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CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

Every year large numbers of students come to the United States for educational training. In the fiscal year 1968, an Immigration and Naturalization Service report showed that there were 121,362 international students who were regularly enrolled in different higher educational institutions in the United States. This number shows a growth increase of 10 per cent over the previous year (Shearer, 1970:55-58). These students came from 172 different countries.

Approximately three-fourths of the foreign students came from "developing nations", as defined by the United Nations. Not only must these international students make adjustments to the educational system of the host nation, in this case, the United States, but they must also face and adapt to the cultural and social environment. Upon their arrival in the host society (United States), many will encounter new values, relationships, and customs that may differ from their own. For those students who see their past cultural experiences as very different from those of the host nation, their adjustment to this new culture might be either a traumatic shock or a pleasant experience.

The area of academic adjustment and achievement - that is, the adjustment of foreign students to the academic system of the United States - has received a fair amount of attention (Deustch, 1970; Ellakany, 1968, 1970; Smith, 1969; and Swayampati, 1955). However, more study is still needed in the area of cultural and social adjustment to the host nation. Less attention appears to have been given to possible readjustment difficulties that students encounter when they return to their own nations.
after being in the United States for a period of time.

A recent study (Deutsch, 1970) indicates that while adjustment to campus life is necessary step for all students entering a university, regardless of their nationality, it appears to be greater in the case of foreign students. Table 1 shows that students from "underdeveloped areas" have more serious difficulties in adjusting to the social or cultural pattern of the United States than do students from developed countries. Deutsch considered Asia, Africa and Latin America as underdeveloped countries. Students from Asia, Africa, and Latin America most frequently encounter difficulties related to financial difficulties, jobs, housing, food, being homesick, meeting Americans, American patterns of dating and difficulties with American social etiquette as reported by Deutsch. Students from developed countries most frequently encounter problems with financial difficulties, jobs, and being homesick as reported by Deutsch. Deutsch suggests that these reported difficulties may stem from a lack of familiarity with American social and cultural patterns.

This research will deal with the adjustment of foreign students to the United States and their anticipated readjustment problems to their native cultures.

Learning to deal with the new culture that a foreign student encounters is a complicated process to someone in the position of a stranger. The norms and role expectations are less "visible" to him than they are to a member of the host society (Merton, 1968). In addition, he may be unaware of the range of permissible deviations from the declared official
norms; and consequently, he may even overconform.

(Since people from different areas of the world have different culture experiences and backgrounds, the degree of their adjustment may vary depending on how close their culture is to the culture of the host country. That is, the closer the cultural background of foreign students to the cultural pattern of the host nation, region, and/or local area, the less the degree of adjustment or transition to be made; where there are significant differences in the cultural pattern between home and host nation, the adjustment and readjustment may be expected to be more acute (Sewell and Davidson, 1961:66-75).)

Table I: Foreign Students' Nonacademic Problems and Country of Origin (in Percentage, Rounded)\(^a\)

The total number of foreign students from whom usable data were obtained was 286, from Cleveland, Ohio.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Under-developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial difficulties...</td>
<td>No(^b) 27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes 73</td>
<td>63 (41)(^c)</td>
<td>77 (134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties finding a job...</td>
<td>No 25</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes 75</td>
<td>52 (21)</td>
<td>82 (83)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Source: Deustch, 1970:81.

\(^b\)"never" considered as "no"; "hardly ever", "sometimes" or "many times" considered as "yes".

\(^c\)Raw figures are in parentheses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulties arising from lack of comfortable housing...</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>54</th>
<th>71 (41)</th>
<th>49 (133)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29 (41)</td>
<td>51 (133)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties related to lack of necessary clothing...</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60 (132)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29 (41)</td>
<td>40 (132)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties in obtaining accustomed food...</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>31 (134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>29 (41)</td>
<td>69 (134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being homesick...</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11 (133)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>52 (40)</td>
<td>89 (133)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiencing racial or cultural discrimination...</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>56 (131)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20 (41)</td>
<td>44 (131)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties meeting Americans...</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30 (129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>42 (40)</td>
<td>70 (129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties following American pattern of dating...</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>36 (124)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>38 (37)</td>
<td>64 (124)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties following the American pattern of social etiquette...</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28 (127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>39 (41)</td>
<td>72 (127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties following accustomed sanitary habits...</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>61 (122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12 (41)</td>
<td>39 (122)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This study will deal with the extent of perceived cultural differences between the United States and the country of origin; degree of adjustment to the United States; extent of preference for United States patterns; and anticipated readjustment difficulties of two groups of male foreign students attending Iowa State University in Ames, Iowa. One group of students represents the students from "developing nations" while the other group consists of students from "developed nations." The specific aims of this thesis are the following:

1. To examine the relationship between perceived differences between American and native culture; extent of preference for American culture; anticipated readjustment difficulties and adjustment to American culture.

2. To determine the degree to which students from developed and developing nations differ on the following: the extent to which aspects of United States cultural patterns are perceived as different from their native culture; the extent to which they indicate a preference for American culture; the degree to which they anticipate readjustment difficulties, and the extent to which adjustment varies.

---

1 The term "developing" countries will be used interchangeably with the terms "less developed", "underdeveloped", and "emerging" nations.

2 The term "developed" countries will be used interchangeably with terms "industrialized", "emerged", and "advanced" nations. The specific rationals for delineating between developed and developing nations is presented in Appendix A.
3. To determine the degree to which relationships between perceived differences; preferences for American cultural patterns; anticipated readjustment difficulties; and adjustment are influenced by effects of selected demographic variables.

4. To discuss implications of the findings for facilitating the adjustment of foreign students to American cultural patterns and in the transition back to the country of origin.

The independent variables are country of origin, whether developed or underdeveloped nation, population of the region students come from, marital status, number of years of education before coming to the United States, fathers' educational background, and the parents' social and financial status. The dependent variables are adjustment to host nation, the degree of difference within the cultures, preference for host culture, and anticipatory readjustment problems upon return to the native culture.
CHAPTER 1. THEORETICAL ORIENTATION

Introduction

The objective of this chapter will be to review relevant literature and to delineate the concepts to be used in this study of adjustment to American social and cultural patterns and of perceived readjustment problems foreign students will face (when they return to their own country).

According to the theoretical scheme adopted for this study, the sojourner is assumed to be situated between two social and cultural systems. The individual who has moved from his country to the United States brings with him a set of well-established habits, norms, values, characteristics and skill. These include past academic experiences; prior contacts with other cultures; feeling of identification with home country; habits relating to social interaction and religious practices; and the manner in which friendships are formed.

Once newcomers are situated in the host nation, they are confronted to some degree with different customs, norms, and values - ones typical of the host nation and its members. Among these are the general university and community environment, social interaction as well as different cultural patterns. These factors may operate as a determinant to adjustment to host culture and the readjustment of foreign students to their native cultural pattern when they return home.

Cultural adjustment

The concept of cultural adjustment, often referred to simply as adjustment, has also received wide use in literature. This study will examine the concept of adjustment of an individual within a foreign culture.
and relate it to anticipated adjustment difficulties with the native culture of the foreign students, but then makes specific references to the individual's adjustment and well-being.

Concept adjustment has been defined by others in this manner: Adjustment represents the state of experience that terminates an imbalance or tension. It is a state of "equilibrium" (Martindale, 1960). In a social psychological approach to the concept adjustment, one can say that it is a mechanism that the individual utilized to cope with resolving conflicts or problems in order to reduce anxiety and tension (Anastasi, 1964:344-345). A sociologist defines adjustment as the means situation in which the activities of an organism come to rest in equilibrium and equilibrium, in turn is referred to as the 'normal' in any social situation (Coser, 1956:23-24). Given this premise, maladjustment is regarded as conflict. However, the absence of conflict does not mean a stable relationship and adjustment level has been reached (Coser 1956:24,82). Conflict may be used as a way of growth or learning and may be of positive or negative valence.

For the purpose of this study, adjustment can be considered as conformity to an external set of norms and values of the host nation and also conformity to an internal set of norms and values of the native culture. At a specific level, adjustment can be viewed as the ability and willingness of foreign students to adapt to the American society and its culture. Therefore, adjustment in this thesis will be viewed as the response in the behavioral pattern toward some selected aspects of the host society: namely, language, religion, sports, travel, leisure activities,
dating, music, food, residence, reading of books about the host country, participation in campus organizations, association with the members of the host society, and use of nickname. In relation to adjustment background, these variables will be considered: country or origin, geographical setting (city, farm, small village), the size of the population of the area, age of the students, marital status, number of years of education received, father's educational background, parent's social and income status as compared with other members of their home communities.

Representative studies have treated cultural adjustment in the following ways: 1. alternation of habit patterns that brings about personal adjustment (Foster, 1962:21, Sewell and Davidson, 1961:2); 2. learning the customs, attitudes and patterns of behavior in the new environment (Cohello, 1962:4); 3. recognizing the emotional expressions found in the new society (Fong, 1965:226); and 4. learning the expectations held for a role occupant in given roles in the host country and the behavior of the occupant of a given role (Gullahorn and Gullahorn, 1963:34).

Apparently, cultural adjustment is a means through which the individual retains some sense of personal satisfaction, lack of alienation, and lack of "anomie", through the acceptance of certain parts of the culture. Individual adjustment may vary from complete assimilation to open rejection. Assimilation is defined in the following manner: assimilation is the fusion of the characteristics of unlike cultures to the degree that both groups become alike (Reuter, 1941). Acculturation is somewhat different; it is defined as the process whereby individuals raised in one
culture and transferred to another take on the behavioral pattern of the second culture (Eubank, 1932). For the purpose of this study the definition of the concept of assimilation offered by Gittler (1952) will be used. He interprets the concept as the process representing change through which "outsiders" come to terms and share the values, loyalties, sentiments of a specific group. Therefore, assimilation may be viewed as a process of adjustment in leading to complete integration of newcomer into host environment (Figure 1).

If sojourners are to make effective adjustments, they must learn the interpersonal strategies that are acceptable within the limits set by the host country. Ergo, they must resolve the conflicts that may arise within themselves when they find dissonance between the ways that have been part of their past experiences and those of the new society. Gullahorn and Gullahorn (1963) suggests the following in regard to cross-cultural sojourners:

As they actually become involved in the role relationships and encounter frustration in trying to achieve certain goals when the proper means are unclear or unacceptable, they become confused and depressed and express negative attitudes regarding the host culture (Gullahorn and Gullahorn, 1963:34).

The adjustment problems of foreign students in the United States have been presented with the assumption that students from the same country will most likely face problems that are, on the one hand, more similar than those faced by students from another country. That is to say, students from developed nations will face more or less the same types of difficulties than students from less developed nations.
Interaction is measured by the degree of association.

Adjustment is measured by responses to some selected aspects of host nation.

Acculturation is measured by social acceptance from both sides.

Assimilation is indicated by no distinction between the cultures (complete adjustment).

