: "Americans are immature, Americans are democratic, and Americans are materialistic."¹ The six statements which all the students felt were most important in the formation of their opinions of the United States were items 10, 6, 8, 11, 9, and 17.

The most recent study on foreign students' impressions of the United States was completed in the spring of 1965 by the United States Advisory Commission, International Educational and Cultural Affairs.² This report was based on personal interviews with a sample of all foreign students in the United States. The Commission found the following reasons stated by the sample for finding Americans prejudiced against

¹Ibid., p. 119.

²Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, pp. ii-40.

foreign students."¹

Americans act superior.
 Americans are ignorant of other countries.
 Prejudiced against Africans and other blacks.
 Prejudiced against other races, not against us.
 Prejudiced against anyone who speaks or dresses differently.
 Americans have stereotypes of other countries.
 Won't try to understand us or our background.
 Think we are ignorant and have nothing in our country.
 Treat you as an outsider.
 Cultural prejudice everywhere.
 Students resent financial aid to foreigners.
 Hypocrites, only superficially friendly.
 Language differences make understanding difficult.
 Students are unfriendly.
 People won't rent, charge too much to foreign students.
 Prejudiced against anyone born outside this country.
 Prejudiced against other countries.
 Show no common interests.
 American Negroes show more prejudice than whites.²

The studies, book, and reports here described reflect a growing awareness of the need for research on foreign students' opinions of America and the American people. Most of the studies described a particular group of foreign students, and most used interviews or questionnaires to arrive at generalizations and conclusions.

¹Ibid., p. 35

²Ibid.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Description of Subjects

The subjects in this study were the 633 foreign students who were in the United States on temporary visas and who were at the time of this study attending Wayne State University in Detroit, Michigan and 120 American student leaders who at the time of this study were presidents of active recognized student organizations on Wayne State University's campus and who were attending Wayne State. Of the 633 foreign students who were contacted and asked to participate in this study, 387 or 61 per cent responded. There were, therefore, 246 students or 39 per cent who did not respond. Of the 120 American student leaders who were contacted and likewise asked to participate in this study, 81 or 67.5 per cent responded. There were 39 or 33.5 per cent who did not respond. All of the students who responded to the request to assist in this research took the survey.

The geographic areas from which the subjects came are shown in Table 4. Students from the Far East (Pakistan Eastward) constituted the largest cultural group. There were 151 or 32.3 per cent of the total

distribution from this area. The students from the United States, or the control group, represented the second largest group. There were 81 students or 17.3 per cent of the total distribution from the United States. The third largest cultural area represented is the Middle East with 68 students or 14.5 per cent of the total distribution coming from this area. From Canada there were 66 students or 14.1 per cent of the total distribution. Europe was represented by 54 students or 11.5 per cent of the total distribution; Latin America by 23 students or 4.9 per cent of the total distribution. Students from Africa numbered 23 or 4.9 per cent of the total distribution, and students from Australia numbered the smallest with 2 students or .5 per cent of the total distribution. Excluding the

TABLE 4

**DISTRIBUTION BY GEOGRAPHIC AREA OF 468 FOREIGN
AND AMERICAN STUDENTS SURVEYED
AT WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY**

Geographic Area	Number of Students	Per Cent
Canada	66	14.1
Latin America	23	4.9
Europe	54	11.5
United States	81	17.3
Middle East	68	14.5
Far East (Pakistan Eastward)	151	32.3
Africa	23	4.9
Australia	2	.5
Total	468	100.0

United States, the number of foreign students was 387 or 82.7 per cent of the total distribution. Approximately one out of three subjects was from the Far East and one out of six was from the United States.

Tables 5, 6, and 7 provide data regarding the age of the subjects. Table 5 shows that 212 of the students or 45.3 per cent of the total percentage were in the age range 21 years through 25 years, and 139 or 29.3 per cent of the total percentage were in the age range 26 years through 30 years. Within these two age ranges, therefore, there were 351 students or 75.1 per cent of the total percentage represented. Table 6 gives the distribution by age range according to geographic areas represented by the students. Within the age range 17 years through 20 years there were 8 students from Canada, 5 from Latin America, 6 from Europe, 18 from the United States, 2 from the Middle East, 3 from the Far East, and no students from Africa and Australia. The age range 21 years through 25 years was represented by 34 students from Canada, 9 students from Latin America, 19 students from Europe, 55 students from the Middle East, 49 students from the Far East, 11 students from Africa, and 0 students from Australia. There were 13 students from Canada, 6 students from Latin America, 16 students from Europe, 5 students from the United States, 26 students from the Middle East, 67 students from the Far East, 6 students from Africa, and no students from Australia in the age range 26 years through 30 years. Within the age range 30 years and above there were 11 students from Canada, 3 students from Latin

America, 13 students from Europe, 3 students from the Far East, 6 students from Africa, and 2 students from Australia. Excluding the United States, in age range 17 years through 20 years there were 24 foreign students; in age range 21 years through 25 years, 157 foreign students; in age range 26 years through 30 years, 134 foreign students; and in age range 30 years and above, 72 foreign students. Table 7 shows the percentage of students within each age range according to the geographic areas represented by the students. Except for the Far East and Australia, the age range 21 years through 25 years constituted the largest percentage from each geographic area. In this age range there were 51.5 per cent of the Canadian students represented, 39.1 per cent of the Latin American students represented, 35.2 per cent of the European students represented, 67.9 per cent of the United States students represented, 51.5 per cent of the Middle Eastern students represented, 32.5 per cent of the Far Eastern students represented, and 00.0 per cent of the Australian students represented.

TABLE 5

**DISTRIBUTION BY AGE RANGE OF 468 FOREIGN
AND AMERICAN STUDENTS SURVEYED
AT WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY**

Age Range	Number of Students	Per Cent
17 years-20 years	42	8.9
21 years-25 years	212	45.3
26 years-30 years	139	29.8
31 years-above	75	16.0
Total	468	100.0

TABLE 6

**DISTRIBUTION BY AGE RANGE
ACCORDING TO GEOGRAPHIC AREAS
OF 468 FOREIGN AND AMERICAN STUDENTS
SURVEYED AT WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY**

Geographic Area	Age Range 17-20 years	Age Range 21-25 years	Age Range 26-30 years	Age Range 30 yrs. above	Total
Canada	8	34	13	11	66
Latin America	5	9	6	3	23
Europe	6	19	16	13	54
United States	18	55	5	3	81
Middle East	2	35	26	5	68
Far East	3	49	67	32	151
Africa	0	11	6	6	23
Australia	0	0	0	2	2
Total	42	212	139	75	468

TABLE 7

**PERCENTAGE BY AGE RANGE
ACCORDING TO GEOGRAPHIC AREAS
OF 468 FOREIGN AND AMERICAN STUDENTS
SURVEYED AT WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY**

Geographic Area	Age Range 17-20 years	Age Range 21-25 years	Age Range 26-30 years	Age Range 30 yrs-above	Total PerCent
Canada	12.1	51.5	19.7	16.7	100.0
Latin America	21.7	39.1	26.1	13.1	100.0
Europe	11.1	35.2	29.6	24.1	100.0
United States	22.2	67.9	6.2	3.7	100.0
Middle East	2.9	51.5	38.2	7.4	100.0
Far East	1.9	32.5	44.4	21.2	100.0
Africa	00.0	47.8	26.1	26.1	100.0
Australia	00.0	00.0	00.0	100.0	100.0

Tables 8 and 9 point out the status in the university of the students under study. There were 229 or 49.0 per cent of the students classified as graduate students, and 239 or 51.0 per cent classified as undergraduate students.

Table 9 provides statistics on status in the university by distribution and percentage according to the geographic areas of the subjects. There were 24 graduate students from Canada, 6 graduate students from Latin America, 22 graduate students from Europe, 15 graduate students from the United States, 27 graduate students from the Middle East, 121 graduate students from the Far East, 12 graduate students from Africa, and 2 graduate students from Australia. In the undergraduate status represented

TABLE 8

**DISTRIBUTION BY STATUS IN UNIVERSITY OF 468
FOREIGN AND AMERICAN STUDENTS SURVEYED
AT WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY**

Status in University	Number of Students	Per Cent
Graduate	229	49.0
Undergraduate	239	51.0
Total	468	100.0

TABLE 9

**DISTRIBUTION BY STATUS IN UNIVERSITY ACCORDING TO GEOGRAPHIC
AREAS OF 468 FOREIGN AND AMERICAN STUDENTS SURVEYED
AT WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY**

Geographic Area	Graduate	Undergraduate	Total Distribution
Canada	24 (36.4%)	42 (63.6%)	66
Latin America	6 (26.1%)	17 (73.9%)	23
Europe	22 (40.7%)	32 (59.3%)	54
United States	15 (18.5%)	66 (81.5%)	81
Middle East	27 (39.1%)	41 (60.3%)	68
Far East	121 (80.1%)	30 (19.9%)	151
Africa	12 (52.2%)	11 (47.8%)	23
Australia	2 (100.0%)	0 (00.0%)	2
Total	229	239	468

were 42 students from Canada, 17 students from Latin America, 32 students from Europe, 66 students from the United States, 41 students from the Middle East, 30 students from the Far East, and no students from Australia. If the United States students were excluded, there were 214 graduate foreign students and 173 undergraduate foreign students. With the exception of the Far East, Africa, and Australia, the largest percentage of students was undergraduates. By geographic areas these percentages were: 63.6 per cent of Canadians were undergraduates, 73.9 per cent of Latin Americans were undergraduates, 59.3 per cent of Europeans were undergraduates, 81.5 per cent of Americans were undergraduates, 60.3 per cent of Middle Easterners were undergraduates, 19.9 per cent of Far Easterners were undergraduates, 47.8 per cent of Africans were undergraduates, and 00.0 per cent of Australians were undergraduates.

TABLE 10

**DISTRIBUTION BY SEX OF 468 FOREIGN
AND AMERICAN STUDENTS SURVEYED
AT WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY**

Sex	Number of Students	Per Cent
Male	343	73.3
Female	125	26.7
Total	468	100.0

TABLE 11

**DISTRIBUTION BY SEX ACCORDING TO GEOGRAPHIC AREAS
OF 468 FOREIGN AND AMERICAN STUDENTS SURVEYED
AT WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY**

Geographic Area	Male	Female	Total Distribution
Canada	49 (74.2%)	17 (25.8%)	66
Latin America	17 (73.9%)	6 (26.1%)	23
Europe	31 (54.7%)	23 (42.6%)	54
United States	58 (71.6%)	23 (20.4%)	81
Middle East	57 (83.8%)	11 (16.2%)	68
Far East	118 (78.1%)	33 (21.9%)	151
Africa	11 (47.8%)	12 (52.2%)	23
Australia	2 (100.0%)	0 (00.0%)	2
Total	343	125	468

The sex of the subjects are shown in Tables 10 and 11. The male students represented 73.3 per cent of the subjects, and the female students represented 26.7 percent of the students. There were 343 total male students, and 125 total female students. Approximately 1 out of 4 of the male students was from the Far East. There were 49 male students and 17 female students from Canada, 17 male students and 6 female students from Latin America, 31 male students and 23 female students from Europe, 58 male students and 23 female students from the United States, 57 male students and 11 female students from the Middle East, 118 male students and 33 female students from the Far East, 11

male students and 12 female students from Africa, and 2 male students and 0 female students from Australia. With the exception of Africa, the largest percentage of students from each geographic area was male; 3 out of 4 of the Canadian students were male, and approximately 3 out of 4 of the Latin American students were male. Approximately 1 out of 2 of the European students, 3 out of 4 of the United States students, 5 out of 6 of the Middle Eastern students, 3 out of 4 of the Far Eastern students, and 1 out of 2 of the African students were male. One hundred per cent of the Australian students were male.

TABLE 12

DISTRIBUTION BY MARITAL STATUS OF 468
FOREIGN AND AMERICAN STUDENTS SURVEYED
AT WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

Marital Status	Number of Students	Per Cent
Married	126	26.9
Single	342	73.1
Total	468	100.0

TABLE 13

**DISTRIBUTION BY MARITAL STATUS ACCORDING TO GEOGRAPHIC
AREAS OF 468 FOREIGN AND AMERICAN STUDENTS SURVEYED
AT WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY**

Geographic Area	Married	Single	Total Distribution
Canada	25 (37.9%)	41 (62.1%)	66
Latin America	5 (21.7%)	18 (78.3%)	23
Europe	15 (27.8%)	39 (72.2%)	54
United States	15 (18.5%)	66 (81.5%)	81
Middle East	16 (23.5%)	52 (76.5%)	68
Far East	41 (27.2%)	110 (72.8%)	151
Africa	7 (30.4%)	16 (69.6%)	23
Australia	2 (100.0%)	0 (00.0%)	2
Total	126	342	468

The marital status of the subjects can be seen in Tables 12 and 13. Approximately 3 out of 4 or 73.1 per cent of the students were single, and 1 out of 4 or 26.9 per cent was married. There were 126 married students and 342 single students. Approximately 1 out of 3 of the single students was from the Far East. There are 25 married and 41 single students from Canada, 5 married and 18 single students from Latin America, 15 married and 34 single students from Europe, 15 married and 66 single students from the United States, 16 married and 52 single students from the Middle East, 41 married and 110 single students from the Far East, 7 married and 16 single students from Africa, and 2 married and no

single students from Australia. Excluding the United States subjects, there were 111 married and 176 single students who were from foreign countries. With the exception of Australia, the largest percentage of students from each geographic area was single. From Canada 62.1 per cent of the students were single; from Latin America, 78.3 per cent; from Europe, 72.2 per cent; from the United States, 81.5 per cent; from the Middle East, 72.8 per cent; from Africa, 69.6 per cent; and from Australia, 00.0 per cent.

