2001-03-30

Perceptions of International Students and University Personnel of Cultural Adjustment Problems at Two Private Universities

John R. Jenkins EdD
University of San Diego

Perceptions of international students and university personnel of cultural adjustment problems at two private universities

John R. Jenkins

Dissertation

Dr. Fred Galloway, Ed. D., Chair
Dr. Paula Cordeiro, Ed. D., Member
Dr. Robert Donmoyer, Ph. D., Member

March 30, 2001

The University of San Diego
San Diego, California

**Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Education**

DISSERTATION ABSTRACT

The influx of international students studying at United States colleges and universities during the past five decades has presented many challenges related to accommodating the needs of these "special" students. In the early 1950s, fewer than 40,000 international students were enrolled within the higher education system of the U.S.; today that number has grown to more than 490,000 students. The problems confronted by these students are both numerous and complex. University personnel often address these problems by developing specific programs designed to meet the needs of the international students at their university. However, the perceptions of these problems by international students, faculty, and staff differ in important ways.

To explore these problems in more detail, this study first collected data from 215 international students and 44 university personnel at one liberal arts university and a doctoral comprehensive university in the United States, both religiously affiliated, through the use of a well-established survey instrument. The responses from these two groups were then compared and analyzed through the use of paired sample t-tests in 11 possible areas of concern, ranging from health services to financial aid. After their responses were compared and analyzed, multiple regression analysis was then used to examine the extent to which the variation in their responses could be explained by a number of demographic factors.

The findings of the study revealed that the university personnel on both campuses significantly overstated the problems of international students, although both groups considered the problems to be relatively minor. Since it was thought that the students would consider their problems more serious than the university personnel, this suggests

iv

that the two universities are responding appropriately to a large majority of the problems faced by international students on their campuses. When the student responses were examined in detail, country of origin, time at the university, and the particular university attended proved to be significant factors in explaining the variance in the student responses, while gender, marital status, and major field of study did not.

Dedication

This study is dedicated to Eric Scott Jenkins and Allison Kay Jenkins. May their love of learning be a lifelong pursuit bringing them the joy and happiness that they have brought to my life.

Acknowledgements

Sincere gratitude and appreciation must be expressed to the numerous individuals who provided encouragement, direction, and hours of guidance both in the graduate coursework and in this dissertation. They will always be remembered. First, I wish to express my appreciation to Dr. Fred Galloway as the chairman of my dissertation committee. The long hours of guidance and counseling he provided inspired a dedication to excellence within this work. Also, to Dr. Paula Cordeiro and Dr. Robert Donmoyer, who served on my dissertation committee, I must express a heartfelt thank you for the encouragement and direction they both provided. A very special thank you goes to all of the members of the dissertation committee.

I wish to express my gratitude to T. C. Kao, my friend, who made it possible for me to pursue this course of study. I also wish to thank Dr. Dan Miller for his contribution to this work, who although not a committee member gave his time. Thank you also goes to Dr. Ray Latta who introduced me to the program. Thank you to all of my professors at San Diego State University and the University of San Diego.

To Rebecca Brown, Jacky Chan, Christian Schumann and Rosie Rodriguez, I express my appreciation for your support in distributing and collecting the instruments used in this study. To Greg Stout and Brian Pai, I express my thanks for assistance in understanding the statistical procedures used within the study. To

Dr. Philip Brown, thank you for your encouragement. The long hours of attending to the tedious details of this dissertation are only a minor inconvenience when compared to the friendships gained and professional relationships developed during the entire course of study.

Table of Contents

List of Tables   **xv**

Chapter I

Introduction

The enormous influx in the number of international students studying in American colleges and universities during the past five decades has presented those institutions with numerous challenges accommodating the needs of these "special" students. In the early 1950's, fewer than 40,000 international students were enrolled in the higher education system of the United States. Today, according to Davis (1999), that number has grown in excess of 490,000 students. One of the reasons for this remarkable growth relates to the Fulbright Act of 1944. This act intended to promote international goodwill through the exchanging of students, faculty, culture, and science. By 1965, the number of international students had grown to just over 80,000. At the end of the 1970s that number had doubled. In the next decade, the international student population doubled again. Although such startling increases have not continued, the total number of international students in the U.S. continued to rise steadily each year.

Additional information regarding the number of international students studying in the U.S. is reported by Sarkodie-Mensah (1998). In this journal article, Sarkodie-Mensah discusses the history of the international student growth in the U.S. and provides tables depicting the growth patterns. Sarkodie-Mensah suggests that although the number of students continues to grow there is an end to the rapid growth patterns observed in the past; however, the problems these students bring with them have increased proportionately to their population. The best source for information regarding international students comes from The Institute of International Education (IIE). IIE has provided a comprehensive report on international educational exchange since 1948 in its

1

annual publication known as "Opendoors." The report provides information regarding the numbers of international students in the United States, their majors, the destinations of these students, intensive English programs, and countries of origin along with other related data. These international students come to the United States from countries all around the globe bringing with them, not only their personal problems, but also the problems associated with the adjustment to living within another culture.

Statement of the Problem

When American colleges and universities accept international students for enrollment, these institutions must assume some of the responsibility for meeting the unique needs of these individuals. The institution has a responsibility for their international students, but these students also must assume a certain degree of responsibility for themselves. This dual or shared responsibility suggests an array of questions: How have colleges and universities responded to the needs of international students? Is this response of the institution both appropriate and adequate? What are the perceptions of the international student regarding their adjustment problems, and what perceptions do student affairs personnel, university staff, and faculty have of the problems of international students? Understanding the perceptions of both international students and university officials charged with working with these students would be a helpful first step in designing more adequate and appropriate strategies to meet the international student's needs. Developing policies and programs for international students should be based, in part, upon input received from them.

The problems confronted by international students studying in the U.S. are often addressed by programs within the university or by university personnel. Sometimes the

perceptions of university personnel differ in important ways from the reality of these students, and consequently, at times programs fail to address the most important issues faced by international students. Research needs to contribute to our understanding of these issues and provide direction for institutions so that the peculiar needs of international students are not neglected.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is three-fold. This study first attempts to identify what adjustment problems international students have while attending American institutions of higher learning. Second, the study identifies some of the causes of the variances in these problems. The third purpose of this study is to identify the perceptions that university personnel working directly with international students have regarding the severity and nature of the adjustment problems of internationals students. Comparing the data of the international students and university personnel helps provide insight into the new programs and policies, services and activities that are needed at the respective universities. The sample consists of international students from two private universities and university personnel who work directly with these students.

Research Questions

This study endeavors to answer the following research questions.

1. What adjustment problems do international students enrolled in a college or university in the U.S. experience?

2. To what extent does gender, marital status, country of origin (Taiwan, Japan, Hong Kong), time at the university under one year, and what university the student attended explain the variation in the student's perceptions of their

adjustment problems?

3. What perceptions do university faculty and staff hold concerning the types of problems encountered by international students in the United States?

4. To what extent does gender, whether or not a person has lived or worked abroad, position at the university, and what university the individual works at explain the variation in the university personnel's perceptions of internationals students adjustment problems?

5. To what extent do the perceptions of these adjustment problems differ between international students and university personnel?

Methodology

This quantitative study used a survey instrument developed by Dr. John W. Porter (1962) named the Michigan International Student Problem Inventory (MISPI) (see Appendix A). The instrument consists of 11 categories and 132 item questions (see Appendix B) associated with terminology common to student services departments within many universities. The instrument has been used in approximately 80 other studies during the past 40 years. A second instrument adapted from the MISPI by this researcher was used with the personnel at these universities to measure their perceptions of the problems of international students. The Michigan International Advisor Perception of Student Problem Inventory (MIAPSPI) (see Appendix C) consists of only the 11 categories found within the MISPI. The reason for the use of a shortened questionnaire with the university personnel was because the 132 items on the MISPI were too detailed for university personnel to respond to specifically. For example, the MISPI asks students to rate their concerns about political discussions, but it is unlikely that university

personnel would have such a detailed knowledge of students that would enable them to respond to such specific questions. To solve this problem, a definition based on the items within each category was provided for each of the questions that the university personnel were asked to respond to on the survey. As such, the definition assists the participant in understanding the nature of the category. In addition to the categorical information collected, the instruments also gathered demographic data from the survey respondents.

At the end of each instrument, international students and university personnel were asked to respond to three open-ended questions concerning what programs and policies, activities and services on their campus meet the needs of international students. The questions also asked these individuals to suggest additional programming needs at their university. These data were categorized by reoccurring themes, and their responses are reported at the end of the data analysis section of chapter four. The relationship between these data and the quantitative data is also discussed.

Data Analysis

A paired sample t-test was used to compare the means of the students, faculty/staff, and the faculty/staff and students of a given university to determine if a statistically significant difference existed between any of the groups. The means were an important way to determine the extent of a problem to the international students or as perceived by university personnel. A mean of 1 to 1.5 meant "no problem" whereas a mean of 1.5 to 2.5 meant a "minor problem" existed. A mean of 2.5 to 3.5 indicated a "moderate problem" while a mean higher than 3.5 indicated a "major problem." When significant differences existed, explanations for these differences were sought.

The data were analyzed using multiple linear regression techniques that compare

seven independent variables with 11 dependent variables. The independent variables included gender, marital status, and country of origin (Taiwan, Japan, Hong Kong). They also included the number of years at the university and what university the student attended. The 11 dependent variables included the admissions and selection services, orientation services, academic advising and records, social-personal activities, living-dining services, religious services, health services, English language, student activities, financial aid services, and placement services. Each of these 11 categories contains 12 items that were aggregated to determine the amount of variance each contributes to the category. The advantage of using a multiple linear regression technique is that the variance within the dependent variable can be controlled at one time for each of the independent variables permitting a more sophisticated evaluation of the data and a clearer understanding of the causes of the variances. The problems of international students are ranked according to their importance by use of mean scores and as much of the variance as possible is explained. These data were then compared with the data collected from the university personnel to identify differences in the perceptions of these two groups.

The open-ended responses were categorized by reoccurring themes. These themes, along with representative data, are reported in a description of the findings located at the end of chapter four. The total number of references to each theme is also reported.

Significance of the Study

The significance of this study is that few studies in the past have compared the perceptions of university personnel to the common problems experienced by international students. This study attempts to determine how well university personnel perceive the problems of international students. The stated problems of these international students

and the stated perceptions of the university personnel provided insight into whether or not the needs of international students were met during their sojourn at the university. The data also provided a basis for ongoing assessment of programs, services, and policies at the university. The result is that these institutions are in a position to initiate new programs or redefine and extend existing programs to increase the quality of service offered to the international students on their campuses. Furthermore, since few studies have been conducted with private universities, this study contributed to the general body of literature. Another importance of the study is that student populations at two schools can be compared whereas most other studies have engaged students in a study from only one university.

Definition of Terms

1) <u>Adjustment</u>. The process through which individuals become integrated into a new environment.

2) <u>Alienation</u>. A lack of a sense of belonging, powerlessness, and estrangement.

3) <u>Culture Shock</u>. The conflict that results from cross-cultural experiences.

4) <u>ESL</u>. An acronym for English as a second language.

5) <u>F-1 Students (J-Visas)</u>. An international student visa permitting entrance into the U.S. for the purpose of study or training only.

6) <u>IEP</u>. An acronym for Intensive English Program. A university program designed to assist international students in their use of the English language in order to ready them for entrance into the academic program.

7) <u>International Student (Foreign Student)</u>. Any student who speaks a first language that is not English, and is not an American citizen.

8)   Problems. Any concerns, fears, frustrations, difficulties, or worries related to attending an American university.

9)   Sojourner. A person living, working, or studying in a foreign country.

10)   Stress. The pressures of a new culture or environment leading to feelings of frustration, anxiety, or loss encountered by international students.

11)   Student Affairs. The organizational structure responsible for out-of-class education of students. This organization often assists students with non-academic type problems or concerns.

12)   Test of English as a Second Language (TOEFL). This entrance exam determines admission to university based upon an international student's English speaking, listening, reading, and writing ability.

Delimitations and Limitations

The population studied included only international students enrolled in, and student services personnel working at two small, private universities. This is a limitation of the study. The study is further limited by the use of only non-native English speaking international students in the study. Only students enrolled in the fall of 2000 were used as participants, and the students were required to use the English language, which is not their first language, to respond on the questionnaire.

Organization of the Dissertation

This dissertation is divided into five chapters. Chapter one includes the statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, and a statement describing the significance of the study. The chapter also includes a brief introduction to the methodology and data analysis techniques used in the research. Furthermore, the chapter

outlines the limitations of the study, discusses the issue of confidentiality, and defines unusual terms within the study. This paragraph on the organization of the dissertation and a summary of the chapter completes chapter one. Chapter two is a review of the literature regarding the problems of international students. Chapter three outlines the quantitative methodology used within the study and describes the procedures used in the study. The data analysis methods are discussed and the research questions are outlined. The chapter, furthermore, describes the instruments used in the study, the sample used in the study, and the setting for the research. Finally, a more elaborate description of the delimitations and limitations of the research are provided along with a confidentiality statement. Chapter four discusses the findings of the study and includes a description of the respondents and a description of problem areas identified by the study. Chapter five is a summary of the study including a discussion of the limitations of the study, conclusions of the study, recommendations of the study, and suggestions for further research.

Chapter II

Review of Related Literature

Introduction

International students enrolled in American universities are confronted with an array of cultural, social, psychological, and practical problems related to daily living that pose a genuine threat to their physical and emotional well-being. Pedersen (1991) states:

When international students arrive at overseas universities, the circumstances suddenly and simultaneously impose a variety of competing and sometimes contradictory roles that must be learned. When the requirements of those roles are realistically perceived and effectively learned, the student's experience is likely to be "successful," but when the roles are not accommodated, the resulting identity diffusion and role conflict may affect the student's emotional well-being, and present serious obstacles to the achievement of educational objectives (p. 10).

Numerous research projects have attempted to identify and define the problems of international students, but it is imperative for universities to understand that these problems are not issues for these international students alone. These problems are also the problems of the university. They must be addressed if universities are to accept any of the responsibility they assumed when international students were invited to further their education at the university.

This review of the literature is organized into three general areas related to international student problems and student affairs. Section one concerns the most immediate challenges facing international students, culture shock, and attempts to define and identify the causes of culture shock. The section also outlines the stages of culture

10

shock experienced by virtually every international student enrolled in an American university. Section two identifies a broad range of research topics related to many issues important to international students enrolled in American universities. These involve academic, health, and adjustment concerns and include such topics as stress and use of the library. In addition, many of the instruments used in the study of international students are reviewed in the section. Section three reviews the perceptions of student services and student affairs personnel as related to international students. The section also attempts to identify how the leadership within American universities has responded, or should respond, to the specific needs of the international student.

Culture Shock Defined

Refugees, businesspersons on assignment overseas, immigrants, and international students all experience the problems associated with living in a foreign culture. Dulebohn (1989) states that historically culture shock was "explained as a disease from which the sojourner would ideally recover from over time" (p. 1). Often referred to as "nostalgia" and defined as extreme homesickness, Oberg (1960) wrote that, "culture shock is precipitated by the anxiety that results from losing all our familiar signs and symbols of social intercourse"(p. 177). Dulebohn (1989) views culture shock as a normal psychological reaction caused by an encounter with an unfamiliar culture, but not as a disease such as Oberg (1960) suggested (p. 4). Pederson (1995) explains the current perspective of culture shock when he says: "First, culture shock is not a disease but a learning process, however uncomfortable or painful it might be. Culture shock may, however, be connected with disease and pathological states or may result in unhealthy reactions under the right conditions" (p. 11). Culture shock is a learning experience in the

sense that many of its problems are eliminated when individuals adapt through learning to the changes they experience in their environment and to the different life style experienced in a different culture. Culture shock can lead to pathological states when depression results from an individual's inability to learn and adapt to the new culture.

Whatever view one takes, the reality is that "cultural (or culture) shock is a multifaceted experience resulting from numerous stressors occurring in contact with a different culture," as Winkelman (1994) suggests, (p. 121). Culture shock is the feeling of alienation, confusion, and depression. It involves a sense of loss, excitement, or surprise that people encounter in unfamiliar cultures. Winkelman (1994) suggests that culture shock results from the challenge of living in new cultural surroundings and losing a familiar cultural environment effecting people psychologically and physiologically.

The effects of culture shock are experienced by most sojourners who pass through a number of stages while experiencing culture shock. Some researchers outline a five-stage model of culture shock (Adler, 1975, Pederson, 1995). According to other researchers, individuals living in another culture experience four phases or stages of culture shock (Ferraro, 1990; Kohls, 1984; Oberg, 1954). Winkelman (1994) maintains that these stages are "sequential and cyclical" and include the following phases (p. 123).

- The honeymoon or tourist phase: This phase consists of a period of time of excitement, idealization, and euphoria related to all of the new experiences of living in a different culture. Similarities between the host culture and the individual's culture validate the continued use of cultural behaviors. The problem is that the new culture is viewed from one's ethnocentrism since the person is still integrated with his or her own culture.

- <u>The crisis phase:</u> This phase relates to individual characteristics, but generally develops within a few weeks of arrival in a new culture. Negative experiences created by an inability to manage problems identify this phase. Tension and frustration begin to grow because of the differences in the cultures not only related to behaviors, but also related to values and attitudes the sojourner experiences.

- <u>The adjustment and reorientation phase:</u> Individuals learn to adjust to a new environment in this phase. Adaptation is the key to this stage of development. It is first marked by a rejection of the second culture. A growing sense of being different and a rejection of the second culture is replaced with an ability to accommodate oneself in the new culture.

- <u>The adaptation, resolution, or acculturation stage:</u> This stage is achieved when an individual develops stability by learning how to manage the new culture, resolve problems, and adapt to the environment. (pp. 123-4) Skills and understanding of the new culture are acquired in this stage of development.

The five-stage model names the stages as contact, disintegration, reintegration, autonomy, and independence stages. The difference with the four-stage model is that the adjustment and reorientation phase of the four-stage model is divided in the five-stage model. There is an over-lapping of experiences between stages in either model. These four stages or five stages are sequential indicating that they occur one after the other and are to some degree predictable. They are also cyclical indicating that they are reoccurring even as the amplitude of the problems diminishes over time. The sojourner adapts to the environment by degrees and is destined to relive the experience of culture shock

throughout the sojourn period sometimes to a greater and sometimes to a lesser degree.

The causes of culture shock include stress reaction, cognitive fatigue, role shock, and personal shock. Pederson (1991) writes, "Of all the roles confronting the international student, perhaps the most diffuse and difficult to fulfill is the stereotypes of what international students are supposed to be. There is a perception of international students as helplessly confronting all kinds of problems, defenseless and bewildered" (p. 13). These problems are not only associated with international students, but with all sojourners. Dulebohn (1989) identifies the essence of the problem of the sojourner by stating that "a culture provides structure for a community and individuals with a predictable world order" (p. 15). When a sojourner is confronted with the unpredictable world order of a different culture the experience can be extremely upsetting and stressful. Therefore, the sojourner experiences culture shock. There is a collision between the two cultures. Dulebohn (1989) remarks that "a sojourner experiences shock because he has left the safe, predictable haven of his natural culture and has entered a strange world" (p. 35). Therefore, that international students experience culture shock is an expected phenomenon even though it can be traumatic and debilitating. Concern for international students, therefore, behooves us to identify their problems and develop programs designed to resolve the conflicts that are confronted daily during their sojourn in the United States.

International Students Issues

This section of the literature review examines the broad range of specific problems encountered by international students. The topics include entry and re-entry problems, health care issues, psychological problems, and library issues. The review also

examines some of the measurement scales developed in the research conducted with internationals students. Even the travel concerns of international students have been studied. This is not to suggest that the study of any topic has been exhaustive or that additional research questions cannot be formulated in the study of any of these topics; however, the broad range of concerns regarding international students is reflected in the literature.