Figure 1. Pattern of interaction between adjustment, acculturation and assimilation (Noury, 1970:15).
Other studies dealing with adjustment define the concept somewhat differently. Psychologists define the term adjustment in a manner to delineate some degree of conformity to desirable norms and a satisfactory relationship between the individual and parts of a society. A similar view is held by sociologists - that is, the adjustment climax has been reached when there is a state of equilibrium between the person and aspects of an environment that he may be a member or a visitor in. Both disciplines view adjustment as some form of conformity to the values and rules that are acceptable (Newstetter, Feldstein, and Newcomer, 1938). Newstetter et al. (1938) look at adjustment as a psychic entity which is the product of a psychic interaction and bond, a feeling of mutually satisfying relationships among individuals and other members of a society at a given time. The interest of this research is to look at the individual responses to some selected social and cultural aspects of the United States and native cultures as well as areas of difference, preference for the United States cultural-social patterns and anticipated degree of difficulty of adjustment of the students upon return to their home country.

Adjustment as investigated in this study should not be confused with assimilation. Assimilation, as pointed out before, can be viewed as a process of adjustment leading to integration of newcomers into the host society and their reintegration to their native culture. Adjustment could be considered as an anchorage point of self, for example, like clothing, symbols, titles closely associated with one's family group, and nation. Students may return home after having made little adjustment to the new environment and may have negative responses to the education or training
received. Total rejection of the whole experiences can occur, partial rejection or overconformation to the new.

It has been established that every society teaches its members certain appropriate ways of coping with their stresses and crises that occur during their experience. However, when an individual leaves his homeland and sojourns in a culturally strange society, he is often confronted with problems which he may not have the proper solution to in the framework of the host society.

The similarity or dissimilarity between home and host culture greatly define the limits of the student's culture shock. Secondly, the student's adjustment is influenced by his basic personality. An individual who is more withdrawn, quiet, and reserved will be more likely to withdraw from new social situations in the new environment. Finally, the depth of social relations the student experiences can have an effect on his adjustment. If he finds people with whom he can discuss his emotions freely, many of the tensions can be removed. Ergo, it is not possible to separate personality as related to adjustment. Each individual is a separate "entity" under a unique combination of all influences.

When an individual is faced with intense emotional strain from cross-cultural experiences, he is confronted with what is referred to as "cultural shock". Shattuck (1965) in his study, relates cultural shock to "anxiety" (Shattuck, 1965:1-3). To determine and validate the relationship between anxiety and cultural shock, a battery of indicators from each of the two concepts was developed for comparison (Table 1). Upon comparison, the relation between anxiety and cultural shock is
unmistakable. Thus, strangers have to modify their old behavior or learn new behaviors which are goal-achieving in the new environment. These new behaviors may have been either unknown to him, ineffective, or prohibitive in his native culture. The stranger's socialization to home-culture may interfere with the adequate performance of behavior that is expected in the host-culture. The problem of acquiring knowledge about the new cultural pattern in a partially unknown social environment is not specifically to be identified with the stranger from foreign countries alone. All members of a society pass through various new situations which require them to learn new behavior to fit the new setting. Generally speaking, however, the social structure of society is set up in a manner that allows for the effective learning of prescribed behavior to take place and facilitates this learning. In the case of a stranger, the situation is attended by complexities which cause more difficulty in the formation of the learning process. The reasons for this increased difficulty are that: 1. the opportunity for the newcomer to find a place in the learning setting may be limited when compared with those of the members of the society, and that 2. his previous learning has taken place in a different culture. Social learning builds on past experience and motivation. Ergo, a given learning situation in the host country could be highly effective for members of the society who have acquired the appropriate repertoire of motives and symbols, while it could be relatively ineffective for the strangers who have been socialized in different cultures.

There are three ways which may be available to the stranger for learning the behaviors that are prescribed by the host nation: 1. observation,
2. participation, and 3. explicit communication. Initially when the newcomers arrive in the United States, they begin to observe the behavior of the members of the host nation. This observation process provides information for the foreign student about the norms of the activities and the cultural pattern of the host country. This observation alone becomes a mode of learning for the individual even though it might be passive (Watson and Lippitt, 1955). Foreign students who are strangers in a new environment do not remain strangers for long. They must participate to some degree, in the lifestyle of the country that they are residing in, in order to obtain the necessities for the achievement of their set goals. In the course of participation, foreign students try out different kinds of actions. Some of these actions prove to be more effective than others. Participation of the newcomers in the visiting society covers a wide scope and intensity; at one end of the continuum there is specific and a narrow interaction and at the other end of the scale there is intensive and wide interaction. An example of such participation would be active work in school government or community clubs and organizations. The third method for learning available to these newcomers is diverse circumstances (Watson and Lippitt, 1955).

The effectiveness of the foreign student's learning is dependent on four factors: 1. the newcomer finds himself in a variety of new situations during his sojourn. Some situations are similar in the sense that a behavior pattern which is appropriate in one is also appropriate in another. Therefore, a stranger learns to generalize his behavior to fit other situations; 2. the learning of behavior must come before the
performance; 3. the behavior has to be reinforced in order to be learned; and 4. the motivation of the stranger in such social learning situations must be conducive to learning (Schild, 1962:41-54). In order for foreign students to learn the adequate responses to a variety of situations as well as to the cultural pattern of the host nation, they need to be in contact with members of that society. The visitor, learning by whatever forms, encounters certain basic obstacles brought about as a result of his position as a stranger and his previous socialization in a possibly totally different culture and surrounding.

Obviously from the discussion so far, adjustment to the new environment and its culture is vital for the foreign students who are trying to achieve their goals. These students have to make a number of important adjustments during their stay in the United States. Some of these adjustments have to do with their relationship with the community setting, such as the facilities offered, as well as with the norms and values that they must abide by. The stranger must develop language fluency and find new friends and leisure time activities. The stranger must also adapt to other aspects of the culture as varied as the food, weather, political and educational systems that dominate.

**Characteristics of adjustment**

Stein (1966) in studying the success, adjustment and changes in Peace Corps Volunteers in Columbia, defines cultural adjustment as adjustment of individuals to overseas experience. He supports his definition by presenting a list of examples or the sorts of adjustment volunteers had
to make in Columbia; this list is as follows:

1. Arrange for own food and become accustomed to new kinds of cooking.
2. Find a mode of transportation.
3. Learn local customs and traditions and become familiar with the new geographical environment.
4. Establish contact with members of community.

These are examples of adjustment that the individual must make in a wide range of adjustment in order to adjust culturally. The individual learns new knowledge, skills, customs, behavior and attitudes. An individual must fit into the new environment that he is in and also he must function well; obviously in order to fit in, he is required to make basic changes in himself. If the individual makes an adjustment that allows him to function well in the culture, then he will manifest a sense of well-being and his personality will be shown to be adjusted, in contrast to those who unsuccessfully adjust to the culture and whose personality is not adjusted. These adjustment problems may result from culture shock, a personality disorientation which results from diverse modes of behaving and interacting with people which take place between cultures.

**Differential pattern of adjustment**

The way in which foreign students adjust to the sojourn environment, and readjust to home culture could markedly be influenced by how they view aspects of home culture and host culture, in degrees of perceived difference, preference and difficulty adjusting to the culture (Sewell and Davidson, 1961). Morris (1960) in his study of foreign students found that there is a significant difference in adjustment between Europeans and non-Europeans. Sellitz et al. (1956) in their research of 348 students
attending 35 colleges and universities found differences in adjustment among foreign students, which they attributed to nationality and cultural similarity factors. Researchers concluded that foreign students from Europe perceive fewer differences between their culture and the culture of the United States and were apt to adjust to the host nation better than non-Europeans.

Du Bois, 1954, also arrived at the same conclusion in her study of students from foreign countries attending school in the United States. The author concluded that the more similar is the culture of the sojourner to that of the new environment, the greater his adjustment will be to the society he is situated in. Noury (1970) in his investigation of 60 foreign students from India and Western Europe at Iowa State University found that there is a significant difference between the adjustment between the two groups.

Morris (1960) in his exploratory study of 318 foreign students attending the University of California at Los Angeles in 1960, discovered significant differences in perception toward the United States and Americans between European and non-European students. Morris concludes that perception is an important factor in adjustment and that students from developing countries perceive things differently, both at home and in the host country and therefore, adjust less than students from developed nations (Morris, 1960:131).

Becker (1966) investigated the perceptual and attitudinal changes among three groups of foreign students attending University of California in Los Angeles in 1966. One group represented developed nations, another
semi-developed, and the third group was composed of students from under-developed nations. The study revealed that perception about the United States varied with each group and that favorable perception leads to favorable adjustment. Becker's study divulged that students from under-developed and semi-developed nations were less favorable in their perception of the United States as compared to the perception of students from the developed countries (Europeans), and that students from developed nations were found to be more adjusted to the host nation.

It is expected that there will be a difference between students from emerging nations and students from highly industrialized countries in regard to their adjustment to the host society and its culture; further, there will be a difference in the degree of difficulty readjusting to their native countries. Students from the developed nations appear to adjust more easily and more favorably to the United States' society and its culture than students from less developed nations of the world.

On the basis of the above discussion one might expect that students from developed nations will have much more favorable cultural adjustment than students from the developing countries.

Stages of adjustment

One prevalent adjustment pattern that has been observed resembles a "U-curve relationship". Based on exploratory studies sponsored by Social Science Research Council, it has been suggested that foreign students generally go through the following stages of adjustment: 1. spectator period, in which these students observe with interest the life pattern around them but participate in it superficially; 2. an adaptive
period, in which they start to become actively involved and so they en-
counter problems with adjustment; 3. a coming-to-terms period, in which
these students work out more stable modus vivendi in the new environment;
and 4. a pre-return period, in which they are concerned with impending
transition back to life in their own countries (Sellitz et al. 1963).
Albertson and Birky (1961) refers to these periods when he discusses the
"U-curve hypothesis" (Figure 2). All of these three ways of learning are
utilized by the foreign students throughout their stay in the United States.
During the first period of the stay, observation is the most important
method of learning; only after a while does participation develop to the
point where it allows further effective training to take hold. Watson
and Lippitt (1955) suggest that the sojourn may be divided into several
phases. The first phase is labeled the "spectator-phase (observation),
the second "involvement" (participation), the third "coming to terms",
and the last "pre-departure-phase".

A study of Peace Corps participants was done to test the "U-curved
hypothesis" (Figure 2). Steps along the curve refer to increases and
decreases of personal adjustment in terms of cultural and social adjust-
ment over a period of time (Albertson and Birky, 1961:90). Thus, the "com-
ing-to-terms phase" designates the personal satisfaction increase due to
the trainees adjustment to the new culture. Here adjustment ascribes both
involvement in the local community and personal satisfaction.

Gullahorn and Gullahorn (1963); however, suggest that the adjustment
pattern is in accord with "W-hypothesis" - that is the shape of the ad-
justment curve looks like a "W". In terms of this hypothesis, an
individual who works or studies abroad for a period of time is said to go through various phases of an adjustment process. Initially, while in the host society, the individual starts his adjustment process by absorbing impressions about the country. Some of his previous habit patterns have to be modified, but generally he finds a place for himself and forms a mode of operation. Shortly before the individual leaves the host environment, he goes through a period of evaluation of his experiences in the new society. When the individual returns to his native society, there is another period of adjustment what may be labeled as "re-entry" phenomena. He had to readjust to his own country as he had to do to the host nation. Again he seeks out and adopts patterns of behavior that will be acceptable to the country and its norms as well as bring about self satisfaction to himself. This may involve integration of previous experiences with what is psychologically a relative new situation (Stein, 1966) (Figure 3).

