Foreign students' perceptions of

barriers: A comparative analysis

by

Melvin Carl Ray

A Thesis Submitted to the

Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department: Sociology and Anthropology
        Major: Sociology

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa
1983

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION

To John and Missouri Ray

In recognition of and appreciation for all the years of guidance, sacrifices, and emotional support you both have given me. May God Almighty forever bless your loving and caring souls.

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

The number of foreign students attending colleges and universities

in this country has been steadily increasing annually (Edles, 1980).

The number of foreign students attending U.S. colleges and universities

has risen from 47 thousand in 1954 to over 300,000 in 1981 (Institute

of International Education, 1981). As a result of this influx of foreign

scholars, the United States probably ranks as the world's leading host

for undergraduate and graduate students from other countries.

The recognition of the role of education, especially higher educa-

tion, in the attainment of international understanding and cooperation

is exemplified by international, national, governmental, and nongovern-

mental agencies' efforts to develop student exchange programs (Payind,

1979).

Need for Study

With the substantial increase in the foreign student population in

this country, educators and policymakers of international education pro-

grams have been faced with some unique questions. These questions concern

the extent to which the American society integrates foreign students into

the local communities during their stay and how the students perceive

the treatment accorded to them (Lysgaard, 1955; Coelho, 1958; and Selltiz

and Cook, 1962). Social adjustment studies of foreign students are

numerous (e.g., Smith, 1956; Quinn, 1975; Pruitt, 1978; and Hull, 1978).

However, a review of the literature regarding adjustment problems of

foreign students reveals a lack of understanding of specific factors

associated with the barriers foreign students face in establishing
satisfying relationships with U.S. nationals.

Objectives of the Study

Baron (1974) stated that our behavior and attitudes towards others
with whom we interact are significantly affected by certain personal
characteristics which they possess in addition to their observable
behavior. Furthermore, others are also affected by our perceptions
of their being different from ourselves, with regard to physical and
cultural characteristics (e.g., skin color, language, and customs).
That perception sets the stage for much of our behavior and attitudes.
Thus, foreign students' perceptions of U.S. national have a significant
effect on the nature of their interaction with U.S. citizens.

The objectives for which this study has been undertaken are as
follows: (1) to determine the effects of selected personal character-
istics (sex, region of origin, and academic classification) of foreign
students on their perceptions of barriers, (2) to determine the effects
of those characteristics of foreign students on their level of satis-
faction with their relationships involving faculty members, (3) to
determine the effects of those characteristics of foreign students on
their level of satisfaction, with regard to relationships involving
U.S. students, (4) to determine the relationship between foreign students'
perceptions of barriers (English proficiency, racial background, and
cultural background) and their level of satisfaction with relationships
involving faculty members, and (5) to determine the relationship between

foreign students' perceptions of barriers and their level of satisfaction with their relationships involving U.S. students.

Organization of the Thesis

Chapter II contains a review of relevant literature on the symbolic interactionist perspective, the theoretical framework upon which the data will be analyzed, theoretical definitions of relevant concepts, and a list of the theoretical hypotheses which will be tested. Chapter III includes data sources, data collection procedures, operationalization of concepts and a description of the statistical procedures employed. Chapter IV contains the results of hypothesis testing, a discussion of some policy implications.

CHAPTER II.   THEORETICAL ORIENTATION

This study draws on the tradition of theory known as symbolic
interactionism.   It designates the perspective adopted by several gener-
ations of sociologists whose research developed from the work of Charles
H. Cooley and that of George Herbert Mead.   The term symbolic interaction-
ism directs our attention to the most significant proposition of this
perspective: Humans create and use symbols, which enable them to inter-
act and communicate with one another.

According to Mead, one of the most significant contributors to the
symbolic interactionist perspective, human interaction is a cooperative
behavior.   Meltzer, with reference to cooperative behavior wrote:

> ...cooperation can only be brought about by some process wherein
> (a) each acting individual ascertains the intention of the acts
> of others, and then, (b) makes his own response on the basis of
> that intention.   What this means is that, in order for human
> beings to cooperate, there must be present some sort of mechanism
> whereby each acting individual: (a) can come to understand the
> lines of action of others, and (b) can guide his own behavior
> to fit in with those lines of action (1964:10-31).

The starting point, according to symbolic interactionists, is the
act.   An act is the behavior of an individual evoked by an impulse
requiring some adjustment to appropriate objects in the external world
(Lindesmith and Strauss, 1968).   Thus, a social act is one in which the
appropriate object of concern is another individual.   We must remember,
however, that the other individual also acts, with reference to the first
actor.   Every social act involves at least two individuals, interacting,
and taking each other's behavior into account.   Since these acts occur

over time, they have a history and they have meaning. At this stage,
we refer to social acts as gestures.

When individuals are interacting with one another, they are
engaged in a process Mead coined as a "conversation of gestures." Their
responses to one another are based on the intentions or perceived mean-
ings of the gestures used in the conversion. Gestures and symbols
acquire their meaning from the acts of others toward them (Meltzer, 1964).
In order for individuals to engage in concerted behavior, each inter-
acting individual must be able to attach the same meaning to each gesture.
When gestures have a shared meaning in the form of common understandings
and expectations, Mead referred to them as "significant symbols."

To illustrate the process by which gestures become significant
symbols, Sheldon Stryker depicted the following scene between a crying
infant and his mother:

> The cry of the infant may serve as a sign of hunger to the mother,
> and she responds by feeding the infant. The cry is a gesture
> whose meaning lies in the parental response. At a later stage,
> the child may call out "milk!" and, unless the appropriate parental
> response is made, protests vigorously. The word "milk" is here a
> significant symbol. Language, basically, is a system of signifi-
> cant symbols. This is equivalent to asserting that language is a
> system of shared meanings, and this, in turn, implies that language
> is a system of shared behavior (1959:111-119).

Thus, shared meanings for gestures and symbols are vital elements in
the communication process among humans.

Significant symbols differ according to the cultural and linguistic
context in which they are employed. Thus, foreign students' command of
English and their cultural background may be barriers to sharing and
correctly interpreting the symbols and gestures expressed by U.S.

nationals. Such difficulties will influence the level of satisfaction
or dissatisfaction foreign students will experience in their inter-
actions with U.S. nationals.

Definition of Situation

William I. Thomas (1931) maintained that there are rules of behavior
which govern our conduct in recurring situations. Before entering into
any self-directed act, there is usually a period of examination and
deliberation which Thomas denoted as "definition of situation." When
a new-born infant is delivered into the world, he is placed into an
environment in which the situations have been previously defined and
corresponding rules of conduct prescribed. The family unit is the
infant's primary defining agency. As soon as the infant is able to
pull, prowl, and destroy things, his parents begin to define situations
for him. For instance, the parents may tell the child to be quiet in
church, sit up straight at the table, and/or look in both directions
before crossing the street. Hence, the child is given rules of conduct
in particular situations.

Hewitt (1976) argued that human behavior takes place within situa-
tions that are defined by the interacting participants. According to
Hewitt, people act in specific contests and circumstances (i.e., Midwest
Sociological Meetings, champion game, and church service), for they
conduct themselves according to their definitions of such situations.
Thus, he defined "definition of situation" as an organization of percep-
tions, through which individuals assemble objects, give them meaning and
act toward them in a coherent and organized manner. However, it can

also be perceived as an overall understanding of the nature of a particular setting.

Stebbins (1969) stated that most of our definitions of situations are classified as belonging to the cultural definition mode. Thus, we define situations in our daily life according to the meaning of events found in a culture as a whole or a subculture, a meaning which we learn either through primary socialization or secondary socialization.

The language used in the interaction among humans helps in defining the situations (C. Wright Mills, 1940). The language we use in our conversations gives others with whom we are interacting a cue with regard to our future actions. Thus, humans distinguish situations with particular vocabularies or significant symbols, and it may be due to some specified vocabulary that they anticipate consequences of others' conduct. Mills argued that:

> Anticipation is a subvocal or overt naming of terminal phases
> and/or social consequences of conduct. When an individual names
> consequences, he elicits the behaviors for which the name is a
> redintegrative cue. In a societal situation, implicit in the
> names for consequences is the social dimension of motives.
> Through such vocabularies, types of societal control operate. Also,
> the terms in which the question is asked often will contain both
> alternatives: "Love or Duty?" "Business or Pleasure?" Institu-
> tionally, different situations have different vocabularies of
> motives appropriate to their respective behaviors (1940:904-913).

Mills' argument is consistent with that of George H. Mead, for it places great emphasis both on the overt and covert behavior of individuals. It reminds us that both motives and behavior often arise, not from stimulus within the individual, but from reaction to the situation in which the individuals find themselves (Mills, 1940).

A human may project negative sentiments to persons regarding their behavior and their characteristics by his employing epithets which are at the same time brief and emotional terms for the situation. "Bastard," "whore," "coward," and "nigger" are such epithets. For example, it was found that in the Southeast, Southwest, and West there exists a sub-culture of U.S. students who label students from the Middle East with such epithets as "camel jocks" and "A-rab" (Couser, 1978). Winks, shrugs, nudges, laughter, sneers, and "giving the once over" are also symbolic representations which define the situation and they are painfully per-ceived by some individuals as unfavorable recognitions.