TABLE 14

**DISTRIBUTION BY LENGTH OF TIME IN THE UNITED STATES
OF 468 FOREIGN AND AMERICAN STUDENTS SURVEYED
AT WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY**

Length of time in the United States	Number of Students	Per Cent
1-30 days	4	.9
30 days-6 months	25	5.3
6 months-1 year	100	21.4
1 year-2 years	76	16.2
2 years-above	147	31.4
Commute daily	35	7.7
Life	81	17.7
Total	468	100.0

TABLE 15

**DISTRIBUTION BY LENGTH OF TIME IN THE UNITED STATES ACCORDING
TO GEOGRAPHIC AREAS OF 468 FOREIGN AND AMERICAN STUDENTS
SURVEYED AT WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY**

Geographic Area	1-30 days	30 days-6 mos.	6 mos.-1 yr.	1 - 2 yrs.	2 years. above	Commute Daily	Life	Total
Canada	0	0	0	0	0	66	0	66
Latin America	0	2	9	4	8	0	0	23
Europe	1	2	19	13	19	0	0	54
United States	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	81
Middle East	0	5	13	9	41	0	0	68
Far East	0	14	41	36	59	1	0	151
Africa	0	1	8	5	9	0	0	23
Australia	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Total	4	25	100	76	147	67	81	468

TABLE 16

PERCENTAGE BY LENGTH OF TIME IN THE UNITED STATES
ACCORDING TO GEOGRAPHIC AREAS OF 468 FOREIGN AND AMERICAN
STUDENTS SURVEYED AT WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

Geographic Area	1-30 days	30 days-6 mos.	6 mos. - 1 year	1 - 2 yrs.	2 yrs. above	Commute Daily	Life	Total
Canada	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	100.0	00.0	100.0
Latin America	00.0	8.7	39.1	17.4	34.8	00.0	00.0	100.0
Europe	1.9	3.7	35.2	24.1	35.1	00.0	00.0	100.0
United States	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	100.0	100.0
Middle East	00.0	7.4	19.1	13.2	60.3	00.0	00.0	100.0
Far East	00.0	9.3	27.2	23.8	39.1	0.7	00.0	100.0
Africa	00.0	4.3	34.7	21.7	39.2	00.0	00.0	100.0
Australia	00.0	00.0	100.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	100.0

Tables 14, 15, and 16 give the length of stay of students in the United States. Table 14 shows that less than 1 per cent have been in the United States less than 30 days, that 31.4 per cent have been in the United States 2 years and above, and that 7.7 per cent commute daily from Canada. Table 15 shows that with the exception of 1 student from the Far East only Canadian students commuted daily from Canada, and only American students have been here for life.

Construction and Description of the Instrument

The questionnaire technique was considered the most practicable method for obtaining the data for this study. The data was concerned with the opinions of foreign students toward the United States and the character of people in the United States. In this study certain principles were followed to make the questionnaire as effective as possible. The principles followed by the writer were those suggested by Best as being essential for the construction of a valid and reliable questionnaire:

1. Define or qualify terms that could easily be misinterpreted.
2. Be careful of using descriptive adjectives and adverbs that have no agreed-upon meaning.
3. Beware of double negatives.
4. Be careful of inadequate alternatives.
5. Avoid the double-barreled question.
6. Underline a word if you wish to indicate special emphasis.

7. When asking for ratings or comparisons a point of reference is necessary.
8. Avoid unwarranted assumptions.
9. Phrase questions so that they are appropriate for all respondents.
10. Design questions that will give a complete response.
11. Provide for the systematic quantification of responses.
12. Consider the possibility of classifying the responses yourself, rather than having the respondent choose categories.¹

After the decision by the writer to use the questionnaire as the instrument for data collection, the actual construction of the questionnaire took place during the months of November, December, January, and February, 1966-67. All possible related research was reviewed to gather information on similar studies. Several revisions of the questionnaire were made so that changes, deletions, and additions which were suggested by colleagues, and foreign students at Wayne State University could be included.

During the first week of February, 1967, a group of ten Wayne State University foreign students who were holding temporary visas, who were from various geographic areas in the world, and who had been in the United States varying lengths of time were contacted by letter (See Appendix F) and asked to complete the questionnaire. Each student was asked to make an appointment to see the writer in the Foreign Student Office at Wayne State University. When the student arrived at the Foreign Student Office and when rapport was established, he was escorted by the

¹ John W. Best., Research in Education (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1959), pp. 146-150.

writer to a private room, handed the questionnaire and writing utensils, and given instructions for completing the questionnaire. The student was told to return to the writer's office when he had finished. After he had completed the questionnaire, each student was personally interviewed by the writer and asked to indicate the items which were vague, semantically troublesome, or which need changing. The student was also asked to recommend additions to the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was then rewritten by the writer and again assembled. Recommended changes were included. The revised questionnaire was given to a second group of foreign students who were identical to the first group. They also were asked their opinions concerning the items and were asked which items were ambiguous and needed changing. After the second group of foreign students had completed the questionnaire and had given recommendation for improvements, the questionnaire was once again rewritten. This time only minor changes were required.

In order to establish validity, the third revision of the questionnaire was submitted to a panel of experts. During the first week of March, 1967, four colleagues at Wayne State were contacted by letter and asked to act as a jury to assess the validity of the questionnaire as a device to test foreign students' opinions of the American character (See Appendix F). They were requested to appraise each question by circling 5 if they considered the question to be excellent, 4 if good, 3 if average, 2 if below average, and 1 if unsatisfactory. The jury members' answers were recorded

and the mean for each question was then computed. Any question which had a mean below 2.5 was either eliminated or changed as suggested by the jury. The mean for each question is shown in Appendix G. The jury members were also asked to add further comments concerning the questionnaire. Only one, the Foreign Student Adviser at Wayne State University, did so.

The criteria for selecting jury members were:

1. Have travelled extensively abroad.
2. Have written professionally concerning some aspect of foreign student adjustment.
3. Have a working relationship with foreign students and their difficulties.

The following colleagues at Wayne State University consented to act as jury members:

1. Dr. Virgil R. Loughheed
Foreign Student Adviser
Foreign Student Office
448 Mackenzie Hall
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan 48201
2. Dr. Marion Edman
Professor of Education
231 Education Building
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan 48201
3. Dr. Edward C. Cieslak
Director of Special Projects, Graduate Division
1196 Mackenzie Hall
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan 48201

4. Dr. Harlan L. Hagman
Dean of Administration
Office of Vice-President for Academic Administration
1186 Mackenzie Hall
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan 48201

No serious changes were suggested by the jury. Some questions required only substituting one word for another. Minor changes were also made in the directions to the questionnaire. The measuring instrument was then put in final form.

The final form of the questionnaire was given to a third pilot group of Wayne State University foreign students during the latter part of March, 1967. The same procedure as before was followed: The students were contacted, asked to see the writer and given the questionnaire to complete. This time, however, the group was not interviewed or asked for their suggestions. One week later this group was again asked to complete the questionnaire, and the results of the first questionnaire were correlated with the results of the second. The correlation was .936. This established the reliability of the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was constructed so that students' responses could be rated on a Likert type scale from agree to disagree:

The Likert method . . . A Likert type scale consists of a series of statements to which subjects are asked to react. Instead of simply checking the items with which they agree, however, the subjects are asked to respond to each item in terms of several degrees of agreement or disagreement; for example, (1) strongly approve, (2) approve, (3) undecided, (4) disapprove, (5) strongly disapprove . . . Each individual's

score is computed by summating his responses to all items. Before summating; the responses to the various items must be scored in such a way that a response which is indicative of the most favorable attitude is given the highest score.¹

So that the student could easily mark his agreement or disagreement with the statement, each statement within the questionnaire has printed beside it the numbers 5, 4, 3, 2, 1. The student was instructed on the front page to mark 5 if he strongly agreed with the statement, 4 if he agreed with the statement, 3 if he is undecided about the statement, 2 if he disagreed with the statement, and 1 if he strongly disagreed with the statement. There were six pages in the questionnaire; one page was for general directions, and five pages were for questions. (See Appendix B).

Procedures Used

On April 6, 1967, letters were sent to 633 foreign students. The letter explained the purpose of the study, provided instruction for students to follow, assured the students of confidentiality of respondents, and urged the student to participate. A self-addressed post card, which had a schedule of hours printed on the reverse side, was also enclosed (See Appendix H). The student was asked to check the hour most convenient for him to complete the questionnaire. Each student was instructed

¹Marie Jahoda, Morton Deutsch, and Stuart Cook, Research Methods - In Social Relations: With Special to Prejudice (New York: Dryden Press, 1953), pp. 423

to mail the post card as soon as possible; they were also invited to telephone the writer at the Foreign Student Office if none of the times were convenient.

A follow-up letter was sent on April 21, 1967 to the students who had not responded. Post cards were enclosed as before. A third letter which confirmed the student's appointment was sent on April 26, 1967. All students who had indicated they would participate were contacted by telephone the day before they were scheduled to take the survey.

On May 12, 1967, a fourth letter was sent to those students who had not responded to the other two. Again the students were urged to assist in the study. This time, however, the writer enclosed a copy of the questionnaire and a self-addressed stamped envelope for returning it.

The students were also contacted through the Crossroads, a monthly newsletter published by the Foreign Student Office and sent to all non-citizens attending Wayne State University.

The American student leaders were contacted by letter on April 17, 1967 and again on May 12, 1967. The letters contained questionnaires and self-addressed envelopes, which the students were instructed to return to the Foreign Student Office or deposit in the campus mail. The letters outlined the reasons for the study, provided general instructions, and asked for the students' support.

For the students who did not fill out the questionnaire by mail, the administering of the questionnaire was supervised by persons other

than the writer or a staff member of the Foreign Student Office. The proctor was provided instructions for administering the questionnaire (See Appendix E). This person proved to be valuable as a resource person for answering questions. A large box was provided for the students to deposit their completed questionnaire.

These foregoing procedures were felt to be responsible for the high percentage of foreign and American students completing the questionnaire.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The subjects' responses to the special eleven questions at the bottom of page six of the questionnaire are shown in Tables 20 through 30. These special eleven questions were designed to obtain foreign students' opinions of the ways in which their concepts and attitudes of the United States were formed. The subjects were instructed to circle the statements which they felt indicated the way in which their opinions were formed.

Table 20 shows that 91 per cent of all foreign students felt that "personal observation" was not important in the formation of their opinion about the United States. This 91 per cent figure represented a total of 352 students. There were 62 students from Canada who concurred; 23 from Latin America; 45 from Europe; and 65 from the Middle East; 134 from the Far East; 21 from Africa; and 2 from Australia. There were only 35 students who responded to the statement.

Forty-two and two-tenths per cent of all the foreign subjects responded to statement two, "reading books, magazines, or newspapers printed in the United States." This is shown in Table 21. There were

55.8 per cent of the students who did not respond to the statement. These figures represented 171 and 216 students respectively.

There were 47.5 per cent of the total foreign sample or 184 foreign students who responded and 52.5 per cent of the total foreign sample or 203 students who did not respond to statement three, "listening to television or radio programs in the United States." This is shown in Table 22.

One hundred forty-six foreign students responded affirmatively to statement four, "visiting American homes." There were also 241 students who did not respond. These figures represent a percentage of 37.7 and 62.3 respectively. Table 23 points out these figures.

Table 24 shows that a high percentage, 77.8 per cent, of the foreign students did not respond to statement five, "talking with American students and friends." There were only 22.2 per cent of the students who did respond. A high percentage of Canadian students did not respond to this question. There were 59 Canadian students who did not respond and only 7 who did respond. Similarly only 1 out of 23 Latin American students responded affirmatively to this statement.

Statement six, "reading official government documents or papers from your own country," was responded to by a very high percentage of the foreign students. Three hundred seventy or 95.6 per cent of the students circled this statement as being important. There were only 17 or 4.4 per cent who did not. Each geographic area also showed a high

percentage of students responding. There were only 3 students from Canada, 2 students from Latin America, 2 students from Europe, 3 students from the Middle East, 6 students from the Far East, and 1 student from Africa who did not respond. These figures are shown in Table 25.

There were 86 per cent of the total foreign student population or 333 students who responded to statement seven, "listening to your friends or fellow students in your own country." Fifty-four students or 14 per cent did not respond to statement seven. There was an exceedingly high percentage of Far Eastern Students who responded to this statement. Only 15 out of 151 Far Eastern students failed to respond. Likewise only 3 out of 51 European students did not respond.

Table 27 shows that 91 per cent or 352 of the foreign students thought statement eight, "listening to members of your own family speak about the United States," was an important influence on their opinions of the United States. Only 9 per cent or 35 students did not respond.

Three hundred twenty-six or 84.2 per cent of all foreign students felt that statement nine, "reading books, magazines, or newspapers printed in your own country," was significant in the forming of their opinions. Sixty-one or 15.8 per cent did not respond. Table 28 shows that only 19 out of 151 of the Far Eastern students and 3 out of 23 of the African students failed to respond to this statement.

Again in Table 29 there was a high percentage of students responding. Three hundred forty-eight or 90 per cent of the foreign subjects responded, and only 39 or 10 per cent did not. This time only 7 out of 151 Far Eastern students failed to respond. Statement ten, "listening to television or radio programs in your own country," was perceived as highly important by foreign students from each of the seven geographic area.

There were 72.1 per cent of 279 students who circled statement eleven, "personal experiences which may have prejudiced your objectivity in viewing the United States," as important. Similarly there were 108 or 27.9 per cent of the students who did not respond. None of the Australian students responded to this question and only 15 out of 23 African students responded.

The student responses to the special eleven statements indicated that statement six, "reading official government documents or papers from your own country," was perceived as the most important way that their opinions of the United States were formed and that statement one, "personal observation," was perceived as the least important way that their opinions of the United States were formed.

The foreign students responded strongly to these statements which denoted that their opinions were formed either in their own country or by their own media, but they responded weakly to those statements which

denoted that their opinions were formed either in the United States or by media in the United States. Similarly visiting American homes had an affect on only a small percentage (37.7); whereas, listening to members of their own family discuss the United States strongly affected their attitudes of the United States (91 per cent).

Personal observation was also perceived by only a small percentage (9.0) as being important, but on the other hand, listening to friends was perceived by a large percentage (86.0) as being important.

The participants from each of the geographic areas were consistent with each other in their beliefs concerning how their opinions were formed. In only three cases did any geographic area not agree with the entire sample. In responding to statement two, "reading books, magazines, or newspapers printed in the United States," 74 Far Eastern students did not respond and 77 did respond; whereas, in the entire sample 216 or 55.8 per cent did not respond and 171 or 44.2 per cent did respond. Also in responding to statement three, "listening to television or radio programs in the United States," 24 European students did not respond and 30 did respond and 62 Far Eastern students did not respond and 89 did respond; whereas in the total population 203 or 52.5 per cent did not respond and 184 or 47.5 did respond.