Initial enthusiasm results from the adventure, enrichment, and romance the student anticipates in the new country. Quite often the opportunity to study in a foreign country carries with it prestige for the individual. This feeling creates a situation in which the individual utilizes his feelings for absorbing impressions and taking the first step toward adjustment in the new environment.

Factors start building up that lead to disillusionment throughout the period of initial enthusiasm. At the same time, the student anticipates the adventures facing him. He has reservations and anxiety about his ability to communicate in the new culture. There are many factors
(1) Spectator Phase:
Satisfaction high;
High expectation.

(2) Involvement Phase:
Satisfaction decrease;
Low level of involvement;
but unsatisfactory results;
Still adjusting to the
new culture.

(3) Coming-to-Term Phase:
satisfaction increase
as adjustment increases.

(4) Pre-departure Phase:
react and maintain a
reasonable level of satisfaction
and adjustment.

Figure 2 "U" Curve (Albertson and Birky, 1961:61)
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Figure 3 "W" Curve (Gullahorn and Gullahorn 1963, Stein 1966)
that contribute to the disillusionment and these factors revert back to
the culture shock process.

This disillusionment forces a reorganization in the individual's
life. If a student's concept of friendship patterns, professor-student
relation, or dating behavior does not correspond to those of the new
society, he may have to adjust his behavior accordingly. This cultural
and personality reorganization is at the core of his adjustment pattern.
With modification of certain attitudes and habit patterns he will learn
to deal with the problems he encounters.

Adjustment behavior can take many forms. Students may entirely as­
similate and view the cultural aspects of American society as superior
to his own, or he may on the other hand model his behavior according to
what is expected of him, accepting American culture as worthwhile for
Americans but always remaining spiritually separate and internally secure.
Finally, he may fall into social isolation for his entire stay, rejecting
any of the behavioral patterns of the American way of life.

Close to the time of return to the native society students, will,
according to the "U-curve" and "W-curve", begin to worry about the prob­
lems facing him at home. Once the individual student returns to his na­
tive country he will go through the readjustment processes and will have
to relearn to deal with the problems according to the rules and regulations
of his country.

This entire adjustment pattern is affected by the factors which de­
termine the direction that the individual takes for his final adjustment.
The length of time a person takes to reach his final steady stable state,
the depth of his cultural shock and his ability to make the social adjustment are all thought to be determined by his background and personality.

Readjustment

In various research it has been shown that foreign student's adjustment to the United States varies considerably in relation to their past experience with the new norms, values, and attitudes (Du Bois, 1954; Allaway, 1957; Bloom, 1960). The problems in adjustment might be less severe if foreign students find familiar customs and values when they arrive in the host society. Experience in a foreign country exposes an individual to variety of influences that may challenge his existing values, norms, and attitudes. These experiences may lead to varying degrees of attitude change or to a confirmation of the earlier attitudes, images or perhaps to a defensive resistance to change. These changes may be fairly temporary and disappear when the individual returns to his home culture, or fairly lasting change that becomes independent of the immediate situation and it is integrated with the person's value system. Gullahorn and Gullahorn (1963); Useem and Useem (1955); Lysgaard (1955); and Morris (1960), in their studies agree that foreign students change as a result of their sojourn, however, when they return to their native society, cultural and social patterns becomes a difficult experience. Further, the number of foreign students remaining permanently in the United States upon completion of their studies has been on the rise; although accurate estimation of proportion is difficult, a study of highly selected sample
of foreign students showed that approximately nine percent did not return to their home land (United States Department of State, 1961). If it were not for obstacles in the United States Immigration Law and possible commitments to home country government, it is possible that much larger proportion would stay.

In respect to the above discussions of foreign student's adjustment, from their study dealing with foreign students from six countries (Canada, Norway, India, China, Turkey and Venezuela). The adjustment of foreign students to the host nation and their readjustment to their native countries are closely related. That is, there is a relationship between country of origin of the foreign students and their total adjustment problems in the host nation. They suggest as result of the degree of problems they observed that there is a definite need to plan specific counseling programs for the newcomers in a manner to help foreign students generally, and to handle individual problems of adjustment as well.

Reference Group

It is suggested that one alternative framework for viewing the adjustment and readjustment problems of foreign students in the United States consists of the relationship between the foreign students' reference group and their adjustment in the host nation and, consequently, their anticipated adjustment problems upon return to their home country (Russell, 1966:1-3). In the present context, the concept of reference group can be used to designate those national, religious, political and local campus groups to which the foreign student in the host society relates himself as belonging socially, psychologically or to which he
desires to belong. One approach that may be raised, to the problem could be through the medium of knowledge of a person's reference groups, which provides a basis for the prediction of his attitude, perspectives, expectations and goals, as well as adjustment, in various spheres related to the goals and activities of the group (Russell, 1966:3). The roles of reference groups are treated implicitly in this research. Comparison will be made between students from developed and developing countries. It is assumed that reference groups for these students are different. The degree that these students feel life in the United States is different and the degree they have come to prefer life in the United states will be considered with empirical data. The logic in suggesting the reference group theory is that much of the behavior of the individual is conditioned by the group to which he "belongs" or "associates" with. The norms of the various groups determine the adjustment of the individual to variety of groups. In relation to the group's norms the attitude whether positive or negative - is crucial in differentiating the individuals, further; it gives identification with certain groups and individuals (Reisman and Glazer, 1948:633-648).

There is a distinction between membership in a group and reference group. The membership group refers to those that we actually belong to the reference group is the group with which we identify ourselves. NewCome, 1950, states the following in regard to the concepts membership and reference group:

a membership group is one in which a person is recognized by others as belonging...such as family, political, religious, and social groups...If a person's attitude are influenced by a set of norms which he assumes that are shared with other
individuals these individuals constitute for him a reference group... The significant thing about a reference group is, in fact, that its norms provide frame of reference which actually influence the attitudes and behavior of a person (NewCome, 1950:227).

NewCome (1950) further indicates that a single membership may perform as a positive reference on certain matters, and as a negative reference group on other issues. In case of a reference group the discrimination between positive and negative reference group is vital and clarification necessary:

...a positive reference group is the one in which a person is motivated to be accepted and be treated as a member (overtly or symbolically), whereas a negative reference group is one which he is motivated to oppose, or in which he does not want to be treated as a member (NewCome, 1950:226).

Membership is established when "significant others" or "groups" become meaningful. The individual holds the reference group as a base for his own comparative self-adjustment, but it may not be comparative self-adjustment, but it may not be equivalent to the group that he belongs to. The reference group may be a normative or comparative one. The normative type is one which stimulates values and attitudes. Groups set and maintain standards for the individual. The comparative-type reference group is the group which the individual uses to compare and evaluate himself relative to others. Through the interactive framework the comparative and normative types may be distinguished from one another. The interactive type comes about from the frequency of interaction which is part of individual's social environment. The degree of membership in a reference group in the contest of frequency of interaction depends on the rate of social interaction. Social interaction within a group is not
evenly distributed among the members and continuing events which may increase interaction among some members may cause reduction among others, which in turn tends to be the cause of the formulation of sub-groups within a group. These sub-groups develop distinctive social relations among its members which are not mutually shared by the individuals in the larger group (Turner, 1956).

Individuals through association with other members acquire information about the group and transmit it to others. The existence of a large number of individuals of the same sub-group in the close vicinity undoubtedly has influence on their adjustment to a larger group's attitudes, norms and values. Not only does the importance of this lie in the sheer number but also in the fact that a large number of members will be sharing a common culture which brings about opportunities for the development of the primary social relationships within the sub-group, which in turn may delay their adjustment. Foreign students who, after arrival in the host society, limit their interaction to their own sub-group will tend to adjust less than those who interact on a large scale outside of their sub-group (Noury, 1970:11).

The available literature suggests that the concept of reference group as applied in this research could unify a body of knowledge about adjustment to diverse cultures showing similarities as well as differences, negative as well as positive reaction toward the host and native countries.
Background

The background of an individual is closely related to his nationality and cultural exposure. Some segments of the foreign student population have been exposed to cultures that are very similar to that of the host nation's, while others have had experiences in societies that are totally dissimilar in culture from the culture of the United States. There are differences in nationality, population, age, social status, income status, marital status, and education backgrounds of the person and his family. Background experiences influence adjustment; that is it influences the perception and attitudes of the students toward the United States' culture and its people. Some feel there is a definite relation between perception and adjustment as well as a direct relation between attitude and adjustment.

The concept perception is defined by Mead as follows:

One perceives an object in terms of his response to it. It is true of all our experience that it is the response that interprets to us what comes to us in the stimulus (Mead, 1949:114).

Cattell (1950) offers the following statement in regard to attitude:

A dynamic trait commonly arising from deeper sentiment or innate drive—which it seeks to satisfy. It is a readiness to implement a certain course of action in regard to some object (Cattell, 1950:84).

Both perception and attitude are influenced by man's needs and interest, and because of his membership in a common culture, according to Krech, Crutchfield and Ballachey, 1962; man's attitude and his world images develop as he develops, and the development of man's life is not separate from the lives of his peer groups. As each man develops similarly and yet
differently from the others, so does his attitude and perceptions of his friends and family as well as his neighbors (Krech, Crutchfield and Ballachey, 1962:180).

Evidently both perception and attitude are formed in the individual through the process of socialization and reference groups are influential in the formation of perception and attitude. Perception and attitude are also part of the value orientation. In general, value orientation is an organized conception, influencing behavior, of nature, of man's place in it, of man's relation to man, and of the desirables and non-desirables as they may relate to man-environment and inter-human relations (Kluckholn, 1957).

Based on this argument about past experiences and learning, it appears to be logical and empirically valid that adjustment may be related to backgrounds of the students; thus, background variables will be utilized in this study. That is, background variables will be related to adjustment perceptions of how different the United States culture appears to be, how much the students prefer the United States culture and their perception of readjustment problems when they return home.

Hypotheses

On the basis of the above discussions, the following general hypotheses around which this study is centered are presented to give structure to the remaining section of this chapter. The following hypotheses are based on the previous concepts and their relationships which have already been discussed in this chapter.
**General hypothesis I**

Students from the developed countries will have more favorable adjustment to the host society's (United States) culture than students from the developing nations.

**General hypothesis II**

Students from the developed countries will perceive fewer differences between their native culture and host culture than students from the developing nations.

**General hypothesis III**

Students from the developed countries will have higher preference for United States culture than students from the developing nations.

**General hypothesis IV**

Students from developed countries will perceive fewer readjustment problems upon return home than students from developing countries.

Another objective of this research will be to determine the correlation between selected social-cultural and demographic variables with adjustment, perceptions of differences, preference for the United States, and perceived readjustment difficulties.

**Summary Of Theoretical Orientation**

In the scope of general objectives of the research, a theoretical perspective appropriate to the subject matter was developed. The theoretical orientation regarded appropriate for the problem is within the framework of the reference group theory, with emphasis attached to the inter-
active type of reference groups.

The purpose of this chapter was: 1. to present a theoretical basis within the framework of reference group theory; 2. to define and present some basic concepts that are appropriate for this research; and 3. to state some hypotheses within which these concepts could be related.