Re-entry Issues

Numerous studies have been conducted concerning the re-entry difficulties of international students as they return to their homelands. Pai (1996) found that the re-entry problems of Taiwanese students were affected by gender, willingness to return home, parental expectations, career considerations, and lifestyle in Taiwan. Of the 427 surveys mailed, 191 returnees (44.7%) responded to a mailed survey that evaluated the effects of the 11 variables on the re-entry problems of Taiwanese students. The variables included: age, gender, academic level, field of study, time overseas, overall satisfaction with overseas experience, willingness to return home, motivation for re-entry/re-entry reasons, time since return, change of home society/environment, and perceived treatment from home people. Furthermore, Pai (1996) determined that there was a statistically significant relationship between satisfaction in life, satisfaction with the overseas experience, and willingness to return home.

In a similar research project, Tsukada (1996) conducted a qualitative study of 41 returning Japanese students and found that a relationship existed between a student's willingness to re-embrace the Japanese culture and the degree of bad experiences encountered by the student while in the United States. There were 14 male and 27 female

participants in the study ranging in age from 23 to 42. The researcher conducted in depth interviews using an unstructured question format. The interviews were conducted in Japan in the homes of the students. All of these students had attended the University of Hawaii, and had returned to Japan between 1990 and 1993. This fact does limit the generalizing of the study. Tsukada writes, "Most of interviewees recalled their experiences in their host culture as fun, wonderful, and educational" (p. 62). Negative experiences, however, were attributed mainly to English language proficiency that hindered progress in their respective programs. The findings of the study show that students who had more problems in the U.S. had fewer problems upon their re-entry into the Japanese culture. An interesting aspect of the study relates to the motivation of these students for studying in the U.S., since many of them were dissatisfied with Japanese culture.

An Andrews University quantitative study by Bourget-Tactuk (1998) identifies seven main effects of variables studied and ten significant interactive effects for variables unrelated to the research hypotheses. These unrelated variables were included because changing the instruments used in the study was not possible without questioning the reliability of the instrument. One of four instruments used provided for a self-assessment and was developed by the researcher. Part one of the instrument gathered demographic data while part two identified re-entry problems in the areas of cultural adjustment, social adjustment, linguistic aspects, educational aspects, professional aspects, adjustment to required church work, and national and political conditions. One and two-way ANOVAs were used to analysis the data. The other three instruments were developed by other researchers and were designed to evaluate re-entry difficulties within specific societies

such as Japanese and Indonesian. Bourget-Tactuk states, "Only 96 surveys were returned out of the 324 distributed" (p. 70). Five of these were not usable so the return rate amounted to 28%. Bourget-Tactuk found that marital status, level of degree program, location of Andrews University, use of the English language and socialization with students from the home country represent significant student characteristics that shaped expectations of re-entry problems. Bourget-Tactuk states, "When looking at each of the seven areas of the re-entry experience, students were concerned about educational aspects in the return experience, followed by national and political conditions, and professional aspects" (p. 144). An important recommendation of the study relates to a universities responsibility to provide re-entry counseling for returning students.

Martha Denney (1986) has authored a text titled "Going Home: A Workbook for Re-entry and Professional Integration." This text is designed for international students and assists them in planning a program of study, building a professional network, and preparing to go home. This workbook was developed in cooperation with the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA). A second text by Nobleze Asuncion-Lande (1975), "A Program Guide for a Re-Entry/Transition Seminar-Workshop," is a guide to developing re-entry and transition workshops. The program guide was developed as part of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities Model Programs Inventory Project. Although these books can be helpful to international students and universities alike, more research needs to be conducted into the problems of re-entry.

<u>Non-return Issues</u>

An opposite problem of re-entry difficulties is the problem of students desiring to remain in the U.S. and not return to their homeland. A survey-correlational study

conducted by Negash (1988) sought the reasons why students choose to remain in the host country instead of returning to their homeland. The 80-question survey was responded to from samples drawn at Stanford University and the University of Southern California, and included 200 enrolled and 100 alumni from both universities. Negash (1988) found that students married to spouses from their home country tended to return home. He also determined that students who needed to contribute to their family welfare, or were previously employed in their homeland tended to return home; however, he also discovered that students with a higher proportion of American friends, those who had become permanent residents, and those who stay in the United States longer tend to remain in the host country permanently. Those with relatives in the United States were found to be more likely to stay. Africans and those with a stronger original intent to return to their homeland tended to return home. Students struggle with the issue of whether or not to return to their homeland or remain in the U.S.

Pre-entry Issues

Petress (1995) conducted a qualitative study into the imagined interactions of Chinese students before beginning their studies in the United States. He guided 56 interviews with Chinese students with a mean age of 24.2 years. The respondents included 38 males and 18 female students participating in 16 academic fields. The interviews lasted up to 90 minutes while asking 40 questions in the same sequence with each of the students. Petress found that almost half of these students rehearsed meetings or interviews with others relevant to their foreign study before the actual meetings or interviews were conducted. He also discovered that the participants reviewed and evaluated the rehearsals. The reason he determined these students participated in such

rehearsals was because recommendations of advisors in Chinese universities are rarely ignored. Thus these students were determined to have a positive interaction with any advisor they encountered during their sojourn. Petress also found that there were significant gender differences concerning the topics of the meeting and interviews rehearsed, length of the rehearsals, and language use during the rehearsal. Petress concluded that, "being aware of the needs, attitudes, values, and belief differences between Chinese students and American students can help support personnel..." (p. 60).

Health Issues

Another area of research related to international students that has received some attention is the health care issue. Harju and Long (1998) conducted a study into the reaction of international students to U.S. health care. They surveyed 107 international students at a large public university using the International Student Health Care (ISHC) questionnaire jointly designed by the authors and a committee at the university. The questionnaire contained 20 demographically related questions concerned with health care and counseling services used by the students. The researchers found that a large percentage (92%) of these students used campus health care services. However, women used the services significantly more than men. The services were commonly used for treatment of illness or injury. Other uses of the services included pharmacy and examinations. Only 14% of the students used counseling services. These services were mainly used for adjustment or family issues as opposed to academic pressure issues. The researchers found that "some students were disappointed by long waits for treatment, staff who were perceived as incompetent as well as not being seen by a medical doctor" (p. 116). The authors recommended that more research into the topic of health care is

necessary and that cross-cultural training programs need to be developed for health care providers.

NAFSA has published a workbook (1989) entitled "Optimizing Health Care for Foreign Students in the United States and American Students Abroad." The workbook is organized around 15 guidelines for improving health care for international students and provides an instrument for the self-assessment of health care personnel. Topics include: understanding cultural differences, improving orientation programs, and overcoming challenges in providing health care to international students. Also, in a paper presented at the annual NAFSA conference, Charlotte Siegel (1983) suggested that, "because foreign student advisors (FSA) have a cross-cultural perspective as well as a knowledge of the campus health system, they can play an important part in linking foreign students and health care providers".

Yi (1989) conducted a mixed methodology study into the eating disorders of Asian-American college females. Using the Eating Disorders Inventory, Yi surveyed 82 Japanese female college students and 80 American female college students while also interviewing four students diagnosed with bulimia nervosa. Yi found that the group showed less drive for thinness and that the degree and type of acculturation were non-significantly correlated with the degree of problematic eating. Yi concluded that assimilation into the American culture by Asian immigrant women does not reflect in increased eating disorders.

The area of health care that has received the most attention in research is that of counseling international students. Lee and Mixson (1995) conducted research into the perceived effectiveness of counseling both Asian and Caucasian clients. They state that

"Asians in America have also been shown to use counseling services different than Caucasians" (p. 48). These researchers surveyed 400 students consisting of 255 Caucasian, 73 Asian, and 72 from other ethnic backgrounds. A two-page questionnaire grouped items into three areas including demographic questions, questions regarding the perceived helpfulness of counseling, and use of counseling services. The researchers found that Asian students were on average three years younger than the Caucasian students who sought counseling. Asians were also more likely to seek career-vocational advice through counseling whereas Caucasian students sought personal-social-emotional counseling. Furthermore, Asians rated counselors significantly lower in competence than Caucasians, and also rated counseling less helpful than did the Caucasians. One conclusion that the researchers came to is that multicultural counseling competencies need to become part of counselor training and practice.

In another study, Sandhu and Asrabadi (1991) assessed the psychological needs of international students and the implications for counseling in their research. The researchers field-tested the new Acculturative Stress Scale for International Students (ASSIS) in an attempt to help international students more effectively. The ASSIS consists of 125 Likert-type statements that reviewed 12 major factors identifying acculturation difficulties. A total of 136 students from 27 countries responded from ten randomly chosen universities in the United States. Statistical analysis of the data revealed that international students perceive alienation as their greatest concern. That alienation appears to be caused by international students seeking co-nationals for support and by American students being complacent about the need to reach out to international students. Other findings concluded that loneliness was a major factor in the adjustment problems

of international students. Stress due to change, fear of the unknown, and perceived racial discrimination were other major factors causing problems for these students. The researchers recommended that counselors, student advisors, and others be more proactive in their approach to helping international students. Counseling needs to be offered on a continuous basis. Orientation programs must be ongoing and comprehensive. International students need to be encouraged to become involved in campus activities. They also need to be encouraged to use available campus services.

In a study reflecting a review of the literature, Khoo and Abu-Rasain (1994) discuss the strategies used in counseling international students. This literature review defines the problems of international students, reviews the stages of development of culture shock, and makes numerous recommendations to counselors of international students. They suggest that every international student is different, but it is important for counselors to be aware of the background of their clients while using appropriate cross-cultural intervention strategies. They, furthermore, recommend that counselors modify their communication style, counseling strategy, and client expectations. The paper offers insight into the literature related to the counseling of international students.

A quantitative study conducted by Mau and Jepsen (1990) reports the help-seeking behaviors and perceptions of American and Chinese graduate students. The purpose of the study conducted at the University of Iowa in 1986 was to compare perceptions of problems and preferences for helpers. The sample consisted of 148 American and 102 Taiwan Chinese graduate students all of whom completed a four-page questionnaire developed by the investigators. The questionnaire was divided into two parts including help-seeking perceptions and behaviors and attitudes towards counselors

and the counseling process. Only the responses to the first part of the questionnaire were reported in this article. The first section of the questionnaire was derived from the Mooney Problem Check List and consisted of 10 items. This checklist was developed in 1950 and uses a 4-point Likert scale. Respondents indicate agreement or disagreement related to ten potential problem areas of student satisfaction with university life (Mooney, 1950). The questionnaire was pre-tested with 25 American and 25 Chinese students after which it was modified to the form reported in the article. The research reflected a significant difference in perceptions of problems by nationality in seven problem areas. Health, financial, personal-psychological, vocational-educational, courtship, sex and marriage were areas of significant differences with Americans perceiving six of the seven areas as more serious problems than the Chinese. The Chinese students considered only the vocational and educational item more serious. A MANOVA yielded a significant difference in perception of problems by nationality. A follow-up ANOVA on the problem areas also yielded differences; however, no significant differences were found in length of study or fields of study. The American and Chinese students did agree on choice of helpers for all areas, choosing first to seek help from fellow students before seeking help from a teacher. The research does not suggest that Chinese students encounter problems more often than American students.

Stress Issues

Stress has been identified by researchers as a specific and serious problem confronted by international students. Many studies have specified the areas of most concern that produce stress for international students. Numerous measurement scales have been developed to determine the level of international student stress. Both

quantitative and qualitative studies have been conducted. The studies reviewed below provide insight into the vast reservoir of information related to stress in international students.

Seven factors that predict stress among international students was the research topic of Cho (1988). Three questionnaires were mailed to 245 international students from Korea, the Arab nations, and Nigeria studying at the University of Missouri in Columbia, Missouri. A response rate of 72% included the 177 questionnaires that were returned. All Nigerian students received the questionnaire, however only 100 out of 135 Korean students, and 100 out of 131 Arab nations students were mailed the questionnaires. No explanation was provided for why the researcher did not include international students from other countries in this study. The samples were chosen randomly by use of a random number generator after the names of all students were arranged alphabetically. Cho indicates that one instrument used was the "State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI), A Self-Evaluation Questionnaire constructed by Spielberger (1970)," (p. 39). Another instrument used was the "Depression Adjective Check Lists (DACL), constructed by Lubin (1989)," Cho says (p. 41). The researcher developed the third unnamed instrument and pilot tested the instrument. The seven stress factors Cho identified included English language proficiency, social interaction with Americans, social interaction with co-nationals, social international with other internationals, career certainty, health conditions, and financial condition. Cho found that the two best predictors of stress producing factors were anxiety due to their interactions with Americans and their health conditions. When international students have frequent contact with American students there is a lower level of stress for them. Poor health is an indicator of higher stress levels with

international students. The two best predictors of depression were found to be interactions with Americans and nationality. Again more interaction with American students indicated less depression. Koreans appear to have greater levels of stress and depression than Arab students indicating that country of origin is a factor needing consideration regarding the health issues of international students. An important finding of the study was that international students seek psychological help from professional counselors on campus as a last resort. Counselors need to be sensitive to the level of stress and depression these students are experiencing knowing how difficult coming to counseling is for them.

Mallinckrodt and Leong (1992) researched the level of stressors and stress symptoms in the lives of international graduate students at a large eastern university. There were 106 international student participants who returned the surveys distributed by the researchers. American students returned 166 surveys. These numbers represent a return rate of 62%. The researchers adapted the Life Events Survey Scale for use. "Stress symptoms were measured with the Bell Global Psychopathology Scale..." (p. 73). The scores were composed of the sums each student experienced with a given symptom over the previous 6 months. The purpose of the study was to determine the most helpful types of social support for international graduate students. Mallinckrodt (1992) states, "Findings for the aggregate sample suggest that quality relationships with faculty, faculty interest in students' professional development, and the quality of instruction perceived by students can provide a strong protective function against the development of depression in international students undergoing stress" (p. 76). The quality of the relationship between international students and faculty is important to these students coping with the

with the problem of stress.

The Acculturative Stress Scale for International Students (ASSIS) was used to measure international student's concern related to six acculturative stress themes by Ninggal (1998). The ASSIS consists of a 36-item Likert format questionnaire. A total of 138 international students participated in the study conducted at Western Michigan University. Six demographic issues were compared to the stress themes including gender, academic major, financial sponsorship, family socioeconomic status, type of residential setting, and scores on the Test of English as a Second Language (TOEFL). Ninggal (1998) found that Malay students experienced higher stress levels on all six measures than did either Chinese or Indian students. The homesickness stress theme was found to pose the greatest problem for the three groups mentioned above, however, differences were noted among age groups and student types of sponsorship. Other findings indicated that discrimination, hate, culture shock, guilt, and fear produced stress for these students.

Wilson (1990) conducted a study among East Asian international students using both quantitative and qualitative techniques in gathering data. The purpose of the study was to describe the adjustment concerns and stressors of East Asian international students and to identify coping behaviors and help-seeking behaviors of these students. Wilson used the International Student Questionnaire "designed by Parr, Bradley and Bingi (1992) of the Texas Tech University, School of Education" (pp. 41-2). The questionnaire has 66 items of concern rated on a 6-point Likert-type scale ranging from great concern to no concern, or very frequently to very infrequently (p. 42). Students from four Northeastern United States universities participated in the study. Of the 200 surveys distributed, there were 109 students who responded to the survey for a return rate of 54%. The students

were from China (42), Japan (30), Taiwan (21) and Korea (16). The qualitative dimension of the research consisted of a semi-structured interview with 11 students who volunteered for the study in response to an introductory letter and follow-up telephone call. The interviews lasted approximately an hour and thirty minutes. A pilot test of the interview questions was conducted with two subjects. Wilson (1990) found that there were no significant differences between males and females concerning any stressors. There were also no significant differences between countries in preferences for using various help sources or coping behaviors. The findings reveal that international students are concerned most with their academic achievement, maintaining contact with their families, having adequate financial support, language problems, and cultural adjustment. However, generally speaking about international students Wilson (1990) states, "Their emotional profile depicts them as rather positive and robust, with dominant feelings of determination, confidence and happiness" (p. 74). The interview findings reaffirmed the findings of the quantitative data. Wilson (1990) states, "All of the students identified succeeding academically as being one of their greatest concerns" (p. 93). Involvement with faculty was also said to be important by the students. Another concern frequently expressed related to the problem of homesickness and loneliness because of separation from their families. Students identified friends as their most frequent source of help regarding personal problems followed by parents and relatives. In general, international students reluctantly used university resources to solve their problems, and Wilson suggests that this phenomenon deserves research attention. Wilson believes that international students are confronted with a large number of problems, but adjust to life within another culture with positive attitudes and adaptability.

Parr, Bradley and Bingi (1992) developed the International Student Questionnaire in an attempt to answer three research questions. "The first asked, what are the concerns of international students and how might their concerns be best classified" (Parr, p. 21)? "The second question concerned whether students' concerns were related to their feeling" (p. 21). "The third question addressed whether the magnitude of students' concerns and feeling varied significantly across demographic differences such as sex and race" (p. 21). There were 234 respondents to the survey, which was a return rate of 34%. These researchers distributed surveys to students attending both small private and large public universities from various regions of the United States. The researchers found that the areas of greatest concern were extended family, cultural differences, finances, and academics. Areas of least concern included socialization, practical necessities, and use of time. The profile described of international students is one of a robust student with moderately intensive concerns. International students possess a positive attitude and appear to handle stress-producing experiences adequately. The next section of the review is similar in nature, but identifies more broadly the comprehensive nature of the problems with which international students are confronted.

Adjustment Issues

Zhong (1996) conducted an ethnographic study of Chinese students adaptation to the American culture and what affects the process. The researcher interviewed three graduate students attending a large mid-western university. The subjects included two male students and one female student. Each of the subjects had spent a different length of time in the U.S. The interviews lasted for approximately an hour. The researcher reports that all three subjects were very positive about their experiences in the U.S. They were all

"content with how Americans in general treat them," Zhong stated (p. 14). The researcher

also found that these three subjects considered the language barrier to be the most

important problem with which they were confronted. The subjects had expected to

experience culture shock and viewed it as unavoidable. In fact, none of them considered

100% adaptation as possible. The four stages of culture shock outlined by the interviewer

were reflected during the discussions with the subjects. There, however, appears to be

few other concerns for these individuals except for the communication process with

Americans. The value of this study is limited although it encourages a more extensive

qualitative approach to problem identification among international students.

Ying and Liese (1994) reported a study on the initial adjustment of Taiwanese

students to the U.S. The purpose of the study was to measure factors that influence

adjustment. The researchers developed a multidimensional model of adjustment

consisting of nine dimensions based on a review of the literature. The sample consisted of

172 students who were recruited in Taiwan with the cooperation of the Taiwan Ministry

of Education at a large education seminar attended by thousands of students anticipating

studying in the U.S. The follow-up was conducted a few months after their arrival in the

U.S. Students completed the questionnaire written in Chinese and an instrument referred

to as the CPI that was written in English. The researchers found that students who were

better prepared by learning about the host culture, academic setting, or who developed

future support networks for overseas study reported higher levels of adjustment. The

entire group was found to possess a moderately high level of adjustment, but those

experiencing more homesickness, relationship, cultural, and academic problems reported

poorer adjustment. Interestingly, language was not significantly correlated with

adjustment in this study.

Another study by Sun and Chen (1997) related to the dimensions of difficulty that Chinese students encounter in the U.S. These researchers conducted in-depth interviews with ten Mainland Chinese students enrolled in a mid-size public university. They found that the most difficult problems facing Chinese students in the study were making American friends, English language problems, and understanding cultural values. Food, clothing, recreation, transportation, and finances were not important problems for these students.

Academic Issues

Academic achievement is an important issue to international students. Research into the academic problems of international students has revealed the specific concerns surrounding this issue including their English ability and test taking skills. The following research projects are examples.

Stoynoff (1997) discusses the factors associated with the academic achievement of international students. The study was conducted in the fall of 1989 at a large, public northwestern university. There were 77 freshman respondents out of a total of 87 participating in a mixed methodological study. During the first weeks of the semester, the students completed the Learning and Study Strategies Inventory (LASSI). Following their second term of study, 18 students were involved in a 30-minute interview. These students were among the lowest and highest achievers according to their cumulative GPAs. The researchers found that the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) correlates significantly with GPA. The researcher also suggested that students who received training in study strategies had lower anxiety and had better test taking ability.