Reading books, magazines, or newspapers printed in their own country was considered more important by the foreign students in the formation of their opinions concerning the United States than books,

TABLE 17

STUDENTS' RESPONSES TO SPECIAL QUESTION

1. "PERSONAL OBSERVATION"

Geographic Area	Number of Students Responding	Number of Students Not Responding	Per Cent of Total Sample Responding	Per Cent of Total Sample Not Responding
Canada (66)	4	62	1.0	16.0
Latin America (23)	0	23	.0	6.0
Europe (54)	9	45	2.3	11.6
Middle East (68)	3	65	.8	16.8
Far East (151)	17	134	4.4	34.6
Africa (23)	2	21	.5	5.4
Australia (2)	0	2	00.0	.6
Total	35	352	9.0	91.0

TABLE 18

STUDENTS' RESPONSES TO SPECIAL QUESTION

2. "READING BOOKS, MAGAZINES
OR NEWSPAPERS PRINTED IN
THE UNITED STATES"

Geographic Area	Number of Students Responding	Number of Students Not Responding	Per Cent of Total Sample Responding	Per Cent of Total Sample Not Responding
Canada (66)	25	41	6.5	10.6
Latin America (23)	6	17	1.5	4.4
Europe (54)	22	32	5.7	8.3
Middle East (68)	30	38	7.8	9.8
Far East (151)	77	74	19.9	19.1
Africa (23)	10	13	2.6	3.4
Australia (2)	1	1	.2	.2
Total	171	216	44.2	55.8

TABLE 19

STUDENTS' RESPONSES TO SPECIAL QUESTIONS

3. "LISTENING TO TELEVISION OR
RADIO PROGRAMS IN THE
UNITED STATES"

Geographic Area	Number of Students Responding	Number of Students Not Responding	Per Cent of Total Sample Responding	Per Cent of Total Sample Not Responding
Canada (66)	20	46	5.1	11.9
Latin America (23)	11	12	2.8	3.1
Europe (54)	30	24	7.8	6.2
Middle East (68)	27	41	7.0	10.6
Far East (151)	89	62	23.0	16.0
Africa (23)	6	17	1.6	4.4
Australia (2)	1	1	.2	.2
Total	184	233	47.5	52.5

TABLE 20

STUDENTS' RESPONSES TO SPECIAL QUESTION

4. "VISITING AMERICAN HOMES"

Geographic Area	Number of Students Responding	Number of Students Not Responding	Per Cent of Total Sample Responding	Per Cent of Total Sample Not Responding
Canada (66)	32	34	8.2	81.8
Latin America (23)	3	20	.8	5.2
Europe (54)	27	27	7.0	7.0
Middle East (68)	22	46	5.7	11.9
Far East (151)	56	95	14.5	24.6
Africa (23)	4	19	1.0	5.0
Australia (2)	2	0	.5	00.0
Total	146	241	37.7	62.3

TABLE 21

STUDENTS' RESPONSES TO SPECIAL QUESTION

5. "TALKING WITH AMERICAN STUDENTS OR FRIENDS"

Geographic Area	Number of Students Responding	Number of Students Not Responding	Per Cent of Total Sample Responding	Per Cent of Total Sample Not Responding
Canada (66)	7	59	1.8	15.2
Latin America (23)	1	22	.3	5.7
Europe (54)	16	38	4.1	9.8
Middle East (68)	11	57	2.8	14.7
Far East (151)	46	105	11.9	27.1
Africa (23)	4	19	1.0	5.0
Australia (2)	1	1	.3	.3
Total	86	301	22.2	77.8

TABLE 22

STUDENTS' RESPONSES TO SPECIAL QUESTION

6. "READING OFFICIAL GOVERNMENT
DOCUMENTS OR PAPERS
FROM YOUR OWN COUNTRY"

Geographic Area	Number of Students Responding	Number of Students Not Responding	Per Cent of Total Sample Responding	Per Cent of Total Sample Not Responding
Canada (66)	63	3	16.2	.8
Latin America (23)	21	2	5.4	.5
Europe (54)	52	2	13.4	.5
Middle East (60)	65	3	16.8	.8
Far East (151)	145	6	37.4	1.6
Africa (23)	22	1	5.9	.2
Australia (2)	2	0	.5	00.0
Total	370	17	95.6	4.4

TABLE 23

STUDENTS' RESPONSES TO SPECIAL QUESTION

7. "LISTENING TO YOUR FRIENDS
OR FELLOW STUDENTS
IN YOUR OWN COUNTRY"

Geographic Area	Number of Students Responding	Number of Students Not Responding	Per Cent of Total Sample Responding	Per Cent of Total Sample Not Responding
Canada (66)	49	17	12.7	4.4
Latin America (23)	17	6	4.4	1.6
Europe (54)	51	3	13.1	.9
Middle East (68)	60	8	15.5	2.1
Far East (151)	136	15	35.1	3.9
Africa (23)	18	5	4.7	1.2
Australia (2)	2	0	.5	00.0
Total	333	54	86.0	14.0

TABLE 24

STUDENTS' RESPONSES TO SPECIAL QUESTION

8. "LISTENING TO MEMBERS OF YOUR
OWN FAMILY SPEAK ABOUT THE
UNITED STATES"

Geographic Area	Number of Students Responding	Number of Students Not Responding	Per Cent of Total Sample Responding	Per Cent of Total Sample Not Responding
Canada (66)	57	9	14.7	2.3
Latin America (23)	20	3	5.2	.8
Europe (54)	49	5	12.7	1.3
Middle East (68)	64	4	16.5	1.0
Far East (151)	139	12	36.0	3.1
Africa (23)	21	2	5.4	.5
Australia	2	0	.5	00.0
Total	352	35	91.0	9.0

TABLE 25

STUDENTS' RESPONSES TO SPECIAL QUESTION

9. "READING BOOKS, MAGAZINES OR
NEWSPAPERS PRINTED IN
YOUR OWN COUNTRY"

Geographic Area	Number of Students Responding	Number of Students Not Responding	Per Cent of Total Sample Responding	Per Cent of Total Sample Not Responding
Canada (66)	52	14	13.4	3.6
Latin America (23)	16	7	4.1	1.8
Europe (54)	44	10	11.4	2.6
Middle East (68)	60	8	15.5	2.0
Far East (151)	132	19	34.1	5.0
Africa (23)	20	3	5.2	.8
Australia (2)	2	0	.5	00.0
Total	326	61	84.2	15.8

TABLE 26

STUDENTS' RESPONSES TO SPECIAL QUESTION

10. "LISTENING TO TELEVISION OR
RADIO PROGRAMS IN YOUR
OWN COUNTRY"

Geographic Area	Number of Students Responding	Number of Students Not Responding	Per Cent of Total Sample Responding	Per Cent of Total Sample Not Responding
Canada (66)	50	16	13.0	4.1
Latin America (23)	20	3	5.2	.8
Europe (54)	51	3	13.2	.8
Middle East (68)	61	7	15.8	1.0
Far East (151)	144	7	37.2	1.8
Africa (23)	21	2	5.4	1.8
Australia (2)	1	1	.2	.2
Total	348	39	90.0	10.0

TABLE 27

STUDENT'S RESPONSES TO SPECIAL QUESTION

17. "PERSONAL EXPERIENCES WHICH
HAVE PREJUDICED YOUR
OBJECTIVITY IN VIEWING THE
UNITED STATES"

Geographic Area	Number of Students Responding	Number of Students Not Responding	Per Cent of Total Sample Responding	Per Cent of Total Sample Not Responding
Canada (66)	44	2	11.4	5.7
Latin America (23)	16	7	4.1	1.8
Europe (54)	44	10	11.4	2.6
Middle East (68)	46	22	11.9	5.7
Far East (151)	114	37	29.4	9.6
Africa (23)	15	8	3.9	2.0
Australia (2)	0	2	0.0	.5
Total	279	108	72.1	27.1

magazines, or newspapers printed in the United States. There were 326 or 84.2 per cent who marked the former compared with 216 or 44.2 per cent who marked the latter.

In comparison to listening to their own friends, few foreign students were influenced by talking with American friends. There were 86 per cent or 333 foreign students who thought that listening to their own friends affected their concepts of the United States; whereas, only 86 or 22.2 per cent of the foreign students thought that listening to American friends affected their concepts of the United States.

In presenting and analyzing the subjects' responses to the eighty-eight statements contained within the questionnaire, means for each geographic area and for length of time in the United States according to geographic area were obtained. For each question, therefore, there were twenty-seven means. For Canada there was only one mean since all Canadian students were commuters. Similarly for the United States students and Australian students there was only one mean since all United States students were lifetime residents of the United States and all Australian students had been in the United States from six months to one year. For Latin America there were four means; for Europe, five means; for the Middle East, five means; for the Far East, five means; and for Africa, five means.

For purposes of this questionnaire, the following interval scale was used:

- 5.00-4.50 - strongly agree
- 4.49-3.50 - agree
- 3.49-2.50 - undecided
- 2.49-1.50 - disagree
- 1.49-1.00 - strongly disagree

A mean, therefore, falling between 5.00 and 4.50 was regarded as "strongly agree." Similarly a mean falling between 4.49 and 3.50 was regarded as "agree"; a mean falling between 3.49 and 2.50, as "undecided;" a mean falling between 2.49 and 1.50, as "disagree;" and a mean falling between 1.49 and 1.00, as "strongly disagree."

In "Category I - Personal Characteristics" the subjects tended to agree with 52 per cent or 13 of the statements. They were generally undecided about 26 per cent or 9 statements, and they were in disagreement with 8 per cent or 2 of the statements. The following statements were generally agreed to:

1. Have a sense of humor.
2. Are only slightly interested in foreign countries.
5. Consider themselves superior to foreigners in most respects.
6. Believe in working hard.
8. Place great value on success in their work.
9. Are frank and open in dealing with others.
11. Value material things too much.
16. Are sensitive to criticisms of their own country.
18. Are boastful of their achievements.
19. Are friendly toward others.
20. Believe that nothing is beyond their power.
21. Are optimistic in their outlook toward life.
24. Believe in conforming to the beliefs of the group to which they belong.
25. Overemphasize sex.

The 9 statements which the subjects tended to be undecided about were:

3. Lack basic religious values.
7. Are discourteous and thoughtless in their relations with others.
10. Are often prejudiced against foreigners.
12. Are religious.
13. Take a strong interest in foreign countries.
14. Are cold, distant, and reserved when meeting strangers.
15. Become easily excited when faced with difficult problems.
17. In their daily relations, treat everyone as equals.
23. Have little concern for people as individuals.

The subjects were generally in disagreement with the following 2 statements:

4. Are immature and childish.
22. Are unenergetic (lack of energy) in their work.

There were little differences between the means of each geographic area and the means of "length of time in the United States" according to geographic areas. Likewise, in only five cases were there any differences between the mean of the United States students and the means of the other geographic areas. The United States students were generally in agreement with the statement. Statement six was also perceived by the United States students as undecided and by the other students as agree. For statement nine, the United States was undecided, and the other geographic areas tended to be in agreement. In contrast to statements two, six, and nine in responding to statement ten, the United States students were in agreement, and the other students were undecided. And in responding to statement twenty-five, the United States students

were undecided, but the other students were generally in agreement.

The entire sample was strongest in its agreement to the following statements:

- 5. Consider themselves superior to foreigners . . .
- 8. Place great value on success . . .
- 11. Value material things . . .
- 21. Are optimistic in their outlook . . .

In disagreement, the entire sample responded strongest to the following statement:

- 22. Are unenergetic (lack of energy) in their work.

More differences between the geographic areas was seen in "Category II - Foreign Affairs." The students had varying opinions concerning the following statements;

- 26. To guarantee freedom in the developing countries of the world.
- 27. To preserve peace in the world.
- 28. To gain control of the economy of the world.
- 29. To improve the standard of living throughout the world.
- 30. To sell surplus American goods.
- 37. To help the poor and impoverished countries of the world.
- 38. To govern the rest of the world.
- 41. To assist other countries which are fighting for freedom only if it is in the interest of the United States.
- 45. To use other countries to further its own means.

In reaction to statement twenty-six, the students from the United States agreed with statement; however, the students from Latin America, Europe, the Middle East, the Far East, and Africa were generally undecided. The Australian students strongly agreed and the Canadian students agreed.

The United States, Australia, and Canada agreed to statement twenty-seven; whereas, Latin America, Europe, the Middle East, the Far East and Africa were again generally undecided.

The United States disagreed with statement twenty-eight, but Latin Americans, Europeans, Middle Easterners, Far Easterners, and Africans were all in general agreement. Canadians, on the other hand, were undecided and Australians were in disagreement.

The United States, Canada, Australia, and the Far East responded agreeingly to statement twenty-nine, but Latin America, Europe, the Middle East, and Africa were undecided.

In response to statement thirty, there was a wide variance of opinion. The United States, Canada, and Europe were undecided; whereas, Australia, Latin America, the Middle East, the Far East, and Africa were in general agreement.

Reacting generally agreeingly to statement thirty-seven were: Canada, the United States, the Far East, and Australia; and generally reacting undecidingly to statement thirty-seven were: Latin America, Europe, the Middle East, and Africa.

Australia, Canada, and the United States were in disagreement with statement thirty-eight. On the other hand, however, Latin America, Europe, the Middle East, the Far East, and Africa were on the whole undecided.

The United States was alone in its reaction to statement forty-one. The United States reacted undecidedly; whereas, the rest of the geographic areas were in agreement.

In reacting to statement forty-five, the United States and Australia disagreed, but the rest of the geographic areas were undecided.

All subjects regardless of geographic areas responded generally agreeingly to the following statements in Category II:

- 32. To promote international understanding.
- 33. To keep itself as one of the leading world powers.
- 35. To stop communism from spreading throughout the world.
- 39. To maintain the balance of power in the world.
- 40. To prevent other countries from forcing their systems of government upon others.
- 42. To give technical assistance to the other countries of the world.
- 43. To maintain its system of military bases around the world.
- 44. To spread what it believes is the "American idea" over globe.