With regard to the substantive area of study, the general concepts of adjustment were defined and discussed; also a general discussion about perception and attitude was presented. Some relevant empirical research was reviewed and pertinent sections of it were presented. Consequently, the theoretical relationships expected were hypothesized and stated.
CHAPTER 3. METHODS AND MEASUREMENTS

Introduction

The objectives of this research were: 1. to investigate and compare the degree of adjustment of students from developed and developing nations to the United States culture, 2. to examine the perceived differences of culture and social patterns of United States and home culture, the preference of United States cultural and social patterns, 3. to examine the anticipated readjustment problems to native country by students from developed and developing nations, and 4. to examine the relationship between socio-cultural and demographic backgrounds to adjustment, perceived differences, preferences and readjustment. For the achievement of the above objectives, this chapter is dedicated to ascertainment of the research design of the study. Two main sections are discussed in this chapter. The first discussion deals with the research setting, population, and the sample. The second section is devoted to the procedure utilized in this study.

Research Setting

This study is based on a total sample of 70 male foreign students attending Iowa State University during the Spring of 1972. Students were selected from two areas, developed and developing nations as defined by United Nations (Appendix A). The sample was drawn randomly through the use of a random table, from a list of students comprising the entire foreign male student population who were enrolled at Iowa State University. The list was obtained from the Office of Foreign Students and Visitor
Services and supplemented by the Admissions and Records Office. Two lists were drawn; one contained the names of students from developed nations and the other students from developing countries. Each list contained 35 foreign students.

The logic for grouping the students into developed and developing is that, these students in each category share certain basic experiences and characteristics that are similar. Based on this assumption categorization of the countries followed the scheme of the United Nations, which is based on economic criteria, as reported by Moyes and Hayter (1964) in "World III". The developed group includes students from: Australia 1, Canada 12, England 6, France 1, Germany 1, Ireland 1, Italy 1, Japan 8, New Zealand 1, Romania 1, South Africa 1, Sweden 1, from the total representing developed nations. The developing group included students from the following countries: Africa (Nigeria) 2, Ceylon 1, China (Republic) 6, Cyprus 1, Hong Kong 3, India 2, Iran 4, Korea 2, Kuwait 2, Lebanon 1, Libya 1, Pakistan 2, Philippine 1, Peru 3, Thailand 2, and Venezuela 2, from the total number of students representing developing nations.

As stated previously only the male foreign students were considered. The decision to exclude female students was based on the following consideration. The number of females from foreign countries at Iowa State in the Spring of 1972, accounts for a minor part of the total number of students in both groups. No attempt was made to screen out graduate students or undergraduates. The stipulation was that the individual must
be at least a part-time registered student with a student visa and passport.

**Interview schedule**

An interview schedule was developed for the study. The interview schedule was in three parts. The first section dealt with the socio-cultural and demographic background of the students. The second section contained a scale devised by Noury (1970) in his study of Adjustment of Indian Students and Western Europeans at Iowa State University. Finally, the third section was divided into three subsections. The first subsection contained 10 questions about the degree of differences in cultural and social patterns perceived by foreign students. The second subsection dealt with degree of preference of United States social and cultural patterns by foreign students. The third subsection contained 10 questions about the anticipated degree of readjustment difficulty upon return home (Appendix B).

**Pretest of the schedule**

The section of the questionnaire which contained the Noury's adjustment questions was used with modification and no pretest was done on it. The other sections of the questionnaire was handled with caution with the first ten interviewees. The first ten interviewees were from the two groups, that is five from developed nations and five from developing countries. On the basis of the first ten interviews the ambiguous terms were clarified and/or eliminated from the schedule. Further, interpretation to the questions were formed so that all questions be explained
uniformly.

Data collection

Upon the final draft of the questionnaire, four interviewers were selected and trained. Each interviewer carried an identification letter about the research to be given to the interviewees. A package of eleven cards were prepared which contained scales and indices. Some of the cards, which were labeled by numbers, were used more than once. Interviewers would read the question and would ask the interviewee to refer to the appropriate card and the respondent was to answer the question accordingly by stating a number from the index or scale.

The interview schedule consisted of items designated to elicit data in the areas of socio-cultural and demographic information (questions 1 - 16), adjustment to the host nation subject (questions 17 - 40), the perceived differences in culture (questions 41 - 50), the preference for United States cultural patterns (questions 51 - 60), and the anticipated adjustment difficulty upon return to native country (questions 61 - 70) (Appendix B).

The questionnaire schedule was administered by personal interview to 70 foreign students, thirty-five students from developed nations and thirty-five students from developing countries. Interviewers were forced to answer each question and make a choice in their response to the question. It was emphasized that there are no right or wrong answers. In totality seventy interviews were completed. If an interview was refused from either group, through the use of random table another interviewee was selected to replace the refused interview.
Operational Measure

Introduction

In the previous section, the procedure utilized in collecting data, pretesting of the schedule, and the characteristics of the sample have been discussed. In this section measures that were developed in order to test the hypotheses will be discussed at some length. Through the deductive method general concepts were deduced to the level whereby operational measures are formed. This process of transformation is called explication (Carnap, 1950).

The deductive method refers to statements that are specific and are derived from the general level. Therefore, concepts by postulations are given operational meanings. In this section the procedure for formulation of empirical measures and empirical hypotheses will be presented.

Cultural adjustment concept

For the purpose of this study, the general level concept of adjustment is not operationalized by a single statement. Adjustment of the foreign students to the host society is one dependent variable. The measure of some segments of adjustment to the host society was composed by asking the sojourners to report on some selected aspects of their social behavior.

Adjustment in this study can be considered as conformity to an external set of norms and values of the host nation and also conformity to an internal set of norms and values of the native culture. At the specific level, adjustment can be conceived as the ability and willingness of foreign students to adopt to the American society and its culture.
Therefore, adjustment will be viewed as the response with regard to behavioral patterns toward some selected aspects of the host society. For the operationalization of the concept adjustment, an index of thirty-one quantifiable statements of several areas of adjustment to host society was developed by Noury, 1970. These segments are thought to measure adjustment to: religion, food, dress parties, language, picnics, sports, travels, music, use of nicknames, reading materials, visiting Americans, association with Americans, participation in campus organization, and marry an American female. The degree of involvement of foreign students with home country was also taken as measure of adjustment such as number of letters written and received from home, reading materials of native country, and celebration of native holidays in the United States. Some statements were given five-point continuum, others three-point, while others were on a two-point scale. The statements were either negative or positive in value structure. Numerical values were assigned each item (Noury, 1970).

The seventy respondents included in the sample were used and a total score was calculated for each group of thirty-five students. The adjustment scores for students from developing and developed nations were determined by adding the scores of the thirty-five students in each group. The items, the choices and corresponding scores that have been included for the scale are as follows:
The Foreign Students' Adjustment Measure

1. Do you attend American churches?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once a month</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once every two weeks</td>
<td>3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once a week</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than once a week</td>
<td>5 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Do you feel that the facilities of religious institutions in the United States have been adequate for your needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very inadequate</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inadequate</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fairly adequate</td>
<td>3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very adequate</td>
<td>5 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Assume you were with a friend (not American) in a restaurant, which do you prefer to order?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>native food, if available</td>
<td>0 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American food</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Do you like the American style of dress?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dislike it very much</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dislike it</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like it fairly well</td>
<td>3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like it</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like it very much</td>
<td>5 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Do you attend parties with American friends?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occasionally</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>often</td>
<td>3 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. During your stay in the United States, how often have you visited American families?

**Choices**
- practically never
- once in a great while
- sometimes
- fairly often
- very often

**Scores**
- = 1 point
- = 2 points
- = 3 points
- = 4 points
- = 5 points

7. Do you date American girls?

**Choices**
- never
- occasionally
- often

**Scores**
- = 1 point
- = 2 points
- = 3 points

8. With which group do you most associate with out of class?

**Choices**
- fellow countrymen
- Americans
- others'

**Scores**
- = 0 point
- = 1 point
- = 2 points

9. What nationality are most of your friends?

**Choices**
- fellow countrymen
- Americans
- others'

**Scores**
- = 0 point
- = 1 point
- = 2 points

10. Which language do you speak when you converse with fellow countrymen?

**Choices**
- native language
- American language

**Scores**
- = 0 point
- = 1 point

11. Do you go on picnics?

**Choices**
- never
- occasionally
- often

**Scores**
- = 1 point
- = 2 points
- = 3 points
12. During your stay in United States, how often have you attended sports events?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>practically never</td>
<td>= 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once in a great while</td>
<td>= 2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>= 3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fairly often</td>
<td>= 4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very often</td>
<td>= 5 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. How often do you participate in sports?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>practically never</td>
<td>= 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once in a great while</td>
<td>= 2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>= 3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fairly often</td>
<td>= 4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very often</td>
<td>= 5 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. How many times since you were enrolled at Iowa State University have you traveled outside of the state of Iowa?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td>= 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occasionally</td>
<td>= 2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>often</td>
<td>= 3 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. If you had time, would you rather read a book that tells you about the life in America, some other country, or your home country?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>book about home country</td>
<td>= 0 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>book about America</td>
<td>= 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>book about other countries</td>
<td>= 2 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Do you often read newspapers, magazines, etc. of your native country?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td>= 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occasionally</td>
<td>= 2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>often</td>
<td>= 3 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. How many letters per month do you receive from home?

**Choices**  
- about one or less monthly  
- about two letters monthly  
- about four or more monthly

**Scores**  
- = 0 point
- = 1 point
- = 2 points

18. How many letters per month do you write home?

**Choices**  
- about one or less monthly  
- about two letters monthly  
- about four or more monthly

**Scores**  
- = 0 point
- = 1 point
- = 2 points

19. Do you participate in any campus organization activities whose purpose is to provide for the social needs of the foreign students?

**Choices**  
- never  
- occasionally  
- often

**Scores**  
- = 1 point
- = 2 points
- = 3 points

20. How many organizations of the type do you participate in?

**Choices**  
- none  
- one  
- two  
- three  
- four  
- more than four

**Scores**  
- = 0 point
- = 1 point
- = 2 points
- = 3 points
- = 4 points
- = 5 points

21. Do you use "nicknames" while communicating with American friends (i.e. Robert - "Bob")?

**Choices**  
- no  
- yes

**Scores**  
- = 0 point
- = 1 point
22. Which music do you listen to most often?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>native country music</td>
<td>= 0 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American music</td>
<td>= 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>= 2 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Do you celebrate your native festivals and/or holidays while you are in the United States?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>= 0 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>= 1 point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. If you had the choice to marry, would you consider marrying an American?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>= 0 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>= 1 point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The item index was developed by Noury, 1970, to measure adjustment. A possible maximum score of 68 points was possible with a minimum score of 12 possible.

The actual range of scores for students from developed nations was 27 to 52 with a mean of 41.00 and a standard deviation of 6.16. The actual range of scores for students from developed nations was 27 to 48 with mean of 37.63 and a standard deviation of 5.27.