Implicit in the discussion throughout is the fundamental idea that situations have to be recognized, named, and classified by the individual so that appropriate action may be taken. Foreign students' definitions of situations arise from within their cultural definitional mode, and with some modification, based on their understanding of U.S. culture. Thus, rules governing their behavior in a particular situation are partially derived from the standard meaning of events characteristic of their culture. Furthermore, the gestures and symbols employed by U.S. nationals, in a particular situation, may have different meanings to foreign students. A symbol regarded by U.S. nationals as having a neutral or positive connotation may in fact be perceived by foreign students as a negative epithet in reference to them. One can reason then that foreign students' cultural background, English proficiency and knowledge of U.S. culture have a profound effect on their definitions

of situations and their level of satisfaction with their relationships

involving U.S. nationals.

The Self

Charles H. Cooley (1902) expressed the view of "self" as the result

of the process by which individuals perceive themeslves as objects, to-

gether with other objects in their social environment. According to

Meltzer:

> An object represents a plan of action. That is an object doesn't
> exist for the individual in some pre-established form. Perception
> of any object has telescoped in it a series of experiences which
> one would have if he carried out the plan of action toward that
> object. The object has no qualities for the individual, aside
> from those which would result from his carrying out a plan of
> action. In this respect, the object is constituted by one's
> activities with reference to it (1964:10-31).

When humans interact with one another through the medium of signif-

icant symbols, they are able to view themsleves from each other's point-

of-view as an object. The individuals imagine how the other persons

assess them and they construct images of themselves on the basis of

those perceived evaluations. Cooley defined this process as the "looking

glass self." If we see ourselves in the mirror, we are either pleased

or disappointed at the reflection which appears. The reason for our

attitudes toward the image that we see in the mirror can be attributed

to our perception of others' attitude toward it. An idea of self of this

kind, according to Cooley, has three principal elements: (1) the imagin-

ation of our appearance in the minds of the significant others, (2) our

perception of their evaluation of that appearance, and (3) one's own

reaction (e.g., pride or embarrassment) to the perceived evaluations

by the significant others.

The self is composed of two distinct entities, the "I" and the "me."
Benard Meltzer, in his interpretation of Mead's exposition of these two
entities, argued that:

> The "I" is the impulsive tendency of the individual. It is the
> initial, spontaneous, unorganized aspects of human experience.
> Thus, it represents the undirected tendencies of the individual.
> The "me" represents the incorporated other within the individual.
> Thus, it comprises the organized set of attitudes and definitions,
> understandings and expectations or simply meanings -- common to
> the group. In any given situation, the "me" comprises the general-
> ized other and often some particular other (1964:10-31).

Therefore, the self can be viewed as a balanced social system, in the
sense that it has incorporated in it the mechanism for social control on
one hand, and on the other, a mechanism for novelty and innovations
(Meltzer, 1964).

Blumer (1962) in his exposition of the self makes no explicit
reference to the "I" or the "me." He regarded the self as being a process
of intrahuman interaction, in the course of which the individual comes to
view himself/herself in a novel way. Perhaps the most important feature
of man is his image of his self, his idea of what kind of person he is.
This experience of self is a crucially interpersonal one. Its basic
orientation is derived from surrounding persons to whose approbation
and criticisms one pays attention (Gerth and Mills, 1953).

Kinch (1963) argued that the two most influential sets of evalua-
tions to the self-concept are those received in the earliest part of
one's life, and the evaluations received through most recent contacts
(his idea of temporary proximity). According to Kinch, we try to
select significant others in such a way that their evaluations of us

are similar to those of our own self-concept. This selection of signifi-
cant others explains why foreign students tend to select fellow country-
men as friends in addition to the convenience of shared meaning of
symbols and other cultural idiosyncracies needed for communication and
interaction. However, the social fabric is such that foreign students
attending colleges and universities in this country are in a sense forced
to interact with U.S. nationals. As a result of "temporary proximity,"
foreign students include some U.S. nationals as part of their signifi-
cant others.

When foreign students look into a mirror they see themselves as
the reflection of their personal, cultural, and racial characteristics.
If they have perceived these characteristics to be salient and negative
features in their interaction with U.S. nationals, their evaluation of
their appearance in the eyes of significant others is likely to affect
their self-concept negatively.

The Mind

Mead began his exposition of the mind with reference to the relation
of the organism to its environment. He reasoned that all human behavior
involves selective attention and perception. The individual accepts
certain events, behavior, or symbols as a stimulus and rejects others.
The mind is an active entity that involves selective attention to
specific aspects of a situation, rather than merely something coming
into the individual's nervous system and leaving an impression. At
the human level, perception involves delaying, organizing and

selecting a response to a stimulus in the individual's environment.
The mind makes it possible for the individual to control and organize
his responses (Mead, 1934).

The mind is social in both origin and function. The mind evolves
out of the social process of communication through the medium of signif-
icant symbols. As individuals interact with significant others, they
come to internalize the meanings transmitted to him/her through symbols.
Thus, they begin to perceive the point-of-view of others. The mind is
social in function, in the sense that the individual is constantly
indicating to himself from the perspective of others and he controls
his behavior by referring to the expectations and definitions provided
by them.

Foreign students may try to internalize the expectations and the
definitions of situations of significant U.S. nationals. This indoctri-
nation takes place through the medium of their own language and cultural
orientation. Thus, their internalized expectations and definitions may
not be in compliance with those of their new significant others (called
"me" by Mead). Consequently, foreign students' "me" may not be able
to guide them appropriately in interactions involving U.S. nationals.

Role-Taking

Role-taking is a theoretical conceptualization, within the
symbolic interaction perspective which has been addressed by many
social philosophers. Shelson Stryker (1959) referred to role-taking
as an anticipation of the responses of others with whom one is engaged
in some social act.

Lindesmith and Strauss described the process of role-taking in the following manner:

> A person, by imaginatively or actually using the gestures, postures, words, and intonations of someone else and by drawing upon his understanding of that person from past experience, evokes in himself responses that approximate those of the other person. He, thus, "feels" his way into the others' views, and by so doing makes predictions about the other's behavior. He is greatly assisted in this process by knowledge of others' motives and of the symbols and values in terms of which they act (1968:282).

Hans Vailinger (1924) presented a rather unique way of interpreting the process of role-taking. He reasoned that an individual acts for a time "as if" he/she were someone else. The "as if" behavior involved in role-taking includes two distinguishable elements: (1) a hypothetical assumption, "Suppose I was John Ray?" and (2) a consideration of the consequences of the assumption, "What would I think and do if I were John Ray?" (Sarbin, 1954). For Weber, individuals who are sufficiently involved with one another in defined situations are able to penetrate the other's subjective world. Thus, they experience a common social reality.

The literature reviewed above suggests that role-taking includes interpreting other's gestures, adopting another's attitudes, and pretending to be someone else. Through role-taking, foreign students visualize themselves through the perceptual model of U.S. nationals. By doing so, they construct an image of themselves which may not be consistent with that actually held by their new significant others (U.S. nationals). The skepticism, with regard to the accuracy of foreign students' role-taking modeled on U.S. nationals, is due to possible misinterpretation of vocabulary and gestures used by U.S. nationals. In the case of foreign

students, their role-taking of U.S. nationals is guided by their own cultural background, their language, and their often limited understanding of English and U.S. culture.

Barriers

In the process of getting adjusted to U.S. culture, foreign students learn the social meaning associated with race and its significance in the United States. When they realize that their racial background is an important factor in interhuman interaction in the United States, their racial background will become an influential factor in their definitions of situations and their self-concept as they assess U.S. nationals' view of themselves as members of a certain racial group.

Foreign students' cultural background, their command of English, and their racial background are major influential factors in their role-taking, formation of their self-concept, and their definition of situations. These factors may become sources of misunderstanding, thus, become barriers in establishing good relationships with U.S. nationals. The term "barrier" is used to denote anything that restricts or limits the interaction between foreign students and U.S. nationals. These barriers may not be concrete entities, but are real to foreign students as long as they are preceived when defining particular situations.

In the literature concerning foreign students' social adjustment, a number of personal characteristics of foreign students have been suggested as barriers in their attempt to interact with American citizens. The barriers investigated in past studies include English proficiency, cultural differences, and foreign students' racial backgrounds.

English proficiency

The English language is ordinarily taken for granted by U.S.

citizens. Its smooth and easy use leads to the belief that it is a

transparent medium for the projection of one's own thoughts or per-

ceptions. It offers no perceptible obstruction to ones customary flow

of ideas. One may reason that it can convey any attitude or belief.

Thus, language enables its users to experience the world in which they

exist.

Edward Sapir, more than 50 years ago, argued that:

The relation between language and experience is often misunder-
stood. Language is not merely a more or less systematic inven-
tory of the various items of experience which seem relevant to
the individual. As is so often naively assumed, but is also a
self-contained, creative symbolic organization, which not only
refers to experience acquired without its help but actually
defines experience for us by reason of its formal completeness
and because of our unconscious projection of its implicit
expectations into the field of experience (1931:578).

Sapir, in this passage, is trying to convey the relationship

which exists between language and our conscious world. In support of

Sapir's argument, Carroll (1956) stated that language forms a kind

of logic, a general frame of reference, and it facilitates the thought

patterns of its users.