Test taking ability was correlated with higher grades (p. 60). Another factor that seems to influence academic achievement is whether or not students participate in a study group. Also, successful students frequently participated in a minimum of a three-hour study period per night. By providing services that accommodate the needs of these students as described above, universities can assist international students in adapting academically.

Stoynoff (1996) conducted another study among freshman students at the same school as the previous study reported. In this study, 27 students were interviewed for 30 minutes during the first two weeks of the spring, 1990 semester. The students were divided into high-, moderate-, and low-achievers according to their GPAs in the U.S. High achievers were found to study longer each night, take careful notes in class, review notes, and participate in study groups. The researcher also suggested that, "self-regulated learning strategies may play a role in achievement differences" (p. 333). Furthermore, it was found that higher achievers seek more social assistance than lower achievers.

Ladd and Ruby (1999) report on the learning-style preferences of graduate international students. These researchers used the Canfield Learning Styles Inventory with a group of 35 MBA students attending a state university. Ladd and Ruby imply that all 35 students participated in the study, but provide no return rate information in this article. The authors do not indicate how many other international students were attending this university or why they were not included in the research. The research found the MBA students preferred teaching methodologies such as group discussion more then the lecture method most experienced in their homeland. It was also found that these students' goals related to their immediate and specific interests. These students were also interested in having warm and close relationship with faculty members. They preferred helping

occupations, but need to adapt to solving problems rather than memorizing facts learned in a lecture.

Another study conducted by Kim and Sedlacek (1995) was concerned with the factors influencing an international student's social and academic success. These researchers surveyed 124 international students at a large, eastern university using the Non-cognitive Questionnaire (NCQ) composed of 29 multiple choice, open-ended, and Likert-type items. The questionnaire was designed to assess eight non-cognitive variables. The 124 students were attending an orientation meeting when the questionnaire was administered. No information is reported regarding how many international students attended this university, or why the research was limited to this group only. The researchers state, "From an interpretation of the factor analysis, it appears that these constructs are independent and are not measuring one overall variable accounting for international students' academic and social success" (p. 7). Different factors apparently account for different kinds of success. One importance of this finding is that research that measures one or two non-cognitive variables may miss important information that would contribute to a better understanding of international students. For students to achieve academically, it was found that social support systems should increase their satisfaction with their college experience. The researchers concluded that qualitative measures could be more helpful than closed-ended questionnaire items in understanding the international student experience.

International students are confronted with a myriad of problems that produce an enormous amount of stress. The resources that these students can marshal to combat these problems is limited. However, it does appear as if most international students adjust to

campus life in America successfully. The question becomes one of what responsibilities do the colleges and universities have to these students invited to become a part of the academic community. The final section of this literature review addresses the responsibility of the university to international students.

Library Issues

Another problem confronted by international students and receiving some attention of researchers is the use of the library. Ziegler (1997) surveyed ten mid-western universities regarding news sources the libraries provided for international students concerning their own countries. Ziegler found that international student centers on the campuses provided adequate country of origin news sources, but librarians failed to do so even though most librarians and students considered the library the likely source of such material.

Sarkodie-Mensah (1998) wrote a descriptive paper concerning the problem of international students and the campus library. The paper suggests that diversity on campus challenges librarians in their interactions with international students. Sarkodie-Mensah points out that pronunciation differences, intonation, and even cultural considerations should influence how librarians respond to international students. English is the second language of most international students and since that language is learned from different sources, word usage also varies among the students. Librarians need to be sensitive to these differences when communicating with international students. The importance of recognizing the differences between international students from different countries is emphasized in the paper.

Measurement Instrumentation

The last part of this section of the literature review concerns the various measurement scales that have been developed to evaluate the problems of international students. Many instruments accumulate data related to the problems of international students. Listed below are four examples of such instruments.

Shin and Abell (1999) developed an instrument referred to as the Homesickness and Contentment (HC) scale. This instrument was designed specifically for use with an Asian population " in measuring emotional and psychological adjustment to a new culture" (p. 45). Data were collected from 201 Chinese and Korean graduate married students and their spouses attending a large public university in the southeastern region of the United States where 786 international students were enrolled. There were 144 Chinese and 57 Korean students who returned usable questionnaires. The instrument was translated into the Korean language by Shin (1999) while another unnamed doctoral student translated the instrument into the Chinese language. Native speakers of the respective languages completed the translations of the instrument. The purpose of these translations was " so that participants who were not fluent in English could participate in this study" (p. 48). Shin and four Chinese interviewers conducted personal interviews with the participants as they completed the questionnaire. The findings of the research cannot be generalized because of the limited sample. Another weakness of the research that Shin and Abell (1999) indicate is that the "selection of relevant variables for analysis of convergent construct validity was restricted by length of the original data collection package..." (p. 52). More research needs to be conducted evaluating the reliability and validity of the HC scale as a measure of the emotional and psychological adjustment of

international students to a new culture.

Created by Sanhu and Portes (1996), The Cultural Adaptation Pain Scale (CAPS) was developed "to assess the degree of subjective pain, social distance, and discouragement that may be related to cultural adaptation" (p. 15). CAPS consists of a 150-item questionnaire containing 15 major themes of psychological pain. Ten items represented each theme. Two judges were used to rate the item relevancy after which 25 items were discarded because the inter-rater agreement of .88 was not found for these items. Following a pilot study, the final pool of 55 items using a 5-point Likert scale constituted the CAPS reported in the study. The study consisted of 192 students attending a large urban university in the mid-South. The sample consisted of university students and 28 of their peers including 18 secondary students 75% of which were Caucasian. Further studies need to validate the instrument and establish its test-retest reliability using larger samples. Sandhu (1996) states, however, "In sum, the CAPS seems to advance our understanding of cultural adaptation" (p. 21).

Another instrument is the East Asian Student Stress Inventory (EASSI) developed in a study by Chwee, Jainsan, and Perez (1998). The instrument measured stressors in the academic performance and social activities of Asian international students. The questionnaire was distributed to a sample of 300 non-randomly chosen Asian students at the University of North Texas, 235 of which were returned. The researchers administered and collected questionnaires in person from 50 of the respondents whereas the remaining participants completed the questionnaires without assistance that may have produced a sample bias. The sample consisted of 60% male and 40% female participants. Their average length of stay in the United States was one year and eight months. A panel of

seven experts from the University of North Texas Testing Center, Intensive English

Program, and International Student Office evaluated the cultural relevance of the EASSI,

and 71% of them found the instrument to be acceptable. The pool of items in the survey

was reduced from 57 to 39 items by the panel. The physiological dimension contained

five of the items while the social-psychological dimension contained 34 of the items. The

test reflected high reliability in both social-psychological and physiological sub-scales.

To test the construct validity, a principal components (PC) factor analysis was employed

and accounted for 62.8% of the total variance related to eight factors that were generated.

The instrument was deemed valid and reliable for measuring stress of East Asian college

students despite limitations that included homogeneous treatment of multiple cultures,

limited English ability of participants, and cultural reluctance of Asians to reveal personal

information.

Suinn and Ahuna (1992) report findings on a research project conducted to

evaluate the Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA). This report

is a follow-up to a research project conducted by Suinn in 1987. The subjects of the

research included 284 Asian-American university students from Colorado. The SL-ASIA

is a 21-item multiple choice questionnaire covering subjects including identity,

friendships, behaviors, and attitudes. According to Suinn (1992), "Cronback's alpha for

the SL-ASIA was found to be .91, comparable to the internal-consistency estimates of .88

reported in the study by Suinn et al. (1987), and .89 reported by Atkinson and Gim

(1989)" (Suinn, 1992, p.p. 53-54). These numbers confirm the concurrent validity and

reliability of the SL-ASIA. However, Ponterotto and Baluch (1998) also conducted a

study into the strengths and limitations of the SL-ASIA. These researchers identified 16

empirical studies using the SL-ASIA. They used only studies subject to peer review in their research and limited their study to published journal articles. They determined that "collectively, these data provide strong initial support for the convergent validity of the SL-ASIA" (p. 116). They also point out, however, that correlational tests must be conducted, that a satisfactory level of internal consistency exists, and that only moderate support for the criterion-related nature of the SL-ASIA exists. It was the intention of these researchers to begin an in depth discussion of the SL-ASIA which they considered to be the "leading Asian American acculturation measure reported in the counseling literature" (p. 117).

The broad range of research conducted related to the problems of international students is reflected in this section of the literature review. The following section of the literature review identifies stress as a serious problem confronted by international students.

Michigan International Student Problem Inventory (MISPI)

The development of the Michigan International Student Problem Inventory (MISPI) originated with a study conducted by John Porter (1962). The preceding year almost 70,000 international students were enrolled in institutions of higher learning in the United States. There were some 700 international students enrolled at Michigan State University where Porter (1962) conducted his research. Porter was interested in comparing the problems of American university students with those of international students. To do so, Porter used two instruments to conduct the research. The Mooney Problem Checklist was the instrument used to gather data from American students. There were 47 American students involved in the study whom completed this form. Porter

surveyed a small group of international students with this instrument in order to compare the findings with the MISPI and establish the validity and consistency of the instrument. The MISPI was used to gather data from 108 international students at Michigan State University. This instrument developed by Porter resulted from a review of the literature and as a result of questions developed during personal interviews with international students and Foreign Student Advisors at four universities in Michigan. Also, all of the questions on the instrument were referred to a panel of ten judges made up of professional educators in Michigan working with international students. Porter commented, "There were 5 revisions in the instrument from the initial construction in August, 1961 to the final form which was completed in February, 1962" (p. 102). The panel provided a final approval of the instrument. A pilot study was also conducted involving 29 international students from four universities in Michigan.

Porter (1962) suggests that the purpose of the study was to develop the instrument and to determine if the problems of international students differed from those of American students. Regarding the reliability of the instrument, Porter found a .58 estimate of reliability using the Kuder-Richardson Formula. He found an estimate of .67 using the Spearman-Brown split-half method for reliability. Porter suggests that there is evidence in his research that the MISPI can be used to help international students express their concerns, and to show differences among groups of international students. Furthermore, the MISPI can differentiate the problems of international students as compared to American students. Also, although not significant at the .10 level of significance, Porter suggests that female students reported more problems than male students and undergraduate students reported more problems than graduate students. He

also found that students on campus longer than 13 months experienced more problems than students on campus less than a year; however, younger students reported more problems than older students. Finally, non-Western students reported more problems than students from Western countries. Porter concludes that there are real differences between American and international students, and that the MISPI identifies those problems more effectively than the Mooney Problem Checklist. Porter suggests that these conclusions be viewed as tentative because this was the first administration of the MISPI. Since the time of the first administration of the MISPI some 80 additional studies have been conducted using the MISPI. Some of these studies are discussed below.

Green (1998) conducted a quantitative study investigating the adjustment problems of Taiwanese, Korean, and Japanese international students at California State University in Fullerton, California. The purpose of the study was to identify the adjustment problems of international students and the complex nature of those problems (p. 4). The research was conducted in the 1995-96 school year. There were 429 international students participating in the study. The countries of origin of these students were Taiwan, Korea, and Japan. However, the researcher does express concern about response bias because the response rate of 31% is well below a generally accepted rate of 50-60%. This meant that those who responded might respond differently from those who did not respond to the questionnaire. The Michigan International Student Problem Inventory (MISPI) was modified slightly for use in this research project. Greene (1998) states that Porter's own reliability test of the MISPI indicates a Spearman-Brown split-half method reliability of .67. This is below the desired .80 meaning that some of the variation in responses is due to the lower reliability of the inventory. In this study, the

researcher mailed out the MISPI to the students who participated in the project. Greene writes, "The data was analyzed using a standard multiple regression (Tabachnick & Fidell 1989). The regression was performed between each category as the dependent variables and country of origin (Taiwan, Korea, and Japan), class level (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, and graduate), gender, length of time in the U.S., and age as the independent variables" (p. 66). Means were calculated for each of the categories and averaged to get one mean value. This was done to gain more accurate information by comparing each independent variable with the dependent variable of each category. The researcher then compared the independent variables of country of origin, class level, gender, time in the U.S., and age upon the dependent variable. The means enabled the researcher to determine what problems troubled the students the most or the least. The research found that the problem of communicating in the English language caused the most difficulty for these students. The mean was 7.04 (p. 85). Placement services with a mean of 3.33 were the next most troublesome finding of the research. There were a possible 24 points. Seven of the total number of categories had statistical significance at the .10 significance level. Green explains, "Those scales are Admissions, Orientation, Academic Record, Social-Personal, Living-Dining, Health, and English Language" (p. 86). Country of origin, gender and class level proved to be the most helpful independent variables. Age was not significant on any category. Korean students demonstrated the greatest number of adjustment problems scoring highest on 10 of the 11 categories although Green does not hypothesize as to why. Class level was significant for freshmen and junior students only and only in five categories. Gender was significant on six categories. The researcher concludes, "Finally, the results of this study suggest that, when

considering the importance of country of origin, class level or gender as factors in international student adjustment, more weight should be given to gender, specifically female adjustment, and class level, namely undergraduate, than to country of origin" (p. 136). The MISPI provides for short-answer responses at the end of the instrument. The researcher organized the statements into groups identified by the 11 categories. When evaluating the comments made by students the researcher determined that making friends with Americans was the second greatest problem with which they were confronted. The quantitative data did not reveal this information. Therefore, the researcher recommends combining quantitative and qualitative research methods for a future study of this topic.

In another study using the MISPI, Abu-Ein (1993) identified and analyzed the adjustment problems of international students at Texas Southern University. There were 428 respondents to the questionnaire from a total of 991 international students for a return rate of 45%. This exceeded the number the researcher desired using a proportion-stratified sampling. The sample size was determined by use of the National Education Association (NEA) small sampling formula. The study found that financial aid was the greatest problem faced by these students followed by placement services and social personal problems. There were significant differences by age in 4 of the 11 problem areas, but no significant differences by gender. This finding is contradictory to the study done by Greene (1998). Classification (freshman, etc.) was significant in only 3 of the 11 problem areas while country of origin was significant in 6 of the 11 problem areas. Majors were significant in only 1 of the 11 problem areas and length of stay was significant in 3 of the 11 problem areas. Social interaction was significant in 6 of the 11 problem areas. Abu-Ein (1993) states, "...age, geographic location, source of financial

support, and social interaction, are considered as the variable most useful in predicting international student's adjustment problems" (p. 124). In general, the findings are similar to those referred to in this literature review.

Harre (1995) conducted a quantitative study at Southern Illinois University. The response rate of 55.2% appears high, but is limited as a stratified random sample (n = 250) representing only 15% of the international student population at the school. The MISPI was used to gather data in the study. One-way analysis of the variance was used in analyzing the data. Harre found that country of origin and academic status significantly explain the variance in the dependent variables while age, gender, marital status, and length of stay in the U. S. indicated no significance. Financial aid, placement, and social activities were the three highest mean ranked categories.

A study conducted at the University of Memphis by McCoy (1996) also used the MISPI. A total of 287 students were surveyed with a response rate of 48% when 138 surveys were returned. In analysis of the data, McCoy used a one-way analysis of the variance. A multiple regression methodology would have been preferred, but McCoy found that country of origin, academic level, and marital status were significant in explaining the variance among many of the categories of the MISPI. Finances, placement, and English were the first three ranked categories for this study. The five-page literature review is a major weakness in this study.

Fitzgerald (1998) also completed a study of the problems in academic and social support systems for international students. Conducted in 1995 in the Eastern Iowa Community College District (EICCD), the study attempted to investigate the needs and perceptions of international students towards academic and social support systems

available to them. The researcher used the MISPI described earlier, but only compared four independent variables with the categories. A total of 53 international students completed the questionnaire from three community colleges representing a 74% return rate. There were 22 countries represented in the research. The MISPI was chosen because of its validity and extended use. The study found that non-western students had more problems than western students. English was found to be the most serious problem for international students followed by finances and the living-dining category.

International Students and Student Affairs

There are approximately 490,000 international students enrolled in American colleges and universities. The literature reveals that the cultural adjustment of these students to the United States is problematic even though most students appear to be successful in the process. Ping (1999) comments, "International exchange transformed many American campuses" (p. 14). The presence of these students on campuses can produce tension and even clashes. They also bring so much more. Ping states, "The presence on campus of students from many countries brings to student affairs administration a whole new set of responsibilities for providing a range of services for international students and faculty" (p. 19). What assistance, however, are they receiving from the colleges and universities where they are enrolled? Pfaffenroth (1997) argues that "…most community colleges, which by then were enrolling increasingly large numbers of such students, had not yet seriously addressed questions of why and how their institutions should be involved with such students" (p. 1). Is there a corresponding lack of services for these students due to a lack of policy? There is a lack of a national policy regarding international students, but is there also a lack of policy on the part of the

individual institution regarding international students? If this is true for most colleges and universities, it is essential that a thorough research into the topic of student affairs and the international student be made as soon as possible. Hayes and Lin (1994) think there is a special responsibility that the university has to international students when they say that "international students do have concerns and problems that are different from those of American students. As a consequence, American colleges and universities have a special responsibility to international students to provide special services or the customary services in special ways" (p. 12). Some of these responsibilities can be met by developing programs at the university level that meet the needs of international students. Lin and Yi (1997) suggest the following programs be developed on university campuses.

- <u>Pre-Arrival Adjustment Stage:</u> Universities should assist students by providing appropriate information that will reduce anxiety and culture shock.

- <u>Initial Adjustment Stage:</u> Universities should assist students by developing a six month long orientation program for students first arriving on campus. Housing, transportation, shopping, developing friendship networks, and becoming acquainted with the campus and university policies should be part of the orientation.

- <u>On-going Adjustment Stage:</u> This stage lasts until graduation and assists the student in adapting to the new culture while they maintain their own cultural identity. Opportunities for networking in both cultures should be provided and is essential to the continued adjustment of these students.

- <u>Return-Home Adjustment Stage:</u> The goal of this stage is to assist students in anticipating the return home readjustment process. (Lin, 1997, pp. 476-7)

These broad categories of programs provide direction for colleges and universities, but the individual needs of students must be considered during the process of program development. Universities cannot expect to accept international students on campus without accepting a corresponding responsibility to assist them in meeting their unique needs. Levy (1990) offers a dissenting voice, however, when he makes the following statement: "One of the most perplexing problems facing chief student affairs officers today is what and how much can a counseling center do" (p. 614). Levy suggests that there is just so much a university can do to help students. Universities are educational institutions. If people are not able to function within that community, then that person might not belong there. Because of the multitude of problems with which international students are confronted and their cultural differences, Charles and Stewart (1991), on the other hand, suggest that advisors maintain close contact with these students. International students have numerous adjustment issues to confront including academic overload and various academic restrictions that are sometimes placed upon them. Academic advisors who work closely with these students can provide an invaluable service to them. That universities should provide such services to international students is commonly accepted as a responsibility of student affairs for all students. However, what special program responsibilities do and should universities provide for international students? Furthermore, what are the perceptions of international students regarding those services offered to them? The following five research papers provide insight into this question.

Johnson (1993) conducted a study at the University of Southern Mississippi into the perceptions of international students regarding services provided by higher education. The researcher used a Q-methodology and Q-sort technique with 17 international

students asking only one demographic question and that regarding length of stay at the University. Johnson (1993) states, "Q-methodology is often used in attitude studies because it is an objective, organized method for studying many aspects of a person's attitudes and behavior" (p. 10). It is a form of factor analysis that correlates facets of measurement across one another. The instrument used was developed by the researcher and named the "International Student Perceptions." The instrument consists of 40 statements regarding services recorded on sort cards that the students divided into seven groups on a Likert-type scale. The range of responses were from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The researcher used a 'forced sort' procedure and instructed subjects to place a given number of cards in each of the seven piles. This forced an even distribution of the cards from strong disagree to strongly agree and thus the "forced sort procedure".