**Perception of difference**

Perception of differences between the cultural and social patterns of student and host nation was considered as a dependent variable. This difference of culture is thought to be an important factor related to adjustment. As pointed out previously, it is assumed the closer the cultural similarities the more favorable will adjustment be.
Ten dimension of culture was selected. These were: 1. differences between language of United States and the foreign students', 2. differences in food, 3. differences in housing set-up, 4. diversity in work conditions, 5. variance of educational system, 6. differences in leisure and recreation, 7. dissimilarity of political systems, 8. differences in community services, 9. differences between American people and native countrymen, and 10. diversity of pace of life. The ten items were based on a ten point continuum. The scores were ranged from zero to nine. Score of zero meant no difference at all, while score of nine indicated great deal of difference. The items that have been considered in the final index and choices with their corresponding scores are listed below:

The Foreign Students' Perceived Differences of Culture of United States and Native Culture Measure

1. How different is the language in the United States from that you have at home?

   0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9

   no difference  great difference

(The same 0 - 9 continuum was used for each item)

2. How different is the food in the United States from what you have at home?

3. How different is the housing in the United States from what you have at home?

4. How different is the work condition in the United States from what you have at home?
5. How different is the educational system in the United States from what you have at home.

6. How different is the recreation and leisure in the United States from what you have at home?

7. How different is the political system in the United States from what you have at home?

8. How different is the community services in the United States from what you have at home?

9. How different are the American people in the United States from people at home?

10. How different is the pace of life in the United States from the one at home?

The ten items developed were for the purpose of measuring the foreign students' perception of differences between their culture and the culture of host society. A possible maximum score of 90 points and a minimum of zero could occur. The actual range was from 8 to 69. The mean of 32.86 while the standard deviation was 15.83 for students from developed nations. The actual range was from 17 to 82. The mean 57.57 while standard deviation was 11.71 for students from developing nations.

The Foreign Students' Preference of the Culture of the United States Measure

The following questions were used to determine the preference of United States cultural aspects over the cultural patterns of the students' native country.
1. To what degree do you prefer the language in United States to your own at home?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

__no difference__

__great difference__

(The same 0 - 9 continuum was used for each item)

2. To what degree do you prefer the food in the United States to your own at home?

3. To what degree do you prefer the housing in United States to your own at home?

4. To what degree do you prefer the work condition in United States to your own at home?

5. To what degree do you prefer educational system in United States to your own at home?

6. To what degree do you prefer recreation and leisure in United States to your own at home.

7. To what degree do you prefer political system in United States to your own at home?

8. To what degree do you prefer community services in United States to your own at home?

9. To what degree do you prefer American people to your own people at home?

10. To what degree do you prefer the pace of life in United States to your own at home?

The items developed above to measure the degree of preference of United States culture by foreign students has a possible maximum score of 90 points and possible minimum of zero. The actual range for students from developed nations was 0 - 62, with mean of 20.914 and standard deviation of 18.92. The actual range for students from developing nations was from 8 to 68 with the mean of 43.60 and standard deviation
The Foreign Students' Perceived Anticipated Readjustment Difficulty upon Return Home Measure

The following questions will be used to determine the readjustment difficulty in the native country upon return.

1. To what degree do you think you will have problems getting use to the language back in your native country?

   
   no difficulty 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
great difficulty

   (The same 0 - 9 continuum was used for each item.)

2. To what degree do you think you will have problems getting use to the food back in your native country?

3. To what degree do you think you will have problems getting use to the housing back in your native country?

4. To what degree do you think you will have problems getting use to the work conditions back in your native country?

5. To what degree do you think you will have problems getting use to educational system back in your native country?

6. To what degree do you think you will have problems getting use to recreation and leisure back in your native country?

7. To what degree do you think you will have problems getting use to political system back in your native country?

8. To what degree do you think you will have problems getting used to community services back in your native country?

9. To what degree do you think you will have problems getting use to the people back in your native country?

10. To what degree do you think you will have problems getting use to the pace of life back in your native country?
The above items were developed for the purpose of measuring the anticipated degree of difficulty expressed by foreign students in readjusting to their native countries. There is a possible maximum score of 90 and a possible minimum score of zero. The actual range for students from developing nations was from 0 to 36 with a mean of 8.34 and standard deviation of 9.82. The actual range for students from developing nations was from 0 to 56, mean of 27.46 with standard deviation of 15.59.

The Foreign Student's Socio-Cultural and Demographic Background Information Measure

The following questions were used to determine the background of the students.

1. Please indicate what country you are from?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>developed</td>
<td>= 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>underdeveloped</td>
<td>= 0 point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Where did you live most of your life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>city</td>
<td>= 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small village</td>
<td>= 2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>farm</td>
<td>= 3 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. If in a village or city, what is the approximate population?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5,000</td>
<td>= 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 - 50,000</td>
<td>= 2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 - 500,000</td>
<td>= 3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000 - 1 million</td>
<td>= 4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 million - 5 million</td>
<td>= 5 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 million - 10 million</td>
<td>= 6 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 million and over</td>
<td>= 7 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. What is your age?

number of years ____________

5. What is your marital status at present time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>married</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single</td>
<td>0 point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What is the nationality of your spouse?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>developed</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>underdeveloped</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>0 point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Is your spouse in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>home country</td>
<td>0 point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Please indicate number of years of formal education you completed before coming to the United States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 6</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 9</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 12</td>
<td>3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 16</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 - 19</td>
<td>5 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 and over</td>
<td>6 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. How many years of formal education did you take outside of your native country and the United States?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 1</td>
<td>0 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 and over</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. How many years of formal education did you receive in the United States?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 2 years</td>
<td>= 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5 years</td>
<td>= 2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 8 years</td>
<td>= 3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 and over</td>
<td>= 4 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. What is the educational background of your father (equivalent to the United States system)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 6 years</td>
<td>= 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 9 years</td>
<td>= 2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 12 years</td>
<td>= 3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 16 years</td>
<td>= 4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 - 19 years</td>
<td>= 5 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 and over years</td>
<td>= 6 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. What sort of place are you living in now?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>room with an American family</td>
<td>= 3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apartment</td>
<td>= 2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dormitory</td>
<td>= 1 point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Do you live alone or do you share a room (apartment) with someone else?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>with someone else</td>
<td>= 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alone</td>
<td>= 0 point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. What is your roommate's nationality?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>= 0 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fellow countryman</td>
<td>= 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>= 2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>= 3 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. What would you say your parents social position is (not economic position) as compared with others in the community they live in?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

- very low
- very high

16. How does the income of your parents compare with the income of other families in their community?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

- very low
- very high

The items discussed above were used to enclosure selected socio-cultural and demographic variables and were items 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 15, and 16 of the schedule.

The general hypothesis will be restated in the next section along with the appropriate empirical hypothesis. Data will be presented in the next chapter to test the empirical hypotheses and to aid in the discussion of selected socio-cultural and background demographic variables.

Statistical analysis

"Methods and Measurements", sample characteristics, as well as operational measures, of the concepts have been discussed in this chapter.

This section will be devoted to the statistical techniques that have been used to test the hypothesis. The statistical test selected for the study
had the property that revealed the degree of association among the adjustment of the individuals to the new environment, perception of cultural differences, degree of preference for the sojourn society's culture, the readjustment problems with the native culture upon return, and the social-cultural and demographic backgrounds. A correlational analysis is applied to this research to determine the degree of relationships. In conjunction with correlation coefficient, chi square, gamma, and contingency coefficient were utilized. The rank-order correlation coefficient, \( \tau \), may take any value between -1 and 1, the higher the value of \( \tau \) that is closer to -1 and 1 the stronger the relationship. The reason for using rank-order correlation coefficient was that not all of the variables were internal, which is a requirement for product moment correlation (simple correlation). The formula for this correlation is:

\[
\tau = \frac{S}{\sqrt{1/2 (N)(N-1)}}
\]

Chi square analysis tests are used to determine if there is a significant relation between two variables. However, this analysis does not determine the degree of the relationship. The formula used to compute chi square is:

\[
\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{(O_i - E_i)^2}{E_i}
\]

The function of contingency coefficient (C) is a measure of the extent of association or relation between two sets of attributes. It is not necessary to have an underlying continuity for the various categories used. The degree of association between two sets of attributes, whether orderable or not, and irrespective of the nature of the variable can be
assessed, i.e., the variables may be either continuous or discrete. The formula for the contingency coefficient is:

$$C = \frac{x^2}{N + x^2}$$

(Siegle, 1956)

Goodman and Kruskal (1959:123-163) have defined gamma ($\gamma$) as the difference between conditional probabilities of discordance (between column and row) and concordance. Gamma is an appropriate statistic to use when measuring the degree of association between two ordinal scales classification. The gamma measures the predictability of order on one variable from order on another. Gamma values were computed to obtain an indication of association between students country or origin with adjustments, differences in culture, preference, and readjustment problems. Costner (1965: 341-353) has indicated that gamma as defined by Goodman and Kruskal (1959) is only indirectly related to the general intuitive notion of predictability. Costner has provided a formula which can be used to transpose the gamma value into one that shows the "probability of a correct estimate of order" (PCEO) between the dependent and independent variables. The formula for PCEO is

$$PCEO = .5 + \left| \frac{\text{gamma}}{2} \right|$$

was used to compute four PCEO values.

A chi square, a contingency, a rank-order correlation coefficient and gamma are used to test the hypotheses.

Hypotheses

General hypothesis I.

Students from the developed countries will have more favorable adjustment to the host society's (United States culture that students from the
developing nations.

**Empirical hypothesis I**

Students from the developed countries will have higher adjustment scores than students from developing countries.

**General hypothesis II**

Students from the developed countries will perceive less differences between their native culture and host culture than students from the developing nations.

**Empirical hypothesis 2**

Students from the developed nations will have a lower score on perceived cultural difference than students from the developing nations.

**General hypothesis III**

Students from the developed countries will have higher preference for United States culture than students from the developing nations.

**Empirical hypothesis 3**

Students from the developed countries will have higher preference score than students from the developing nations.

**General hypothesis IV**

Students from developed countries will perceive less readjustment problems upon return home than students from developing countries.
Empirical hypothesis 4

Students from developed countries will have lower readjustment difficulty score than students from developing nation. In pursuing the discussion the general and empirical hypotheses are linked together in the following manner: \( U_1 \) and \( U_2 \) are two population mean scores of students from developed and developing nations respectively, in the areas of adjustment, difference, preference, and readjustment. The statistical hypothesis \((H_0)\) states that \( U_1 = U_2 \). Thus any evidence against \((H_0)\) is evidence for \((H_a)\) which states that \( U_1 \neq U_2 \). These relationships apply to the four hypotheses previously discussed.
CHAPTER 4. FINDINGS

Introduction

In the previous chapter the general hypotheses have been developed and measuring devices were constructed for the operationalization of the concepts. Measures of concepts were used to form empirical hypotheses which will be tested statistically for significance. In this chapter, the results of the analysis of the data as well as the statistical analysis and the statistical tests of each hypotheses will be presented.

The assumption has been made that is a relationship can be determined among measures of adjustment, differences of culture, preference of United States culture, and readjustment difficulties in native country with social-cultural and demographic factors, then this relationship shows a correlation between independent and dependent variables. This correlation between the independent and dependent variables would support the hypotheses.

Statement and test of hypotheses

General hypothesis 1

Students from the developed countries will have more favorable adjustment to the host society's (United States) culture than students from the developing nations.

Empirical hypothesis 1

Students from the developed countries will have higher adjustment scores than students from developing countries.
Null hypothesis 1

There is no difference between students from developed and developing nations in their adjustment to the host society.