The majority of foreign students attending colleges and univer-

sities in the United States come from countries where English is not

the first language. Past studies indicate that those foreign students

who are not proficient with English indeed face difficulties in their

relationship with U.S. students and faculty members. Cowan (1968)

found that Japanese students who were better skilled in English tended

to interact with American students more frequently than those who were

less proficient. English proficiency was reported as a salient factor

with regard to foreign students' interaction with U.S. citizens at

both Oregon State University (Penn and Durham, 1978) and University of

Tennessee (Johnson, 1971). There also exists the misconception among

some U.S. nationals that any student who does not speak English fluently

is profoundly ignorant (Couser, 1978). The above findings suggest that

English could be a serious barrier for foreign students in their inter-

actions with U.S. citizens.

Cultural background

Shepard (1974) defined culture as: "All man-made. patterns for

thinking, feeling, and behaving that are socially conveyed to an

entire society or to segments of the society." Thus, culture is viewed

as an abstraction, not directly visible but inferred from the behavior

patterns of individuals.

According to Davis (1971), some foreign students thought that the

American family unit was not as closely integrated as it should be and

that women and children were given too much freedom. When foreign

students visit their U.S. counterparts, the interaction between them

and the American family unit may be drastically different from that

which they are accustomed. Thus, they may experience some discomfort-

ing sensations in those situations due to their cultural background.

John Bennett et al. (1958) reported that Japanese students arriv-

ing in the United States encounter customs which are significantly

different from their own. For instance, they are accustomed to regard-
ing their instructors as far above them in status, yet the professors,
playing by American rules, usually try to put the foreign student at
ease by interacting with them in an informal manner. According to
Bennett, Japanese students occasionally have a difficult time coping
with this interactional contingency. As Bennett notes:

> In many cases...Americans do not behave toward Japanese as
> equals, while the Japanese perceive the Americans as, and in
> some cases expect them to behave like superiors.... Since the
> Japanese is generally not able to respond as an equal, and since
> withdrawal and distant respect are proper behavior both for
> interaction with superiors and for interaction in situations
> where status is ambiguous, he simply retires into enyro and
> communication is impaired (1958:237).

In this passage, Bennett presents a vivid example in which one's
cultural background has a limiting affect on his/her interaction with
others. According to Penn and Durham (1978), foreign students regarded
unfamiliarity with American customs and language problems as the major
barriers in their interaction with U.S. nationals.

Individuals from differing cultural backgrounds have different
beliefs and values which govern their behavior, and they perceive their
worlds differently. For example, being one of several wives to one man,
or vice versa, may be strongly defended as the most natural form of
marriage by individuals of one culture, while monogamous unions are
the most acceptable to persons of another culture. Cultural variations
may inhibit intergroup interaction, thus, foreign students may perceive
their cultural background as another barrier in their attempt to
establish desirable relationships with U.S. nationals.

Racial background

In the United States, as well as in other parts of the world, one's racial background has a significant influence on how one is received by others. Many foreign students have some distinct physical traits which differ from those of the majority in this society. The term race is used to denote a group of individuals which has certain physical characteristics that distinguishes them from the dominant group.

Deutsch (1970) questioned 172 foreign students with regard to their experiences of racial or cultural discrimination. He found that 20 percent of the students from developed nations (North America and Europe) said thay had experienced some form of discrimination. Among the students from developing nations, 44 percent said that they had experienced some discriminatory behavior from U.S. nationals. One may note that students from developing nations are more likely to be non-white while those from developed nations are more likely to be white.

The literature seems to suggest a pattern among U.S. nationals of prejudicial attitudes and racial discrimination toward foreign students whose physical characteristics are strikingly similar to those of American blacks. Arubayi (1980) reported that, at first sight, white Americans were perceived by African students as having negative attitudes toward them. Miller (1967) noted similar findings. He cited African students as saying that they were treated more favorably when they were not known as black Americans. Hull (1978), in a study of the coping behavior of foreign students within their educational

environment, concluded that African students were more likely to face
discrimination than foreign students of any other racial background.
Thus, foreign students may perceive their racial backgrounds as a
barrier in their relationships with U.S. students and faculty members.
Consequently, their level of satisfaction, with regard to those relation-
ships, may be affected negatively.

Personal Characteristics

The question emerges: To what extent is there variability in the
perception of barriers by foreign students? Certainly we cannot
generalize and assume that the degree to which barriers are perceived
is identical for all. Certain personal characteristics (i.e., sex,
region or origin, and academic classification) of foreign students may
affect the degree to which barriers are perceived, with regard to their
relationships involving U.S. nationals. Female students, from develop-
ing nations, were found to perceive their cultural background as a
barrier to a greater extent than their male counterparts (Dunnett, 1977;
and Pruitt, 1977). Foreign students' level of satisfaction with their
stay in the United States and ease of adjustment were found to vary by aca-
demic classification (Selltiz et al., 1963; and Quinn, 1975), and region
or origin (Spaulding and Flack, 1976; Hountras, 1956; and Hull, 1978).
As suggested in the literature, selected characteristics of foreign
students may have different effects on their level of satisfaction
with relationships involving U.S. nationals and their perception of
barriers.

Theoretical Hypotheses

The literature review suggests that foreign students' perception of barriers will have: (1) an effect on their interaction with U.S. nationals and consequently on their level of satisfaction, with regard to their relationships with U.S. nationals, and (2) foreign students' perception of barriers and their level of satisfaction with relationships involving U.S. nationals will vary according to personal characteristics of foreign students selected. The following hypotheses will be tested in this thesis.

General Hypothesis 1:

Foreign students' perception of barriers influences their level of satisfaction, with regard to their relationships with U.S. nationals.

Specific Hypotheses:

1.1. The extent to which foreign students perceive English as a barrier is negatively related to their degree of satisfaction, with regard to their relationships involving U.S. nationals.

1.2. The extent to which foreign students perceive their cultural background as a barrier is negatively related to their level of satisfaction, with regard to their relationships involving U.S. nationals.

1.3. The extent to which foreign students perceive their racial background as a barrier is negatively related to their level of satisfaction, with regard to their relationships involving U.S. nationals.

General Hypothesis 2:

Foreign students' perception of barriers, with regard to relationships involving U.S. nationals varies by personal characteristics of foreign students.

Specific Hypotheses :

2.1. The extent to which foreign students perceive English as a barrier varies by their academic classification.

2.2. The extent to which foreign students perceive their cultural background as a barrier varies by their academic classification.

2.3. The extent to which foreign students perceive their racial background as a barrier varies by their academic classification.

2.4. The extent to which foreign students perceive English as a barrier varies by gender.

2.5. The extent to which foreign students perceive their cultural background as a barrier varies by gender.

2.6. The extent to which foreign students perceive their racial background as a barrier varies by gender.

2.7. The extent to which foreign students perceive their English as a barrier varies by region of origin.

2.8. The extent to which foreign students perceive their cultural background as a barrier varies according to their region of origin.

2.9. The extent to which foreign students perceive their racial background as a barrier varies according to their region of origin.

<u>General Hypothesis 3</u>:

Foreign students' level of satisfaction, with regard to their relationships involving U.S. nationals, varies by selected personal characteristics.

<u>Specific Hypotheses</u>:

3.1. Foreign students' level of satisfaction, with regard to their relationships with U.S. nationals, varies by their gender.

3.2. Foreign students' level of satisfaction, with regard to their relationships with U.S. nationals, varies by their region of origin.

3.3. Foreign students; level of satisfaction, with regard to their relationships with U.S. nationals, varies by their academic classification.

CHAPTER III. METHODS

The data utilized in this investigation were drawn from the study

entitled, "Needs of Foreign Students from Developing Nations at

Colleges and Universities in the U.S." The Agency for International

Development (AID) contracted the National Association of Foreign

Student Affairs (NAFSA), which, in turn, subcontracted the Department

of Sociology and Anthropology at Iowa State University to conduct the

study. The objectives of the study were to assess the needs of foreign

students from developing nations who were studying in academic degree

programs at U.S. colleges and universities. For a complete description

of this national survey, see Lee et al., (1981).

Data Source

The survey population for the study was defined as all the foreign

students from developing nations who: (1) were studying toward a degree

at U.S. colleges and universities, (2) had spent at least one regular

academic quarter or semester at the school where they were enrolled at

the time of sampling, and (3) were enrolled at colleges and universi-

ties that had at least 300 foreign students attending in the spring

of 1979. The criteria, provided by the sponsoring agency, required

the survey to include students from 102 developing nations.

A multistage cluster sample, with probability proportionate to

size, was used to select the schools and students across the nation.

To secure the names of the students, a letter stating the objectives

of the projects was sent to the office of foreign student advisors at each selected school. They were asked to provide a list of foreign students attending their school as of spring, 1979. If, for some institutional policy or regulation, the list was not made available, the participating school selected the sample for that particular institution, with the instructions provided by the research team. The total sample comprised 1,897 students from 30 universities across the nation who participated in the survey.

Data collection

The questionnaire used to obtain the data for this thesis was constructed at Iowa State University for a study to assess needs of students from developing nations at U.S. colleges and universities (Lee et al., 1981). Only those items related to the objectives of this thesis will be presented.