The results of the study tend to group international students into three clusters. There are dissatisfied nonusers, selective users, and satisfied selective users. Two major reasons were given for the dissatisfied nonusers not using student services, including preferring to keep their problems to themselves or thinking that international student service staff do not care or have little interest in helping them. International students might lack awareness of services available, lack trust in staff, or perceive staff as incompetent. The selective users prefer to take their personal problems such as finances to their friends. They have sought assistance with immigration and academic issues, however. Their view of staff is positive. The satisfied selective users of services cluster see the staff as knowledgeable and helpful. They talk to professors about academic concerns and are less reluctant to talk with student services staff about other problems. The researcher suggests that two questions that still need to be answered relate to what demographic

characteristics predict student use of services and is the perception of effectiveness of services related to the use of services.

Tomkovick and Al-Khatib (1996) researched the service quality provided to international students in U.S. business schools. The purpose of the study was to determine what services are most important to international students, how international students perceive education service quality, and what demographics influenced their perceptions of educational service quality. The researchers divided the study of service quality into five dimensions including tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy. The instrument used for data collection was an adaptation of the SERVQUAL scale developed by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1988) to assess service quality. The instrument contained 20 items. A total of 282 useable surveys were returned from 25 U.S. business schools and included students from 50 different countries for a response rate of 45%. The sample was predominately male. Reliability and validity of the instrument was tested using Cronbach's alpha. The research found that level of education is significant for the empathy and reliability dimensions of service quality. Males and females also differ significantly regarding empathy and reliability of service. The study also found that the quality of facilities and equipment were both important to the students. Responsiveness to students was found to need improvement. How international students interact with faculty was also found to be an issue with these students. This study is of interest because it focuses on students as customers and their perceptions of service quality.

Walker (1998) completed a study of student affairs professionals' perceptions of the concerns and feelings of international students at private, liberal arts colleges. The

researcher also attempted to identify and classify influential and non-influential concerns of international students as perceived by student affairs professionals. The researcher conducted a simple random sampling of 689 institutions rated as Baccalaureate Colleges (I & II) by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The International Student Questionnaire: Director Form (ISQDF) consisting of three sections was used for the research. The first section collects demographic information. Section two is divided into seven areas related to the concerns of international students. The third section is related to the feelings of the international students. Walker (1998) conducted a pilot study with three local institutions meeting the criteria listed above. The instrument was then mailed to 100 institutions and a follow-up mailing resulted in a total of 78 usable responses. The research found that student affairs professionals perceived international students to be well adjusted with slightly moderate concerns. They also perceived the international students as having infrequent negative feelings. International students were observed to be highly qualified and well-educated students. These professionals differed in opinions concerning the problems and feelings of international students based on the size of the institution, gender, age, degree obtained, and religious affiliation of the respondent. Walker (1998) lists 12 implications and 16 recommendations for student affairs professionals that could prove helpful for those institutions seeking to improve their services to international students (pp. 128-31).

Larbi (1990) completed a similar study of student advisors' perceptions related to the social adjustment of international students. The purpose of the study was to identify the social adjustment issues of international students, to identify the perceptions of student advisors of the social adjustment issues of international students, and to compare

these perceptions. The population sample was drawn from all public and private 4-year

and 2-year degree granting institutions in Oklahoma with 15 or more international

students enrolled. A total of 23 institutions that met this criteria returned useable surveys.

The survey was divided into two sections. Section A of the instrument gathered

demographic information about the respondents. Section B contained 19 statements

responded to on a four-point Likert-type scale. (p.69) This researcher stated that he

"...was encouraged to depend on the survey instruments of Gaither and Griffin (1971)

and Reiff's (1972, 1979) modified version of the same instrument" (p. 71). A pilot study

was conducted in 1989 with 12 institutions in the southwestern United States to establish

the reliability of the instrument. The respondents consisted of 12 women and 11 men

whose ages were evenly distributed between 25 and 60 years of age. This number does

not seem to reflect a sufficient quantity to establish reliability of the instrument. There

were 12 respondents whose sole work was with international students while 11 of the

respondents had other duties at the school. The size of the institutions ranged from under

1000 students to 25,000 students. The study found that there was no significant difference

concerning the perceptions of these respondents regarding the importance of English

language proficiency of international students. Seventy-three percent of these advisors

considered language very important. Fifty-five percent of these respondents viewed the

adequacy of educational preparation as very important. Thirty-four percent of these

respondents saw the adequacy of educational preparation as sometimes a problem.

However, there was no significant difference between the advisors on this issue. A lack

of friends was found to be important 52% of the time, but no significant difference was

found among the advisors. A significant difference was found regarding racial or

religious discrimination among the advisors. The study found that larger, public institutions considered this issue important while smaller, private institutions considered the issue not important. Climate, health needs, unfriendliness of the community, and immigration laws were all considered very important by the advisors and there was no significant difference among them. Food, dating, homesickness, unfriendliness of American students, housing, finances, and academic demands were variables with no significant differences that were rated as important by the advisors (pp. 82-106). A weakness in the study is that no comparison of the perceptions of the international students themselves is made.

A final study evaluated in this literature review was written by Roper (1995) and concerned the ideal and actual functions of the chief student affairs officers. This study was conducted among small, private religious colleges. The purpose was to determine the actual and ideal function of the chief student affairs officer and to examine the relationship between these. Another purpose of the study was to determine if the variables of size, location, length of service, and percentage of commuter students would have any significant effect upon the actual functions of the chief student affairs officer. This study included the perceptions of these officers and those of the president of these institutions. Roper (1995) says, "This research design was based upon the Getzels and Guba model which explains behavior as a function of the interaction between role and personality" (p. 54). A questionnaire dividing data into five major categories was used to gather the data. The categories included welfare, control, co- and extra-curricular, administrative, and educative seen to describe the areas of responsibilities of the chief student affairs officer (CSAO). The questionnaire consisted of 58 questions divided into

these five categories. A four-point Likert-type scale was used ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." The instrument was structured so that the CSAOs could indicate whether the function was actual or ideal. Three Temple University professors evaluated the instrument, and a pilot study among ten small, private religious college presidents and CSAOs was conducted to determine the reliability of the instrument, although this number calls into question the reliability of the instrument. (p. 61) Six changes in the instrument resulted from the pilot study. During the actual data gathering stage of the research 82 out of 89 institutions responded to the questionnaire. The responses included 66 presidents and 73 chief student affairs officers. The study found that there is a high degree of consensus between the presidents and CSAOs regarding the ideal and actual functions of the CSAO. The t-tests reflect a significant difference between actual and ideal means. Three of the top 20 functions also reflect a significant difference at the .10 level between the presidents and the CSAOs. The size of the university did not make a significant difference to the findings. The urban location of the college was significant at the .10 significance level as indicated by the responses of the students regarding the importance of urban or rural locations. There was no significant difference for schools with larger commuter populations. There was no significant difference for the length of service of the presidents and CSAOs. The value of this study relates to identifying the actual function of the CASOs even though the study does not focus on the problems of international students. It clarifies the areas of responsibility of the CSAOs and what are the ideal and actual functions of these individuals within an institution. Invariably these actual and ideal functions will have an impact upon the international student population.

McIntire and Willer (1992) state, "The question remains of how to better prepare student affairs professionals to work with international students" (p. 21). The problems and challenges of working with international students are addressed in the McIntire and Willer (1992) text. In this book, contributing authors address the issues of the academic challenges facing international students and student affairs professionals, legal issues faced by international students, integration of international students in the university community, re-entry issues, and health care issues. The text is one of a select few that address the problems of international students directly with positive suggestions about how to work with these students. The importance of this study among international students and about international students cannot be overestimated when one considers the vastness of the problems reflected in this literature review.

In the introduction to the text, McIntire (1992) outlines the differences between international and American students. McIntire states that there are legal differences that require the attention of student services consuming "over half their time and resources on assisting international students" (p. 19). There are language difficulties that enhance the degree of difficulty in interacting with international students. Constantinides (1992) outlines in chapter one the academic challenges and opportunities that exist in working with international students. English language competence is an obvious challenge, but differences in educational systems, learning styles, status of teachers, purpose and philosophy of education, and cultural differences all contribute to these challenges and opportunities of working with international students. DeArmond and Stevenson (1992) discuss the health care differences between American and international students in chapter two of the text. There are problems of cultural transition and differences between

cultures in how to interact with medical personnel. Legal issues are outlines in chapter

three by Levitov (1992). There are immigration related concerns, status concerns,

admissions concerns, employment concerns, INS reporting concerns, and visa

classification concerns. Re-entry issues and the effects of "brain drain" on countries is the

topic of discussion by Butler (1992) in chapter four. Re-entry problems are the problems

of culture shock in reverse. Chapter five discusses the problems of working with

international students on campuses. Neuberger (1992) outlines the problems of housing,

transportation, admissions, and financial matters for international students.The last

chapter of interest to this study relates to how international students are integrated into

the university community. Thielen and Limbird (1992) discuss the motives and methods

for integrating international students. These authors suggest that student affairs must

proceed beyond the concern for initial orientation of international students and survival

skills to developmental skills enrichment. International students need assistance in being

assimilated into the community. There may be many methods to accomplish this task.

The success of student services work with international students is measured by assisting

the international students to integrate fully into the university community.

Devyani Sharma (1999) is an international student from India studying at

Dartmouth College. Sharma makes this startling statement concerning the severity of the

problems with which international students are faced. She said, "Sometimes I sit alone in

this college and feel very fully what the word 'alien' means. At times like this, one

doesn't rationally reflect on what the source of loneliness is. The person becomes an

invalid, unable to move or speak, let alone think constructively or communicate" (p. 64).

This comment is part of a series of essays edited by Garrod and Davis (1999) and written

by students attending Dartmouth College. The prevailing theme of each essay is a reflection of the problems contained in each of the sections of this literature review. These are problems that cannot be ignored by international students and should not be ignored by the universities these students attend.

Student services face many challenges and opportunities when working with international students. Obviously, student service personnel involved in working with international students need specialized training to cope with the magnitude and variety of the problems confronted by and produced by these students.

Chapter III

Methodology

Introduction

This chapter describes the methods and procedures that were used to conduct a study of the adjustment problems of international students at two private universities. The chapter also describes the methods and procedures used to study the perceptions of university personnel regarding the adjustment problems of international students. Finally, the chapter describes how the open-ended responses from the questionnaires used in this study are reported. The intent is to formulate recommendations regarding strategies for working with international students, as well as programs that could be designed to meet the needs of international students.

The chapter first discusses the research design and next describes the sample and the criteria for selecting the sample. Third, a description of the procedures and instrumentation used in the study are presented. Following this, a detailed outline of the research questions is provided and the research questions are listed. Next, the data analysis procedures are described, a statement of confidentiality is made, and concerns about the human subjects issues is found within the chapter. Finally the delimitations and limitations of the study are outlined within the chapter. The chapter will then be summarized.

Research Design

The research design used in this study is quantitative in nature. The form of research to be used here is called "survey research" and involves the gathering of data through the utilization of a written questionnaire or personal interviews to answer

55

research questions. Two questionnaires were used in this study. The MISPI (see

Appendix A) was used with the international students, and the MIAPSPI (see Appendix

C) was used with university personnel.

A review of the literature was conducted in order to identify an appropriate

instrument. These instruments were discussed in more detail along with their limitations

within Chapter Two, the Literature Review. There are many instruments that have been

used in the frequent study of international students, but many of these designs are to be

used with one ethnic group. In addition, some instruments measure only stress levels.

Other instruments measure only limited numbers of categories of academic performance

and social activities of international students. These instruments were not considered

comprehensive enough for the purposes of this study.

Porter (1962) developed one of the instruments selected for use in this study. The

Michigan International Student Problem Inventory (MISPI) has 11 categories closely

matching categories associated with student services (e. g., admissions and selection,

orientation services, academic advising, social-personal, living-dining, health services,

religious services, English language, student activities, financial aid, and placement

services). Each of these 11 categories had 12 different questions that reviewed the

severity of the categorical problem for international students. The comprehensive nature

of the instrument allows for differentiating between the problems of U.S. and

international students. Furthermore, the instrument recognized the major student service

categories of concern to international students and allows the differentiation between

groups of international students (Porter, 1993, 4-5). Permission to use the instrument was

requested on June 20, 2000 (see Appendix D) and received on July 10, 2000 (see

Appendix E).

The second instrument used with university personnel, the Michigan International Advisor Perception of Problem Inventory (MIAPSPI), is an adaptation of the MISPI made by this researcher. The instrument gathers demographic data concerning the individuals completing the questionnaire. Then these individuals are asked to rate the degree of difficulty international students face concerning the 11 categories found on the MISPI.

At the end of each of the instruments, three additional open-ended questions were asked. These questions asked students to identify existing programming, policies, and activities. Recommendations from participants regarding additional programming needs at the respective university were also sought. The written documentation of the policies and programs of both universities were also gathered and compared with the responses of the participants on the questionnaires. Through the combining of the quantitative data gathered from the international students and university personnel with the data gathered from documentation and open-ended sections of the instruments recommendations made designed to improve the services offered to international students these universities can be suggested.

Description of the Sample and Sample Selection

The target population included all international students enrolled in two private universities during the fall semester of the year 2000. International students are defined as non-U.S. citizens requiring a student type visa to enter the U.S. (F-1, 2, J-1, M). There were 252 students enrolled in the Texas private university and 338 students enrolled in the California private university. The student responses were from a total of 38 countries.

The sample was selected using the following criteria. First, students had to be attending the university on a student visa. Next, they were to be non-native English speakers. This eliminated students from Canada, English, Australia, and other native English speaking nations because it was presumed that they would adjust more easily to living in an English dominate culture. Also, no international students enrolled in distance learning classes were included in the study because they were not physically present on campus, and did not experience the same problems with culture shock as a full-time, on-campus student would experience. Finally, students who were participating in practical training, but not enrolled in the university were not included in the study. The students included were mainly F-1 visa students who were non-native, full-time students enrolled in the fall term of the year 2000 and attending classes on the main campus.

There were 243 international students enrolled in the Texas private university who met the above criteria and were included in this study. The international student return rate was 50.6% with 123 surveys returned out of a total of 243 surveys mailed at the Texas school. There were 28 graduate and 95 undergraduate students, 49 of which were male and 74 of which were female who returned surveys from the Texas school. The California school had 174 international students who met the selection criteria. The international student return rate was 52.8% with 92 out of 174 surveys returned. There were 23 graduate and 69 undergraduate students, 44 of which were males and 48 of which were females who returned surveys from the California school. Table 1 provides a breakdown of the demographic data of the students who returned the survey. Respondents represented 35 different countries. The majority (68%) of students in the Texas school were from Asia even though there are students from more than 35 countries

attending the school. The California school experienced a wider distribution of students with many countries having fewer than five representatives and a total number of 60 countries represented. Business was the most represented major. A total of 88 students (40.9%) who completed the survey majored in business. All other majors had fewer than 15 students enrolled in the program with education, computer science, MBA, and communication having the largest representation. There were 18 different majors represented. Table 1 presents the number of male and female, graduate and undergraduate, and single and married students. Table 1 also presents the length of time at the university and the age of the students.

Table 1 Student Demographics

ITEM	TEXAS		CALIFORNIA	
	Number	**Percentage**	**Number**	**Percentage**
1. Males	49	40	44	48
2. Females	74	60	48	52
1. Graduate	28	23	23	25
2. Undergraduate	95	77	69	75
1. Married	9	7	12	13
2. Single	114	93	80	87
1. Business Major	43	35	45	49
2. Other	80	65	47	51
1. Age 18 – 20	34	28	19	20
2. Age 21 – 22	39	32	21	23
3. Age 23 – 24	25	20	23	25
4. Age 25 – 27	10	8	11	12
5. Age 28 – 30	6	5	6	7
6. Age 30+	9	7	12	13
1. Time: Under 1 Year	64	52	37	40
2. Time: One to two Years	28	23	30	33
3. Time: Two to three Years	17	14	15	16
4. Time: Three to Four Years	14	11	10	11
1. Taiwan	28	23	4	4
2. Japan	23	19	7	8
3. Indonesia	11	9	4	4
4. Mexico	1	0	18	20
5. Hong Kong	22	18	2	2
6. Other	38	31	57	62

Note. Texas N = 123 California N = 92

The faculty/staff members selected to participate in the study were those

responsible for working directly with international students. Faculty members who

frequently taught international students were requested to complete a survey. The

International Student Services office on both campuses assisted in developing a list of

appropriate faculty/staff members who should receive a copy of the survey. The faculty/

staff demographics include data from 30 faculty/staff members at the Texas school and

14 staff members at the California school. Table 2 provides a breakdown of the

demographics pertinent to the faculty/staff. Unfortunately, no faculty members from the

California school returned the survey. The return rate of the survey for the faculty/staff in

Texas was 60%. Thirty surveys out of 50 were returned. The return rate for the

faculty/staff at the California school was 70%. Fourteen out of 20 surveys were returned.

Table 2 Faculty/Staff Demographics

ITEM	TEXAS		CALIFORNIA	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
1. Male	15	50	4	29
2. Female	15	50	10	71
1. Married	24	80	7	50
2. Single	6	20	7	50
1. Trained (Yes)	23	77	11	79
2. Trained (No)	7	23	3	21
1. Lived Abroad (Yes)	13	43	4	29
2. Lived Abroad (No)	17	47	10	71
1. Age: 30 - 34	5	17	5	36
2. Age: 45 - 49	4	13	5	36
3. Age: 50+	12	40	2	14
4. Age: other	9	30	2	14
1. Faculty	14	47	0	0
2. Staff	16	53	14	100

Note. Texas N = 30 California N = 14

Settings

Texas

The private university in Texas is a liberal arts college located in a large

metropolitan city offering bachelor and master degrees. The institution is a religiously

affiliated university. There were approximately 4,000 students enrolled at the university

of which 252 were international students representing at least 40 countries. There were 39

graduate females and 22 graduate male students enrolled. There were 102 undergraduate

females and 89 undergraduate males enrolled. Forty-one of these students were enrolled

in the intensive English program of the school. The 42 graduate students in the academic

program were enrolled in the MBA program or a related field such as accounting. Five

students were enrolled in education. There was one student enrolled in art, two in biology,

one student in psychology, one in English, and one in music. There are a total of 18

graduate majors represented by these numbers. There were also 27 undergraduate majors represented by these numbers the largest group being business related majors such as accounting, business administration, and marketing. The majority of the international students were from Asia with Taiwan representing the largest group of international students. Japan had the second largest representative group of students on campus.

Unique times for course offerings include a summer schedule, Christmas holiday schedule, spring break schedule, between semesters schedule, night schedule, and weekend college schedule with classes offered both on campus and at sites convenient to the student population off campus. The university also offers some courses on the Internet.

The demographic section of the survey provided information regarding visa types, reasons for attending this university, sources of financial support, and how the student learned of the university. The majority, 98%, of the students were F-1 visa students meaning they entered the U.S. for the purpose of studying at a university and returning to their homeland after completion of their course of study. Approximately 13% of the students intend to transfer to another school to continue their education on the graduate level. Another 65% of the students were attending the school to gain a degree while 16% were there to improve their employment opportunities in the future. The students' financial support came from the following areas: 1) Family 76%; 2) Scholarship 5%; 3) Self 16%, and 4) Other 3%. Recommendations of friends or family were the reasons why 47% of these students attend this school. Another 35% learned of the school through an agent or some other source such as a church in their homeland. Some 11% learned of the school through advertising and another 6% through the Internet.

California

The private university located in California is a doctoral comprehensive university located in a large city offering bachelor, master, and doctor degrees. The institution is a religiously affiliated university and has an enrollment of approximately 7,000 students of which 338 are international students representing at least 65 countries. Mexico had 56 students representing the largest student contingency at the university. Germany had the second largest group with 26 students and France the third largest group with 21 students. There were 17 students from Japan; 13 from Brazil; 13 from Turkey; 11 from China and Indonesia; 10 from Taiwan and Italy; 9 from Switzerland; 8 from India and Norway; 7 from Sweden and Thailand; and 6 from Spain. The other countries had fewer than five students representing them. There were 92 undergraduate students enrolled in business administration, 14 in communication, and 10 in liberal arts. The other majors had fewer than five students enrolled out of a total of 19 majors that are represented. There were 38 graduate students enrolled in the MBA program, 30 graduate students enrolled in law, and 6 graduate students enrolled in international relations. The other eight majors had no more than three students enrolled in the program. Of the 338 total students, 194 were male and 144 are female, but no figures were available specifically concerning the 174 effective students participating in this research.