The following statements were generally marked as undecided by all subjects:

- 31. To support and assist colonial governments in all parts of the world.
- 34. To find markets for American arms and weapons.
- 36. To impose its system of government upon others.

Throughout this Category as in the first Category, there was little difference within geographic areas according to length of time in the United States.

All subjects including the United States subjects were strongest in their agreement of the following statements:

33. To keep itself as one of the leading world powers.
 35. To stop communism from spreading throughout the world.

The subjects responses to "Category III - Religion" showed that all subjects were generally undecided about the statements contained in it.

The following statements were reacted to as generally undecided:

46. Consider religion as being important in their individual lives.
 47. Do not like active membership in an organized religious body.
 48. Live by the principles and teachings of their religious beliefs.
 50. Are tolerant and understanding of all religions.
 52. Regard religion as more often a spiritual experience such as worshipping, praying, or fasting.
 53. Are hypocritical.
 54. Desire to have all people in all parts of the world become Christian.
 55. Consider religion as important in planning their daily activities.
 56. Are extremely rigid in their religious beliefs.
 58. Regard religion as having very little meaning in their individual lives.
 60. Have no serious religious views or beliefs.

There were eleven statements or 69 per cent of all the statements within the Category which were marked as undecided.

Statement forty-nine, "have developed their religion to conform with their society," was agreed to by all subjects including the United States. Similarly statement fifty-one, "Try to force or impose their religion on others," was generally disagreed to by all subjects.

There were some differences between the geographic areas concerning the following statements:

57. Believe religion should exercise a strong influence upon the civil laws.
59. Look at religion as more often a social activity such as making efforts for world peace, helping the poor, giving food to the underprivileged, presenting musical selections, having picnics and get-togethers, and improving working conditions.
61. Attempt to hide their religious views.

In response to statement fifty-seven, Canada, Australia, and Africa generally disagreed with the statement, but Latin America, Europe, the United States, the Middle East, and the Far East were generally undecided. The United States was undecided about statement fifty-nine; however, the rest of the geographic areas agreed with the statement. And in reaction to statement sixty-one, Canada, Latin America, and the United States were undecided; whereas, the rest of the geographic areas were in general disagreement with the statement.

Again as in the other two Categories there were very few differences within geographic areas according to length of time in the United States. In "Category IV - Time Consciousness" there were two statements which were generally agreed to by all geographic areas:

68. Tend to regulate their lives by the clock.
70. Seem to be in a hurry to get things done.

Only one statement was marked by all geographic areas as generally undecided. This was statement sixty-six, "Have little respect for customs or traditions."

The rest of the statements contained in Category IV elicited differences among the separate geographic areas. These statements were:

- 62. Tend to waste time.
- 63. Regard promptness highly.
- 64. Have little interest in past events or happenings.
- 65. Are interested only in passing the time and not in planning the use of it.
- 67. Are extremely optimistic about the future.
- 69. Are often thinking of future events (what will take place tomorrow or at some time yet to come).
- 71. Tend to resist change.
- 72. Often arrive late for appointments.

In reacting to statement sixty-two, Canadian and United States subjects were undecided; however, Latin Americans, Europeans, Middle Easterners, Far Easterners, Africans, and Australians were generally in disagreement with the statement.

Statement sixty-three was indicated as being undecided to Canada, United States, Australia; whereas, Latin America, Europe, Middle East, Far East, and Africa generally agreed with the statement.

The United States, Latin America, Europe, the Middle East, the Far East, and Africa all responded generally undecided to statement sixty-four; however, Canada and Australia indicated a disagreement with the question.

Australia, Canada, and the United States subjects were undecided about statement sixty-five, but Latin America, Europe, the Middle East, the Far East, and Africa generally disagreed with the statement.

The Middle East, Australia, and the United States were all generally undecided concerning statement sixty-seven; and Canada, Latin America, Europe, the Far East, and Africa were all generally in agreement

with statement sixty-seven.

In response to statement sixty-nine all countries except Australia who marked undecided, were in general agreement about the statement, and similarly in response to statement seventy-one all countries except Australia, who marked disagree, were generally undecided about the statement.

Canada and the United States were the only geographic areas which were undecided concerning statement seventy-two; the rest of the areas were generally in disagreement with the statement.

Little differences were seen within Category IV between lengths of time in the United States according to geographic area.

"Category V - Family Life" elicited a slight variance of opinion from the different geographic areas. The following statements, however, were reacted to as generally undecided by all geographic areas:

- 77. Quickly accept a stranger into the family.
- 79. Prefer the son to the daughter.
- 80. Regard the wife as dominating the family.
- 81. Believe that most social activities should take place outside of the family.
- 85. Plan the entire family around the children.

In contrast, the following statements were responded to differently by different geographic areas:

- 73. Consider the family as important in their individual lives.
- 74. Would feel a strong obligation to help a member of their family even though it would require a personal sacrifice.

75. Believe that children should be obedient to their parents.
76. Consider the father as the dominant figure in the family.
78. Believe in giving children much freedom.
82. Believe that the social position of the wife in the family should be equal to that of the husband.
83. Teach the male child to become independent early.
84. Spend a large amount of time with their families.
86. Have unsuccessful marriages because too much emphasis is given sex.
87. Have little respect for old or aged members of the family.
88. Consider their individual happiness more important than the family happiness.

Responding "agree" to statement seventy-three were the United States and Canada; and responding generally "undecided" to statement seventy-three were Latin America, Europe, the Middle East, the Far East, and Africa.

The United States and Canada agreed with statement seventy-four. Latin America, Europe, and Australia were generally undecided about the statement. The Middle East, the Far East, and Africa generally disagreed with the statement.

In response to statement seventy-five, the United States and Australia agreed with the statement; whereas, Canada, Latin America, the Middle East, the Far East, and Africa were on the whole undecided.

Statement seventy-six was reacted as "agree" by the United States; Canada and Australia, however, were undecided about the statement, and Latin America, Europe, the Middle East, the Far East, and Africa all generally responded "disagree."

Australia and the United States reacted undecidedly to statement seventy-eight, but the rest of the geographic areas, Canada, Latin America, Europe, the Middle East, the Far East, and Africa, all agreed with the statement.

Canada and Australia marked statement eighty-two as undecided; however, Latin America, Europe, the United States, the Middle East, the Far East, and Africa all responded generally as agreeing.

Statement eighty-three caused wide spread opinion. The United States and Canada were undecided; Australia was in disagreement; and Latin America, Europe, the Middle East, the Far East, and Africa were in general agreement with the statement.

In reacting to statement eighty-four, Australia alone disagreed with the statement; the rest of the geographic areas were undecided.

The United States, Canada, the Middle East, and Africa were generally undecided concerning statement eighty-six. Australia was in disagreement, and Latin America and the Far East generally agreed with the statement.

The geographic areas were generally either undecided or in agreement with statement eighty-seven. Canada, the United States, Africa, and Australia were undecided; whereas, Latin America, Europe, the Middle East, and the Far East were in agreement.

Again in responding to statement eighty-eight, the geographic areas were either in general agreement or undecided. Those generally

marking undecided were: Canada, Europe, the United States, and Australia; those marking generally agreement were: Latin America, the Middle East, the Far East, and Africa.

There was more variance among geographic area according to length of time in the United States in this Category; however, in general these differences were slight and could not be contributed to any general pattern of response.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, PROBLEMS FOR FURTHER STUDY, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purposes of the preceding study have been to discover the opinions of foreign and American students who were attending Wayne State University regarding characteristics of the people and the society of the United States, to determine possible reasons and explanations for these opinions, to add to the body of knowledge concerning images of the United States, and to devise a research tool for studying opinions and attitudes and for counseling and advising foreign students.

The opinions of foreign students and American students were revealed through the use of a questionnaire (See Appendix B). Reliability was established through the use of pilot groups, and validity was established through the use of a jury. The questionnaire contained eighty-eight statements divided into five categories. Each statement was arranged for response on a Likert Scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The students responses were computed for each question, and a group mean was established according to geographic area and length of time in the United States.

Conclusions and Problems for Further Study

This study has pointed out the importance of geographic area in determining students opinions and reactions to the United States and the American character. The significant differences between response on question after question were a result of geographic area rather than length of time in the United States. This survey does not bear out the idea that to be exposed or to become better acquainted with a country alters one's opinion. There was no sojourn or development cycle which appeared in this study; the foreign students' reactions, although sometimes different with differing lengths of time in the United States, followed no set pattern or cycle as pointed out by some studies on foreign students' images. This study reveals that although foreign and American contacts increased while in the United States, the foreign students' opinions of the United States change rather little, if at all; their impressions do not become more positive as a result of being in the United States. In fact the foreign students indicated that American life, reading American magazines and newspapers, listening to Americans, or visiting American homes really had little effect on their opinions and impressions.

Americans were revealed as possessing a sense of humor, as being only slightly interested in other countries, and as thinking themselves better than people from other countries. They were thought to be hard workers placing a great amount of emphasis on success. People in the United States were found by subjects in the study to be boastful in their

personal achievements, but at the same time friendly toward other people. Americans were optimistic, sensitive to criticism which reflect on their own country, and sure of their ability to accomplish anything for which they had the desire. They seemed to be conformists and they tended to place great emphasis on sex.

In foreign affairs the United States was shown as desiring to stop the spread of Communism but at the same time wanting to keep its status among the powers of the world. The United States was seen as having among its goals in foreign relations providing technical advice and assistance to all countries and preventing other countries from forcing its ideology on others. They desired, on the other hand, to maintain their military troops around the world and to make the world aware of the American way.

Religion in the United States was vaguely perceived. There was general agreement on only two concepts: religion in America conforms with American society, and Americans do not attempt to impose their religion on other people.

In reaction to time orientation in the United States, Americans were described as clock watchers who closely plan their daily activities around the hours of the day and who are characterized by their hurriedness in accomplishing tasks.

This study pointed out that the subjects were generally undecided about Americans' religious values, code of manners, and prejudice against

foreigners. They were also undecided concerning interest in the United States toward other countries, concerning equality in the United States, and about concern in the United States for people as individuals. The subjects were neutral in their reaction to the United States colonial policies and to the United States arms sales. Similarly the survey revealed that the majority of the subjects were undecided about the importance of religion in America, about the membership of religious bodies in America, about the tolerance toward other religions in America, and about the rigidity of religion in America. The subjects were also undecided about some aspects of American family life such as the acceptance of a stranger into the home, the preference for one child, the dominance of the wife in the family, and the role of children.

There were some differences between the way Americans view themselves and the way foreigners view Americans. The United States students in this study, for example, were undecided about America's lack of interest in other countries; whereas, the foreign students felt strongly that Americans on the whole displayed a lack of concern for foreign countries. The United States students were also undecided about Americans' working habits and Americans' frankness when dealing with people; foreign students on the other hand, found Americans to be hard workers and frank and open with others. Americans found themselves prejudiced toward foreigners, but foreigners were neutral concerning this point. Americans were described by Latin Americans, Europeans, Middle

Easterners, Far Easterners, and Africans as wanting to gain control of the world economy, as wanting to help others only if they benefit, and as wanting to find markets for surplus American goods. All countries looked at religion in America as a social activity; Americans, on the other hand, were undecided about this aspect of American life.

Another finding of this study was that Canadians and Australians were closer to the opinions of the American students than the other countries. The rest of the countries were often grouped together in their opposing opinions of American life.

This study underscores the very great importance for further research into national images and impressions. At a minimum, the findings of this study suggest that further study of duration of residence and attitudes toward the United States is needed. Further research is also needed on the processes which cause attitudinal formation and change. Possibly studying foreign nationals' attitudes before they depart from their homelands as well as frequent interviewing during their sojourn in the United States might produce some insights into this problem.

Some in-depth studies of smaller groups using such variables as residential background, father's and mother's occupation background, size of the city or village of residence in their own country, academic successes and failures, language fluency, travel abroad, and personal adjustment might prove helpful in understanding foreign impressions.

Another area for further study which was revealed by this survey

was that there may be underlying patterns of variables which would be of special significance in understanding foreigners' attitudes. These may be preconceived attitudes which interpret experiences in the United States from one point of reference. It will also be necessary to determine whether or not a sojourn cycle exists with other groups and if it is descriptive of the experiences of groups other than foreign students at Wayne State University. It is also possible that many of the effects of study in the United States can only be determined after the student returns home. A follow-up study on students might prove to provide reactions that were not before apparent. Further study also is needed in understanding the dynamics of foreign-American student interaction.

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS

U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs. Foreign Students in the U.S., A National Survey, Vol. I. Prepared by the Operations and Policy Research, Inc., 1965.

U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor. International Education: Past, Present, Problems and Prospects. Report No. 527, 89th Congress, 2nd Session; October, 1966.

U. S. Information Service. A Government by the People, 1959.

BOOKS

- Allport, Gordon W. The Nature of Prejudice. Garden City, New York: Doubleday Books, 1958.
- Beals, Ralph Leon, and Humphrey, Norman D. No Frontier to Learning: The Mexican Student in the U.S. St. Paul, Minnesota: North Central Publishing Company, 1957.
- Best, John W. Research in Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1959.
- Blum, Robert. Cultural Affairs and Foreign Relations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1963.
- Brogan, Dennis W. The American Character. New York: Vintage Books, Random House, 1956.
- Brown, Ina Corrine. Understanding Other Cultures. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1963.
- Cieslak, Edward C. Foreign Student in American Colleges. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1955.
- Coelho, George W. Changing Images of America: A Study of Indian Students Perceptions, Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1958.
- Cook, Steward, Chrisp, June, R., Havel, Joan, and Sellitz, Clair. Attitudes and Social Relations of Foreign Students in the United States. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1963.
- _____. The American Mind. New Haven: Yale Paperback, 1950.
- Dubois, Cora. Foreign Students and Higher Education in the U.S.A. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1956.