In the fall of 1979, the data were collected by mailing questionnaires to selected students. The number of contacts ranged from two to five times. These contacts were used to urge the respondents to return the completed questionnaire promptly. The actual return rate ranged from 23.2 percent to 64.6 percent, depending on the school, due to: (1) variability in the updatedness of the list, (2) difference in sampling (sampled by the Iowa State University research team and contacted up to five times, or sampled by a sample school and contacted only twice), and (3) variability in mail services from locale to locale. A random check of some of the responses found no significant differences by contacts or by sample situations.

Operationalization of Concepts

In this section, measurements of the main theoretical concepts included in this study will be discussed. Those concepts are: academic classification, sex, region of origin, perception of barriers, and the level of satisfaction, with regard to relationships involving U.S. nationals.

Academic classification

The academic classification of the respondents was operationalized as graduate versus undergraduate, which will be referred to in the remaining of this thesis as graduate versus undergraduate distinction. This distinction was considered as a more substantial distinction in the experience of students than the detailed classification of the original response categories. The original question and response categories were as follows:

What is your present university classification? Circle one number.

1. Freshman

2. Sophomore

3. Junior

4. Senior

5. Master's student

6. Ph.D. student

Then, those students who responded with a value of four or less were categorized as undergraduates and those who responded with a value of five or greater as graduate students.

Sex

The gender of the respondents was measured by their response to
the following:

What is your sex? Circle one number.

1. Female

2. Male

Region of origin

Respondents' countries were categorized into the following regions
by the sponsoring agency (The Agency for International Development).
Europe was excluded for comparison of regions, due to its small number
of cases. The values assigned were as follows:

1. Africa

2. South and East Asia

3. Southwest Asia

4. Latin America

Southwest Asia is defined as being east of Egypt, excluding Egypt, and
West of Iran, including Iran.

Barriers

To measure the respondents' perception of barriers in their
relationships involving U.S. nationals, students were asked to rate
three factors in response to the question, "How much do you think each
factor is preventing you from having a good relationship with U.S.
nationals?" The three factors were: (1) students' command of English,
(2) students' cultural background, and (3) students' racial background

Each factor was rated on a five-point scale as follows: 1 = not at all, 2 = a little, 3 = somewhat, 4 = much, and 5 = very much. The scores on these items will be referred to in the remaining of this thesis as follows: (1) English barrier score, (2) cultural barrier score, and (3) racial barrier score.

Satisfaction with relationships involving U.S. nationals

The respondents' level of satisfaction with their relationships involving U.S. nationals was measured using satisfaction ratings of the following need items:

1. Need for being treated as fairly as U.S. students by faculty,

2. Need for good relationships with course instructors,

3. Need for being respected as a fellow human being by U.S. students, and

4. Need for U.S. friends with whom one can discuss personal problems.

Each item was rated by students using a seven-point scale as follows: 1 = very unsatisfied, 2 = quite unsatisfied, 3 = somewhat unsatisfied, 4 = neither satisfied nor unsatisfied, 5 = somewhat satisfied, 6 = quite satisfied, and 7 = very satisfied.

The scores on these items will be referred to in the remainder of this thesis as follows: (1) satisfaction score for fair treatment by U.S. faculty, (2) satisfaction score for relationship with course instructors, (3) satisfaction score for discussing personal problems with U.S. friends,

and (4) satisfaction score for being respected as a fellow human being
by U.S. students.

Empirical Hypotheses

With the operational measures presented in the preceding section,
the empirical hypotheses will be presented along with the general
and specific hypotheses.

G.H.1. Foreign students' perception of barriers influences their level
of satisfaction, with regards to their relationships involving
U.S. nationals.

S.H.1.1. The extent to which foreign students perceive English as a
barrier is negatively related to their degree of satisfaction,
with regard to their relationships involving U.S. nationals.

E.H.1.1.1. Foreign students' English barrier score is negatively related
to their satisfaction score for being respected as a fellow
human being by U.S. students.

E.H.1.1.2. Foreign students' English barrier score is negatively related
to their satisfaction score for discussing personal problems
with U.S. friends.

E.H.1.1.3. Foreign students' English barrier score is negatively related
to their satisfaction score for fair treatment by U.S. faculty.

E.H.1.1.4. Foreign students' English barrier score is negatively related
to their satisfaction score for their relationships involving
course instructors.

S.H.1.2. The extent to which foreign students perceive their cultural

background as a barrier is negatively related to their level

of satisfaction, with regard to their relationships involving

U.S. nationals.

E.H.1.2.1. Foreign students' cultural barrier score is negatively

related to their satisfaction score for being respected as a

fellow human being by U.S. students.

E.H.1.2.2. Foreign students' cultural barrier score is negatively

related to their level of satisfaction score for U.S. friends

with whom they can discuss personal problems.

E.H.1.2.3. Foreign students' cultural barrier score is negatively

related to their satisfaction score for fair treatment by

U.S. faculty.

E.H.1.2.4. Foreign students' cultural barrier score is negatively

related to their satisfaction score for relationships with

course instructors.

S.H.1.3. The extent to which foreign students perceive their racial

background as a barrier is negatively related to their level

of satisfaction, with regard to their relationships involving

U.S. nationals.

E.H.1.3.1. Foreign students' racial barrier score is negatively

related to their satisfaction score for being respected as

a fellow human being by U.S. students.

E.H.1.3.2. Foreign students' racial barrier score is negatively related

to their satisfaction score for fair treatment by U.S. faculty.

E.H.1.3.3. Foreign students' racial barrier score is negatively related to their satisfaction score for relationships with course instructors.

E.H.1.3.4. Foreign students' racial barrier score is negatively related to their satisfaction score for discussing personal problems with U.S. friends.

G.H.2. Foreign students' perception of barriers, with regard to relationships involving U.S. nationals, varies by selected personal characteristics.

S.H.2.1. The extent to which foreign students perceive English as a barrier varies by their gender.

E.H.2.1.1. Foreign students' English barrier score varies by gender.

S.H.2.2. The extent to which foreign students perceive their cultural background as a barrier varies by gender.

E.H.2.2.1. Foreign students' cultural barrier score varies by gender.

S.H.2.3. The extent to which foreign students perceive their racial background as a barrier varies by gender.

E.H.2.3.1. Foreign students' racial barrier score varies by gender.

S.H.2.4. The extent to which foreign students perceive English as a barrier varies by their academic classification.

E.H.2.4.1. Foreign students' English barrier score varies according to the graduate versus undergraduate distinction.

S.H.2.5. The extent to which foreign students perceive their racial background as a barrier varies by their academic classification.

E.H.2.5.1. Foreign students' racial barrier score varies according

to the graduate versus the undergraduate distinction.

S.H.2.6. The extent to which foreign students perceive their cultural

background as a barrier varies by their academic classification.

E.H.2.6.1. Foreign students' cultural barrier score varies according

to the graduate versus undergraduate distinction.

S.H.2.7. The extent to which foreign students perceive their cultural

background as a barrier varies by their region or origin.

E.H.2.7.1. Foreign students' cultural barrier score varies by region

of origin.

S.H.2.8. The extent to which foreign students perceive their racial

background as a barrier varies according to their region of

origin.

E.H.2.8.1. Foreign students' racial barrier score varies by region of

origin.

S.H.2.9. The extent to which foreign students perceive English as a

barrier varies by their region of origin.

E.H.2.9.1. Foreign students' English barrier score varies by their

region of origin.

G.H.3. Foreign students' level of satisfaction, with regard to their

relationships involving U.S. nationals, varies by selected

personal characteristics.

S.H.3.1. Foreign students' satisfaction score for relationships

involving U.S. nationals varies by gender.

E.H.3.1.1. Foreign students' satisfaction score for fair treatment
by faculty varies by gender.

E.H.3.1.2. Foreign students' satisfaction score for relationships with
course instructors varues by gender.

E.H.3.1.3. Foreign students' satisfaction score for being respected as
a fellow human being by U.S. students varies by gender.

E.H.3.1.4. Foreign students' satisfaction score for discussing personal
problems with U.S. friends varies by gender.

S.H.3.2. Foreign students' level of satisfaction, with regard to their
relationships involving U.S. nationals, varies by their
academic classification.

E.H.3.2.1. Foreign students' satisfaction score for fair treatment by
faculty varies according to the graduate versus undergraduate
distinction.

E.H.3.2.2. Foreign students' satisfaction score for relationships
with course instructors varies according to the graduate versus
undergraduate distinction.

E.H.3.2.3. Foreign students' satisfaction score for being respected
as a fellow human being by U.S. students varies according to
the graduate versus undergraduate distinction.

E.H.3.2.4. Foreign students' satisfaction score for discussing personal
problems with U.S. friends varies according to the graduate
versus undergraduate distinction.

S.H.3.3. Foreign students' level of satisfaction, with regard to their

relationships involving U.S. nationals, varies according to

their region of origin.

E.H.3.3.1. Foreign students' satisfaction score for fair treatment

by faculty varies according to their region of origin.

E.H.3.3.2. Foreign students' satisfaction score for being respected

as a fellow human being by U.S. students varies according to

their region of origin.

E.H.3.3.3. Foreign students' satisfaction score for discussing personal

problems with U.S. friends varies according to their region

of origin.

E.H.3.3.4. Foreign students' satisfaction score for relationships

with course instructors varies according to their region of

origin.