The demographic section of the survey provided information regarding visa types, reasons for attending this university, sources of financial support, and how the student learned of the university. The majority, 88%, of the students were F-1 visa students meaning they entered the U.S. for the purpose of studying at a university and returning to their homeland after completion of their course of study. Approximately 6% of the

students intend to transfer to another school to continue their education. Another 75% of the students were attending the school to gain a degree while 11% were there to improve their employment opportunities in the future. The students' financial support came from the following areas: 1) family 73%; 2) scholarship 11%; 3) self 14%; and, 4) other 2%. Recommendations of friends or family were the reasons why 45% of these students attend this school. Another 16% learned of the school through an agent or other source in their homeland such as a church. Some 8% learned of the school through advertising and another 15% through the Internet while 16% attend the school because of the reputation of the school.

Procedures

The MISPI instrument was mailed directly to all international students on both campuses utilizing a mailing list provided by the International Student Services Office or Admissions Office on the respective campuses. A stamped, self-addressed return envelope was provided for students to return mail the instrument to the International Student Services Office at the Texas private university or the Leadership Studies office at the California private university. The envelop contained a cover letter (See Appendix F) expressing appreciation for participating in the research, encouraging a quick response to the survey, and describing a drawing for prizes that were participation rewards for the winners. The letter also indicated that the student's name would remain anonymous.

The drawing was for a $100.00US telephone card that was awarded to the student whose name was selected randomly. A special registration form (see Appendix G) was used in the drawing. The form is not part of the instrument. One telephone card per campus was awarded. An additional three students from each campus received a theater

gift certificate (for two persons) (a $16.00U.S. value) for a movie of their choice. In addition, the university in Texas contributed two other gifts. These gifts were "Hot Shots," an electric device for heating a cup of water for use in the dormitory where cooking is not permitted. Students completed a separate form containing their name, address, and telephone number to be eligible for the drawing. These forms were separated from the instrument to protect the anonymity of the participants. University personnel separated the forms before the instruments were returned to the researcher. At no time did the researcher know the names of the students or university personnel who participated in the study. The participants were told that completing the registration for the drawing is voluntary and that the names would be separated from the instrument upon their receipt and placed in a box from which the random drawing would take place.

The MIAPSPI instrument was mailed or hand delivered to personnel working at the university asked to participate in the study. These personnel were selected as a result of an interview with the International Student Services Director on the respective campuses who assisted in identifying individuals who work directly with international students at the university. A stamped, return envelope was provided that these personnel used to return the document to the International Student Services Office at the Texas private university or the Leadership Studies office at the California private university. The instrument contained a cover letter (see Appendix H) expressing appreciation for participating in the research, encouraging a quick response to the survey, and describing a drawing for prizes that was a reward to the winner for participating in the study.

The cover letter for the instrument contained information regarding a drawing for movie gift certificates that were awarded to three participants. The names were selected

randomly. Three certificates per campus were awarded. Personnel completed a separate form containing their name, address, and telephone number. These were separated from the instrument to protect the anonymity of the participants on the survey. The participants were told that completing the registration for the drawing is voluntary and that the names would be separated from the instrument upon their receipt and placed in a box from which the random drawing would take place.

In an attempt to improve the initial return rates at both universities, the researcher engaged international students in personal conversations during a seven-day visit to each of the campuses. The research project was described to the students, and the students were encouraged to complete the questionnaire. Some of the students completed the survey immediately while others returned the survey by mail. An additional 40 to 60 surveys were distributed in this manner on both campuses. A second mailing was also used at the California school to encourage the return rate. The Texas school left a telephone message for each international student encouraging the survey's return. In addition to the telephone message, a member of the staff spent two days seeking students on campus to complete the survey. Announcements were made through the various international associations on both campuses. In Texas, announcements were also made during IEP classes. In California, announcements were made at the weekly tea held for internationals students. Similar announcements were made at orientation meetings and other functions frequented by international students. The university offices used the registration form for the prize drawing to eliminate multiple surveys completed by the same students. This provided a 96% assurance that no multiple surveys were completed. In these ways, one of the highest return rates achieved on any similar study found within

the literature review of this report was achieved.

Instrumentation

The instrument used to gather data from the international students regarding their perceptions of their adjustment problems was the Michigan International Student Problem Inventory (MISPI). Dr. John Porter developed this questionnaire in 1962 and modified it in 1977. The instrument is divided into three sections. Section one contains 15 short answer or multiple-choice type questions concerned with demographic information. Section two contains the 132 item questions. The MISPI consists of 11 problem areas measured on a 1 to 4 scale. Responses are on an ordinal scale ranging from 1 meaning "no problem" to 4 meaning a "major problem." Each problem area contains 12 items each totaling the 132 items referred to above. Questions are divided into admissions and selection services, orientation services, academic records and advising, social-personal activities, living-dining services, health services, religious services, English language, student activities, financial aid, and placement services (Porter, 1993). A third section of the instrument gathers qualitative data from the students using three open-ended questions. In this way, students could express their feelings concerning any particular problem area. They were also asked to identify important programming existent on the campus and additional programs needed at the university designed to serve international students. The instrument is self-administered and takes about 30 minutes to complete.

The MISPI was chosen because of its intended purpose of identifying the adjustment problems of international students and because of its comprehensive nature. The MISPI has been used in excess of 80 times providing a basis for evaluating the use of this information for the purposes of this study.

The instrument used to gather data from the student affairs and intensive English personnel regarding their perceptions of the adjustment problems of international students was an instrument designed by this researcher and adapted from the MISPI. The instrument was named the Michigan International Advisor Perception of Student Problem Inventory (MIAPSPI). The questionnaire is divided into three sections labeled Step One, Step Two, and Step Three. Step One solicits demographic information from the participants and contains 12 multiple-choice or short answer questions. Step Two contains 11 statements responded to on a four-point ordinal scale ranging from 1, "no problem," to 4, "major problem." Step Three asks participants to express their opinions concerning their major problems. Then they are asked about what the university can do to reduce the stress the problems cause, and what programs exist that address the problems.

Materials concerning international student programming were collected along with the data from Step Three of the MIAPSPI. Information was analyzed to determine how well the perceptions of university personnel and university policy match the problems identified by international students. Themes identified through the written documentation and qualitative responses of participants were described at the end of the data analysis section of the report.

Research Questions

This study endeavors to answer the following research questions.

1. What adjustment problems do international students enrolled in a college or university in the U.S. experience?

2. To what extent does gender, marital status, country of origin (Taiwan, Japan, Hong Kong), time at the university under one year, and what university the

student attended explain the variation in the student's perceptions of their adjustment problems?

3. What perceptions do university faculty and staff hold concerning the types of problems encountered by international students in the United States?

4. To what extent does gender, whether or not a person has lived or worked abroad, position at the university, and what university the individual works at explain the variation in the university personnel's perceptions of internationals students adjustment problems?

5. To what extent do the perceptions of these adjustment problems differ between international students and university personnel?

Data Analysis

To address the first research question, mean scores were tabulated for both groups of students in each of the 11 categories represented within the survey instrument. The 12 questions related to each of the 11 categories were first averaged for each respondent before the mean scores were tabulated. These mean scores were then used to rank the extent of the problems faced by the students, where a mean of 1.0 to 1.5 indicated "no problem," a mean of 1.5 to 2.5 a "minor problem," a mean of 2.5 to 3.5 a "moderate problem," and a mean higher than 3.5 indicated a "major problem" in that category. Thus, the higher the mean score the greater the problem. After calculating the means for both groups of students in each category, the means were then compared using a paired-sample t-test to test for categorical differences between the two groups of students. These means were compared for all 11 categories of the MISPI and MIAPSPI to determine if a statistically significant difference existed within and between the represented groups. The

significance level of .10 was chosen for the test giving the researcher 90% confidence that any observed difference between groups is real. The means of the faculty/staff at each institution were compared to the student means in each of the 11 categories. The categories included admissions and selection; orientation services; academic records; social-personal activities; living-dining, health services, religious services; English language; student activities; financial aid; and, placement services. The SPSS 10.0 student package was used to code the data.

After the means were tabulated and compared, possible explanations for the variation in student responses was explored in the second research question. Specifically, the techniques of multiple regression analysis were used to explain the extent to which the variation in student responses could be explained by such demographic factors as gender, country of origin (Taiwan, Japan, Hong Kong), marital status, length of time at the university, and what university the student attended. However, since the reliability scores for the MISPI were below the .80 level this suggests that some of the variance in the responses are due to measurement error in the MISPI and the MIAPSPI, making it harder to accurately estimate the regression model. Three sorts of regressions were run in this part of the analysis – a "super" regression that aggregated the responses of the students in all 11 categories, 11 independent regressions corresponding to each of the 11 categories, and separate question-by-question regressions for each of the 132 questions. Appendix B contains a complete listing of these questions and indicates what questions and effects were significant for each of the 11 categories and all 132 of the questions. The question-by-question regressions were run in an attempt to more fully explain the critical

factors driving a particular categorical result allowing the researcher to identify sources of within-question variation that helped shape the overall within-category effect.

The same model specification was used for all of the regressions, with only the dependent variables differing among the three types of regressions. The model chosen for this research was derived from a comparison of the models used in previous studies using the MISPI. Although data was collected on the respondents' age, gender, country of origin, marital status, academic level, major field of study, length of time at the university, visa type, reasons for choosing the university, and university attended, the final model specification contained only five types of independent variables. These five variables – gender, marital status, country of origin, university attended, and whether or not the student was in their first year at the university – were used in all of the student-based regressions and were based on the empirical work of others as well as numerous exploratory regressions.

A major question arose with the issue of collinearity related to several distinct ways of measuring the "time effect" – age, academic level, time at the university, and time in the U.S. All four measures were correlated enough so that only one could be used in the final set of regression models. After much exploratory analysis, whether or not the student was in their first year at the university was used to measure the "time effect" in the most robust way possible. However, the decision regarding which other variables to use was not as easy – the lack of variation in the "major field of study" prevented the use of this measure.

Ultimately, the model included the independent variables of gender, marital status, time at the university, country of origin (Taiwan, Japan, Hong Kong), and the university

attended. A few studies indicated that Asian countries displayed the most statistically significant problems. These countries were included in my model because the number of students from these countries was large enough to attempt to measure an effect. Finally, since students were surveyed at two different institutions, a variable was included to differentiate the responses from each university. Tables display the results of the regressions for each of the dependent variables. The results of these regressions, along with the accompanying discussion are presented in chapter four.

In addressing the third research question, mean scores were tabulated for both groups of faculty/staff in each of the 11 categories represented within the survey instrument. These mean scores were then used to rank the extent of the problems faced by the faculty/staff, where a mean of 1.0 to 1.5 indicated "no problem," a mean of 1.5 to 2.5 a "minor problem," a mean of 2.5 to 3.5 a "moderate problem," and a mean higher than 3.5 indicated a "major problem" in that category. Thus, the higher the mean score the greater the problem. After calculating the means for both groups of faculty/staff in each category, the means were then compared using a paired-sample t-test to test for categorical differences between the two groups of faculty/staff. The means of the faculty/staff of a particular university were compared with the students from that university as described in the above discussion of research question number one. These means were compared for all 11 categories of the MIAPSPI to determine if a statistically significant difference existed within and between the represented groups. Again, the significance level of .10 was chosen for the test giving the researcher 90% confidence that any observed difference between groups is real.

After the means were tabulated and compared, possible explanations for the

variation in faculty/staff responses were explored in the fourth research question. Specifically, the techniques of multiple regression analysis were used to explain the extent to which the variation in faculty/staff responses could be explained by such demographic factors as marital status, position, whether or not the faculty/staff member had lived or working a another country, and at which university the faculty/staff member worked. Two sorts of regressions were run in this part of the analysis – a "super" regression that aggregated the responses of the faculty/staff in all 11 categories, and 11 independent regressions corresponding to each of the 11 categories. The same model specification was used for all of the regressions, with only the dependent variables differing between the two types of regressions.

The faculty/staff model was developed based on the experience of this researcher working with international students for the past 15 years. No other studies were found that adapted the MISPI for use with the faculty/staff of a university. The faculty/staff position at the university, gender, whether or not the faculty/staff member had lived or worked abroad, and what university the faculty/staff worked for were independent variables projected to have an influence on the dependent variables. Position was divided into two categories. One category was faculty or people in teaching positions. The other category included administration and staff positions because these positions tend to interact in similar ways with international students. Age, experience, and marital status were not included in the model because of the small number of faculty/staff involved in the study. The tables in this chapter display the results of the regressions for each of the dependent variables. The results of these regressions, along with the accompanying discussion are presented in chapter four.

The fifth research question was addressed by comparing the mean scores of the faculty/staff and students of a particularly university to determine the extent to which they differ. The paired sample t-tests permitted a similar comparison for research question number five as they provided for both research questions number one and three. In this case, the greater distance between the two means illustrated the extent of the difference in the groups. The paired sample t-tests indicated if a statistically significant difference existed between the groups.

Limitations and Delimitations

Every study will have some delimitations and limitations that influence the generalizing of the study findings. This study is limited by the population studied which included only international students enrolled in, or university personnel working at, one of two small, private universities. The study was further limited by the use of only non-native English speaking international students in the study. The limitations of this study include the fact that the population studied were limited to only international students enrolled in, or student services personnel, advisors or faculty working at, one of two small, private universities. A second limitation is that students enrolled in the fall of 2000 were used as participants in the study. Another limitation was that the international students are required to use the English language, which is not their first language, to respond on the questionnaire. Given the length of the survey, this raises the possibility that those least proficient in the English language may have been less likely to complete and return the survey. Also, individual differences of international students and the causes of problems were not examined. A potentially significant limitation of the study relates to the instrument, the MIAPSPI, used to understand the perceptions of university

personnel. The instrument was not as comprehensive in nature as the MISPI nor was it pilot tested. Finally, some of the students are newly arrived in the U.S. and it can be assumed that the problems they experience will change over time.

Human Subjects and Confidentiality

Permission to conduct the research was granted by both institutions (see Appendixes J and K). These letters have been modified to maintain the confidentiality of the institutions.The names of all participants including students and school personnel will remain confidential along with the names of each university. No names will be released under any circumstances. All survey instruments are designed to be anonymous. The Committee on the Protection of Human Subjects at the University of San Diego approved this research study on August 15, 2000.

Summary

This chapter discussed the methodology to be used within this study. The research design was explained and the procedures for conducting the research were detailed. The sample was described along with the setting of the institutions involved within the research. The instruments to be used in data collection were also described in this chapter. The research questions were reiterated along with the confidentiality statement and the delimitations of the study. Finally, the data analysis procedures were described within the chapter.

Chapter IV

Data Analysis

Introduction

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of the international students and university personnel at two private universities in the United States concerning problems encountered by international students enrolled in these universities. A second aim of the study was to analyze the differences in the perceptions of the students and faculty/staffs of both universities as well as the differences within each group. This data analysis describes the statistical findings from the administration of the MISPI and the MIAPSPI at two private universities, one of which is in California and the other in Texas.

This chapter is organized around the 11 categories of the MISPI and integrates the research questions into each of the categorical discussions where appropriate. The discussion about each category is sub-divided into a comparison of relevant means and a discussion of the regressions in order to facilitate a clearer understanding of the research questions. The structure of the discussion duplicates the order of the topics used by Porter (1962) in the original study using the instrument. The faculty/staff regressions reported follows the student regressions. These were preceded by a discussion comparing the means for each category of dependent variables. There is also a discussion of the collective means and regressions that precedes the discussion of the categories of dependent variables. The collective means and regressions summarize the entire research and relate to the research questions in the manner of each of the 11 categories.

The means address research question number one concerning what problems

76

international students experience, and research question number three regarding what perceptions are held by university personnel concerning the problems of international students. The regressions address research question numbers two and four concerning the variance that exists within a group and indicated what independent variables have an effect upon the dependent variables. The regressions permit a comparison of the student-to-student group and the faculty/staff-to-faculty/staff groups, but not between the students and faculty/staff. The means were used to show this relationship. Research question number five, which focuses on the differences between the students and university faculty/staff perspectives, is interwoven into the discussion of the means of each of the 11 categories through the comparison of the means.

The descriptive data provided through written comments of the faculty/staff and students are also summarized at the end of the chapter. The qualitative responses were grouped according to the three open-ended questions asked of students and faculty/staff at the end of the survey. Most of the qualitative responses of the students are discussed at the end of this chapter although comments pertinent to a category are included in the discussion of the category as well. The chapter concludes with a summary of findings.

Collective Mean/Regression Summary

This section begins with a discussion of the aggregated means and regressions for all 11 categories of the survey. Following this discussion is a category by category discussion beginning with a comparison of means using a paired sample t-test for each of the 11 categories of the MISPI. Next the use of multiple regression statistical analysis begins with a discussion of the student data followed by a discussion of the faculty/staff data. Tables are presented for only statistically significant categories except for the

aggregated data of the faculty/staff regressions. This table is presented only to demonstrate the model used for the faculty/staff data since the data recorded on it were not found to be statistically significant. These regressions, however, do provide an overview of the entire data analysis.

The term "collective" refers to the combining of all the means of the 11 categories into a single mean for all respondents for the following four groups. The groups include the faculty/staff at the school in Texas, the faculty/staff at the school in California, the students at the school in Texas, and the students at the school in California. Research questions number one and three identify the adjustment problems of international students as recognized by themselves, or as perceived by the university personnel. Mean tests and regressions were run using these data in order to provide a summary, or overview, of all of the data collected for this study that can be related to research questions number one and three regarding what problems international students face while attending an American university.

A paired sample t-test was run to compare the means of the faculty/staff at both of the universities, the students at both universities, and the faculty/staff and students from the school in Texas and the school in California. Four paired sample t-tests were run. The purpose of this test was to determine if there was a statistically significant difference between the means of each of these groups. For example, in a comparison of faculty/staff and student perceptions, results could indicated that the faculty/staff either overestimated the extent of the problems, underestimated the extent of the problems, or agreed with the students as to the extent of the student problems.

The means of each group of students, faculty/staff, and combination of

faculty/staff and students ranged from 1.77 to 2.30 indicating that every group viewed the problems of international students, in general, as minor problems. Research questions number one and three regarding what are the adjustment problems of international students are thus addressed. The means of both faculty/staffs were higher than the means for both groups of students. The means of the participants in Texas were higher than their counterparts in California. The sources of these discrepancies will be discussed in the 11 categories of the MISPI to follow.

The combined means of the faculty/staff members of both universities was 2.14. The mean of the Texas faculty/staff was 2.31 and the mean of the California faculty/staff was 1.97 suggesting that the faculty/staff in Texas perceive that their students are experiencing more problems than their counterparts in California. This difference was statistically significant at the .10 level of significance (p = .038). However, both means still fall within the minor problem rating for means.

The combined means of the students from both universities was 1.85. The mean for the Texas students was 1.91 and 1.78 for the California students. This difference was statistically significant at the .10 level of significance (p = .000), indicating that the two groups of students differ significantly in how they perceive their own problems as international students. However, both means fall within the minor problem rating.

The means of the faculty/staff and students from the Texas school was 2.11. The faculty/staff mean was 2.31 and the student mean was 1.91. This difference was statistically significant at the .10 level of significance (p = .016), again suggesting that the faculty/staff and students at the Texas school differ significantly in how they perceive the problems of international students. Both means fall within the minor problem rating.

The combined means of the faculty/staff and students from the California school was 1.88. The faculty/staff mean was 1.97 and the student mean was 1.78. The difference was statistically significant at the .10 level of significance (p = 000), indicating that the faculty/staff and students at the California school differ significantly in how they perceive problems. Both means fall within the minor problem rating for means.

The analysis of the MISPI categories will provide insight into the reasons why these statistical significant differences exist. It should not be assumed that there are significant differences in all categories. The regressions will explain how and to what extent these groups differ while indicating the effects of the independent variables on the dependent variables. In this way, research questions number two and four are addressed.