The calculated chi square, contingency coefficient and gamma for the differences in adjustment between two groups, students from developed and developing nations respectively are $X^2 = 1.430$, $C = .1415$, and $\gamma = .333$ and $PCEO = .665$. The $X^2$ value is not significant at the .01 level of confidence, nor do the other results indicate significant results. The contingency table used in these analyses are found in Appendix C. The null hypothesis that $U_1 = U_2$, that this is no difference between students from developed and developing countries, can not be rejected. Therefore students from developed nations do not have more favorable adjustment to the host society than students from developing nations.

General hypothesis II

Students from the developed countries will perceive less differences between their native culture and host culture than students from the developing nations.

Empirical hypothesis 2

Students from the developed nations will have a lower score on perceived cultural difference than students from the developing nations.

Null hypothesis 2

There is no difference between students from developed and developing nations in their perception of cultural differences
between host and native culture.

The computed $X^2 = 36.458$, $C = 0.5852$, $\gamma = -.9702$ and $\text{PCEO} = .99$. The $X^2$ is significant at the .01 level of confidence. The other statistics are congruent with the $X^2$ results. Both the calculated $C$ and $X^2$ indicate a strong relationship as does the PCEO. The null hypothesis that $U_1 = U_2$ that there is no difference between students from developed and developing nations as far as perception of differences in cultures (host and native country) is rejected. Therefore, students from developed nations perceive less difference between their home and the host culture.

**General hypothesis III**

Students from the developed countries will have higher preference for United States culture than students from the developing nations.

**Empirical hypothesis 3**

Students from the developed countries will have higher preference score than students from the developing nations.

**Null hypothesis 3**

There is no difference in degree of preference for the culture of the United States between students from developed and developing nations.

The calculated $X^2 = 21.053$, $C = .4809$, $\gamma = .8750$ with $\text{PCEO} = 0.94$, which is significant at .01 level of confidence. The calculated $X^2 = 21.053$, $C = .4809$, $\gamma = -.8750$ and $\text{PCEO} = 0.94$. The $X^2$ is significant at the .01 level of confidence. The other statistics are congruent with the $X^2$ results. The calculated $C$ and $\gamma$ indicate a strong relationship
as does the PCEO. The null hypothesis that $U_1 = U_2$, that is no difference in preference of students from developed and developing nations for American culture, is rejected. There is a significant relationship between country of origin and preference for American culture. However, the relationship is not in the hypothesized direction as suggested by the literature. Individuals from developing nations have higher preference of United States culture than individuals from developed nations. The null hypothesis of no difference in reference of United States culture between students from developed and developing nations is rejected.

**General hypothesis IV**

Students from developed countries will perceive less readjustment problems upon return home than students from developing countries.

**Empirical hypothesis 4**

Students from developed countries will have lower readjustment difficulty score than students from developing nation.

**Null hypothesis 4**

There is no difference in perceived readjustment problems to their native countries between students from developed and developing nations.

The computed $X^2 = 19.0748$, $C = 0.4628$, $Y = -0.8581$ and PCEO = 0.93. The $X^2$ is significant at the .01 level of confidence. The calculated $C$ and $Y$ also support the $X^2$ results and suggest a strong relationship as
does the PCEO. Therefore, the null hypothesis \( U_1 = U_2 \), that there is no difference in readjustment problems between students from developed and developing nations upon return home, is rejected. Consequently, students from developed nations will anticipate fewer readjustment difficulties than students from developing nations.

The relationships between socio-cultural, and demographic factors and characteristics of the students backgrounds were considered. The technique used for computing this relationship and items within the background section, was Kendall's rank-order correlation coefficient.

All correlations between selected independent and dependent variables are presented in Table 2. The dependent and independent variable discussed in this study are listed below. For students from developed countries adjustment \( X_9 \) was not significantly correlated with those independent variables \( (X_1 \) through \( X_8 \)). For these students, adjustment \( X_9 \) was not correlated with any of the other dependent variables except with perceived readjustment difficulty \( X_{12} \) (-0.344 significant at .01 level).

In addition to the relationships with adjustment, the other significant correlated dependent and independent variables are as follows: \( X_1 \) and \( X_{10} \) (0.391 at .001 level); \( X_1 \) and \( X_{11} \) (0.302 at .01 level); \( X_5 \) and \( X_{11} \) (0.570 at .001 level); \( X_{10} \) and \( X_{12} \) (0.396 at .001 level); and \( X_{11} \) and \( X_{12} \) (0.519 at .001 level).

Variables Used in Study

\( X \) = variable
\( X_1 \) = population of students home town
\( X_2 \) = age
\( X_3 \) = marital status
Table 2. Correlation between selected socio-cultural and demographic variables and adjustment, difference, preference and readjustment dimensions (Developed nations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Number</th>
<th>X_1</th>
<th>X_2</th>
<th>X_3</th>
<th>X_4</th>
<th>X_5</th>
<th>X_6</th>
<th>X_7</th>
<th>X_8</th>
<th>X_9</th>
<th>X_10</th>
<th>X_11</th>
<th>X_12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X_1</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>-0.194</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_2</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>-0.237</td>
<td>-0.240</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_3</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>-0.268</td>
<td>-0.225</td>
<td>-0.111</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_4</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.467</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>-0.224</td>
<td>-0.139</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>-0.076</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>-0.248</td>
<td>-0.102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>-0.225</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>-0.117</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.227</td>
<td>-0.212</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.069</td>
<td>-0.206</td>
<td>-0.344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.570</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
$X_4$ = years of education received at home  
$X_5$ = years of education received in United States  
$X_6$ = father's educational background  
$X_7$ = parents' social status  
$X_8$ = parents' income status  
$X_9$ = adjustment to United States  
$X_{10}$ = perceived difference of home and host culture  
$X_{11}$ = preference of United States' culture  
$X_{12}$ = perceived readjustment problems with native country

All correlations between selected independent and dependent variables are presented in Table 3 for students from developing countries. Adjustment $X_9$ was significantly correlated with $X_2$ (-0.307 at .01 level); $X_3$ (-0.268 at .05 level); and $X_5$ (0.268 at .05 level). For these students adjustment was correlated with none of the other dependent variables. Results indicate that there is no significant correlation between adjustment and the other dependent variables.

In addition to relationships with adjustment, there is a significant correlation between the following independent and dependent variables:  
$X_3$ and $X_{11}$ (-0.3 at .01 level); $X_4$ and $X_{11}$ (-0.268 at .05 level); $X_4$ and $X_{12}$ (-0.329 at .01 level); $X_6$ and $X_{12}$ (-0.253 at .05 level).

The significant correlation between the dependent variables are as follows: $X_{10}$ and $X_{11}$ (0.318 at .01 level); and $X_{11}$ and $X_{12}$ (0.461 at .001 level).

In the testing of the four hypotheses it was found that two of the hypothesis were supported by the data (General hypothesis II and IV). General hypothesis III was rejected; the findings were significant but reverse direction from the hypothesized results. The hypothesis dealing
Table 3. Correlation between selected socio-cultural and demographic variables and adjustments, difference, preference and readjustment dimensions (Underdeveloped nations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Number</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>X4</th>
<th>X5</th>
<th>X6</th>
<th>X7</th>
<th>X8</th>
<th>X9</th>
<th>X10</th>
<th>X11</th>
<th>X12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>-0.177</td>
<td>-0.110</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>*-1.94</td>
<td>-0.223</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td>-0.120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>-0.307</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>-0.145</td>
<td>-0.267</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>-0.300</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4</td>
<td>-0.270</td>
<td>-0.367</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>-0.114</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>-0.268</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X5</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X6</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>-0.170</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X7</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X8</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X9</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X10</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X11</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .001  
** .01  
*** .05
with adjustment differences of students from developed and developing nations was not supported (General hypothesis I).

The most significant relationship observed for students from developed and underdeveloped nations was between perceived differences of cultures and the preference for the host culture 0.318 at .01 level of significance. For students from developing countries the correlation between the perceived difference in culture and readjustment problems in native country was 0.317 at .01 level. Finally, there is a significant relationship between preference for American culture and degree of anticipated readjustment problems upon return to native country for students from developing nations, 0.461 at .01 level of significance.

The most significant correlation between the variables for students from the developed nations are between adjustment to host society and anticipated degree of readjustment difficulties in their native country. The correlation is negatively related, -0.344 at .01 level of significance. The other most significant correlation is between perceived differences in cultures and preference for American culture, 0.570 at .01 level of significance. An additional positive correlation was found between perceived cultural differences and degree of anticipated readjustment problems upon return to the native country, 0.396 at .01 level. Finally there is a positive correlation between preference for American culture and anticipated problems of readjustment to the native country, 0.519 at .01 level of significance.
CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary of Procedures and Findings

This study had several goals: 1) to examine and compare the degree of adjustment to the United States between students from developed and developing nations; 2) to investigate the differences in perception of degree of differences students from two groups see between home and host culture; 3) to compare the degree of differences in preference for American culture; and 4) to compare the degree of anticipated readjustment problems between the two groups upon their return home. Another objective was to relate selected socio-cultural and demographic background to adjustment in the host nation.

For the purpose of this study, the concept adjustment was defined as the response to behavioral patterns characteristic of certain aspects of the host society. Perception was defined as the means by which individuals form impressions, while attitude is a mental state of readiness which is organized by way of experience and influence upon the individual's situations and behaviors. The three areas of perception and attitude which were investigated were cultural differences, preference for American culture and anticipated readjustment difficulties upon their return home. In Chapter 2, dealing with theory, distinctions were drawn among adjustment, assimilation and acculturation. The theories pertinent to adjustment, perception and attitudes were reviewed and applied to the study. The relevant concepts of reference group theory were delineated and suggestion for their application was discussed. General and empirical hypothesis were developed and discussed.
A random sample of 70 foreign students, 35 students from developed nations and 35 from underdeveloped nations, attending Iowa State University in the spring session of 1970, was selected. The empirical hypotheses were derived from general hypotheses. The statistical techniques used to test the hypotheses were Kendall's rank-order correlation coefficient, chi square, gamma, and contingency coefficient.

(The findings of this study) did not support the hypotheses that states that students from developed nations would be more adjusted than students from developing nations. The hypothesis that students from developing countries would perceive greater difference in American culture than students from the developed countries was supported. That is, students from developing countries perceive greater differences in American culture.

The hypothesis that students from the developing countries would not prefer American cultural pattern to the degree that students from developed countries would was not supported. In fact, the results indicate just the opposite. Students from the developing countries prefer the American cultural pattern more so than students from developed countries.

(The hypothesis that students from the developing nations would have greater readjustment problems after return home was supported.) In general, the relationship between the dependent variables and independent variables were of low order and inconclusive.

It is concluded that differences in perception of cultural differences, preference for American culture, and readjustment problems back home, do exist between students from developed and developing nations.)
It is also concluded that students from the developed nations perceive less difference between their culture and host culture as well as a lesser degree of readjustment problems with home culture than students from the developing nations. Students from less developed nations have a greater preference for American culture than students from developed nations. Students from the developed nations score no higher on the adjustment index than students from developing nations.) Suggestions for the expected and unexpected relationships will be given later in this chapter.

Suggestions for future research in the area of foreign students' adjustment will be stated.

Discussion and Summary

In the preceding chapter, the results of statistical analysis that were applied to test the null hypotheses were presented and discussed. In this chapter the major results of this study are discussed and conclusions drawn. Suggestions for further research are also made in this chapter.