Statistical techniques

To determine the degree of association between the measures of

preceived barriers (English, racial background, and cultural background)

and the measures of the level of satisfaction of foreign students, with

regard to relationships involving U.S. students and faculty members

(Empirical Hypotheses E.H.1.1.1. through E.H.1.3.4), Pearson correlation

coefficients (r) were computed between these variables since they were

measured on an interval level.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) is a statistical technique employed

to measure the effects of one or more nominal independent variables

upon a continuous dependent variable that is generally assumed to be measured at the interval level (Nie, et al., 1975). In terms of each personal characteristic, barrier scores and satisfaction scores were examined with the analysis of variance using GLM procedures in SAS (Helwig and Council, 1979). Where rating differences were significant among more than two categories, Fisher's Least Significant Difference (LSD) was used to compare means using SPSS (Nie et al., 1975). This statistical technique is applicable to assess the effects of personal characteristics (categorical independent variables) with regard to foreign students' level of satisfaction with relationships involving U.S. nationals and their perception of barriers (Empirical Hypotheses E.H.2.1.1 through E.H.3.3.4).

CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the results of the hypothesis testing, a discussion
of the test results, implications for future research and the concluding
remarks will be presented.

Perceived Barriers and Satisfaction

Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated to determine the
relationship between the respondents' barrier scores and their satis-
faction scores. Table 1 summarizes the correlation coefficients of
these bivarite relationships. In the following discussion on Pearson
correlation coefficients, hypotheses were considered to be substantively
significant only when the probability value was .0001 or less. The
customary use of .05 level was avoided, since with a large sample size
(n=1897) extremely small correlation coefficients will be statistically
significant at .05 level. Such small coefficients, even though statis-
tically significant at .05 level, will not demonstrate the existence of
a substantial relationship between variables.

E.H.1.1.1. Foreign student' English barrier score (X5) is nega-
tively related to their satisfaction score for being respected as a
fellow human being by U.S. students (X2). Results: E.H.1.1.1. was
not supported at the .0001 level of significance.

E.H.1.1.2. Foreign students' English barrier score (X5) is nega-
tively related to their satisfaction score for discussing personal
problems with U.S. friends (X4). Results: E.H.1.1.2. was not supported
at the .0001 level of significance.

Table 4.1. Pearson correlation coefficients between satisfaction scores and barrier scores

	X_1	X_2	X_3	X_4	X_5	X_6	X_7
X_1 Satisfaction scores for fair treatment by faculty	1.00	0.59336[a] 0.0001[b]	-0.04652 0.0259	0.07114 0.0015	-0.12300 0.0001	-0.22801 0.0001	-0.18605 0.0001
X_2 Satisfaction scores for respect by U.S. students		1.00	0.01517 0.2614	0.04753 0.0229	-007041 0.0026	-0.34596 0.0001	-0.25317 0.0001
X_3 Satisfaction scores for relationship with course instructors			1.00	0.32402 0.0001	-0.01414 0.2870	-0.04544 0.0358	-0.01829 0.2336
X_4 Satisfaction scores for discussing personal problems				1.00	0.00123 0.4805	-0.02840 0.1302	0.03146 0.1057
X_5 English barrier score					1.00	0.09719 0.0001	0.16348 0.0001
X_6 Racial barrier score						1.00	0.53439 0.0001
X_7 Cultural barrier score							1.00

[a]Correlation coefficient.

[b]Significant level.

E.H.1.1.2. Foreign students' English barrier score (X5) is negatively related to their satisfaction score for fair treatment by U.S. faculty (X1). Results: E.H.1.1.3. was supported. The Pearson correlation coefficient of -0.12300 (P < .0001) demonstrated a moderate negative relationship between these two variables.

E.H.1.1.4. Foreign students' English barrier score (X5) is negatively related to their satisfaction score for their relationships involving course instructors (X3). Results: E.H.1.1.4. was not supported at the .0001 level of significance.

E.H.1.2.1. Foreign students' cultural barrier score (X6) is negatively related to their satisfaction score for being respected as fellow human beings by U.S. students (X2). Results: E.H.1.2.1. was supported. A moderately strong inverse relationship between these two scores is shown by the correlation coefficient of -0.25317 (P < .0001).

E.H.1.2.2. Foreign students' cultural barrier score (X6) is negatively related to their satisfaction score for U.S. friends with whom they can discuss personal problems (X4). Results: E.H.1.2.2. was not supported at the .0001 level.

E.H.1.2.3. Foreign students' cultural barrier score (X6) is negatively related to their satisfaction score for fair treatment by U.S. faculty (X1). Results: E.H.1.2.3. was supported at the .0001 level of significance. The Pearson correlation coefficient was -0.18605.

E.H.1.2.4. Foreign students' cultural barrier score (X6) is negatively related to their satisfaction score for relationships with

course instructors (X3). Results: E.H.1.2.4. was not supported at the .0001 level of significance.

E.H.1.3.1. Foreign students' racial barrier score (X7) is negatively related to their satisfaction score for being respected as a fellow human being by U.S. students (X2). Results: E.H.1.3.1. was supported. The Pearson correlation coefficient -0.34596 (P < .0001) suggests a strong inverse relationship between these two scores.

E.H.1.3.2. Foreign students' racial barrier score (X7) is negatively related to their satisfaction score for fair treatment by U.S. faculty (X1). Results: E.H.1.3.2. was supported. The Pearson correlation coefficient -0.22801 (P < .0001) indicates a moderate negative relationship between these variables.

E.H.1.3.3. Foreign students' racial barrier score (X7) is negatively related to their satisfaction score for relationships with course instructors (X3). Results: E.H.1.3.3. was not supported at the .0001 level.

E.H.1.3.4. Foreign students' racial barrier score (X7) is negatively related to their satisfaction score for discussing personal problems with U.S. friends (X4). Results: E.H.1.3.4. was not supported at the .0001 level.

Foreign students' perceptions of their English as a barrier was negatively related to their satisfaction with being treated fairly by faculty. The students' perceptions of their racial background as a barrier in establishing good relationships with U.S. nationals was negatively related to two of the need items. Those students

who perceived their racial background as a barrier to a greater extent than others indicated less satisfaction with being treated fairly by faculty and being respected as fellow human beings by U.S. students.

The students' perceptions of their cultural background as a barrier were also negatively related to the need items mentioned above. However, their satisfaction for those need items were less strongly related to their perceptions of their cultural background as a barrier than to those of their racial background as a barrier, as demonstrated by the higher negative correlation for the latter than for the former.

The data did not include the reasons why the above negative relationships occurred. Therefore, the following proposed explanations should be considered in future inquiries. Foreign students who are less proficient with English might have some problems regarding their communication of ideas to faculty. Consequently, they perceived the evaluations of them by faculty members as a reflection of their lack of English language skills more than of the content of their work. The reason for the inverse relationship between the students' perceptions of their cultural background as a barrier and their satisfaction with being respected as a fellow human being by U.S. students can be attributed to foreign students' perceptions of U.S. students' lack of understanding of their cultural backgrounds. The negative relationship between foreign students' perceptions of their racial background as a barrier and their satisfaction for the need item mentioned above can be due, in part, to foreign students' recognition of their physical characteristics being similar to those of minority group members in the United States and

other stereotypic characteristics associated with them. They perceive

these characteristics being the source of prejudice and discrimination,

as in the case of U.S. minorities.

Barrier Scores by Personal Characteristics

In this section, the results of the hypotheses which predicted

variation in foreign students' barrier scores by selected personal

characteristics will be presented. F values will be reported together

with the level of significance (P.05). Results are presented in

Tables 4.2-4.4.

Gender

E.H.2.1.1. Foreign students' English barrier scores vary by

gender. Results: E.H. 2.1.1. was not supported at the .05 level.

E.H.2.2.1. Foreign students' cultural barrier scores vary by gender.

Results: E.H.2.2.1. was supported (F=6.38, P < .05). Foreign students'

perceptions of their cultural background as a barrier varied directly

by their gender. Male students' cultural barrier scores were signifi-

cantly higher than female scores.

E.H.2.3.1. Foreign students' racial barrier scores vary by gender.

Results: E.H.2.3.1. was supported (F=23.09, P < .05). Male students'

racial barrier scores were significantly higher than females.

The students' racial and cultural barrier scores varied by their

gender. Male students perceived their racial and cultural backgrounds

to be more of a barrier than did female students. However, gender did not

make a significant difference on foreign students' English barrier scores.

Table 4.2. Analysis of variance: English barrier scores, cultural barrier scores, and racial barrier scores by gender

Barrier scores[b]	Gender[a]			
	Female	Males	(F-value)	PR>F
	Means			
English	2.17	2.17	0.52	0.4700
Racial	2.10	2.51	23.09	0.0001
Cultural	2.38	2.53	6.32	0.0120

[a]Female = 488 and male = 1,409.

[b]1 = not at all, 2 = a little, 3 = somewhat, 4 = much, 5 = very much.

Table 4.3. Analysis of variance: English barrier scores, racial barrier scores and cultural barrier scores by graduate versus undergraduate distinction

Barrier scores[b]	Academic classification[a]			
	Undergraduate	Graduates	(F-values)	PR>F
English	2.03	2.24	5.47	0.0195
Racial	2.54	2.37	1.53	0.2158
Cultural	2.61	2.45	.047	0.4938

[a]Undergraduates = 666 versus graduates = 1,231.

[b]1 = not at all, 2 = a little, 3 = somewhat, 4 = much, 5 = very much.