When a multiple regression technique was applied to the student group representing the aggregated data of the 11 categories, the adjusted R^2 for the model was .101, suggesting that about 10% of the variance in students' responses were explained in the student collective regression. Most variables in the collective regression are significant, but this was not true for all 11 categories. Table 3 describes the findings.

Table 3 Student Collective Regression

Model	Variables	Estimated Coefficients	Std. Error	t
	(Constant)	1.529	.106	14.422
	University	.185	.072	2.574***
	Time, Under 1 Year	.118	.064	1.847*
	Taiwan	.205	.100	2.046**
	Japan	.193	.098	1.963**
	Hong Kong	.209	.110	1.898*
	Gender	4.874E-02	.065	.746
	Marital Status	-3.530E-03	.101	-.035

Note: Statistically significant— * = 10% level; ** = 5% level; *** = .1% level.

An examination of table 3 shows that all of the independent variables have a significant influence on the collective category except gender and marital status. Students

from the Texas school score .185, or 6% higher than students from California. Students in

attendance at school less than a year score .118, or 3.9% higher than students in

attendance for a longer period of time. Students from Taiwan score .205, or 6.8% higher

than students from other countries. Students from Japan scored .193, or 6.4% higher than

student from other countries and students from Hong Kong score .209, or 6.9% higher

than students from other countries. This means, for example, that a student from Taiwan

studying in Texas for less than a year should score .508, or 16.9% higher than other

students. Multiple regression analysis used in this manner will permit institutions to

anticipate the needs of students and adjust programming accordingly. However, it should

be understood that while students from the three Asian countries perceived that they had

more problems than other students, they were more alike than different. It is in this way

that multiple regression techniques are valuable in answering research question number

two regarding how students differ in opinions about adjustment problems, and how much

an independent variable effects the dependent variables.

When a multiple regression technique was also applied to the faculty/staff group

representing the aggregated data of all 11 categories for all respondents, the adjusted R^2

was .085 for the faculty/staff collective regression. All 11 means for the dependent

variables were averaged into a single mean to acquire the collective mean. This collective

mean describes the data providing an over-view of the entire study. The F value was

1.995 (p = .114), indicating no statistical significance at the .10 level for the faculty/staff

collective regression. Table 4 describes the findings for the aggregated data; this table is

the only table displayed that does not present statistically significant data.

Table 4 Faculty/Staff Collective Regression

Model	Variables	Estimated Coefficients	Std. Error	t
	(Constant)	2.006	.157	12.783
	University	.472	.198	2.380**
	Position	-.208	.193	-1.074
	Abroad	.113	.165	.686
	Gender	-.248	.164	-1.510

<u>Note</u>: Statistically significant-- * = 10% level; ** = 5% level; *** = .1% level.

The regression reflects a difference between the faculty/staff at both of these universities worthy of investigating within the following 11 dependent variables, but the faculty/staff at both universities differ to a much lesser degree than do the students from these universities regarding the problems of international students. Research question number four is thus addressed through the regressions within each of the categories.

In the discussion of the following 11 MISPI categories, research questions number one and three are answered within the mean section of the report. Those questions identify what problems international students have as identified by themselves, or as perceived by the faculty/staff of the university. The regression sections discuss research questions number two and four regarding the extent of the effects of the independent variables upon the dependent variables, and how the various groups differ within themselves. Research question number five is interwoven into the discussion of the means and the regressions along with being discussed at length in the synopsis and research question sections following the discussion of these 11 MISPI categories.

Admission and Selection Category

The admission and selection category includes questions regarding the evaluation of school credentials, concerns about the value of a U.S. education, choosing college subjects, admission policies, registration procedures, understanding college catalogs,

immigration regulations, knowledge of the U.S., differences in purposes among U.S. colleges, and differences between U.S. and home education systems. The specific questions are presented in appendix B along with all of the survey questions used for each of the 11 categories.

Research question number one related to students' perceptions, and research question number three related to the faculty/staffs' perceptions asks that adjustment problems be identified, but the responses indicate that the admissions and selection process creates only a minor problem for any of the four groups of respondents. The range of the means for all 11 of the categories is from 1 to 4. A 1 indicates "no problem", a 2 indicates a "minor problem", a 3 indicates a "moderate problem", and a 4 indicates a "major problem." The higher the mean the greater the problem groups perceive the experience with admissions for international students. An evaluation of tables 5, 6, 7 and 8 for this category allows for a comparison of means between the groups of respondents.

Table 5 Faculty/Staff Admissions Mean Report

University Faculty/Staff	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
California	1.8571	14	1.0995
Texas	2.1667	30	.9855
Total	2.0682	44	1.0207

Table 6 Student Admission Mean Report

University Students	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
California	1.6683	92	.4662
Texas	1.8341	123	.5562
Total	1.7631	215	.5249

Table 7 Texas Faculty/Staff Texas and Student Admission Mean Report

Faculty/Staff Student	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Faculty	2.2069	29	.9776
Student	1.8342	123	.5558
Total	1.9053	152	.6696

Table 8 California Faculty/Staff and Student Admission Mean Report

Faculty/Staff Student	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Faculty	1.8571	14	1.0995
Student	1.6678	92	.4659
Total	1.6928	106	.5847

The faculty/staff mean of 2.07 in the admissions and selection category indicates that the problem associated with university admission is considered a minor problem by the faculty/staff. The students also consider admissions to be a minor problem with a mean of 1.76. The faculty/staff and student mean in Texas was 1.91, and the California faculty/staff and student mean was 1.69, also indicating that each of these groups perceived problems in this area as minor. In general, admission procedures of both universities appear to pose only minor problems for the international students.

Research question number five, which focuses attention on how the groups differ, is addressed with the use of a paired sample t-test procedure reflected in the tables. The faculty/staff means at both institutions reveal no statistically significant difference in the means for the admissions and selection category. However, there was a statistically significant difference between the two groups of students. There was also a statistically significant difference between the faculty/staff and students at the Texas school while there was no significant difference between the faculty/staff and students at the California school.

The faculty/staff means were consistently higher than the student means at both universities. The student means of the Texas school were higher than the California school even though the California school is a competitive university and the Texas school is a non-competitive school. This difference might have to do with language ability or the relative familiarity of the students with American universities and admissions procedures. The California school accepts students with a higher language standard than the standard used at the Texas school. One reason for this is that the Texas school provides English language training of a non-academic nature to prepare students for the academic program. Another consideration is that the California school admits more students from western cultures than does the Texas school. A majority of the students admitted in Texas are from Asian countries. Students from the high context cultures of Asia normally have a difficult time adjusting to cultural differences as extreme as those found in the low context culture of the U.S. Culture and learning are critically related. Each culture is an integrated whole and has rules for learning the culture. To understand another culture one must understand how that culture is organized and how people learn in that culture. When the difference between cultures is greater, the difficulty in adjustment conceivably will be greater.

The high context culture is collectivistic with the group being important and consisting of subtle forms of communicating beyond words. The low context culture is individualistic and the word message conveys everything. This cultural reality influences how information is transmitted and interpreted. However, despite these cultural differences, it should be pointed out that both student groups found the problem of admission to be a minor problem.

The student admissions and selection regression describes a much different story for the students than the faculty/staff in this category in attempting to explain the variance necessitated by research question number two. The adjusted R^2 for the student regression was .067, suggesting that only about 7% of the variance in students' responses to admissions problems could be explained by the regression. The F value was 3.180 (p = .003), indicating at the highest level of statistical significance the independent variables possessed some explanatory power in the regression. Table 9 presents the results of this regression.

Table 9 Student Admissions Regression

Model	Variables	Estimated Coefficients	Std. Error	t
	(Constant)	1.458	.117	12.423
	University	5.869E-02	.079	.740
	Time, Under 1 Year	.216	.071	3.059***
	Taiwan	.240	.111	2.164***
	Japan	.112	.109	1.027
	Hong Kong	.212	.122	1.738*
	Gender	9.276E-02	.072	1.283
	Marital Status	6.885E-02	.112	.615

Note: Statistically significant— * = 10% level; ** = 5% level; *** = .1% level.

As shown in table 9, students who have spent less than a year at the university have significantly more problems than students at the university for a longer period of time regardless of age. Specifically, their average score on this part of the survey was .216 higher, an increase of almost 7% over students who have been at the university for a longer period of time. The problem may just seem less great for students who have been at the school over a longer period of time. It is also possible that conditional admission standards at the Texas school contribute to the perception of a greater problem in the admission category. However, since adjustment to a new culture is so demanding,

universities need to address this issue by providing more support for newer students on campus. Student from Taiwan and Hong Kong also experience significantly greater problems with admissions than students from other countries. These "westernized" Chinese cultures may have greater expectations for their university experience than students from other countries. This would explain more of their dissatisfaction with the university experience. The score for students from Taiwan increased by .240, or 8% above all other countries. The scores for students from Hong Kong are .212 higher, about 7% greater than other countries. Gender and marital status yield no significant influence on the dependent variable of admissions nor does the university a student attends.

Regressions were run for each of the 12 questions for the admissions and selection category and six of the questions were found to be statistically significant including questions number 35, 36, 67, 69, 100, and 102.

The independent variable time at the university was statistically significant three times. Questions number 35, 67, and 69 concern themselves with the issues of class registration, understanding college catalogs, and knowledge about the U.S. These are issues with which international students are confronted immediately upon their arrival in the U.S. leading to a matter of greater concern for those less proficient in English and less familiar with university procedures. Seven of the other questions deal with matters that are more general in nature and not related to a time issue. This finding leads to a conclusion that time at the university is an important variable.

Students from Taiwan, Japan, and Hong Kong scored higher on question 36 dealing with the issue of attending the college of their first choice, and this difference proved to be statistically significant. These students appear to want to go to a different

school, but no explanation as to why they were unable to attend the first choice school is possible from this data set.

The university attended was not a significant variable when the admissions model was run. However, when the individual question model was run the university became significant for question 9 concerning knowledge of the U.S., question 100 concerning the purposes of U. S. colleges, and question 102 concerning not being met on arrival at campus. The students at the Texas school had greater concerns in this area than the students from California. This issue may relate to English language ability or country of origin factors, and consequently, these findings may be consistent with the previous comments made about this matter.

Gender was not a coefficient that was statistically significant when the admission model was run. However, when the individual question model was run gender became significant for question 35 regarding registration, and for question 36 regarding not attending the university of their first choice. Male students have greater concern in these areas than do female students.

A multiple regression technique was applied to the faculty/staff group and the student group for the admissions and selection category. The F value was .559 (p = .694), indicating no statistical significance for the explanatory power of the independent variables in the regression for the faculty/staff category at the .10 significance level. Therefore, research question number four regarding how the faculty/staff differ and the extent of the effects of independent variables on dependent variables cannot be determined. This could be the result of the small sample size, or the use of too short a survey form.

Orientation Services Category

The orientation services category includes questions regarding the treatment students received during orientation meetings, unfavorable remarks made about a student's country, the concept of being a "foreign" student, the student's relationship with the foreign student advisor, leisure time activities of U.S. students, law enforcement practices in the U.S., campus size, understanding how to use the library, the sufficiency of the college orientation program, trying to be student, tourist, "ambassador," attitudes towards "foreign" students, and the U.S. emphasis on time and promptness.

Research question number one involved student perceptions, and research question number three involved perceptions of the faculty/staff. With respect to the orientation services, the data suggests that there were only minor problems for any of the four groups of respondents. The staff mean of 1.81 indicates that the problem associated with student orientation is considered a minor problem by the faculty/staff. The students consider orientation to be an even more minor problem; the mean here is only 1.70. The Texas faculty/staff and student mean of 1.79 and the California faculty/staff and student mean of 1.61 also indicates a minor problem as perceived by these groups. Orientation is a minor consideration in identifying adjustment problems related to research questions number one and three. Tables 10, 11, 12, and 13 reflect the category scores.

Table 10 Faculty/Staff Orientation Mean Report

University Faculty/Staff	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
California	2.0714	14	.8287
Texas	1.7000	30	.8367
Total	1.8182	44	.8428

Table 11 Student Orientation Mean Report

University Students	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
California	1.5417	92	.3917
Texas	1.8227	123	.5810
Total	1.7025	215	.5264

Table 12 Texas Faculty/Staff and Student Orientation Mean Report

Faculty/Staff Student	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Faculty	1.7000	30	.8367
Student	1.8227	123	.5810
Total	1.7986	153	.6379

Table 13 California Faculty/Staff and Student Orientation Mean Report

Faculty/Staff Student	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Faculty	2.0714	14	.8287
Student	1.5417	92	.3917
Total	1.6117	106	.5005

Research question number five, as to how the groups differ, is addressed with the use of a paired sample t-test procedure reflected in the tables. The analysis of the faculty/staff means reveals no statistically significant differences for the orientation services category. However, there was a statistically significant difference between the student groups with the mean of the Texas student group .28 higher than the California student group. There was no statistically significant difference between the faculty/staff and students at the Texas school, but there was a significant difference between the faculty/staff and students in California with a difference in means of .53. The mean for the California faculty/staff was higher than that for the Texas faculty/staff. This was also true for the California faculty/staff and the students in California. The limited number of faculty/staff members from California responding to the survey may contribute to this

difference. Also, some of the staff in California stated in the qualitative responses that they were not frequently involved with international students. This lack of involvement might produce some difference in the means also.

When a multiple regression technique was applied to the student group for the orientation services category in order to address research question number two, the findings were different from the faculty/staff group. The adjusted R^2 was .098 for the student-to-student comparison. Approximately 10% of the variance of the responses can be explained for this group and category. The F value was 4.308 (p = .000), indicating that at the highest level of statistical significance the independent variables had some explanatory power.

Table 14 describes the findings.

Table 14 Student Orientation Services Regression

Model	Variables	Estimated Coefficients	Std. Error	t
	(Constant)	1.457	.116	12.593
	University	.151	.078	1.931*
	Time, Under 1 Year	5.476E-02	.070	.787
	Taiwan	.356	.109	3.256***
	Japan	.169	.107	1.581
	Hong Kong	.277	.120	2.310***
	Gender	4.666E-02	.071	.655
	Marital Status	7.982E-03	.110	.072

Note: Statistically significant-- * = 10% level; ** = 5% level; *** = .1% level.

Which university a student attends influences the dependent variable significantly at the .10 significance level. Students who attend the university in Texas have a .151, or 5% greater problem with orientation services than students attending the school in California. This may be due in part to the fact that students in Texas are admitted with limited English proficiency and thus have a greater problem understanding and adjusting

to a new environment. Students from Taiwan and Hong Kong also experience significantly greater problems with orientation services than students from other countries. Taiwan student scores are .356, or 12% higher than students from other countries. Hong Kong student scores are .277, or 9% higher than students from other countries. This is not true for students from Japan although Japanese students came close to exhibiting a statistically significant difference. The lower score for the Japanese students may result from the orientation program the students experience while still in Japan. Many Japanese students at the Texas school are recruited by a company in Japan that provided two weeks of training in Japan and one week of training in the U. S. before the students reported for the academic or IEP programs at the Texas school. This training provided these students with cultural insights and experiences that other students do not normally enjoy in an orientation program. The Texas school has a much larger group of students from Asia enrolled at the university than the university in California. This could also explain why the students in Texas have more problems associated with orientation services than do their counterparts in California. Asians have a greater adjustment problem to cultural differences than students from western cultures. This influence, along with English language proficiency issues, may explain the magnitude of this effect. Time at the university, gender, and marital status do not significantly influence the orientation services category.

Regressions were run for each of the 12 questions of the orientation services category and seven of the questions were found to be statistically significant including questions number 4, 39, 70, 72, 103, 104, and 105.

Students in Texas reported more concern about questions 70, 72, 103, 104, and

105 which are related to campus size, using the library, the sufficiency of the orientation program, issues of self-perception, and the attitude of others towards international students. Campus size could be a reference to the available facilities, but it might also be a reference to the number of students enrolled or the number of students living on campus. Many students in Texas are commuters. Other students are employed full-time and attend school part-time. Despite an enrollment of approximately 4,000 students, the school might be perceived as much smaller. The issues of self-perception and attitudes of others could be a reflection of the sensitivity that Asian people have to how they appear to others and to "saving face." Students from Taiwan reported more concern with questions 4 and 103 both having to do with the sufficiency of the orientation programs of the schools. They also reported more concern with questions 70, 72, and 104 dealing with the size of the campus, use of the library, and self-perceptions. The Japanese students reported more concern with questions 4, 70, and 104 related to the orientation program, campus size, and self-perceptions. Students studying in the U.S. for less than a year reported more concern with question 4 about the orientation program and question 72 about the use of the library. These would be issues of greater concern for students just arriving on campus as compared with students who have attended school for a longer period of time. The third question with which students who have been at the university less than a year were concerned was number 39 dealing with law enforcement practices in the U.S. A lack of familiarity and feeling comfortable might explain this concern. In general, both universities may want to evaluate additional orientation programming that could assist these students in adjusting to university life.

Marital status was significant for questions number 39 regarding law enforcement practices in the U.S. Single students were more concerned than married students about this issue which might again be a reflection of a lack of knowledge concerning the U.S.

When a multiple regression technique was applied to the faculty/staff group for the orientation services category, the F value was .921 (p = .462) indicating no statistical significance for the effect of the independent variables at the .10 significance level in the orientation category for the faculty/staff. Therefore, research question number four regarding how the faculty/staff differ and the extent of the effects of independent variables on dependent variables cannot be determined. This could be the result of the small sample size, or the use of too short a survey form.

Academic Records Category

The student academic records category includes questions concerning the frequency of college examinations, compulsory class attendance, the writing or typing of term papers, the competitive college grading system, objective examinations, insufficient advice from academic advisors, too many interferences with studies, feeling unprepared for U.S. college work, concerns about grades, doing laboratory assignments, insufficient personal help from professors, and relations between U.S. students and faculty.

Research question number one related to students' perceptions, and research question number three related to the faculty/staffs' perceptions asks that adjustment problems be identified, but the responses indicate that academic records category creates only a minor problem for any of the four groups of respondents. The mean of 2.05 indicates that the problem associated with academic records is considered a minor problem by the faculty/staff. The students consider academic records to be a minor

problem with a mean of 1.80. The Texas faculty/staff and student mean of 1.95, and the

California faculty/staff and student mean of 1.69 also indicates a minor problem. Tables

15, 16, 17, and 18 reflect the scores.

Table 15 Faculty/Staff Academic Records Mean Report

University Faculty/Staff	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
California	2.0000	14	1.0377
Texas	2.0667	30	.9444
Total	2.0455	44	.9634

Table 16 Students Academic Records Mean Report

University Students	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
California	1.6479	92	.4984
Texas	1.9178	123	.6797
Total	1.8023	215	.6220

Table 17 Texas Faculty/Staff and Student Academic Records Mean Report

Faculty/Staff Student	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Faculty	2.0667	30	.9444
Student	1.9178	123	.6797
Total	1.9470	153	.7379

Table 18 California Faculty/Staff and Student Academic Records Mean Report

Faculty/Staff Student	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Faculty	2.0000	14	1.0377
Student	1.6479	92	.4984
Total	1.6944	106	.6025

Research question number five, as to how the groups differ, is addressed with the

use of a paired sample t-test procedure reflected in the tables. The analysis of the

faculty/staff means reveals no statistically significant difference in the means in the

student records category. There was a statistically significant difference between the two

groups of students. There was also a significant difference between the faculty/staff and students at the Texas school. There was a significant difference between the faculty/staff and students in California.

The faculty/staff considers academic records more of a problem than do the students. The faculty/staff is more aware of the problems with academic records including the work demands in the classroom, and thus considered the problem more serious even though it is a minor problem. Academic records poses little problem for students at these schools who view the problem as at most minor.

When a multiple regression technique was applied to the student group to address research question number two regarding how students differ for the academic records category, the adjusted R^2 was .091 for the student-to-student comparison. Approximately 9% of the variance of the responses can be explained for this group and category. The F value of 4.061 (p = .000) indicates a statistical significance at the highest level revealing that the independent variables had some explanatory power in the regression. Table 19 describes the findings for this category for the student group. Again the findings are much different from the findings for the faculty/staff group.