- Fox, Richard M. An Introduction to American Civilization for Foreign Students. Georgetown, Virginia: The American Language Institute (No date provided in the book).
- Hall, Edward T. The Silent Language. Greenwich, Connecticut: Fawcett World Library Premier Books, 1959.
- Hofstadter, Richard. The American Political Tradition. New York: Vintage Books, Random House, 1961.
- Good, Carter V., and Scates, Douglas E. Methods of Research: Educational, Psychological, Sociological. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954.
- Johoda, Marie, Deutsch, Morton, and Cook, Stuart. Research Methods in Social Relations: With Special Reference to Prejudice. New York: Dryden Press, 1953.
- Joseph, Franz M. As Others See Us: The U.S. Through Foreign Eyes. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1959.
- Joseph, P. T. The Amiable American. Trivandrum, India: St. Joseph's Press, 1963.
- Kiell, N. Learning with Students from Abroad, in Student Personnel Work as Deeper Training. Edited by E. Lloyd Jones and M. R. Smith. New York: Harper Brothers, 1954.
- Kincaid, Henry. A Study of a Sample of Foreign Students in the U. S. Palo Alto, California: Stanford Research Institute, 1961.
- Koos, Leonard. The Questionnaire in Education. New York: Macmillan Co., 1928
- Lambert, Richard D. Indian Students on an American Campus. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956.
- Lerner, Max. America as a Civilization: Life and Thought in the U.S. Today. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1957.
- McAshan, Hildreth H. Elements of Educational Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1963.

McGifford, Michael. The Character of America. New York: Dorsey Press, 1964.

Mead, Margaret. Cultural Patterns and Technical Change. New York: Mentor Books, 1962.

Meet the U.S.A.: Handbook for Foreign Students and Specialists. Edited by the Institute of International Education. New York: Institute of International Education, 1952.

Morroe, Berger. Arab World Today. (New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc.), 1962

Morris, Richard T. The Two-Way Mirror: National Status in Foreign Students' Adjustment. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1960.

Moser, C. A., Survey Methods in Social Investigation. London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1958.

Riesman, David, Glazer, Nathan, and Denney, Reuel. The Lonely Crowd: A Study of the Changing American Character. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday and Co., 1950.

Rummel, Francis J. An Introduction to Research Procedures in Education. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

Russell, Gene. Indirect Assessment of Attitudes Across Cultures. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1964.

Sarhan, Abdel-Meguid El - Demerdash. Interests and Culture. No. 959 of the Teachers College, Columbia University Contributions To Education. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1950.

Scott, Franklin D. The American Experiences of Swedish Students. Minneapolis: Minnesota Lund Press, 1956.

Sewell, William H., and Davidson, Oluf M. Scandinavian Students on an American Campus. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1961.

Smith, Bradford. Why We Behave Like Americans. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1952.

Smith, Huston. Search for America. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey:
Prentice-Hall, 1959.

Sasnett, Martena Tenny. Foreign Students Look at the United States.
Los Angeles: Holmquist Press, 1960.

Wedge, Bryant M. Visitors to the U.S. and How They See Us. Princeton,
New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1965.

ARTICLES AND PERIODICALS

- "America, What Does It Mean Abroad?" Senior Scholastic, LXII
(February 14, 1958), 6-8.
- Anderson, Wallace L. "A World View for Undergraduates," Saturday Review, _____ (August 20, 1966), _____.
- Blood, Robert O. Jr., and Nicholson, Samuel O. "The Experiences of Foreign Students in Dating American Women," Marriage and Family Living, XXIV, No. 3 (August, 1962), _____.
- Brademas, John. "A New Federal Role," Saturday Review, _____ (August 20, 1966), _____.
- Bressler, M., and Lambert R. D. "Indian Students and the U. S.," Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCLXXXV (September, 1954), 62-72.
- Buckingham, B. R. "The Questionnaire," Journal of Educational Research, _____ (June, 1926), 54-58.
- Costello, A. "As Another Sees Us," Senior Scholastic, LXV (October 20, 1954), 5.
- "Education Around the World: Anniversary of the Fullright Act," Saturday Review, _____ (August 20, 1966) _____.
- "Exchange of Students, and Views, Symposium," New York Times Magazine, _____ (March 8, 1959), 24-25
- "Foreign Teens Sound Off: What We Learned in the U.S." Senior Scholastic, LXXIX (September 27, 1961), 17-18.
- Garnder, J. W. "The Foreign Student in America," Foreign Affairs, XXX (1951-1952), 637-50.

- Hall, A. O., and Bray, B. "Attitudes of American Students Differentially Liked by Latin American Students," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXVIII (November, 1959), 217-221.
- Jain, P. C. "Friendly Americans," Saturday Evening Post, CCXXXIII (July 23, 1960), 24.
- Keyder, Caglar. "The Foreign Student at Yale," Yale Alumni Magazine, (March, 1967), 21-27.
- Kiell, N. "Attitudes of Foreign Students," Journal of Higher Education, XXII (1951), 188-194.
- Lahey, Edwin A. "U.S. Role in Asia Is An Echo of 1950," Detroit Free Press, April, 26, 1967.
- McCarthy, Eugene J. "The U.S. Supplier of Weapons to the World" Saturday Review, _____ (July 9, 1966), _____.
- Marvel, William W. "What Colleges Can Do," Saturday Review, _____ (August 20, 1966), _____.
- Mead, J.F. "As Germans See Us," Collier's, CXXXVI (August 5, 1955), 22-25.
- "Ourselves as Others See Us; Delegates to N. Y. Herald Tribune," Senior Scholastic, LXIV (April 14, 1954), 7-8.
- Pifer, T. "What Young Germans Think of Us," Farm Journal, LXXVIII (January, 1954), 68-70.
- Figman, H. A. "So This Is America," Rotarian, LXXXX, (May, 1957), 24-26.
- "Red Students See Us," Newsweek, LII, (August 11, 1958), 77.
- Reynolds, Q. "European Teen-agers Take a Look at America," Reader's Digest, LXIV (January, 1954), 45-50.
- Sellin, Thorstein, and Lambert, Richard D., The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September, 1954.

- Shimazu, K. J. "Tell Us About America," America, LXXXXIV (October 8, 1955), 41-43.
- Stretch, Bonnie. "An Experiment that Worked," Saturday Review, _____ (August 20, 1966), _____.
- "Survey on African Students in U. S. : Shows American Image Suffering," Liberty Journal, LXXXVII (January 15, 1962), 91.
- Tatnall, E. C. "As Others See Us," National Council Outlook, VI (June, 1956), 10-11.
- "The President's Message," Saturday Review, _____ (August 20, 1966) _____.
- "Through African Eyes," Time, CXXVII (January 6, 1961), 38.
- "Turkist View of Main Street," Rotarian, LXXXIX (December, 1956), 30-31.
- "U.S. High Schools In The Eyes of Foreign Students," Senior Scholastic, LXXII (February 29, 1958), 6-8.
- Ward, Lyle E. "Some Observations of the Underlying Dynamics of Conflict in Foreign Students," Student Medicine, X, No. 4 (April, 1962).
- Wedge, Bryant. "What the Visitors Really Think," Saturday Review, XLIX, No. 11, (March 12, 1966), _____.
- "What Foreign Youth Saw Here," America, LXXXXV (April 14, 1956) 52.
- Woodhouse, Chase. "Communication Is More Than Meets the Eye and Ear," Community Services to International Visitors Newsletter, XI (Spring, 1967), 3-4.

REPORTS

- Institute of International Education. Open Doors: A Report on Three Surveys 1954-1955. New York: Institute of International Education, 1955.
- Institute of International Education. Open Doors, 1965: Report on International Exchange. New York: Institute of International Education, 1965.
- Lougheed, Virgil R. Problems of the Foreign Student on Campus. A report given at the annual meeting of the Michigan College Health Association, Wayne State University, Detroit, May, 1966. Detroit, 1966.
- Regan, John. Culture Shock: An Exploration in Observation. A report of an exploratory study in international understanding sponsored by Phi Delta Kappa at the University of Alberta, May, 1966. Alberta, Quebec, 1966.

PAMPHLETS

Blegen, Theodore C. Counseling Foreign Students. ("American Council on Education. Pamphlet Series, Series VI, No. 15.) Washington, D. C. : American Council on Education, 1950.

Mothershead, Alice P., and Crawford, Marian. Social Customs and Manners in the U.S. : A Guide for Foreign Students. Burleigh, California: Privately printed, 1962.

UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

- Barnes, Donald L. "An International Study of Students' Social Interpretations." Muncie, Indiana: Ball State University, 1966. (Mimeographed.)
- Benson, August G. "Foreign Students in the U. S. Higher Education." Lansing, Michigan: Foreign Student Office, Michigan State University, 1966. (Mimeographed.)
- Cieslak, Edward C. "Cross-Cultural Research Methodology." Detroit Michigan: Wayne State University, 1964. (Hectographed.)
- Spencer, Richard. "The Comparative Attitude Towards Americans Abroad by Foreign Students and Americans." A research paper printed at the XVth Annual Conference of the NAFSA in Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1964 (Mimeographed.)

APPENDIX A

CODING SHEET

FOR

COMPUTING AND DATA PROCESSING

AND

GEOGRAPHIC AREAS

First Card

<u>Column</u>	<u>Entry</u>
1-5	Individual identification number - This number is assigned by the designer. Start with Number 1 in column 5 and run numbers through 9, then place 1 in column 4 and 0 in column 5 for 10 and run through 99. The process is continued through number 99999.
6	Card count per each individual card - Place a 1 in column 6 and on card 1 and a 2 in column 6 on card 2, etc.
7	<u>Age</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 17-20 2. 21-25 3. 26-30 4. 31-above
8	<u>Geographic Area</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Canada 2. Latin America 3. Europe 4. United States 5. Middle East 6. Far East 7. Africa 8. Australia
9.	<u>Status in University</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Graduate 2. Undergraduate
10	<u>Sex</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Male 2. Female
11	<u>Marital Status</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Married 2. Single

ColumnEntry

12

Length of Time in United States

1. 1-30 days
2. 30-days - 6 months
3. 6 months - 1 year
4. 1 year - 2 years
5. 2 years - above
6. Commute daily
7. Life

13-80

On the first card question 1 goes into column 13, etc.
until question 68.

Second Card

<u>Column</u>	<u>Entry</u>
1-5	Individual identification number - same as indicated on card 1.
6	Card count per each individual card - a 2 in column 6 indicates card number 2.
7-26	Question 69-88 goes into column 7-26.
27-37	Special 11 questions at the bottom on page 6 of opinion survey.

CODE TO GEOGRAPHIC AREAS

AFRICA

Angola
Basutoland
Bechuanaland
Burundi
Cameroon
Chad
Congo (Brazzaville)
Congo (Leopoldville)
Dahomey
Ethiopia
Gabon
Gambia
Chana
Guinea
Ivory Coast
Kenya
Liberia
Madagascar
Malawi
Mali
Mauritius
Mozambique
Niger
Nigeria
Portuguese Guinea
Rhodisia
Rwanda
Seychelles
Sierra Leone
Somalia
South Africa
Southwest Africa
Swaziland
Tanzania
Togo
Uganda
Upper Volta

AUSTRALIA

EUROPE

Austria
Belgium
Bulgaria
Czechoslovakia
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France
Germany, Federal Republic of
Greece
Hungary
Iceland
Ireland
Italy
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malta
Monaco
Netherlands
Norway
Poland
Portugal
Rumania
San Marino
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland
United Kingdom
Yugoslavia
U. S. S. R.

FAR EAST

Bhutan
Brunei
Burma
Cambodia
Ceylon
China, Republic of
China, Unspecified
Hong Kong
India
Indonesia
Japan
Korea
Laos
Macao
Malaysia
Nepal
Pakistan
Philippines
Ryukyu Islands
Sikkim
Thailand
Tibet
Vietnam

LATIN AMERICA

Bahama Islands
Barbados
British West Indies
Cuba
Dominican Republic
Guadeloupe
Haiti
Jamaica
Leeward Islands
Martinique
Netherlands Antilles
Trinidad
Windward Islands

British Honduras
Costa Rica
El Salvador
Guatemala
Honduras
Nicaragua

Mexico

Argentina
Bolivia
Brazil
British Guiana
Chile
Colombia
Ecuador
Paraguay
Peru
Surinam
Uruguay
Venezuela

MIDDLE EAST

Aden
Afghanistan
Algeria
Bahrain
Cyprus
Iran
Iraq
Israel
Jordan
Kuwait
Lebanon
Libya
Morocco
Qatar
Saudi Arabia
Sudan
Syria
Tunisia
Turkey
United Arab Republic (Egypt)
Yemen

APPENDIX B

THE

QUESTIONNAIRE

AMERICAN CHARACTER OPINION SURVEY
Robert K. Luther

READ DIRECTIONS CAREFULLY

This is not a test. You are not being tested. There are no right or wrong answers. The only right answer is your opinion or feeling. This opinion survey contains a list of statements designed to obtain information concerning your attitude of the American character. For foreign students taking this survey, you may at times find it difficult to give an opinion; however, do the best you can with the understanding that you will not be held accountable for judging or criticizing Americans. YOU WILL NOT BE IDENTIFIED IN ANY WAY.

PLEASE READ AND FOLLOW THESE STEPS

- Step One: Read each clarifying paragraph at the beginning of each Category carefully and completely.
Step Two: Read each statement.
Step Three: Indicate your feelings or opinion by circling:

5 - If you strongly agree with the statement.

4 - If you agree with the statement.

3 - If you are undecided about the statement.

2 - If you disagree with the statement.

1 - If you strongly disagree with the statement.

Foreign Students Only

- Step Four: After completing Steps One, Two, and Three, read and answer the questions on the last page. These questions will require only that you circle the answer.

CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE ANSWER

AGE:	17-20 21-25 26-30 31-above
GEOGRAPHIC AREA:	Canada Middle East Latin America Far East (Pakistan-Iran Europe Africa eastward) United States Other _____
STATUS IN UNIVERSITY:	Graduate Undergraduate
SEX:	Male Female
MARITAL STATUS:	Married Single
LENGTH OF TIME IN UNITED STATES:	1-30 days 2 years-above 30 days-6 months Commute daily 6 months-1 year Life 1 year-2 year

Printed by:
Foreign Student Office
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan

Circle: 5 - strongly agree 3 - undecided 1 - strongly disagree
 4 - agree 2 - disagree

Category I - Personal Characteristics

The following is a list of sentences that may be used in describing people in general. Indicate by circling the appropriate number your feelings or opinion of the majority of people living in the United States.