Table 4.4. Analysis of variance: English barrier scores, racial barrier scores, and cultural barrier scores by region of origin

Barrier scores[b]	Region of origin[a]				(F-values)	PR>F	Significant difference[c] of means
	Africa (1)	South and East Asia (2)	Southwest Asia (3)	Latin America (4)			(High) (Low)
	Means						
English	1.69	2.49	2.46	2.35	36.34	0.0000	2,3,4,1
Racial	3.18	2.52	2.02	1.86	85.05	0.0000	1,2,3,4
Cultural	2.86	2.63	2.73	2.09	23.81	0.0000	1,3,2,4

[a]Number of students: African = 379, Southwest Asia = 442, South and East Asia = 727, and Latin America = 315.

[b]1 = not at all, 2 = a little, 3 = somewhat, 4 = much, 5 = very much.

[c]Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the 0.05 level. An underline indicates the means of those categories appearing on the same underline did not differ significantly at 0.05 level.

Graduate versus undergraduate distinction

E.H.2.4.1. Foreign students' English barrier scores vary according to the graduate versus undergraduate distinction. Results: E.2.4.1. was supported ($F=5.47$, $P < .05$). Undergraduate students perceived their English proficiency as a lesser barrier than did graduate students.

E.H.2.5.1. Foreign students' racial barrier scores vary according to the graduate versus undergraduate distinction. Results: E.H.2.5.1. was not supported at the 0.05 level of significance.

E.H.2.6.1. Foreign students' cultural barrier scores vary according to the graduate versus undergraduate distinction. Results: E.H.2.6.1. was not supported at the 0.05 level of significance.

Only the respondents' perceptions of their English as a barrier differed significantly by academic classification. The graduate versus undergraduate distinction did not make a significant difference in the students' perceptions of their racial and cultural backgrounds as barriers.

Region of origin

E.H.2.7.1. Foreign students' cultural barrier scores vary by region of origin. Results: E.H.2.7.1. was supported ($F=23.81$, $P < .05$). African students indicated the highest cultural barrier scores, while students from Latin America reported the lowest cultural barrier scores (Table 4.4).

E.H.2.8.1. Foreign students' racial barrier scores vary by region
of origin. Results: E.H.2.8.1. was supported (F=85.05, P < .05).
African students indicated the highest racial barrier scores. They
were followed by students from South and East Asia, Southwest Asia,
and Latin America, respectively.

E.H.2.9.1. Foreign students' English barrier scores vary by their
region of origin. Results: E.H.2.9.1. was supported (F=36.34, P < .05).
Foreign students' English barrier scores varied according to their
region of origin. Students from South and East Asia reported the highest
English barrier scores. Students from Southwest Asia reported the second
highest English barrier scores. They were followed by students from
Latin America and Africa. The region students came from was a strong
predictor of their barrier perceptions. It should be noted that many
students from the regions investigated here (Africa, Latin America,
Southwest Asia, and South and East Asia) more or less represent racial
categories as they are socially perceived by U.S. nationals.

Male students perceived their racial and cultural backgrounds to
be barriers in establishing good relationships with U.S. nationals to
a greater extent than did female students. Graduate students perceived
their English as a barrier with regard to their relationships involving
U.S. nationals to a greater extent than undergraduates. The graduate
versus undergraduate distinction did not make a significant difference
on foreign students' perceptions of their racial background nor their
cultural background as a barrier.

Students from South and East Asia perceived their English as a barrier more than any other group of students. African students reported the lowest English barrier scores among all the students. African students perceived their racial and cultural backgrounds as barriers for establishing good relationships with U.S. nationals to a greater extent than did the other students. Latin American students, among the students included in this study, perceived these barriers as having least effect.

The following may be possible explanations. There was a significant difference in foreign students' perceptions of English as a barrier by the graduate versus undergraduate distinction. Graduate students perceived English to be more of a barrier than undergraduate students, possibly because of the greater demand for oral presentations and classroom discussions at the graduate level.

One can reason that the extent to which foreign students perceived their cultural background as a barrier varied according to their region of origin because of the magnitude of difference between the student's cultural background and U.S. cultural traditions which he/she encountered. The variation according to their region of origin in the students' perceptions of English as a barrier in establishing good relationships with U.S. nationals might be a reflection of the different colonial experience of the regions investigated in this

study. For example, South and East Asian students' perceptions of English as a barrier were stronger possibly because of their limited exposure to English during their colonial period. Conversely, African students' perceptions of this barrier were least because many of the African countries were governed as British colonies.

African students perceived their racial background as a barrier to a greater extent than did the other students. One explanation for this occurrence might be that African students who have observable physical characteristics (i.e., skin color, texture of hair, and facial features) that are similar to those of black Americans are likely to become victims of prejudices and discrimination in the United States. This point was somewhat supported by the fact that students from Latin America perceived their racial background as a less significant barrier than did students from other regions of the world.

Satisfaction Scores by Personal Characteristics

In this section, the results of the hypotheses predicting variation in foreign students' satisfaction scores by selected personal characteristics (Empirical Hypotheses E.H.3.1.1 through E.H.3.3.4) will be discussed. The results are presented in Tables 4.5-4.7.

Gender

E.H.3.1.1. Foreign students' satisfaction scores for fair treatment by faculty vary by gender. Results: E.H.3.1.1. was not supported at the 0.05 level of significance (Table 4.5).

Table 4.5. Analysis of variance: Satisfaction scores by gender

| Satisfaction scores[b] | Gender[a] | | (F-values) | PR>F |
| | Female | Male | | |
	Mean			
Satisfaction scores for fair treatment by faculty	4.81	4.85	0.49	0.4819
Satisfaction scores for respect by U.S. students	4.83	4.83	0.17	0.6801
Satisfaction scores for relationship with course instructors	6.37	6.21	9.09	0.0026
Satisfaction scores for discussing personal problems	5.43	5.28	0.36	0.5492

[a]Females = 488 and males = 1,409.

[b]1 = very satisfied, 2 = quite satisfied, 3 = somewhat unsatisfied, 4 = neither unsatisfied nor satisfied, 5 = somewhat satisfied, 6 = quite satisfied, 7 = very satisfied.

Table 4.6. Analysis of variance: Satisfaction scores by graduate versus undergraduate distinction

Satisfaction scores[b]	Academic classification[a]		(F-values)	PR>F
	Graduates	Undergraduates		
	Means			
Satisfaction scores for fair treatment by faculty	4.94	4.60	15.53	0.0001
Satisfaction scores for respect by U.S. students	4.93	4.62	17.40	0.0001
Satisfaction scores for relationship with course instructors	6.19	6.35	17.04	0.0001
Satisfaction scores for discussing personal problems	5.21	5.49	16.49	0.0001

[a]Undergraduate students = 1,231 and graduate students = 666.

[b]1 = very satisfied, 2 = quite satisfied, 3 = somewhat unsatisfied, 4 = neither unsatisfied nor satisfied, 5 = somewhat satisfied, 6 = quite satisfied, 7 = very satisfied.

Table 4.7. Analysis of variance: Satisfaction scores by region or origin

Satisfaction scores[b]	Means[a]				(F-values)	PR>F	Significant difference of means[c]
	Africa (1)	South and East Asia (2)	Southwest Asia (3)	Latin America (4)			(High) (Low)
Satisfaction scores for fair treatment by faculty	4.51	4.90	4.59	5.26	18.77	0.5844	NS
Satisfaction scores for respect by U.S. students	6.10	5.55	5.48	5.85	17.55	0.0000	1,4,2,3
Satisfaction scores for relationships with course instructors	6.21	6.12	6.28	6.33	4.07	0.0348	4,3,1,2
Satisfaction scores for discussing personal problems	5.10	5.30	5.61	5.46	9.43	0.0001	3,4,2,1

[a]Number of students: Africa = 379, Southwest Asia = 442, South and East Asia = 727, and Latin America = 315.

[b]1 = very unsatisfied, 2 = quite unsatisfied, 3 = somewhat unsatisfied, 4 = neither unsatisfied nor satisfied, 5 = somewhat satisfied, 6 = quite satisfied, 7 = very satisfied.

[c]See footnote c, Table 4.

E.H.3.1.2. Foreign students' satisfaction scores for relation-
ships with course instructors vary by gender. Results: E.H.3.1.2.
was supported (F=9.09, P=.0026). Female satisfaction scores for
relationships with course instructors were significantly higher than
male students.

E.H.3.1.3. Foreign students' satisfaction scores for being
respected as a fellow human being by U.S. students vary by gender.
Results: E.H.3.1.3 was not supported at the 0.05 level of significance.

E.H.3.1.4. Foreign students' satisfaction scores for discussing
personal problems with U.S. friends vary by gender. Results: E.H.3.1.4.
was not supported at the 0.05 level of significance.

Only one of the satisfaction scores for the need items investi-
gated differed significantly by the respondents' gender. Female
students indicated more satisfaction with their relationship with
course instructors than male students.

Graduate versus undergraduate distinction

E.H.3.2.1. Foreign students' satisfaction scores for fair treat-
ment by faculty vary according to the graduate versus undergraduate
distinction. Results: E.H.3.2.1. was supported (F=15.53, P < .05).
Graduate students were more satisfied that they were being treated
fairly by faculty members than were undergraduates (Table 4.6).