The objective of this study was to investigate the degree of adjustment to the American culture among students from developed and developing nations. The concept of adjustment was defined as the response to behavioral patterns characteristic of certain selected aspects of the American culture, measured with the index established and used earlier by Mostafa Noury (1970). The results indicate that there are significant differences between students from the two settings. Chi square analysis of the statistical tools utilized to compare the adjustment of the students from
developed and developing nations. The empirical hypothesis was not supported. The data used in the contingency table analysis (Chi square and other techniques) are found in Appendix B, Table 1, indicating that students from the developed nations have no more favorable adjustment to the American culture as measured by the Noury index (1970). This conclusion is not in agreement with the research and theory of Du Bois (1954, 1962), Sellitz et al. (1963), Sewell and Davidson (1961), and Morris (1960). Sellitz et al. (1963) and Morris (1960) have also stated that students from European countries will adjust better to the United States than students from non-European countries.

Noury (1970) reported that European students tend to adjust better to American culture than Indian students. Using the same adjustment index, the present study indicates that students from developed nations have no more favorable adjustment to the sojourn environment (United States) than do students from developing nations. Further research should be done to determine the adequacy of the index given the wealth of theoretical support for the hypothesis.

Reference group theory suggests that sojourners who do not associate with members of the host society will tend to adjust less in the new setting than those with fewer associates in the host culture. Therefore, intensive association with students from one's home country impede adjustment to the sojourn country (Sellitz 1956:262). Once satisfactory adjustment scale are developed, these reference group theories should be tested with longitudinal data.
The second objective of this research was to examine the perceived differences between cultures, preference for American culture and readjustment problems with native culture upon expected return home for the two groups of students studied. Students responded to ten items used to report ten different aspects of culture. These aspects studied were the language, food, housing, educational system, work conditions, leisure time, political system, pace of life, the people, and community facilities. Each subject was asked to indicate on a nine point continuum the degree to which each aspect of culture was different from that of his country. Composite scores were used to develop an index of perceived differences. The statistical test used indicated significant differences in perception of cultural differences between students from developed and developing nations. On the basis of the statistical test results (that clearly support the literature) it is concluded that students from developed nations perceive less difference between their native culture and the host culture than students from less developed countries.

The differences in preference of American culture between the two groups of students were also considered. Subjected were asked to respond on a nine point continuum the degree that they preferred the American pattern for each of the ten aspects of culture described above. A composite score was developed and used as an index of preference for the American pattern. These ten items were the same ones used for the measurement of differences and readjustment problems. The findings indicate that students from underdeveloped nations have a greater preference for American culture than do students from developed nations. Therefore, the empirical
hypothesis is rejected. These results do not indicate concurrence with the existing literature. The findings of this study do not concur with the findings of Du Bois (1954, 1962), Sellitz (1963), and Morris (1960). Du Bois states that the closer the cultures, the more students prefer the sojourn culture. In the present study, students from developed nations indicate less difference between cultures but are less likely to prefer the host culture. This result is contradictory to the assumption and hypothesis of Du Bois (1954, 1962), Sellitz (1963), Morris (1960), and Sewell and Davidson (1961). Identification with nationalities and ideologies, students from developed countries may account for this finding in part. Students from developing countries may look to innovations in foreign culture in a more positive way than do students from developed countries. This hypothesis should be examined.

In conclusion, from this part of the research report, it appears that findings support the assumption that there is a difference between the two groups of students. While students from developed nations perceive less difference between their home culture and host culture, students from underdeveloped nations have higher preference for American culture than do students from developed nations. The pattern of preference of perceived differences is not consistent with the literature, as noted.

Finally, in relation to the analysis was made to determine the anticipated readjustment problems with students' home cultures. The student subjects were asked to indicate on a nine point continuum the degree to which they anticipate having readjustment problems with each of the ten aspects of culture considered. A complete score was used as an index of perceived adjustment problems. These results of the study
indicate that students from developed nations perceive less difficulty in readjustment to their own culture upon return home than do students from underdeveloped nations. Therefore, the empirical hypothesis developed with regard to the differences in readjustment was supported. That is, students from developed nations have a significantly lower score in readjustment problems than do students from developing nations. These findings of this study with regard to readjustment problems are congruent with the findings and hypothesis of other researchers such as Du Bois (1954, 1962); Gullahorn and Gullahorn (1963); and Albertson and Birky (1961). In summary, these theorists have suggested that the greater the difference between cultures and the greater the preference for the sojourn culture, the more difficulty the readjustment will be. In the present study, students from less developed nations had higher readjustment problem scores than did students from developed nations.

In summation, with regard to the third objective students from less developed nations perceive greater cultural differences, have higher preference scores for American culture and perceive that they will have greater readjustment difficulties than students from developed nations.

Suggestions for future research

With regard to future research, it might be pointed out first that most of the research that has been done in the area of foreign students' adjustment have not been concerned directly with the problem of "brain drain." Are students from underdeveloped nations who have more problems going back home more likely to stay in the United States? The literature in the area of readjustment problems as related to "brain-drain" seems
to be deficient. Further, research might involve a more careful attention to the development of more appropriate and precise instruments for research. That is,

1. Scale analysis of Noury's adjustment items should be done to see if it is a unidimensional instrument.

2. Scale analysis of dependent variables in this study is needed.

3. A larger sample should be used.

4. Longitudinal studies should be conducted.

5. Another area that might be of interest and in which there are deficiencies is that of a comparison in adjustment to host nations between male and female students.

6. The role of socio-cultural and demographic variables should be more carefully considered when larger samples of students are utilized.
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APPENDIX A. CRITERIA USED TO CATEGORIZE DEVELOPED AND UNDERDEVELOPED NATIONS

Characteristics of the Developing Nations

1. Low real income per head.
2. National resources which are not used for the benefit of the inhabitants or not used at all.
3. Large number of unemployment.
4. Small ratio of capital per number of workers.
5. An economy which depends on one or two crops or minerals.
6. High illiteracy rate.
7. Large portion of population involved in agriculture.
8. Population density is very high.
9. Low medical facilities for the population.
10. Infant mortality high and expectation of life short.

The above characteristics of developing nations is based on economic criteria. Nations that belong to this group are Asia (with the exception of U.S.S.R. and Japan), the continent of Africa (excluding South Africa), and South America (Moyes and Hayter, 1964, Higgins, 1959).

Characteristics of Developed Nations

1. High real income per head.
2. National resources used for the benefits of the inhabitants.
3. Large number of people employed.
4. An economy which depends on more than two crops and minerals.
5. High literacy rate.
6. Minor proportion of population involved in agriculture.
7. Adequate medical facilities in ratio to population.

8. Infant mortality low and life expectancy of life long.

The above characteristics of developed nations is based on economic criteria. Nations that belong to this group are: Canada, United States, Europe (excluding Turkey and Cyprus), Japan, U.S.S.R. and South Africa (Rostow, 1965, and United Nations, 1970).
APPENDIX B. FOREIGN STUDENT ADJUSTMENT QUESTIONNAIRE
PART I.

"In this part, I would like to ask some questions about yourself. Please answer the questions to the best of your ability."

*(Interviewer: Write the answers of the respondent in the space provided for you.)*

1. Please indicate what country you are from. ____________

2. Where have you lived most of your life? (check one)
   
   farm ____________
   
   small village _____
   
   city ____________
   
   *(If "farm", go to question 4.)*

3. If in a village or city, what is the approximate population of the village or the city? ____________

4. What is your age? ____________

5. What is your marital status at the present time? (check one)
   
   married ____________
   
   single ____________
   
   *(If "single", go to question 8.)*

6. What is the citizenship of your spouse? ____________

7. Is your spouse in the United States? ____________ at home?
   
   ____________ elsewhere? ____________

8. Please indicate number of years of formal education you completed before coming to the United States. ____________
9. How many years of formal education did you take outside of your native country and the United States? ______________

10. How many years of formal education did you receive in the United States? ______________ (in years)

11. What is the educational background of your father (equivalent to the United States system)? Please state in number of years. ______________

12. What sort of place are you living in now? (check one)
   dormitory ______________
   apartment ______________
   room with a family ______________

13. Do you live alone or do you share a room (apartment) with someone else? (check one)
   alone ______________
   with someone else ______________
* (If "alone", go to question 15.)

14. What is your roommate's nationality? (check one)
   American (United States) ______________
   native countryman ______________
   other ______________
* (Interviewer: Hand the set of cards to the interviewee.)

"PLEASE TURN TO CARD 1."

15. What would you say your parents' social position is (not economic position) as compared with others in your community? Please rate their position, relative to others in your community,
on a scale of 0 to 9. A score of 0 means very low and a score of 9 means very high. However, scores of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 or 8 might better indicate their social position within the community.

*(Interviewer: Please circle one number that represents the respondent's answer.)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

very low

very high

16. How does the income of your immediate family compare with the income of other families in your community? Please rate their income position, relative to others in your community, on a scale of 0 to 9.

*(Interviewers: Please circle one number that represents respondent's answer.)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

very low

very high

PART II.

"In this section I would like to ask you some questions about how well you are getting along in the United States. There are no right or wrong answers; we are interested in your opinions only."

"PLEASE TURN TO CARD 2."
17. Do you attend American churches? Please look at the card and tell me your response.

*(Interviewer: Read the ratings. Score 1 means not at all, 2 means once a month, 3 once every two weeks, 4 once a week and 5 more than once a week. Please circle the appropriate number.)

1 2 3 4 5

| not at all | once not | at all | once | every two weeks | once a week | more than once a week |

"PLEASE TURN TO CARD 3."

18. Do you feel that the facilities of religious institutions in the United States have been adequate for your needs? Please look at card 3 and tell me your answer.

*(Interviewer: Read the ratings. 1 means very inadequate, 2 inadequate, 3 fairly adequate, 4 adequate and 5 very adequate. Circle the number corresponding to the respondent's answer.)

1 2 3 4 5

| very inadequate | fairly adequate | very adequate |

19. Assume you were with a friend (not American) in a restaurant. Which do you prefer to order?

*(Interviewer: Read aloud the categories and circle the respondent's answer.)

1. American food.

2. Native food, if available.

"PLEASE TURN TO CARD 4."
20. Do you like the American style of dress?
*(Interviewer: Read aloud the categories and circle the number which represents respondent's answer.)

1 2 3 4 5

dislike it dislike like it like it like it very much it fairly well it very much

"PLEASE TURN TO CARD 5."

21. Do you attend parties with American friends?
*(Interviewer: Read aloud the categories and circle the number that represents the respondent's answer.)

1 2 3

never occasionally often

"PLEASE TURN TO CARD 6."

22. During your stay in the United States, how often have you visited American families?
*(Interviewer: Read aloud the categories and circle the answer.)

1 2 3 4 5

practically once in a while sometimes fairly often very often

"PLEASE TURN BACK TO CARD 5."

23. Do you date American girls?
24. With which group do you most associate with out of classes?

*(Interviewer: Read aloud the categories and check one.)

1. American ____________
2. Fellow countrymen ____________
3. Others ____________

25. What nationality are most of your friends?

*(Interviewer: Read the categories and check one.)

1. American ____________
2. Fellow countrymen ____________
3. Others ____________

26. Which language do you speak when you converse with fellow countrymen?

*(Interviewer: Read aloud the categories and check one.)