Table 19 Students Academic Records Regression

Model	Variables	Estimated Coefficients	Std. Error	t
	(Constant)	1.596	.137	11.630
	University	.138	.093	1.485
	Time, Under 1 Year	.260	.083	3.145***
	Taiwan	.249	.130	1.924*
	Japan	.235	.127	1.847*
	Hong Kong	.255	.142	1.788*
	Gender	-3.713E-02	.085	-.439
	Marital Status	-7.747E-02	.131	-.592

Note: Statistically significant— * = 10% level; ** = 5% level; *** = .1% level.

Time at the university does significantly influence the degree of problems that the students have with the student records category. Students at school for less than a year score .260, or 8.6% higher than students who have been here for a longer period of time. Students coming to the U.S. from different education systems would be expected to experience a lack of understanding of students records, classroom procedures, and classroom activities when first arriving in the U.S. This would be true of their understanding of university procedures and even the location of various services on campus. As students become more experienced with the U.S. higher education system, less of a problem exists for them in this category because they become more familiar with the nature of academic records in an American university setting. The country of origin of the students also significantly influences the degree of the problem for students from Taiwan, Japan, and Hong Kong on this category. Students from Hong Kong score .255, or 8% higher than students from other countries. Taiwan students score .249, or 8.3% higher and students from Japan score .235, or 7.8% higher than students from other countries. These students come to the U.S. from radically different educational systems than do students from western cultures. Students from Hong Kong, in fact, are more familiar with the British education system in use within that country and it differs greatly from the U.S. system. Gender, marital status, and which university a student attends does not significantly influence the student records category.

Regressions were run for each of the 12 questions for the academic records category and ten of the questions were found to display statistically significant effects, including questions 7, 8, 9, 40, 73, 74, 75, 106, 107, and 108.

Students in Texas, students from all three Asian countries, and students in the

country for less than a year all reported more concern with these questions that related predominantly to the work expected of them in university classes than did their counterparts in California. Classes in the U. S. are much different from Asian countries where students are not expected to participate in class discussion as they are in the U.S. Asian universities value memorization and the teachers are disseminators of information and authority figures who are viewed as individuals having all the answers. Respect for authority in the Asian classroom prohibits confronting or questioning the teacher. Limited knowledge of the U.S. educational system, the English language, and the cultural norms for students all would explain why the country of origin for students and the time at the university are variables that are statistically significant. The previous discussion of the differences between students and the extent of this category as a problem for international students addresses the issue of research question number two as to how the student groups differ.

When a multiple regression technique was applied to the faculty/staff group for the academic records category, the F value was .731 (p = .576), indicating no statistically significant effect for any of the independent variables in this category. Therefore, research question number four regarding how the faculty/staff differ and the extent of the effects of independent variables on dependent variables cannot be determined. This could be the result of the small sample size, or the use of too short a survey form.

Social-Personal Activities Category

The questions asked in the social-personal activities category concern worries about becoming too "westernized," insufficient personal-social counseling, being in love with someone, being lonely, feeling inferior to others, trying to make friends, sexual

customs in the United States, homesickness, feeling superior to others, the U.S. emphasis on personal cleanliness, not feeling at ease in public, and attitudes of some U.S. people to skin color.

Research question number one related to students' perceptions, and research question number three related to the faculty/staffs' perceptions asks that adjustment problems be identified, but the responses indicate that the social-personal activities category creates only a minor problem for any of the four groups of respondents. The faculty/staff mean of 2.47 indicates that the problem associated with social-personal activities is considered a minor problem by the faculty/staff. However, this mean is just .03 from reaching the moderate problem category. The students consider social activities a minor problem with a mean of 1.77. The Texas faculty/staff and student mean of 2.00 indicates a minor problem. The California faculty/staff and student mean of 1.72 indicates a minor problem as perceived by these groups. Tables 20, 21, 22, and 23 reflect the scores for this category.

Table 20 Faculty/Staff Social Activities Mean Report

University Faculty/Staff	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
California	2.0000	14	.9608
Texas	2.7000	30	.9879
Total	2.4773	44	1.0227

Table 21 Student Social Activities Mean Report

University Students	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
California	1.6782	92	.4899
Texas	1.8307	123	.5509
Total	1.7655	215	.5299

Table 22 Texas Faculty/Staff and Student Social-Personal Activities Mean Report

Faculty/Staff Student	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Faculty	2.7000	30	.9879
Student	1.8307	123	.5509
Total	2.0012	153	.7414

Table 23 California Faculty/Staff and Student Social-Personal Activities Mean Report

Faculty/Staff Student	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Faculty	2.0000	14	.9608
Student	1.6782	92	.4899
Total	1.7207	106	.5782

Research question number five, as to how the groups differ, is addressed with the use of a paired sample t-test procedure reflected in the tables. The analysis of the faculty/staff means reveals a statistically significant difference in the means for the social-personal activities category. There was also a statistically significant difference between the two groups of students. There was a statistically significant difference between the faculty/staff and students at the Texas school and the California school. The faculty/staff means are consistently higher than those of the students. A lack of interaction with international students might account for a misperception of social activities by the faculty/staff. There is also a .71 difference in means between the faculty/staff and students. The faculty/staff mean is so much higher than the student mean that it is certainly a number worth of investigating to determine the likely cause for the difference. The international student focus on academic achievement could minimize the importance of social-personal activities for these students, or it is possible that these students have other outlets unknown to the faculty/staff. The extent of the difference

between international students and university personnel, research question number five, is greater for this category than all previous categories.

When a multiple regression technique was applied to the student group to address research question number two regarding how students differ for the social-personal activities category, the adjusted R^2 was .062 for the student group comparison. Approximately 6% of the variance of the responses can be explained for this group and category. The F value was 1.962 (p = .062), indicating at the .10 level of statistical significance that the independent variables possessed some explanatory power in the regression. Table 24 describes the findings for this category for the student group.

Table 24 Student Social-Personal Activities Regression

Model Variables	Estimated Coefficients	Std. Error	t
(Constant)	1.617	.121	13.400
University	3.723E-02	.082	.456
Time, Under 1 Year	2.398E-02	.073	.330
Taiwan	.283	.114	2.480***
Japan	.185	.112	1.657*
Hong Kong	.248	.125	1.979**
Gender	1.143E-04	.074	.002
Marital Status	2.304E-02	.115	.200

Note: Statistically significant-- * = 10% level; ** = 5% level; *** = .1% level.

Results from this regression suggest that a student's country of origin plays a significant role in explaining the extent of their problems. Specifically, students from Hong Kong score .125, or 4.1% higher than students from other countries. Taiwan students score .114, or 3.8% higher and students from Japan score .125, or 4.2% higher than students from other countries. The university the student attends, the time at the university, gender, and the marital status of the students do not significantly influence the social-personal activities category.

Regressions were run for each of the 12 questions of the social-personal category and two of the questions were found to be statistically significant. Only questions 109 and 110 were statistically significant when the regression was run in the question-by-question model. Students in Texas, all three Asian countries, and females all reported more concern with the U. S. emphasis on personal cleanliness in question 109. This may result from culturally different personal hygiene practices, and it may also be associated with the living-dining category where these same groups of variables indicated a statistical significance for bathroom facilities causing problems.

Question 110 deals with not feeling at ease in public and was reported as a greater concern for the Texas students and Japanese students. Since a majority of students in Texas are Asians with lower English ability, including the Japanese, it is easy to understand that they might not feel at ease in public because they fear they will not be able to communicate with other people. Statistically significant independent variables describe differences between students and answered research question number two.

When a multiple regression technique was applied to the faculty/staff group for the social-personal category, the findings for this category differed greatly from the first three categories examined for the faculty/staff group. Research question number four asked to what extent the effects of the independent variables on the dependent variables explain the variance in the faculty/staff response. Since the category is statistically significant that variance can be evaluated within the social-personal activities category. The adjusted R^2 was .203 for the faculty/staff. Approximately 20% of the variance of the responses can be explained for this group and category. The F value was 3.115 ($p = .011$), indicating that at least one of the independent variables in the model had a significant

effect at the 10% level. Table 25 describes the findings for this category for the faculty/staff.

Table 25 Faculty/Staff Social-Personal Activities Regression

Model	Variables	Estimated Coefficients	Std. Error	t
	(Constant)	2.075	.271	7.646
	University	.896	.343	2.613***
	Position	-.237	.334	-.710
	Gender	-.697	.284	2.452***
	Abroad	.434	.286	1.516

Note: Statistically significant— * = 10% level; ** = 5% level; *** = .1% level.

The gender of the faculty/staff and which of the universities they work with significantly influence this dependent variable. Female faculty/staff members working in Texas consider social-personal issues to be a significantly greater problem for international students than do male faculty/staff members or faculty/staff at the California institution. Female faculty/staff members score .697, or 23% higher than male faculty/staff members. The Texas faculty/staff score .896, or 30% higher than the California faculty/staff. Position and having lived abroad do not significantly influence the social activities category for the faculty/staff group.

Living-Dining Category

The questions asked in the living-dining category relate to the taste of foods in the U.S., problems regarding housing, costs of buying food, insufficient clothing, not being able to room with a U.S. student, bathroom facility problems, distance to classes from residence, relationship with roommates, finding a place to live between college terms, changes in weather conditions, and a lack of invitations to visit in U.S. homes.

Research question number one related to students' perceptions, and research question number three related to the faculty/staffs' perceptions asks that adjustment

problems be identified, and the responses indicate that the living-dining category creates only a minor problem for three of the four groups of respondents. However, the faculty/staff mean of 2.64 indicates that the problem associated with the living-dining category is considered a moderate problem by the faculty/staff. The students consider the living-dining category to be a minor problem with a mean of 1.72. The Texas faculty/staff and student mean of 2.05 indicates a minor problem, and the California faculty/staff and student mean of 1.62 indicates a minor problem. The faculty/staff means are higher than the student means. The means of the Texas school are higher than the means of the California school. Food is always a major issue of cross-cultural experiences. Students from Asia are more likely to experience a higher degree of culture shock than the students from western nations because of the vast differences in food taste and types. Again, the school in Texas has a much higher proportion of students from Asia in attendance. This is a likely cause of the higher means because the Texas faculty/staff is possibly more aware of the problem for Asian students. Both schools would serve their international student body by evaluating the food program.

Tables 26, 27, 28, and 29 reflect the scores for this category.

Table 26 Faculty/Staff Living-Dining Mean Report

University Faculty/Staff	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
California	2.2143	14	.9750
Texas	2.8333	30	.8743
Total	2.6364	44	.9423

Table 27 Student Living-Dining Mean Report

University Students	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
California	1.5289	92	.4384
Texas	1.8608	123	.5882
Total	1.7188	215	.5533

Table 28 Texas Faculty/Staff and Student Living-Dining Mean Report

Faculty/Staff Student	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Faculty	2.8333	30	.8743
Student	1.8608	123	.5882
Total	2.0515	153	.7574

Table 29 California Faculty/Staff and Student Living-Dining Mean Report

Faculty/Staff Student	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Faculty	2.2143	14	.9750
Student	1.5289	92	.4384
Total	1.6195	106	.5819

Research question number five, as to how the groups differ, is addressed with the use of a paired sample t-test procedure reflected in the tables. The analysis of the faculty/staff and student means reveals a statistically significant difference in the means of all groups in the living-dining category. There was a statistically significant difference between the faculty/staff and students at the Texas school and the California school.

The adjustment problem in the living-dining category for international students is considered minor by the students, but moderate by the faculty/staff indicating a greater difference for research question number five than any other previous category considered in this study. The living-dining category for all other groups remains a minor problem and addresses this aspect of research questions number one and three.

When a multiple regression technique was applied to the student group to address research question number two regarding how the effects of the independent variables on

the dependent variables explains variation for the living-dining category, the adjusted R^2 was .096 for the students. Approximately 9% of the variance of the responses can be explained for this group and category. The F value was 4.255 (p = .000), indicating at the highest level of statistical significance the independent variables had some explanatory power in the regression. Table 30 describes the findings for the student group that again are statistically significant.

Table 30 Student Living-Dining Regression

Model Variables	Estimated Coefficients	Std. Error	t
(Constant)	1.423	.122	11.695
University	.226	.082	2.748***
Time, Under 1 Year	9.355E-02	.073	1.278
Taiwan	.262	.115	2.278***
Japan	.196	.113	1.739*
Hong Kong	.198	.126	1.568
Gender	6.032E-02	.075	.805
Marital Status	1.171E-02	.116	.101

Note: Statistically significant--* = 10% level; ** = 5% level; *** = .1% level.

Students who attend the university in Texas have a significantly greater problem with the living-dining category than students from the California school. Texas students score .226, or 7.5% higher than their California counterparts. This may be due, in part, to the fact that more students in Texas are from Asia while more students in California are from western countries. The amount of adaptation to food and living quarters for Asian students is greater than for students from western countries. Students from Taiwan and Japan also report greater problems with the living-dining category Taiwan students score .262, or 8.7% higher than students from other countries. Students from Japan score .196, or 6.5% higher than students from other countries. Since cultural norms in dining or in dormitory life are undoubtedly different between Asian and western cultures

these differences might contribute to the problem. When Asian students do not understand cultural cues western students take for granted perhaps an uncomfortable environment is created for Asian students because of the response of an American student. For example, searching through a roommate's desk to borrow some item may be completely acceptable in some Asian cultures, but may be responded to angrily by an American. When the American coughs to indicate displeasure the Asian student might not understand the cue and not respond appropriately. In turn, this could lead to a confrontation unpleasant for both parties, but was the result of not understanding the cue. Gender, time at the university, and marital status of the student do not statistically influence the living-dining category.

Regressions were run for each of the 12 questions in the living-dining category and eight of the questions were found to be statistically significant. Questions 13, 14, 46, 47, 48, 79, 112, and 113 were all significant when this regression was run.

The Texas students reported more concern with seven of these questions mainly related to housing, bathroom facilities, having an American roommate, and between semester housing in questions 14, 46, 47, 48, 79, 112, and 113. Some of the bathrooms in Texas are suite style where two rooms share a bathroom facility. Other bathrooms are community style bathrooms where an entire hallway shares one large bathroom facility. The lack of privacy may be a problem for the more reserved Asian personality.

The students from Taiwan and Hong Kong reported more concern about matters related to taste of food and the cost of food in questions 13 and 46. Food preparation is vastly different in Asia and the taste of food problem can be understood as a cultural difference. The difference in the cost of food problem may be that students have to

purchase food outside of the cafeteria to satisfy their preferences thus enhancing the costs of food.

Marital status was significant only regarding clothing in this category. Singles were concerned about having sufficient clothing. This was another problem for the Texas students. The concern may be related to weather conditions in Texas where greater weather extremes are experienced than in southern California. Gender was only concerned with the cost of buying food, with males reporting more of a problem than females.

When a multiple regression technique was applied to the faculty/staff group for the living-dining category, the adjusted R^2 was .155 for the staff. Again, research question number four asked that the variance in the faculty/staff responses be explained by the effect of the independent variables upon the dependent variables. Approximately 15% of the variance of the responses can be explained for this group and category. The F value was 2.970 (p = .031), indicating at the .10 level of statistical significance that the independent variables possess some explanatory power in the regression for the social activities category for the faculty/staff. Table 31 describes the findings for the faculty/staff that again are statistically significant.

Table 31 Faculty/Staff Living-Dining Regression

Model	Variables	Estimated Coefficients	Std. Error	t
	(Constant)	2.244	.257	8.716
	University	.832	325	2.559***
	Position	-.354	.317	-1.116
	Gender	-.493	.270	-1.829*
	Abroad	.388	.271	1.430

Note: Statistically significant— * = 10% level; ** = 5% level; *** = .1% level.

The faculty/staff members working in Texas consider the problems related to living-dining arrangements to be a greater problem to international students than do the faculty/staff in California. Texas faculty/staff members score .832, or 28% higher than the California faculty/staff members. Female faculty/staff at either school also consider the problem of living-dining arrangements to be significantly greater for international students. Females score .493, or 16% higher than their male counterparts. Greater female sensitivity to this type of issue might explain why female faculty/staff members considered this issue a greater problem for the students. Also, the faculty/staff in Texas are more directly involved with international students and are possibly more aware of these types of problems for these students than their counterparts in California. The smaller number of faculty/staff responses in California could also explain this difference. In the qualitative responses of the California faculty/staff, a number of them indicated they were not sure of some of their responses due to a lack of direct involvement with international students. Whether or not the faculty/staff lived or worked abroad and with regard to what position the faculty/staff hold, there was no significant influence for these two independent variables on the dependent variable.

Health Services Category

Questions regarding health issues included problems with poor eye sight, recurrent headaches, physical height and physique, hearing, nervousness, finding adequate health services, dietary problems, time to rest, mental health, tension, service received at the health center, and the academic pace influencing health.

Research question number one related to students' perceptions, and research question number three related to the faculty/staffs' perceptions asked that adjustment

problems be identified, but responses indicate that the health services category poses only

a minor problem for all four groups. The faculty/staff mean of 1.86 indicates that the

problem associated with the health category is considered a minor problem by the staff.

The students consider the health category to be a minor problem with a mean of 1.77. The

Texas faculty/staff and student mean of 1.91 indicates a minor problem. The California

faculty/staff and student mean of 1.61 indicates a minor problem as perceived by these

groups. The means do not cross from a minor to no problem level despite the fact that a

significant difference among students exists. Therefore, there is some question as to the

practical importance of the significant difference in terms of pursuing corrective

measures. Health questions are not an issue to international students at these schools.

Tables 32, 33, 34, and 35 reflect the scores.

Table 32 Faculty/Staff Health Service Mean Report

University Faculty/Staff	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
California	1.7857	14	.6993
Texas	1.9000	30	.6618
Total	1.8636	44	.6679

Table 33 Student Health Service Mean Report

University Students	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
California	1.5779	92	.5229
Texas	1.9179	123	.6440
Total	1.7724	215	.6174

Table 34 Texas Faculty/Staff and Student Health Service Mean Report

Faculty/Staff Student	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Faculty	1.9000	30	.6618
Student	1.9179	123	.6440
Total	1.9144	153	.6454

Table 35 California Faculty/Staff and Student Health Service Mean Report

Faculty/Staff Student	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Faculty	1.7857	14	.6993
Student	1.5779	92	.5229
Total	1.6054	106	.5500

Research question number five, as to how the groups differ, is addressed with the use of a paired sample t-test procedure reflected in the tables. The analysis of the faculty/staff means for health reveals no statistically significant difference in the means of the faculty/staff group for the health category. There was a statistically significant difference between the students. The mean for the students in Texas is higher than the mean for the students in California. The reasons for this difference are explained in a discussion of the regressions related to the health services category. Neither school indicated a statistically significant difference for the faculty/staff and students.

When a multiple regression technique was applied to the faculty/staff group for the health services category, the adjusted R^2 was .108 for the students. Research question number two asked that the variance in the student responses be explained by the effect of the independent variables upon the dependent variables. Only approximately 11% of the variance of the responses can be explained for this group and category. The F value was 4.715 (p = .003), indicating at the highest level of statistical significance that the independent variables had some explanatory power in the health services regression for the student groups. Table 36 describes the findings for the health services category for the student group.

Table 36 Student Health Regression

Model Variables	Estimated Coefficients	Std. Error	t
(Constant)	1.512	.135	11.211
University	.211	.091	2.311***
Time, Under 1 Year	.175	.081	2.153***
Taiwan	.230	.127	1.805*
Japan	.340	.125	2.724***
Hong Kong	.214	.140	1.532
Gender	-3.245E-02	.083	-.390
Marital Status	-3.228E-02	.129	-.251

Note: Statistically significant— * = 10% level; ** = 5% level; *** = .1% level.