E.H.3.2.2. Foreign students' satisfaction scores for relation-
ships with course instructors vary according to the graduate versus
undergraduate distinction. Results: E.H.3.2.2. was supported

(F=17.04, P < .05). Undergraduates indicated significantly higher satisfaction scores for relationships with course instructors.

E.H.3.2.3. Foreign students' satisfaction scores for being respected as a fellow human being by U.S. students vary according to the graduate versus undergraduate distinction. Result: E.H.3.2.3. was supported (F=17.40, P < .05). Graduate students' satisfaction scores for being respected as a fellow human being were significantly higher than those of undergraduate students.

E.H.3.2.4. Foreign students' satisfaction scores for discussing personal problems with U.S. friends vary according to the graduate versus undergraduate distinction. Results: E.H.3.2.4. was supported which suggests that foreign students' satisfaction scores for discussing personal problems with U.S. friends varied directly by their academic classification (F=16.49, P < .05).

The respondents' satisfaction scores, for the need items investigated, differed significantly by their academic classification. Graduate students indicated more satisfaction with the need for fair treatment by faculty and for being respected by U.S. students than undergraduate students. However, on the other hand, undergraduate students' satisfaction scores for relationships with course instructors and having a U.S. friend with whom to discuss personal problems, were significantly higher than those of graduate students.

Region of origin

E.H.3.3.1. Foreign students' satisfaction scores for fair treatment by faculty vary according to their region of origin. Results: E.H.3.3.1. was not supported at the 0.05 level of significance.

E.H.3.3.2. Foreign students' satisfaction scores for being respected as a fellow human being by U.S. students vary according to their region or origin. Results: E.H.3.3.2. was supported (F=17.55, P < .05). African students indicated the highest satisfaction scores for the need for being respected as a fellow human being by U.S. students, while students from both Asian regions indicated the low scores for this need.

E.H.3.3.3. Foreign students' satisfaction scores for discussing personal problems with U.S. friends vary according to their region of origin. Results: E.H.3.3.3. was supported (F=4.07, P < .05). African students indicated significantly lower satisfaction than students from other regions. Southwest Asian students' satisfaction scores were significantly higher than African students and South and East Asian students while they did not differ significantly from those of Latin American students.

E.H.3.3.4. Foreign students' satisfaction scores for relationships with course instructors vary according to their region of origin. Results: E.H.3.3.4. was supported (F=9.43, P < .05). However, only the scores of students from South and East Asia were significantly lower than those students from other regions, with the exception being the scores of African students.

Foreign students' satisfaction with the need for having a good relationship with course instructors varied by gender. Female students indicated a higher satisfaction level on the average than did males.

All four satisfaction scores varied by the graduate versus under-graduate distinction. Graduate students' satisfaction with receiving fair treatment by faculty members was greater than undergraduates. They also were the most satisfied group, with regard to the need for being respected as a fellow human being by U.S. students. However, undergraduates were more satisfied with their relationships involving course instructors and for having a U.S. friend with whom they could discuss personal problems than were graduate students.

The students' region of origin was a strong predictor of their satisfaction scores, with regard to their relationships involving U.S. nationals.

African students' satisfaction with the need for being respected as a fellow human being by U.S. students was higher than that of any other group included in this study; however, they indicated the least satisfaction with regard to having a U.S. friend whom they could discuss personal problems. Students from Latin America indicated the highest satisfaction for having a good relationship with course instructors. Southwest Asian students reported the highest satis-faction for having a U.S. friend with whom they could discuss personal problems, yet they were the students least satisfied with the need for being respected as a fellow human being by U.S. students. The students from South and East Asia, as shown in Table 4.7, were the

least satisfied group based on their satisfaction scores for the need items investigated in this study.

The following speculations can be made. Satisfaction of the need for having good relationships with course instructors differed significantly by gender. This may be due to the care with which instructors may give instructions and criticism to female students. Given that instructors are equally helpful to both male and female students, another possible explanation might be that females have less expectations of being respected as a result of their cultural traditions. There is no empirical evidence to my knowledge of this occurring; however, as stated earlier, it is a possible explanation for the difference in satisfaction with this need by gender.

African students' satisfaction for the need for being respected as a fellow human being by U.S. students can be attributed to their high self-esteem, even though their perceptions of their racial background as a barrier were higher than any other group of students. It is this writer's perception that African students perceive that their being foreigners commands a higher regard in the eyes of U.S. nationals than being black Americans. Southwest Asian students indicated the least satisfaction for being respected by U.S. students. This finding may be a reflection of campus environments in the late 1970s. The great majority of Southwest Asian students in this study were Iranians. At the time of data collection, Iranian students were the largest group of foreign students on many campuses. Due to their high visibility,

Iranian students might have been subjected to unprovoked hostile behavior by U.S. students.

Satisfaction with the need for good relationships with course instructors was highest for students from Latin America and lowest for students from South and East Asia. This finding may be explained by referring to the barrier scores reported earlier (Table 4.4). Southwest Asian students' relatively high satisfaction with the need for having a U.S. friend with whom they could discuss personal problems is hard to explain. African students reported the lowest satisfaction for the above mentioned need. Thus, this result is consistent with their perceptions of their racial and cultural backgrounds as serious barriers to their establishing good relationships with U.S. nationals.

Graduate students' greater satisfaction with the need for being treated fairly by faculty and being respected as a fellow human being by U.S. students might be a result of closer working relationships with faculty members and students in graduate school than in undergraduate programs. While, on the other hand, undergraduate students' higher satisfaction with having a U.S. friend with whom they can discuss personal problems may be attributed to their lifestyle; undergraduate students attend and get involved in a variety of extra curricular activities more so than graduate students; thus, they have more opportunities to meet and interact with U.S. nationals.

Conclusions

There were five objectives for which this study was undertaken:
(1) To determine the effects of selected characteristics (i.e., sex,

region of origin, and academic classification) of foreign students on
their perceptions of barriers, (2) To determine the effects of selected
characteristics of foreign students on their level of satisfaction,
with regard to their relationships involving faculty members, (3) To
determine the effects of characteristics of foreign students on their
level of satisfaction with regard to their relationships with U.S.
students, (4) To determine the relationship between foreign students'
perceptions of barriers (i.e., English proficiency, racial background,
and cultural background) and their satisfaction with relationships
involving faculty members, and (5) To determine the relationship between
foreign students' perceptions of barriers and their satisfaction with
their relationships involving U.S. students.

For Objective I, it was determined that selected characteristics
(gender, academic classification, and region or origin) of foreign
students have a significant effect on their perceptions of barriers
regarding their relationships involving U.S. nationals. The region of
origin was the most influential variable regarding foreign students'
satisfaction for the need items. As stated earlier, many students
from the regions included in this study represent more or less
socially perceived racial categories in the eyes of U.S. nationals.
Foreign students' gender and academic classification appeared to have
had a significant effect only on their perception of their English
as a barrier.

For Objective II, it was concluded that selected characteristics
of foreign students have a significant effect on their level of

satisfaction with their relationships involving U.S. students. Foreign students' satisfaction with their relationships involving U.S. students varied by their academic classification of region of origin. Students from Latin America seemed to have the highest level of satisfaction with their relationships involving U.S. students; whereas, students from South and East Asia indicated the least satisfaction with these relationships.

Objective III focused on the effects of foreign students' region of origin, academic classification and gender on their satisfaction with their relationships involving faculty members. The students' satisfaction regarding their relationships with faculty members varied by their academic classification. Their gender and region of origin made a significant difference only on their satisfaction with having good relationships with course instructors.

For objectives IV and V, it was determined that foreign students' perceptions of barriers were negatively related to their level of satisfaction regarding their relationships involving U.S. students and faculty members. The level of foreign students' satisfaction with being respected as a fellow human being by U.S. students showed the strongest inverse relationship with the extent to which they perceived their racial background as a barrier and the second strongest inverse relationship was with the extent to which they perceived their cultural background as a barrier. Their level of satisfaction with receiving fair treatment from faculty was also negatively related to their

perceptions of racial and cultural barriers, producing the third and the fourth strongest inverse correlation values, respectively.

Implications

Foreign students' racial and cultural backgrounds seem to be the two most salient factors contributing to their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their relationships involving U.S. nationals. Those students whose racial and cultural backgrounds differ significantly from those of Caucasian U.S. nationals seemed to have perceived these differences as a barrier for their establishing good relationships with U.S. nationals. These findings suggest the existence of prejudicial attitudes and discrimination against foreign students based on their racial and cultural backgrounds.

For example, foreign students who have physical characteristics similar to those of black Americans have often stated that they were treated more favorably by faculty and U.S. students when they were recognized as foreign students than when they were thought to be black Americans.

It is a common belief that prejudices evolve as a result of dissimilarities among individuals or groups. In the case of groups, ethnocetricism is often blamed for the unfavorable attitudes of group members toward others. Administrators and instructors should work toward the amelioration of prejudices and discrimination encountered by foreign students attending U.S. colleges and universities. Administrators should implement policies that would encourage foreign

students to share housing facilities with U.S. students. Foreign students involved in this type of arrangement will become more fluent with English and acquire better understanding of U.S. national, thus, increasing their probability of having a successful academic experience in the United States. On the other hand, U.S. students' understanding and hopefully their appreciation for other persons who have different racial and cultural backgrounds will increase.