In my own judgment, the majority of people in the United States:

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Have a <u>sense of humor</u> . | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 2. Are only <u>slightly interested in foreign countries</u> . | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 3. <u>Lack basic religious values</u> . | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 4. Are <u>immature and childish</u> . | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 5. Consider themselves <u>superior to foreigners</u> in most respects. | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 6. Believe in <u>working hard</u> . | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 7. Are <u>discourteous and thoughtless</u> in their relations with others. | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 8. Place <u>great value on success</u> in their work. | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 9. Are <u>frank and open</u> in dealing with others. | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 10. Are <u>often prejudiced against foreigners</u> . | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 11. <u>Value material things</u> too much. | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 12. Are <u>religious</u> . | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 13. Take a <u>strong interest in foreign countries</u> . | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 14. Are <u>cold, distant, and reserved</u> when meeting strangers. | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 15. Become <u>easily excited</u> when faced with difficult problems. | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 16. Are <u>sensitive to criticisms</u> of their own <u>country</u> . | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 17. In their daily relations, <u>treat everyone as equals</u> . | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 18. Are <u>boastful</u> of their achievements. | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 19. Are <u>friendly</u> toward others. | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 20. Believe that <u>nothing is beyond their power</u> . | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 21. Are <u>optimistic</u> in their outlook toward life. | 5 4 3 2 1 |

22. Are unenergetic (lack of energy) in their work. 5 4 3 2 1
23. Have little concern for people as individuals. 5 4 3 2 1
24. Believe in conforming to the beliefs of the group to which they belong. 5 4 3 2 1
25. Overemphasize sex. 5 4 3 2 1

Category II - Foreign Affairs

The following is a list of sentences that may be used in describing America's goals or aims in its relationships with other countries. Some of these goals may not be expressed openly, but may be seen in some form. Indicate by circling the appropriate number your feelings or opinion of the United States' foreign policy goals.

In my own judgement, among the real goals and aims of the United States' foreign policy at the present time are:

26. To guarantee freedom in the developing countries of the world. 5 4 3 2 1
27. To preserve peace in the world. 5 4 3 2 1
28. To gain control of the economy of the world. 5 4 3 2 1
29. To improve the standard of living throughout the world. 5 4 3 2 1
30. To sell surplus American goods. 5 4 3 2 1
31. To support and assist colonial governments in all parts of the world. 5 4 3 2 1
32. To promote international understanding. 5 4 3 2 1
33. To keep itself as one of the leading world powers. 5 4 3 2 1
34. To find markets for American arms and weapons. 5 4 3 2 1
35. To stop communism from spreading throughout the world. 5 4 3 2 1
36. To impose its system of government upon the rest of the world. 5 4 3 2 1
37. To help the poor and impoverished countries of the world. 5 4 3 2 1
38. To govern the rest of the world. 5 4 3 2 1
39. To maintain the balance of power in the world. 5 4 3 2 1
40. To prevent other countries from forcing their system of government upon others. 5 4 3 2 1
41. To assist other countries which are fighting for freedom only if it is in the interest of the United States. 5 4 3 2 1
42. To give technical assistance to the other countries of the world 5 4 3 2 1

43. To maintain its system of military bases around the world. 5 4 3 2 1
44. To spread what it believes is the "American idea" over the globe. 5 4 3 2 1
45. To use other countries to further its own means. 5 4 3 2 1

Category III - Religion

The following is a list of sentences that may be used in describing how people in general look at religion. Indicate by circling the appropriate number your feelings or opinion of how the majority of people living in the United States regard religion.

In my own judgment, the majority of people in the United States:

46. Consider religion as being important in their individual lives. 5 4 3 2 1
47. Do not like active membership in an organized religious body. 5 4 3 2 1
48. Live by the principles and teachings of their religious beliefs. 5 4 3 2 1
49. Have developed their religion to conform with their society. 5 4 3 2 1
50. Are tolerant and understanding of all religions. 5 4 3 2 1
51. Try to force or impose their religion on others. 5 4 3 2 1
52. Regard religion as more often a spiritual experience such as worshipping, praying, or fasting. 5 4 3 2 1
53. Are hypocritical. 5 4 3 2 1
54. Desire to have all people in all parts of the world become Christian. 5 4 3 2 1
55. Consider religion as important in planning their daily activities. 5 4 3 2 1
56. Are extremely rigid in their religious beliefs. 5 4 3 2 1
57. Believe religion should exercise a strong influence upon the civil laws. 5 4 3 2 1
58. Regard religion as having very little meaning in their individual lives. 5 4 3 2 1
59. Look at religion as more often a social activity such as making efforts for world peace, helping the poor, giving food to the underprivileged, presenting musical selections, having picnics and get-togethers, and improving working conditions. 5 4 3 2 1

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 60. Have <u>no serious religious views</u> or <u>beliefs</u> . | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 61. Attempt to <u>hide</u> their <u>religious views</u> . | 5 4 3 2 1 |

Category IV - Time Consciousness
(How one looks at or regards time)

The following is a list of sentences that may be used in describing how people in general look at time. Indicate by circling the appropriate number how you feel the majority of people in the United States regard time.

In my own judgment, the majority of people in the United States:

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 62. Tend to <u>waste time</u> . | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 63. Regard <u>promptness</u> highly. | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 64. Have <u>little interest</u> in <u>past events</u> or <u>happenings</u> . | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 65. Are <u>interested only</u> in <u>passing the time</u> and <u>not</u> in <u>planning</u> the use of <u>it</u> . | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 66. Have <u>little respect</u> for <u>customs</u> or <u>traditions</u> . | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 67. Are <u>extremely optimistic</u> about the <u>future</u> . | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 68. Tend to <u>regulate</u> their <u>lives</u> by the <u>clock</u> . | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 69. Are <u>often thinking of</u> <u>future events</u> (what will take place tomorrow or at some time yet to come). | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 70. Seem to be in a <u>hurry to get things done</u> . | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 71. Tend to <u>resist change</u> . | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 72. Often <u>arrive late</u> for <u>appointments</u> . | 5 4 3 2 1 |

Category V - Family Life
(The family refers to the immediate family consisting of: mother, father, brothers, and sisters)

The following is a list of sentences that may be used in describing how people in general regard family life. Indicate by circling the appropriate number your feelings or opinion of how the majority of people living in the United States interrelate with their families.

In my own judgment, the majority of people in the United States:

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 73. Consider the <u>family</u> as <u>important</u> in their individual <u>lives</u> | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 74. Would feel a <u>strong obligation</u> to <u>help a member</u> of their <u>family</u> even though it would require a personal sacrifice. | 5 4 3 2 1 |

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 75. Believe that <u>children should be obedient</u> to their parents. | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 76. Consider the <u>father</u> as the <u>dominant figure</u> in the family. | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 77. <u>Quickly accept</u> a <u>stranger</u> into the family. | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 78. Believe in <u>giving children much freedom</u> . | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 79. <u>Prefer</u> the <u>son</u> to the <u>daughter</u> . | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 80. Regard the <u>wife</u> as <u>dominating</u> the <u>family</u> . | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 81. Believe that <u>most social activities</u> should take place <u>outside</u> of the <u>family</u> . | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 82. Believe that the <u>social position of the wife</u> in the family should be <u>equal</u> to that of the <u>husband</u> . | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 83. <u>Teach</u> the <u>male child</u> to <u>become independent early</u> . | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 84. Spend a <u>large amount of time</u> with their <u>families</u> . | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 85. <u>Plan</u> the <u>entire family</u> around the <u>children</u> . | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 86. <u>Have unsuccessful marriages</u> because <u>too much emphasis is given to sex</u> . | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 87. Have <u>little respect for old or aged</u> members of the family. | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 88. Consider their <u>individual happiness more important</u> than the family happiness. | 5 4 3 2 1 |

FOREIGN STUDENTS ONLY

The following is a list of ways people form opinions. Please circle the one(s) which you feel were most important in the formation of your opinion or feeling about the United States.

1. Personal observation.
2. Reading books, magazines, or newspapers printed in the United States.
3. Listening to television or radio programs in the United States.
4. Visiting American homes.
5. Talking with American students or friends.
6. Reading official government documents or papers from your own country.
7. Listening to your friends or fellow students in your own country.
8. Listening to members of your own family speak about the United States.
9. Reading books, magazines or newspapers printed in your own country.
10. Listening to television or radio programs in your own country.
11. Personal experiences which may have prejudiced your objectivity in viewing the United States.

APPENDIX C

LIST

OF

STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS
WINTER QUARTER, 1967

Dance Groups

Apprentice Group
Dance Workshop

Mrs. A. Zirulnik
Mrs. A. Zirulnik

Dramatic and Speech

W.S.U. Student Radio

Charles Schaeffer

Mr. M. Breen

Forensic:

Debate

Extemporaneous Speaking

Oratory

Interpretative Reading

Dr. E. Bahn

Radio and Television

Dr. J. Tintera

Student Readers' Bureau

Dr. E. Bahn

University Theatre

Mr. L. Leone

Fraternities - Professional-Social

Alpha Chi Sigma (Nat. Chem.)

Dean Kenealy

Dr. G. Rich

Alpha Kappa Psi (Nat. Bus. Ad.)

Kenneth Banks

Mr. R. Naylor

Alpha Zeta Omega (Nat. Pharm.)

Stanley Remer

Dr. G. Fenn

Delta Sigma Pi (Nat. Bus. Ad.)

Ronald Piotrowski

Dr. D. Grossens

Delta Theta Phi (Nat. Law)

Arnold Rich

Dr. R. Childs

Kappa Psi (Nat. Pharm.)

Phillip Cold

Dr. R. Dauphinais

Phi Alpha Delta (Nat. Law)

J. Russell Hughes

Mr. K. Callahan

Phi Delta Chi (Nat. Pharm.)

Dennis Kenealy

Dr. R. Mulvey

Phi Mu Alpha (Nat. Music)

Donald Dzoba

Dr. R. Lawson

Rho Pi Phi (Nat. Pharm.)

J. Yale Hechtman

Dr. H. Wormser

Sigma Delta Chi (Nat. Journ.)

Ben Wade

Dr. W. White

Sigma Phi Lambda

Lawrence Damiani

Dr. W. Chavin

Tau Epsilon Rho (Nat. Law)

Allen Goldfine

Mr. Shu an

Theta Tau (Nat. Eng'g.)

Donald Wisniewski

Dr. H. Donnelly

Fraternities - Social

Alpha Epsilon Pi (Nat.)

Marvin Horowitz

Dr. F. Fatemi

Alpha Phi Alpha (Nat.)

Audley Smith, Jr.

Dr. G. West

Alpha Sigma Phi (Nat.)

Dennis Taylor

Dr. V. Wall

Delta Chi (Nat.)

Thomas Mullaney

Dr. H. Herbison Jr.

Kappa Alpha Psi (Nat.)

Donald Lester

Mr. O. Morris

Omega Psi Phi (Nat.)

Harry Clark

Mr. F. Jordan Jr.

Phi Beta Sigma (Nat.)

Joseph Jackson

Dr. K. Gregory

Phi Gamma Chi

Curtis Hudson Jr.

Mr. P. Andrews

Phi Sigma Delta (Nat.)

James L. Borin

Dr. Falk

Pi Kappa Alpha (Nat.)

Pat M. Donofrio

Dr. J. McMicking

Sigma Alpha Mu (Nat.)

Elliott Samson

Mr. C. Sherman

Tau Epsilon Phi (Nat.)

Howard Schwartz

Dr. W. Coplin

Tau Kappa Epsilon (Nat.)

Raymond Dudus

Mr. R. Jones

Theta Xi (Nat.)

Harold Eaton

Dr. W. Knapp

Honorary and Recognition

Alpha Epsilon Rho (Nat. Radio-T.V.)
 Alpha Kappa Delta
 Alpha Omega Alpha (Nat. Med.)
 Alpha Sigma Mu (Nat. Meta. Eng'g.)
 Beta Gamma (Nat. Bus. Ad.)
 Chi Epsilon (Civil Eng'g.)
 Delta Sigma Rho (Nat. Forensics)
 Epsilon Pi Tau (Nat. Ind. Educ.)
 Eta Kappa Nu (Nat. Elec. Eng.)
 Karyatides (Senior Women)
 Mackenzie Honor Society
 Motar Board (Nat. Women)
 Omicron Delta Kappa (Nat. Men)
 Phi Beta Kappa (Nat. Scholastic)
 Phi Delta Kappa (Nat. Educ.)
 Phi Lambda Upsilon (Nat. Chem.)
 Phi Upsilon Omicron (Nat. Home Econ.)
 Pi Lambda Theta (Nat. Educ.)
 Pi Sigma Alpha (Nat. Pol. Sci.)
 Pi Tau Sigma (Nat. Mech. Eng'g.)
 Pi Theta Epsilon
 Psi Chi (Nat. Psych.)
 Rho Chi (Nat. Pharm.)
 Sigma Iota Epsilon (Nat. Mgmt.)
 Sigma Theta Tau (Nat. Nursing)
 Sigma Xi (Nat. Sci. Research)
 Speech & Hearing Honorary
 Tau Beta Pi (Nat. Eng'g.)