1. American language ____________
2. Native language ____________

"PLEASE LOOK AGAIN AT CARD 5."

*(Interviewer: Read aloud the categories and circle the number that represents the respondent's answer.)

1 ____________ 2 ____________ 3 ____________

never occasionally often

"PLEASE TURN TO CARD 6."
28. During your stay in the United States, how often have you attended sports events?

*(Interviewer: Read aloud the categories and circle the answers.)

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practically once in a while</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>fairly</td>
<td>very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td>great while</td>
<td>often</td>
<td>often</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"PLEASE LOOK AT CARD 6."

29. How often do you participate in sports?

*(Interviewer: Circle the proper number.)

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practically once in a while</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>fairly</td>
<td>very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td>great while</td>
<td>often</td>
<td>often</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"PLEASE TURN BACK TO CARD 5."

30. How many times since you were enrolled at Iowa State University have you traveled outside of the state of Iowa?

*(Interviewer: Read aloud the categories and circle the response.)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td>occasionally</td>
<td>often</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. If you had time, would you rather read a book that tells you about the life in America, some other country, or your home country?

*(Interviewer: Read aloud the categories and check the response.)

1. Book about America

2. Book about home country
3. Book about other countries _____________

"PLEASE LOOK AT CARD 5."

32. Do you often read newspapers, magazines, etc. of your native country?

*(Interviewer: Read aloud the categories and circle the proper number.)

1 2 3

never occasionally often

"PLEASE TURN TO CARD 7."

33. How many letters per month do you receive from home?

*(Interviewer: Read aloud the categories and check the answer given.)

1. About four or more monthly _____________
2. About two letters monthly _____________
3. About one or less monthly _____________

"LOOK AGAIN AT CARD 7."

34. How many letters per month do you write to your home?

*(Interviewer: Check the answer.)

1. About four or more monthly _____________
2. About two letters monthly _____________
3. About one or less monthly _____________

"PLEASE TURN BACK TO CARD 5."

35. Do you participate in any campus organization activities whose purpose is to provide for the social needs of the foreign
students?

*(Interviewer: Read aloud the categories and circle the appropriate number.)

1 2 3

never occasionally often

"PLEASE TURN TO CARD 8."

36. How many organizations of this type do you participate in?

*(Interviewer: Read aloud the categories and check the proper answer.)

1. More than four _____________
2. Four _____________
3. Three _____________
4. Two _____________
5. One _____________

37. Do you use "nicknames" while communicating with American friends (i.e. Robert - "Bob")?

*(Interviewer: Read aloud the categories and check the proper response.)

yes _____________
no _____________

38. Which music do you listen to the most?

*(Interviewer: Read aloud the categories and check the appropriate response.)
1. American music
2. Home country music
3. Others

39. Do you celebrate your native festivals and/or holidays while you are in the United States?

*(Interviewer: Read aloud the categories and check the proper response.)

yes
no

40. If you have the choice to marry, would you marry an American?

*(Interviewer: Read aloud the categories and check the proper response.)

yes
no

PART III. Section A.

"The next set of questions will deal with how much difference you see in the cultural pattern of the United States and the cultural pattern at home. Please answer the questions to the best of your knowledge."

"PLEASE TURN TO CARD 9."

Instructions: "Would you please read the instructions on the card as I read it aloud. As you can see on the card, 10 aspects of culture are listed. I will read to you the item and you are to tell me how different it is from that at home. As you can see, there appears on card 9 a rating scale of 0 to 9 indicating the degree of difference. 0 means no differ-
ence. However, scores of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 or 8 may also indicate the degree of differences."

*(Interviewer: Circle the appropriate number and make sure the interviewee understands the instructions. Always read the lead part of the question first, then insert the item listed below, and complete the sentence. For example: How different is the language in the United States from what you have at home?)

A. "How different is the __________ in the United States from what you have at home?"

1. Language
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   -------------------------
   no difference              great difference

2. Food
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   -------------------------
   no difference              great difference

3. Housing
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   -------------------------
   no difference              great difference

4. Work conditions (i.e. equipment, hours)
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   -------------------------
   no difference              great difference
5. Educational system

   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

   no difference   great difference

6. Recreation and leisure (i.e. lectures, sports, etc.)

   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

   no difference   great difference

7. Political system

   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

   no difference   great difference

8. Community services (i.e. post office, police, fire department)

   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

   no difference   great difference

9. American people (their characteristics)

   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

   no difference   great difference

10. Pace, time (being aware of necessity of getting things done rapidly)
PART III. Section B.

"In Section B of Part III, I will read to you an item and you are to tell me to what degree you prefer the United States' pattern over the pattern at home.

"PLEASE TURN TO CARD 10."

Instructions: "Would you please read the instructions on the card as I read it to you aloud. On the card, 10 items appear. I will read you the item, and you tell me to what degree you prefer it. Please rate the degree of your preference on a scale of 0 to 9. 0 means no preference and 9 great preference.

*(Interviewer: Please read the lead part of the question, insert the item in the blank area and ask to what degree the student prefers the United States system. Circle the appropriate number. Be sure the instructions are understood.)

B. "To what degree do you prefer ____________ in the United States to your own at home?"

1. Language

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no difference</th>
<th>great difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Food
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

no difference

3. Housing
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

no difference

4. Work conditions (i.e. equipment, hours)
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

no difference

5. Educational system
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

no difference

6. Recreation and leisure
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

no difference

7. Political system
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

no difference
8. Community services (i.e. post office, police, fire department)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no preference</td>
<td>great preference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. American people (their characteristics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Pace, time (being aware of necessity of getting things done rapidly)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART III. Section C.

"The last section of the interview will deal with problems or difficulties you might face when you return to your country."

"PLEASE TURN TO CARD 11."

Instructions: "Please read the instructions as I read it to you. Again 10 items are listed. I will read each item and you should indicate the degree of difficulty you might have with it when you return home. Please rate the degree of your difficulty on a scale of 0 to 9. Remember 0 means no difficulty while 9 means a great deal of difficulty. Again, scores of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 or 8 might better express the degree of your problem."

*(Interviewer: Make sure the instructions are understood and circle the number indicated by the interviewee. Read the lead part of the
question, insert the item in the blank area, and complete the sentence.)

C. "To what degree do you think you will have problems getting used to the ________ back in your native country?"

1. Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no difficulty</td>
<td>great difficulty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Food

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no difficulty</td>
<td>great difficulty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no difficulty</td>
<td>great difficulty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Work conditions (i.e. equipment, hours)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no difficulty</td>
<td>great difficulty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Educational system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no difficulty</td>
<td>great difficulty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Recreation and leisure (i.e. lectures, sports, etc.)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

no difficulty great difficulty

7. Political system

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

no difficulty great difficulty

8. Community services (i.e. post office, police, fire department)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

no difficulty great difficulty

9. People (characteristics)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

no difficulty great difficulty

10. Pace, time (being aware of necessity of getting things done rapidly)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

no difficulty great difficulty
CARD 1

Please rate on a scale of 0 to 9. 0 means very low; 9 means very high. However, scores of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 or 8 may better indicate their social position. Please indicate by number.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

very low  very high
CARD 2

Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5. 1 means not at all, 2 means once in a month, 3 every two weeks, 4 once a week, and 5 more than once a week. Please state the number that best describes your situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>every</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>than</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>month</td>
<td>two</td>
<td>week</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rate on a scale of 1 to 5. 1 means very inadequate, 2 inadequate, 3 fairly adequate, 4 adequate and 5 very adequate. Please state the position best describing your feelings.
Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5. Please pick a number on the scale that best describes your feeling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dislike</td>
<td>dislike</td>
<td>like</td>
<td>like</td>
<td>like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very</td>
<td>fairly</td>
<td>well</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CARD 5

Please pick a number on the scale that best describes your feelings.

1  2  3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 never</th>
<th>2 occasionally</th>
<th>3 often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
CARD 6

Please pick a number on the scale that best describes your feeling.

1 2 3 4 5

practically never once sometimes fairly often very
great often often
CARD 7

Please indicate which

1. About four or more monthly.
2. About two letters monthly.
3. About one or less monthly.
Please indicate which

1. More than four.
2. Four.
3. Three.
4. Two.
5. One.
CARD 9

Instructions: "Would you please read the instructions on the card as I read it aloud. As you can see on the card, 10 aspects of culture are listed. I will read to you the item and you are to tell me how different it is from that at home. As you can see, there appears on card 9 a rating scale of 0 to 9 indicating the degree of difference. 0 means no difference at all while 9 means a great deal of difference. However, scores of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 or 8 may also indicate the degree of difference."

"How different is the ________ in the United States from what you have at home"?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

no difference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>great difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. work conditions (i.e. equipment, hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. educational system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. recreation and leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. political system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. community services (i.e. post office, police, fire department)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. American people (their characteristics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. pace, time (being aware of necessity of getting things done rapidly)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CARD 10

Instructions: "Would you please read the instructions on the card as I read it to you aloud. On the card, 10 items appear. I will read you the item, and you tell me to what degree you prefer it. Please rate the degree of your preference on a scale of 0 to 9. 0 means no preference and 9 great deal of preference."

"To what degree do you prefer ___________ in the United States to your own at home?"

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

__________

no preference  great preference

1. language
2. food
3. housing
4. work conditions (i.e. equipment, hours)
5. educational system
6. recreation and leisure
7. political system
8. community services (i.e. post office, police, fire department
9. American people (their characteristics)
10. pace, time (being aware of necessity of getting things done rapidly)
Instructions: "Please read the instructions as I read it to you. Again 10 items are listed. I will read each item, and you should indicate the degree of difficulty you might have with it when you return home. Please rate the degree of your difficulty on a scale of 0 to 9. Remember 0 means no difficulty while 9 means a great deal of difficulty. Again, scores of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 or 8 might better express the degree of your problem." "To what degree do you think you will have problems getting used to the __________ back in your native country?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no difficulty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>great difficulty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. language
2. food
3. housing
4. work conditions (i.e. equipment, hours)
5. educational system
6. recreation and leisure
7. political system
8. community services (i.e. post office, police, fire department)
9. people (their characteristics)
10. pace, time (being aware of necessity of getting things done rapidly)
APPENDIX C. TABLES
Table 4: Adjustment to host nation in relation to the categories of countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjustment to host nation</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Underdeveloped</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 1.430$ with 1 degree of freedom not significant

$C = .1415$

$\gamma = .333$  PCEO = .665  25% not significant
Table 5: Perceived differences of host and native culture in relation to the categories of countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived differences of cultures</th>
<th>Underdeveloped</th>
<th>Developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 36.458$ with 1 degree of freedom significant at .05 level

$C = 0.5852$

$\gamma = 0.9702$  PCEO = .99
Table 6: Preference of host culture in relation to the categories of countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference of host nations</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Underdeveloped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Column Total

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 21.053$ 1 degree of freedom at .05 level

C = .4809

$\gamma = .8750$  PCEO = .94
Table 7: Perception of readjustment difficulty in relation to the categories of countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Readjustment Difficulty to Native Country</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Underdeveloped</th>
<th>Developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 19.0748$ with 1 degree of freedom .05 level
$C = .4628$
$\gamma = .8581$ PCEO = .93