Administrators should also modify the system or procedure by which they allocate funds to campus organizations. Presently, on most college and university campuses, students are in a sense institutionally encouraged to segregate. That is, the exclusive nature of some campus organizations facilitates isolation of students from different nations and regions of the world. When students with distinct observable characteristics are placed apart from other students in the university, they are perceived as being different, and this difference is usually not favorable or even neutral but negative. Therefore, campus organizations should be encouraged to recruit foreign students to be active members of their organizations. Foreign student organizations should also be encouraged to recruit U.S. students. This would partially ensure greater involvement in campus activities by foreign students.

Programs and seminars should be provided so that foreign students representing a diversity of cultural backgrounds could enable administrators, instructors, and U.S. students to develop a better understanding of different cultural traditions. These programs should be implemented at the university and departmental level.

Instructors and faculty members should establish more meaningful lines of communication with foreign students, so that he/she can better understand the needs of those individuals. Instructors might also include group projects as part of the course requirements which might be one way to promote interaction between foreign students and U.S. nationals. The group project should be structured so that each member has an integral task to perform. Furthermore, the individual task leader should be encouraged to use other group members as resource persons. This group project can be conducive to establishing inter-personal relationships and building self-esteem. It also would prevent the class from becoming segregated by racial and cultural distinctions. Use of foreign students as resource persons in the classroom may be a way to enhance mutual understanding between foreign students and U.S. students.

The concern regarding foreign students' perceptions of the atti-tudes and disposition toward them by the U.S. nationals is/or should be of great importance to all segments of this society. We are living in a world in which there is a great amount of interdependence among nations. In order for the United States to survive and prosper, the help and cooperation of less developed nations are essential. Foreign students who attend U.S. colleges and universities are likely to become community and national leaders in their home countries. Thus, their views, with regard to their treatment here in the United States, may well affect our future relations with their countries.

An even greater concern is U.S. nationals' acknowledgement of
foreign students as fellow human beings. It is time for us to recognize
the reciprocal relationships which exists between foreign students and
their host country. Their presence in our colleges and universities
make available to administrators, instructors, and U.S. students a
wealth of knowledge which is invaluable. It is this authors' sincere
wish that the results of this study will provide some insight into
the problems and solutions, with regard to foreign students' perceptions
of barriers to establishing good relationships with U.S. nationals.

REFERENCES

Arubayi, E. A.
    1980   "Perceptions of Problems Identified by Nigerian Students in
            American Higher Institutions: A Comparative Analysis."
            College Student Journal 17:116-120.

Baron, M.
    1974   "From Hand-Writing to Action." International Educational and
            Cultural Exchange 10:7.

Bennett, J. H., H. Passin, and R. McKnight
    1958   In Search of Identity. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of
            Minnesota Press.

Blumer, H.
    1962   "Society and Symbolic Interaction." In Arnold M. Rose (ed.),
            Human Behavior and Social Process. Boston, Mass.: Houghton
            Mifflin Company.

Carroll, J. B.
    1956   Language, Thought and Reality; Selected Writings of Benjamin
            L. Whorf . Cambridge, Mass.: Massachusetts of Technology.

Coelho, G. V.
    1958   Changing Images of America: A study of Indian students'
            perceptions. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.

Cooley, C. H.
    1902   Human Nature and the Social Order. New York: Charles
            Scribner's Sons.

Cowan, S.
    1968   "English proficiency and bicultural attitudes of Japanese
            students." English Teachers' Magazine 17:37-42.

Couser, R. L.
    1978   "The foreign student; New Nigger on Campus." Community
            College Review 6:4-7.

Davis, J. F.
    1971   "The two-way mirror and the U-curve: America as seen by
            Turkish students returned home." Sociology and Social
            Research 56:29-41.

Deutsch, S. E.
    1970   International Education and Exchange. Cleveland, Ohio : The
            Press of Case Western Reserve University.

Deutsch, S. E. and G. Y. M. Won
   1963   Some Factors in the Adjustment of Foreign Students." Journal
          of Social Issues 9:115-122.

Dunnett S. C.
   1977   A study of the effects of an English language training and
          orientation program on foreign student adaptation at the
          university of New York at Buffalo.   Council on International
          Studies, State University of New York at Buffalo.   Special
          Studies No. 93.

Edles, N.
   1980   "Foreign students in U.S. colleges and universities." American
          Educator 16:Backcover.

Gerth, H. and C. Wright Mills
   1953   Character and Social Structure: The Psychology of Social
          Institutions. New York: Harcourt Brace, Jovanovich.

Helwig, J. T. and K. A. Council
   1979   Statistical Analysis System. Raleigh, North Carolina: SAS
          Institute, Inc.

Hewitt, J. P.
   1976   Self and Society: A Symbolic Interactionist Social Psychology.
          Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Hountras, P. T.
   1956   "Academic probation among foreign students." School and
          Society 84:157-176.

Hull, W. F., IV
   1978   Foreign students in the United States: Coping behavior
          within the educational environment. New York: Praeger
          Publishers.

Institute of International Education
   1981   Open Doors, 1981, Annual Report of International Education
          Exchange. New York: The Institute.

Johnson, D. C.
   1971   "Problems of Foreign Students." International Educational
          and Cultural Exchange 7:61-68.

Kinch, J. W.
   1968   "Experiments on Factors Related to Self-Concept Change."
          Journal of Social Psychology 74:251-258.

Lee, M. Y., M. Abd-Ella, and Linda Burks
    1981   Needs of Foreign Students from Developing Nations at U.S.
            Colleges and Universities. Washington, D.C.: National
            Association for Foreign Student Affairs.

Lindesmith, A. R. and A. L. Strauss
    1968   Social psychology. 3rd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and
            Winston, Inc.

Lysgaard, S.
    1955   "Adjustment in a foreign country." Internal Social Science
            Bulletin 7:45-51.

Mead, G. H.
    1934   Mind, self and society. Chicago, Illinois: The University
            of Chicago Press.

Meltzer, B. N.
    1964   "Mead's Social Psychology." Social Psychology of George
            Herbert Mead, Center for Sociological Research, Western
            Michigan University.

Miller, J. C.
    1967   "African students and the racial attitudes and practices of
            Americans." Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina,
            Chapel Hill.

Mills, C. W.
    1940   "Situated Actions and Vocabularies of Motives." American
            Sociological Review 5:904-913.

Nie, N. H., C. H. Hull, J. G. Jenkins, K. Steinbrenner, and D. H. Bent
    1975   Statistical package for the social sciences. 2nd ed. New
            York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Payind, M. A.
    1979   "Academic, Personal, and Social Problems of Afghan and Iranian
            Students in the United States. Education Research Quarterly
            4:3-11.

Penn, J. R. and M. L. Durham
    1978   "Dinemsions of cross-cultural interaction." Journal of
            College Student Personnel 19, No. 3:264-267.

Pruitt, F. J.
    1977   The adaptation of African students to American education.
            State University of New York at Buffalo. A report. Bureau
            of Educational and Cultural Affairs, U.S. Department of
            State, Washington, D.C.

Pruitt, F. J.
1978   "The Adaptation of Foreign Students on American Campuses."
        Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Admin-
        istrators and Counselors. (Summer)

Quinn, W. A.
1975   A study of selected sojourn preferences and priorities of
        Stanford University foreign students. Unpublished Ph.D.
        dissertation. Stanford University, Stanford, California.

Sapir, E.
1931   "Conceptual Categories of Primitive Languages." Science 74:578.

Sarbin, T. R.
1954   "Contributions to role-taking theory. I. Hypnotic Behavior."
        Psychological Review 57:225-270.

Selltiz, C. and S. W. Cook
1962   "Factors influencing attitudes of foreign students toward the
        host country." Journal of Social Issues 18:7-23.

Selltiz, C., J. R. Christ, J. Havel, and S. W. Cook
1963   Attitudes and social relations of foreign students in the
        United States. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Shepard, J. M.
1974   Basic Sociology: Structure, Interaction, and Change.
        New York: Harper and Row.

Smith, M. B.
1956   "Cross-cultural education as a research area." Journal of
        Social Issues 1:3-8.

Spaulding, S. and M. J. Flack
1976   The world's students in the United States: A review and
        evaluation of research on foreign students. New York:
        Praeger Publishers.

Stebbins, R. A.
1969   "Studying the definition of the situation: Theory and field
        research strategies." The Canadian Review of Sociology and
        Anthropology 6:4.

Stryker, S.
1959   "Symbolic interaction as an approach to family research."
        Marriage and Family Living 21:111-119.

Thomas, W. I.
    1931   The Unadjusted Girl. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.

Vailinger, H.
    1924   Die philosophie des als-ob, translated by C. K. Ogden as the
            philosophy of "As if." New York.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Motoko Y. Lee for her invaluable assistance in the completion of this thesis. Without a doubt, Motoko has been the most influential person in my life over the past two years, serving as advisor, major professor and a true friend.

I would also like to thank Dr. Charlotte Bruner and Dr. John L. Tait for serving as committee members and for their constructive criticism vital to the completion of this work.

Additionally, I would like to thank Mr. Charles A. Ramsey II for his faith and belief in me. I also thank Phyllis Gray for her encouragement throughout this entire thesis process.

To all of you once over, thank you.