Bernard Murphy
 Nelson Gantz
 Bogdan Lisowsky

 Robert Skrentner
 Donald Ritzenhein

 John Chrisner

 Charlene Keebler
 Thomas G. Catallo

 Arnold Glovinsky
 Thomas Hurford
 Nancy Nersessian
 Anne Zimmer

 Peter Rock
 Kathy Malone
 Benson Rosen
 James Oleszkowski
 Marc Chasson
 Barbara Schade
 Melburn Stewart
 Gloria Burns
 John Chrisner

Mr. F. Wurtsmith
 Mr. N. Goldner
 Dr. J. Chason
 Dr. C. Nagler
 Mr. J. Wallis
 Dr. J. Lamb, Jr.
 Dr. G. Ziegelmueller
 Dr. G. Baysinger
 Mr. Szymanski
 Mrs. V. Schell
 Mr. T. Stone
 Dr. M. Sterne
 Dr. R. Mulvey
 Mrs. N. Tutag
 Dr. W. Reitz
 Dr. R. Hahn
 Miss V. Demerjian
 Miss K. Macks
 Dr. C. Shull
 Mr. G. Howell

 Mr. S. Loibana
 Dr. G. Fenn
 Dr. E. Raney
 Miss C. Pickering

 Mr. M. Falk
 Dr. H. Hess

Interest Groups

Artists' Society
 Folk Music Ass'n.
 Foreign Affairs Club
 Forensic Union
 Goodwill Promoters (Gabe Players)
 International Student Society
 Jeffries Student & Staff Ass'n.
 Judo Club
 Radio Club
 Sailing Club
 Ski Club
 Tang Soo Do Club (Korean Karate)
 University Dames
 Youth Hostellers
 Veterans' Organizations

Arlene Rosenfeld
 Mark Cousens
 Richard Strachan
 Vivian I. Dicks
 Howard Gabe
 Natalie Staszko

 Ronald Polski

 Robert Bauser
 Charles Jones
 Gerald Walston
 Nancy L. Oooley
 Norman Chambers
 Robert P. Bohman

Mr. R. Wright
 Miss E. Stekert
 Dr. D. Herreshoff
 Dr. G. Ziegelmueller
 Mr. J. Schiller
 Mr. R. Luther
 Mr. D. Mato
 Mr. R. Hurley
 Dr. W. Arnold
 Mr. J. Bailey
 Mr. D. Mato
 Mr. R. Stoll
 Mrs. K. Burks
 Dr. D. Herreshoff
 Mr. R. Price

Musical

Apollo Club
 Concert Band
 Men's Glee Club, Varsity
 Opera Workshop
 Varsity Bands
 Women's Glee Club

William Watt
 Stanford Weinberg
 Monte Jahnke

 Guido Fucinari
 Donna Rautio

Dr. H. Langsford
 Dr. H. Begian
 Dr. H. Langsford
 Miss C. Cole
 Dr. H. Begian
 Mr. R. Harris

Political and Social Action

Americans for Democratic Action
 Committee to End War in Viet Nam
 DuBois Club
 Friends of S.N.C.C.
 Republican Club
 Students for a Democratic Society
 Young Democrats
 Young Socialist Alliance

Joseph Sanders
 Marc Nowakowski
 Harriet Ivory
 Thaddeus Ciehorski
 Barbara Burris
 David Weiner
 Evelyn Kirsch

Dr. M. Seidler
 Dr. D. Herreshoff
 Dr. D. Herreshoff
 Dr. D. Herreshoff
 Dr. C. Browne
 Dr. A. Field
 Mr. J. Lama
 Dr. D. Herreshoff

Professional and Departmental

American Chemical Society
 American Inst. of Chem. Eng'g.
 American Inst. of Ind. Eng'g.
 American Pharmaceutical Ass'n.
 American Soc. of Civil Eng'g.
 American Soc. of Mechanical Eng'g.
 American Soc. of Tool & Manf. Eng'g.
 Anthropology Club
 Classical Society
 Council for Exceptional Children
 Deutscher Verein (German Club)
 Doctoral Club
 Economics Society
 Elementary Education (Homeroom)
 Ethel Perrin Club (Phys. Ed. Women)
 Family Life Education Club
 Geography Club
 Geology Club
 History Club
 Home Economics Club (Nat.)
 Industrial Education Guild
 Inst. of Electrical & Elec. Eng.
 International Relations Club
 Language Education Club
 Law School Moot Court Board
 Law Stud. Civil Rts. Research Council
 Marketing Club
 Metallurgical Society (A.I.M.E.)
 Music Educ. Nat'l. Conf. (Chap. 106)
 National Art Educ. Ass'n.
 Newberry Club (Library Science)
 Occupational Therapy Club
 Philosophy Club
 Psychology Club
 Rho Nu Club (Nursing)
 Saarinen Soc. for Hist. of Art
 Society of Auto Eng'g.
 Spanish Club
 Student American Medical Ass'n.

Gary Olson
 Dennis Wilemski
 Dennis Ringwelski
 Jack D. Cronk
 Gerald J. Bensky
 Robert Baroni

 Scott R. Saxon
 Brenda Shaw
 Wesley R. Hillstrom

James E. Thomas

 Rosemary Scarcelli
 Richard Guyot
 Charles Miller
 Larry Kulisek
 Cathie Lindsey

James Mondro
 Peter Grias
 Diane N. Carroll
 Kenneth Smythe
 Arney Mustonen
 Janet Abdo
 James Schroeder

Patrick Foye
 Margaret B. Smith
 Susan Nimlin
 Thomas Croke
 Sally Copley
 Darlene Beyer
 E. J. Vaughn
 Warren J. Anderson

Dr. S. Kirschner
 Dr. R. Mickelson
 Mr. H. Ludwig
 Mr. D. Konner
 Dr. H. Dirasian
 Mr. G. Howell
 Mr. K. Anderson
 Dr. A. Pilling
 Mr. R. Minadeo
 Miss B. Giguere
 Mrs. M. Haag
 Dr. W. Reitz
 Mr. H. Gray
 Mr. P. Allen
 Miss R. Murray
 Miss B. LaChapelle
 Dr. R. Goodman
 Dr. E. Driscoll
 Dr. E. Lurie
 Miss H. Voisine
 Dr. H. Silvius
 Dr. H. Hsu
 Dr. F. Fatemi
 Mr. J. Boyer
 Mr. A. Vernava
 Mr. E. Wise
 Dr. L. Klein
 Mr. N. Lazar
 Dr. A. Cucci
 Mr. J. Victoria
 Miss D. Taylor
 Miss B. Jewett
 Dr. G. Nakhianian
 Dr. L. Anderson
 Miss D. Slater
 Dr. B. Goldman
 Mr. M. Koenig

Publications

Ad Service

Daily Collegian

Wayne Advocate

Wayne Engineer

Wayne Law Review

Wayne Pharmic

Vartan Kupelian

Clifford Weisberg

John M. Polkowski

Michael Terry

Sandra Sharrard

Mr. F. Gill

Mr. F. Gill

Mrs. J. Plihal

Mr. E. Szymanski

Dr. A. Neef

Dr. M. Dunker

Recreation

Intercollegiate Athletics:

Baseball

Basketball

Crew

Cross Country

Fencing

Football

Golf

Swimming

Tennis

Track

Wrestling

Men's Intramural Athletics

Women's Recreation Association

Dr. L. Lande

Mr. J. Mason

Mr. J. Ross

Mr. F. McBride

Mr. I. Danosi

Mr. V. Gale

Mr. L. Russell

Mr. J. Hussey

Mr. F. Mulhauser

Mr. F. McBride

Mr. R. Hurley

Mr. N. Ertell

Miss C. Marquard

Sharon Petro

Religious and Ethnic

African Student Association

Arab Student Association

Baha'i Club

B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation

Canterbury Club (Nat. Episcopalian)

Christian Science Organization (Nat.)

Deseret Club (Latter Day Saints)

Eastern Orthodox Fellowship

Gamma Delta (Missouri Synod)

India Student Association

Israeli Student Association

Latin American Club

Lutheran Student Assn. (Nat. Luth. Coun.)

Newman Club (Nat. Catholic)

Organ. of Greek Students (Delphi)

Slavic Club

Society of Armenian Students

Student Religious Liberals (Channing)

Ukrainian Club

United Campus Christian Fellowship

Wayne Christian Fellowship

Wesley Foundation

Louis Yerodia-Idrissa

Habib Fakhouri

Elizabeth Randall

Marilyn L. Sitron

Robert Kennedy

George Moffett

Jack Stillwell

Carlos Perry

Joel Slesak

Brij B. Garg

Uri Kretchner

Joyce McCotter

Robert H. Brender

George Avgeropoulos

Nicholas Smeed

Jaroslav Koshiv

Thomas Steisma

William Wright

Earl Goad

Dr. F. Fatemi

Dr. F. Fatemi

Mr. H. Herrington

Rabbi Kapustin

Rev. Masson

Mr. B. Wolfe

Mr. J. Hess

Mr. V. Angelescu

Dr. R. Hahn

Dr. R. Goodman

Rabbi Kapustin

Mr. R. Stoll

Rev. Kirkeby

Mr. J. Sullivan

Br. A. Theoharris

Mr. F. Corliss, Jr.

Rev. Rubyan

Mr. R. Wright

Dr. S. Mamchur

Rev. Masson

Dr. J. Nyenhuis

Rev. D. Kidd

Fraternities - Professional - Social

Alpha Delta Theta (Nat. Med. Tech.)
 Delta Omicron (Nat. Music)
 Lambda-Kappa Sigma (Nat. Pharm.)
 Mu Phi Epsilon (Nat. Music)
 Phi Gamma Nu (Nat. Bus. Ad.)
 Sigma Alpha Iota (Nat. Music)
 Theta Sigma Phi (Nat. Journ.)

Julianne Szkody
 Margaret Stava
 Kathleen Price
 Phyllis Fleming
 Linda Ames
 Christine Fiones
 Arlene Chzreska

Mrs. L. Gronkowski
 Dr. M. DeLeonard
 Mrs. C. Turczynski
 Mr. R. Harris
 Miss A. Wolfram
 Mrs. M. Lincoln
 Miss L. Keane

Sororities - Social

Alpha Delta Pi (Nat.)
 Alpha Gamma Delta (Nat.)
 Alpha Kappa Alpha (Nat.)
 Delta Phi Epsilon (Nat.)
 Delta Sigma Theta (Nat.)
 Delta Zeta (Nat.)
 Iota Alpha Pi (Nat.)
 Kappa Delta (Nat.)
 Phi Sigma Sigma (Nat.)
 Sigma Gamma Rho (Nat.)
 Sigma Kappa (Nat.)

Marie Bell
 Patricia Deeny
 Dianne Little
 Beverly Mutchnick
 Julie Carson
 Aileen Cronin
 Joyce Nadler
 Gay Gira
 Patricia Sokoloff
 JoAnn Taylor
 Dianne Drevenica

Mrs. D. Laing
 Mrs. M. Bostick
 Dr. J. Collier
 Miss E. Kommel
 Mrs. M. Washington
 Miss G. Spitler
 Mrs. F. Harrington
 Miss W. Riach
 Mrs. C. Parker
 Dr. A. Kirkland
 Mrs. A. Schnoor

Student Participation in University Government

Assn. of Women Students
 Class of '67 - Senior Board
 Class of '68 - Junior Board
 Class of '69 - Soph Board
 Class of '70 - Frosh Board
 Council of Religious Organizations
 Engineering Student Faculty Board
 Exec. Council for H.N. Joy Res.
 Interfraternity Council
 Law School Board of Governors
 Lib. Arts Student Faculty Board
 Mackenzie Union
 Monteith Student Board
 Panhellenic Council
 Pharmacy Student Advisory Board
 Social Work Student Organization
 Student Council, School of Bus. Ad.
 Student Council, School of Med.
 Student Education Council
 Student-Faculty Council
 Wayne Assn. of Nursing Students

Mary F. Murray
 Dwight Rinke
 Hope Crawford
 Lamont Richie
 Michael Peacock
 Robert Smaile
 Robert Skrentner
 Martha Sandry
 Sanford Feuer
 George Edwards
 James Krumm
 Leonard Klatt
 Delores Bargowski
 Marilyn Pugh
 Ronald Ponichter
 Larry Lippitt
 Stephen Smith
 Daniel Bernstein
 James Wadsworth
 Charles Larson
 Sharon Fandel

Mrs. M. Wade
 Mr. J. Day
 Dr. W. Coplin
 Mr. J. Whidden
 Mrs. M. Wade
 Mr. J. Lyons
 Mr. C. Lewitt
 Mrs. G. Coppin
 Mr. J. Bates
 Dr. A. Neef
 Mr. F. Majeske
 Mr. J. Bates
 Miss P. Verdet
 Mrs. V. Schell
 Dr. M. Dunker
 Dr. A. Krasner
 Mr. J. Roberts
 Dr. B. Rubenstein
 Dr. G. Miller
 Mr. D. Sells
 Mrs. R. Morrissey

APPENDIX D

BREAKDOWN

BY

COUNTRY OF FOREIGN STUDENTS ENROLLED

AT

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

BREAKDOWN BY COUNTRY
FALL QUARTER, 1966

<u>Country</u>	<u>Temporary</u>	<u>Permanent</u>	<u>Total</u>
1. Afghanistan	2	0	2
2. Algeria	1	0	1
3. Argentina	3	10	13
4. Australia	2	5	7
5. Austria	3	5	8
6. Belgium	0	8	8
7. Bermuda	0	1	1
8. Bolivia	0	4	4
9. Brazil	1	6 1-no visa indicated	7
10. Britain	4	19	23
11. British Guiana	0	2	2
12. British Honduras	1	0	1
13. British West Indies	0	2	2
14. Bulgaria	0	1	1
15. Canada	198	174	373
16. Ceylon	0	1	1
17. Chile	2	2	4
18. China	56	26	82
19. Colombia	7	5 1-N. V. I.	13
20. Congo	1	0	1

<u>Country</u>	<u>Temporary</u>	<u>Permanent</u>	<u>Total</u>
21. Costa Rica	0	1	1
22. Cuba	1	21	22
23. Cyprus	3	2	5
24. Czechoslovakia	2	1	3
25. Denmark	0	1	1
26. Dominican Republic	1	2	3
27. Egypt	4	2	6
28. England	2	21	23
29. Ecuador	1	4	5
30. Ethiopia	3	0	3
31. Finland	3	1	4
32. Formosa	1	0	1
33. France	4	8	12
34. Germany	10	68	78
35. Goyana	1	0	1
36. Greece	34	17	51
37. Guatemala	1	0	1
38. Guinea	2	1	3
39. Haiti	0	2	2
40. Hong Kong	7	2	9

<u>Country</u>	<u>Temporary</u>	<u>Permanent</u>	<u>Total</u>
41. Hungary	0	6	6
42. Iceland	0	1 3-N.V.I.	4
43. India	123	38	161
44. Indonesia	3	1	4
45. Iran	34	10	44
46. Iraq	6	12	18
47. Ireland	0	6	6
48. Israel	25	17	42
49. Italy	1	27	28
50. Jamaica	6	8	14
51. Japan	23	7	30
52. Jordan	10	7	17
53. Kenya	2	1	3
54. Korea	24	11	35
55. Latvia	0	7	7
56. Lebanon	17	12	29
57. Liberia	1	0	1
58. Lithuania	0	8	8
59. Malawi	1	0	1
60. Malaysia	1	1	2

<u>Country</u>	<u>Temporary</u>	<u>Permanent</u>	<u>Total</u>
61. Malta	0	1	1
62. Mexico	1	6	7
63. Morocco	1	1	2
64. Netherlands	2	2	4
65. Nigeria	8	1	9
66. Norway	0	3	3
67. Pakistan	8	2	10
68. Palestine	2	1	3
69. Panama	1	2	3
70. Persia	1	0	1
71. Peru	2	3	5
72. Philippines	31	4	35
73. Poland	1	42	43
74. Rhodesia	0	1	1
75. Romania	1	5	6
76. San Marino	0	1	1
77. Saudi Arabia	1	0	1
78. Scotland	0	7	7
79. Serre Leone	2	0	2
80. South Africa	2	3	5

<u>Country</u>	<u>Temporary</u>	<u>Permanent</u>	<u>Total</u>
81. Spain	3	3	6
82. Sudan	2	2	4
83. Sweden	1	2	3
84. Switzerland	2	1	3
85. Syria	12	3	15
86. Taiwan	2	0 1 - N. V. I.	3
87. Thailand	12	1	13
88. Trinidad	2	0	2
89. Tunisia	0	1	1
90. Turkey	9	4 1 - N. V. I.	14
91. Ukraine	0	4 1 - N. V. I.	5
92. United Arab Republic	2	3	5
93. United Kingdom	0	10	10
94. Uruguay	0	1	1
95. Venezuela	3	4	7
96. Viet Nam	2	0	2
97. Yugoslavia	6	12	18
98. Zambia	0	1	1

NON CITIZENS AT WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

VISA BREAKDOWN

FALL QUARTERS, 1966

Temporary Visa Students Other than Canadian			
Student "F"		355	
Exchange Visitor			
P-I-1002	6*		
Other Programs	<u>66</u>	72	
Visitor		8	
Diplomatic		3	
H-2		1	
H-3		2	
No Visa Indicated		<u>5</u>	446
Temporary Visa Students Canadian			
Student "F"		174	
Exchange Visitor		2	
Visitor		10	
H-1		<u>1</u>	187
Permanent Residents Studying			
Canadian		149	
Other than Canadian		<u>464</u>	613
Faculty and Staff			
Temporary			
Canadian	11*		
Other than Canadian	<u>101*</u>	112	
Permanent Residents			
Canadian	26		
Other than Canadian	<u>135</u>	<u>161</u>	273
Practical Trainees			<u>24</u>
TOTAL			1543

*Exchange Visitors on the Wayne State University Program as follows:

P-I-1002		P-II-3506	
Canadian	3	Canadian	5
Other than Canadian	<u>52</u>	Other than Canadian	<u>28</u>
	55		33

NON CITIZENS AT WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

ENROLLMENT BREAKDOWN BY COLLEGE

FALL QUARTER, 1966

Temporary Visa Students	Undergraduate	Graduate	
Liberal Arts	150	178	
Education	20	25	
Engineering	94	47	
Pharmacy	6	9	
Monteith	2	-	
Nursing	17	8	
Business Administration	37	15	
Social Work	-	7	
Medicine	<u>5</u>	<u>13</u>	
Total	331	302	633

Permanent Resident Visa Students

Liberal Arts	342	32	
Education	35	1	
Engineering	104	15	
Law	-	2	
Pharmacy	6	1	
Monteith	11	-	
Nursing	10	-	
Business Administration	33	7	
Social Work	-	5	
Medicine	6	5	
College Unknown	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	
Total	548	65	613

Practical Trainees

24

Faculty and Staff

Temporary Permanent

Adult Education	-	4
Affiliated Hospitals		
Child Research Center	5	-
Childrens Hospital	5	1
Detroit General Hospital	2	-
Detroit Instit. of Child Res.	1	-
Harper Hospital	2	-
Hutzel Hospital	2	1
Veterans Hospital, Dearborn	16	-
Wayne County General Hospital	1	-

ENROLLMENT BREAKDOWN BY COLLEGE (Continued)

FALL QUARTER, 1966

	Temporary	Graduate
Business Administration		
Applied Management and Technology Center	-	2
Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations	1	2
Management	-	1
Materials Management Center	1	-
Education		
Industrial Education	-	1
Physical Education	1	-
Engineering	2	8
Liberal Arts		
Art	-	1
Biology	1	2
Chemistry	8	2
Economics	1	2
English	-	1
Geology	1	1
Junior Year in Munich	1	-
Mathematics	2	15
Music	1	-
Physics	-	5
Political Science	-	2
Psychology	-	1
Romance & Germanic Languages	2	16
Sociology and Anthropology	-	4
Speech	-	2
Slavic Languages	1	1
Medical School		
Anatomy	5	6
Anesthesiology	1	3
Biochemistry	-	3
Dermatology	4	5
Gynecology	1	-
Medicine	11	10
Microbiology	-	2
Neurology	16	3
Obstetrics	1	1
Occupational - Environmental Health	1	4
Ophthalmology	-	4

ENROLLMENT BREAKDOWN BY COLLEGE (Continued)

FALL QUARTER, 1966

	Temporary	Permanent	
Orthopedics	2	-	
Orthopedic Surgery	1	1	
Otolaryngology	1	3	
Pathology	2	4	
Pediatrics	1	1	
Pharmaceutics	-	1	
Physical Medicine & Rehab.	-	1	
Physiological Chemistry	-	1	
Physiology and Pharmacology	5	3	
Radiology	-	1	
Rheumatology	1	-	
Surgery	1	4	
Montieth	-	4	
Nursing	1	-	
Social Work	-	2	
Other Departments			
Accounting	-	1	
Budget Office	-	1	
Building Services	-	4	
Computing Center	-	2	
Electronics Technician	-	1	
Health Service	-	1	
In Inst. for Applied Chemistry and Physics	-	1	
Liberal Arts Advising	-	1	
Liberal Arts - Dean's Office	-	1	
Placement Office	-	1	
Printing Department	-	1	
Science Storeroom	-	1	
University Libraries	-	2	
University Relations	-	1	
	<hr/>	<hr/>	
Total	112	161	<u>273</u>
		Total	1543

APPENDIX E

INSTRUCTIONS

FOR

ADMINISTERING

THE

QUESTIONNAIRE

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING
THE AMERICAN CHARACTER
OPINION SURVEY**

Good morning (afternoon). My name is _____.

Please do not start until I give the signal to begin.

Thank you for taking the time to come here today in order to help us with this opinion survey. All foreign students attending Wayne State University and a selected group of American student leaders at Wayne will be taking this survey.

This should take only 15 to 20 minutes of your time; however, please do not hurry since it is important that you read each question carefully and completely.

I will now read the directions on page one of the survey. Please read them to yourselves as I read them aloud.

(READ ENTIRE PAGE ALOUD)

After you have completed circling the answers at the side of the categories marked AGE, GEOGRAPHIC AREA, STATUS IN UNIVERSITY, SEX, MARITAL STATUS, AND LENGTH OF TIME IN UNITED STATES, please recheck to make sure you have circled an answer for each. If an answer is not circled for each category, the entire questionnaire will be void.

If you are not sure of the GEOGRAPHIC AREA, please write the name of your country in the space beside the word Other.

I will be happy to try to answer any questions that you might have. Please raise your hand anytime that you need help.

When you have completed the entire questionnaire, please show me the first page, then fold the survey and deposit it in the large box provided. DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME. WE WANT YOU TO AVOID IDENTIFICATION.

Are there any questions?

(PAUSE FOR QUESTIONS)

You may now begin.

APPENDIX F

LETTER SENT TO PILOT GROUP

AND

LETTER SENT TO JURY MEMBERS



WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

DIVISION OF STUDENT PERSONNEL

DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48202

FOREIGN STUDENTS' OFFICE

Dear Student :

I am in the process of composing a questionnaire for use by the Foreign Student Office and myself in obtaining necessary information from foreign students concerning their opinions and attitudes of the American character. Before I give this questionnaire, however, I need to be certain that it is reliable and that the questions contained in it are clear and understandable. Would you please consent, therefore, to help us in this endeavor by completing the questionnaire and then adding your comments and recommendations?

Please make an appointment to see me at your earliest opportunity. You can do this by coming to the Foreign Student Office, Room 448 Mackenzie Hall, or by telephoning 833-1400, extension 7170, 7171, or 7172. We will take only thirty minutes of your time, and I am sure that the time you spend will be enjoyable and rewarding.

Thank you, _____, for your cooperation.

Yours very truly,

Robert K. Luther
Assistant Foreign Student Adviser

RKL: jkl



WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

DIVISION OF STUDENT PERSONNEL

DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48202

FOREIGN STUDENTS' OFFICE

Dear Colleague:

For quite sometime I have been interested in foreign students' reactions to the American character. I am sure that my concern is not uniquely my own nor one which has not had a considerable amount written about it. My interest has been due primarily to my intense involvement with foreign students while serving as Assistant Foreign Student Adviser here at Wayne. I have, consequently, composed a questionnaire which I believe will serve as an instrument to measure how certain foreign students feel about what they consider to be certain traits of the American character. This instrument if valid would act as useful tool in increasing our understanding of foreign students and their reactions toward us. It would also prove quite helpful to us in the Foreign Student Office, and, of course, assist me in the writing of my graduate thesis.

Would you please consent, therefore, to act as a jury member in assessing the validity of this questionnaire as a device to test foreign students' opinions of the American character? I have enclosed an exact copy of the questionnaire which I have composed. Please disregard the directions at the beginning of page one as they are only for the use of the foreign students being tested. Beside each statement you will find the numbers 5, 4, 3, 2, 1. In appraising the statement, will you please circle 5 if you consider the question to be excellent, 4 if good, 3 if average, 2 if below average, and 1 if unsatisfactory.

Also enclosed is a self-addressed envelope. After you have completed the questionnaire, please place your name at the top of page one and return it as soon as possible. In addition, if you have further comments to add concerning the questionnaire, I sincerely hope you will do so.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Yours very truly,

Robert K. Luther
Assistant Foreign Student Adviser

RKL:jkl

Enclosures II

APPENDIX G

JURY MEMBERS MEAN SCORES

LETTER FROM FOREIGN STUDENT ADVISER

Jury Means

1.	5, 4, 5 = 4.7	23.	**
2.	4, 4, 5 = 4.3	24.	**
3.	4, 4, 5 = 4.3	25.	**
4.	1, 3, 1 = 1.7	26.	4, 5, 5 = 4.7
5.	1, 4, 5 = 3.3	27.	4, 5, 5 = 4.7
6.	5, 4, 5 = 4.7	28.	4, 5, 5 = 4.7
7.	3, 4, 5 = 4	29.	4, 5, 5 = 4.7
8.	5, 3, 5 = 4.3	30.	4, 5, 5 = 4.7
9.	5, 4, 4 = 4.3	31.	5, 1, 4 = 3.3
10.	5, 4, 5 = 4.7	32.	4, 5, 5 = 4.7
11.	5, 3, 5 = 4.3	33.	5, 5, 4 = 4.7
12.	5, 4, 5 = 4.7	34.	4, 5, 5 = 4.7
13.	4, 5, 3 = 4	35.	5, 5, 4 = 4.7
14.	4, 4, 4 = 4	36.	4, 5, 5 = 4.7
15.	5, 4, 4 = 4.3	37.	5, 5, 4 = 4.7
16.	**	38.	5, 5, 4 = 4.7
17.	1, 4, 5 = 3.3	39.	5, 5, 4 = 4.7
18.	3, 4, 1 = 2.7	40.	5, 5, 1 = 3.7
19.	4, 5, 3 = 4	41.	**
20.	4, 4, 5 = 4.3	42.	**
21.	5, 4, 5 = 4.7	43.	**
22.	5, 4, 5 = 4.7	44.	4, 5, 5 = 4.7

- | | | | |
|-----|-----------------|-----|-----------------|
| 45. | ** | 67. | 5, 4, 5 = 4.7 |
| 46. | 5, 4, 5 = 4.7 | 68. | 1, 5, 1 = 2.3 * |
| 47. | ** | 69. | 5, 4, 5 = 4.7 |
| 48. | 5, 4, 5 = 4.7 | 70. | 5, 3, 5 = 4.3 |
| 50. | 5, 4, 5 = 4.7 | 71. | 5, 4, 5 = 4.7 |
| 51. | 5, 5, 4 = 4.7 | 72. | ** |
| 52. | 5, 5, 4 = 4.7 | 73. | 5, 4, 5 = 4.7 |
| 53. | 5, 5, 4 = 4.7 | 74. | 5, 4, 5 = 4.7 |
| 54. | 5, 5, 4 = 4.7 | 75. | 5, 4, 5 = 4.7 |
| 55. | 5, 5, 4 = 4.7 | 76. | 5, 4, 5 = 4.7 |
| 56. | 5, 4, 3 = 4 | 77. | ** |
| 57. | ** | 78. | 5, 4, 5 = 4.7 |
| 58. | 5, 5, 4 = 4.7 | 79. | 5, 4, 5 = 4.7 |
| 59. | 5, 5, 4 = 4.7 | 80. | 5, 4, 5 = 4.7 |
| 60. | 2, 1, 1 = 1.3 * | 81. | 5, 4, 5 = 4.7 |
| 61. | 2, 1, 2 = 1.7 * | 82. | 5, 4, 5 = 4.7 |
| 62. | 5, 4, 5 = 4.7 | 83. | 5, 4, 5 = 4.7 |
| 63. | 5, 4, 5 = 4.7 | 84. | 5, 4, 5 = 4.7 |
| 64. | 5, 4, 5 = 4.7 | 85. | 5, 4, 5 = 4.7 |
| 65. | 5, 3, 5 = 4.3 | 86. | *** |
| 66. | 5, 4, 5 = 4.7 | 87. | ** |
| | | 88. | ** |

*Changed to meet jury's approval

**Added upon jury's suggestion