Students who attend the university in Texas have significantly greater problems with the health category than the students from the California school. Texas students score .211, or 7% higher than the students from California. This is also true for students who have spent less than one year at the university. They score .175, or 5.8% higher than students who have attended school longer. Students from Taiwan and Japan also have significantly greater problems with the health category than other students. Students from Taiwan score .230, or 7.6% higher and students from Japan score .340, or 11% higher than students from other countries. Radically different medical services are available to students in the U.S. from those in their home countries. For example, in Taiwan a socialized medical program exists. Patients do not call for appointments, but simply go to a clinic of their choice and wait in line until the doctor can examine them. Unfamiliarity with the cultural norms for such services may contribute to these problems for Asian students. Herbal medicine that is much different from any used in the U. S. is also used by many people in Asia. These students would have a greater difficulty in adjusting to medical practices in the U.S. This may also be the case for students who are not familiar with medical services in the U.S. because they have been in the country for such a short

time. Language proficiency may also contribute to the difficulty in communicating symptoms and past medical history thus creating a greater problem for health services for these students. Gender and marital status do not significantly explain the variance.

Regressions were run for each of the 12 questions of the health services category and eight of the questions were found to be statistically significant and included questions 16, 17, 18, 49, 50, 51, 82, and 84.

The Texas students experienced more problems with health services than the students in California. Five of the eight questions were significant for this coefficient mainly having to do with nervousness, hearing, dietary problems, and mental health all of which are problems that these students may have brought with them to school found in questions 49, 50, 51, 82, and 84. Mental health and nervousness may have to do with the stress of college work, but these same students do not express feelings of being under tension or suffering due to the academic pace of the university. Therefore, we must look to some other explanation for these problems. The problem with hearing may be a misinterpretation of the question. People with limited English proficiency might not be thinking of the question as a matter of the function of the ear as it is a matter or comprehension of what they do hear. All three Asian countries experienced significance with from three to five questions.

Marital status was concerned with three of these problems including question numbers 18, 82, and 84 having to do with physical appearance, need for rest, and feeling tension. Students from Taiwan and Hong Kong shared the concern about height and physical physique, which might simply be a matter of the perceptions of Asians regarding their stature since stereotypically Asians are perceived as smaller individuals. The

question of needing more rest and feeling tension may be the result of the additional stress of being married on these students. Gender was significant for question numbers 17 and 49 having to do with headaches and nervousness. Males seem to suffer more from these conditions than females.

When a multiple regression technique was applied to the faculty/staff group for the health services category, the F value was .822 (p = .519), indicating that the general regression model had no explanatory power for this category. Therefore, research question number four regarding how the faculty/staff differ and the extent of the effects of independent variables on dependent variables cannot be determined. This could be the result of the small sample size, or the use of too short a survey form.

Religious Services Category

Questions regarding the religious services category included the issues related to religious practices in the United States, attending church socials, concern about religious beliefs, about finding a worship group of own faith, Christianity as a philosophy, the variety of religious faith in the U.S., having time to devote to their own religion, spiritual versus materialistic values, doubting the value of any religion, criticism of homeland religion, accepting differences in the great religions, and confusion about religion and morals in the U.S.

Research questions number one related to students' perceptions, and research question number three related to the faculty/staffs' perceptions of adjustment problems be identified, but responses indicate that the religious services category creates only a minor problem for any of the four groups of respondents. The faculty/staff mean of 1.91 and the student mean of 1.54 indicate that religion is an issue considered as a minor problem by

these groups. The Texas faculty/staff and student mean of 1.77 indicates a minor problem,

and the California faculty/staff and student mean of 1.37 indicates no problem as

perceived by these groups. Tables 37, 38, 39, and 40 reflect the scores for this category.

Table 37 Faculty/Staff Religious Mean Report

University Faculty/Staff	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
California	1.5714	14	.8516
Texas	2.0667	30	.9444
Total	1.9091	44	.9356

Table 38 Student Religious Mean Report

University Students	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
California	1.3386	92	.4150
Texas	1.6943	123	.6604
Total	1.5421	215	.5942

Table 39 Texas Faculty/Staff and Students Religious Mean Report

Faculty/Staff Student	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Faculty	2.0667	30	.9444
Student	1.6943	123	.6604
Total	1.7673	153	.7364

Table 40 California Faculty/Staff and Students Religious Mean Report

Faculty/Staff Student	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Faculty	1.5714	14	.8516
Student	1.3386	92	.4150
Total	1.3693	106	.4953

Research question number five, as to how the groups differ, is addressed with the

use of a paired sample t-test procedure reflected in the tables. The analysis of the

faculty/staff means for religion indicates no statistically significant difference in the

means for the religion category. The student means do reflect a statistically significant difference using a paired sample t-test procedure. There was a statistically significant difference between the faculty/staff and students at the Texas school, but not at the California school. The faculty/staff means are higher than the student means, but since both universities are private Christian schools it can be assumed that the faculty/staff are more concerned with religious issues than the students who come from a wider variety of backgrounds, religious experiences, and culture. The means of the Texas school are higher than the means of the California school. The difference might be attributed to the evangelic nature of the university in Texas or to the limited number of faculty/staff members in California responding to the survey.

When a multiple regression technique was applied to the student group for the religious services category, the adjusted R^2 was .098 for the students. Research question number two asked that the variance in the student responses be explained by the effect of the independent variables upon the dependent variables. The F value was 4.332 (p = .000), indicating at the highest level of statistical significance that the independent variables had some explanatory power in the religious services regression. Table 41 describes the findings for the student group.

Table 41 Student Religious Services Regression

Model	Variables	Estimated Coefficients	Std. Error	t
	(Constant)	1.118	.131	8.566
	University	.255	.088	2.888***
	Time, Under 1 Year	1.574E-02	.079	.201
	Taiwan	.271	.123	2.193***
	Japan	.200	.121	1.653*
	Hong Kong	.178	.135	1.311
	Gender	.140	.080	1.746*
	Marital Status	.137	.125	1.101

Note: Statistically significant-- * = 10% level; ** = 5% level; *** = .1% level.

Approximately 10% of the variance of the responses can be explained for this group and category. Students from the school in Texas reported greater problems with the religious services category than students from the California school. They score .255, or 8.5% higher than students from California in this category. That is partially explained by the fact that more of the international students in California are from countries where the majority of the population are Christians. The difference is also explained by the greater number of religious services, classes and activities required by the school for the students in Texas than the students in California. Students from Taiwan and Japan and male students have significantly greater problems with the religious services category also. Conflicts with religious beliefs that differ greatly from the Christian philosophy of these two schools may create the problem for these Asian students. Required religious services and emphasis on religion at these schools poses a greater problem for males who are generally less concerned about religious issues than are females. Students from Taiwan score .271, or 9% higher and students from Japan score .200, or 6.6% higher than students from other countries. Male students score .140, or 4.6% higher than female students. The marital status of the student, time at the university, and being from Hong Kong do not significantly influence student scores on the religious services category. The individual question regressions further indicated the concern of the Texas students, but do not clarify the story more than the above statements.

When a multiple regression technique was applied to the faculty/staff group for the religious services category, the F value was 1.402 (p = .251), indicating no statistically significant difference in the religious category for the faculty/staff, and an

inability of the independent variables to explain any effects within the regression. Therefore, research question number four regarding how the faculty/staff differ and the extent of the effects of independent variables on dependent variables cannot be determined. This could be the result of the small sample size, or the use of too short a survey form.

English Language Category

Questions regarding the English language included the problems of speaking English, giving oral reports in class, the ability to write English, class recitation, understanding lectures in English, reading textbooks written in English, understanding U.S. "slang," limited English vocabulary, pronunciation problems, insufficient remedial English services, having a non-English speaking roommate, and holding a conversation.

Research questions number one related to students' perceptions, and research question number three related to the faculty/staffs' perceptions, asked that adjustment problems be identified, but the responses indicate that the English language category creates only a minor problem for three of the four groups of respondents. The faculty/staff mean of 3.07 indicates that the problem associated with the English language is considered a moderate problem by the faculty/staff. The students consider the English language to be a minor problem with a mean of 1.91. The Texas faculty/staff and student mean of 2.40 indicates a minor problem although it is only .10 from the moderate problem level. The California staff and student mean of 1.68 indicates a minor problem as perceived by these groups. Tables 42, 43, 44, and 45 reflect the category scores.

Table 42 Faculty/Staff English Mean Report

University Faculty/Staff	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
California	2.3571	14	.6333
Texas	3.4000	30	.8137
Total	3.0682	44	.8996

Table 43 Student English Mean Report

University Student	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
California	1.5739	92	.5976
Texas	2.1542	123	.7186
Total	1.9059	215	.7273

Table 44 Texas Faculty/Staff and Students English Mean Report

Faculty/Staff Student	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Faculty	3.4000	30	.8137
Student	2.1542	123	.7186
Total	2.3985	153	.8871

Table 45 California Faculty/staff and Students English Mean Report

Faculty/Staff Student	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Faculty	2.3571	14	.6333
Student	1.5739	92	.5976
Total	1.6773	106	.6558

Research question number five, as to how the groups differ, is addressed with the use of a paired sample t-test procedure reflected in the tables. The analysis of the faculty/staff means for English reveals a statistically significant difference in the means of all four groups for the English language category. There was a statistically significant difference between the faculty/staff and students at the Texas school and the California school. The staff means are higher than the student means. The means of the Texas school are higher than the means of the California school. Since the Texas school admits students for participation in an intensive English program, the level of English

proficiency is much lower at this school. The natural result is that both faculty/staff and students will consider the use of language as a more serious problem because the student's use of English is more limited. This is complicated by the larger number of students from Asia who are more likely to experience more difficulty in learning English than students from western cultures. Again, the school in Texas has a much higher proportion of students from Asia in attendance. This is a likely cause of the higher means because the faculty/staff in Texas are possibly more aware of the problem for Asian international students. Both schools would do a service to their international student body by evaluating the need for an IEP, for language tutoring, and for other remedial language programs. The faculty/staff qualitative data at the California school contained suggestions from three staff members that such an IEP program be initiated. The higher language skills of the students in California reflect the greater independence of these students. The problem of the English language is the most serious problem encountered by international students and both universities would serve the students well by evaluating the comprehensiveness of the English language support services they provide for their students.

When a multiple regression technique was applied to the student group for the English language category, the adjusted R^2 was .268 for the students. Research question number two asked that the variance in the student responses be explained by the effect of the independent variables upon the dependent variables. Approximately 27% of the variance of the responses can be explained for this group and category. The F value was 12.175 (p = .000), indicating at the highest level of statistical significance the independent variables had some explanatory power in the regression. Table 46 describes

the findings for the student group.

Table 46 Student English Regression

Model	Variables	Estimated Coefficients	Std. Error	t
	(Constant)	1.575	.144	10.939
	University	.357	.097	3.667***
	Time, Under 1 Year	.252	.087	2.914***
	Taiwan	.309	.136	2.270***
	Japan	.617	.133	4.627***
	Hong Kong	.561	.149	3.755***
	Gender	-1.799E-02	.089	-.203
	Marital Status	-.193	.137	-1.409

Note: Statistically significant— * = 10% level; ** = 5% level; *** = .1% level.

The high R^2 for the group allows more of the variance to be explained and is the

highest value for any category for the student group. The university attended, time spent

at the university, and the countries of origin were all significant factors in explaining the

variance in student responses in this category. Texas students score .357, or 11.9% higher

than California students. Students attending the university for less than a year score .252,

or 8% higher than students who have been at the university longer. Students from Japan

score .617, or 20.5% higher, students from Hong Kong score .561, or 18.7% higher, and

students from Taiwan score .309, or 10% higher than students from other countries. This

finding is understandable in the light that the students attending the university in Texas

are admitted to the university for language instruction prior to beginning the academic

program. This means that their language proficiency is much lower than the students in

California who must pass a higher admission standard for language. Since students from

Asia have a greater degree of difficulty in learning the English language than European

students, the higher scores indicated above are natural. Language and culture cannot be

separated. Students from western countries are much more familiar with cultural norms

and cues in the U.S. than are Asian students. This lack of familiarity might result in a lack

of understanding of non-verbal communication and produce a perception with Asian

students that the problem is language bound. Time at the university impacts this finding

because the longer a student is in the U.S. and studying English the stronger language

skills the student develops. Thus students in the U.S. for less than one year have greater

problems with the English language. The gender and marital status of the student does

not influence the English category significantly.

Regressions were run for each of the 12 questions of the English language

category and all twelve of the questions were reported to be a problem. The major

concern of all students is the English language.

When a multiple regression technique was applied to the faculty/staff group for

the English language category, the adjusted R^2 was .404 for the staff. Research question

number four asked that the variance in the faculty/staff responses be explained by the

effect of the independent variables upon the dependent variables. Approximately 40% of

the variance can be explained for this group and category. The F value was 6.599 (P

= .000), indicating at the highest level of statistical significance that the independent

variables possessed explanatory power in the regression in the English category for the

faculty/staff. Table 47 describes the findings for the faculty/staff group.

Table 47 Faculty/Staff English Regression

Model	Variables	Estimated Coefficients	Std. Error	t
	(Constant)	2.357	.217	10.870
	University	.781	.274	2.853***
	Position	.591	.267	2.215***
	Gender	-.221	.227	-.972
	Abroad	.222	.229	.971

Note: Statistically significant-- * = 10% level; ** = 5% level; *** = .1% level.

The adjusted R^2 score was high indicating that more of the variance is explained for this category than for any of the other categories within this study. Only the faculty/staff position and the university where the faculty/staff member works influence the dependent variable significantly. Texas faculty/staff members scored .781, or 26% higher than their California counterparts. The faculty scored .591, or 19.7% higher than staff members at their respective universities. The difference in perception between the faculty/staff at these universities can be explained, in part, by the fact that the school in Texas has many students enrolled that are not proficient in English. They are enrolled for the specific purpose of improving their English skills and to study the English language before they begin their academic work. The faculty/staff that interact with these students would observe a greater English language problem for these students than the more language proficient students in California. Faculty members perceive a greater problem for international students in the English language category than do the staff members. The demand for English language proficiency in an academic setting is greater than in the general conversations students have with staff members. This explains why faculty members consider the problem of the English language to be greater for the international students than do the staff members of the institutions. The gender of the faculty/staff member and whether that member lived or worked abroad do not significantly explain the variance. This measure indicates that the English language is a serious consideration to the faculty/staff, and issues related to English need to be investigated.

Student Activities Category

Questions regarding the student activities category included the problems of regulations on student activities, treatment received at social functions, relationship of

men and women in the U.S., dating practices of U.S. people, being accepted in social groups, not being able to find "dates," the activities of international house, the U.S. emphasis on sports, problems when shopping in the U.S., activities of foreign student organizations, opportunities to meet more U.S. people, and concern about politics.

Research questions number one related to students' perceptions, and research question number three related to the faculty/staffs' perceptions, asked that adjustment problems be identified, but the responses indicate that the student activities category creates only a minor problem for all four groups of respondents. The faculty/staff mean of 2.23 indicates that the problem associated with student activities is considered a minor problem by the faculty/staff. The students consider student activities to be a minor problem with a mean of 1.70. The Texas faculty/staff and student mean of 1.94 indicates a minor problem. The California faculty/staff and student mean of 1.58 indicates a minor problem as perceived by these groups. Tables 48, 49, 50, and 51 reflect the scores.

Table 48 Faculty/Staff Student Activities Mean Report

University Faculty/Staff	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
California	2.0000	14	.6794
Texas	2.3333	30	.8442
Total	2.2273	44	.8030

Table 49 Students Student Activities Mean Report

University Students	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
California	1.5145	92	.4361
Texas	1.8413	123	.6293
Total	1.7014	215	.5770

Table 50 Texas Faculty/Staff and Students Student Activities Mean Report

Faculty/Staff Student	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Faculty	2.3333	30	.8442
Student	1.8413	123	.6293
Total	1.9378	153	.7016

Table 51 California Faculty/Staff and Student Student Activities Mean Report

Faculty/Staff Student	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Faculty	2.0000	14	.6794
Student	1.5145	92	.4361
Total	1.5786	106	.4992

Research question number five, as to how the groups differ, is addressed with the use of a paired sample t-test procedure reflected in the tables. The analysis of the faculty/staff means for student activities reveals that no statistically significant difference exists in the means of the faculty/staff for the student activities category. A statistically significant difference exists for the students. There was a statistically significant difference between the students and the faculty/staff and students at both the Texas school and the California school.

The faculty/staff means are higher than the student means similar to social activities. The means of the Texas school are higher than the means of the California school. Weather may be a factor in the social activities and student activities categories in that southern California enjoys a milder climate than Texas both in the winter and summer months permitting more outdoor type activities. Also, the location of the schools in proximity to out door and off-campus activities is an issue if transportation is a problem. Public transportation is available at the California school but not at the Texas school, which might be a contributing factor to these higher means. Furthermore, the

lower English ability of the newer students in Texas may contribute to this difference.

Students in Texas may be reluctant to become involved in activities where a higher

degree of language skills are required for interaction with other people. The result may be

that they do not participate in many social activities.

When a multiple regression technique was applied to the student group for the

student activities category, the adjusted R^2 was .086 for the students. Research question

number two asked that the variance in the student responses be explained by the effect of

the independent variables upon the dependent variables. The F value was 3.871 (p = .001),

indicating at the highest level of statistical significance the independent variables possess

some explanatory power in the regression. Table 52 describes the findings for the student

group.

Table 52 Students Student Activity Regression

Model	Variables	Estimated Coefficients	Std. Error	t
	(Constant)	1.360	.128	10.654
	University	.222	.086	2.574***
	Time, Under 1 Year	7.974E-02	.077	1.039
	Taiwan	.164	.121	1.358
	Japan	.201	.118	1.696*
	Hong Kong	.295	.132	2.229**
	Gender	8.043E-02	.079	1.023
	Marital Status	6.650E-02	.122	.546

Note: Statistically significant— * = 10% level; ** = 5% level; *** = .1% level.

Only approximately 9% of the variance of the responses can be explained for this

group and category. The students attending the university in Texas reported a greater

problem with student activities than the students in California. Texas students score .222,

or 7% higher than California students do in this category. That might be due to the fact

that more of these students are from Asia and speak less English. Combining their

English ability with their cultural background, it is possible to conclude that these

students are reluctant to become involved aggressively in the student activities that include American students. Students from Japan and Hong Kong have a significantly greater problem with the student activities category. This is further indication that universities must strive to involve these students in campus activities. Students from Japan score .201, or 6.7% higher and students from Hong Kong score .295, or 9.8% higher than students from other countries. Students from Taiwan do not score significantly higher than students from other countries. This does appear to be a contradiction, but a very active Chinese Student Association in Texas may explain why these students do better. The difference between Hong Kong and Taiwan students may be caused by the amount of exposure to the American culture that each country experiences. Taiwan is closely tied to the U.S. economically. Taiwan is also adapting a U.S. oriented educational system. This is not true for Hong Kong. Perhaps students are more comfortable in U.S. setting whereas Hong Kong students might be more comfortable in a British system common in their country. Gender, marital status, and time at the university do not explain significantly the variance in the responses. Student activities do not pose a large problem for students.

Regressions were run for each of the 12 questions of the student activities category and nine of the questions were found to be statistically significant. Questions 25, 26, 60, 91, 92, 93, 124, 125, and 126 were all significant when this regression was run.

The Texas students reported more concern for social activities in general with six questions identified as problems. The questions included number 26, 91, 92, 93, 124, and 126 that mainly related to daily activities such as going shopping, treatment received at social functions, activities of international houses, and activities of foreign student

organizations. This category must relate to the social-personal category and to the English language proficiency category because all three categories express the same concern about social interactions, meeting Americans, and using the English language publicly.

Time was reported as a greater problem with shopping in question 93 and concerns about political discussions in question 126. Students from Hong Kong had more problems in this category than the other countries and that is a phenomenon difficult to explain. Marital status was significant only for regulations concerning student activities, question number 25. Married students appear to want more freedom to participate in activities of their choice without being regulated by the university. Gender was significant for only activities of international house and international organizations. These organizations plan activities and provide services for international students. Males were more concerned in regards to questions 91 and 124 indicating that the support provided by these organizations were meeting their needs.

A multiple regression technique was applied to the faculty/staff group for the student activities category. The F value was 1.067 (p = .386), indicating that the independent variables cannot explain any of the variance in faculty/staff responses. Therefore, research question number four regarding how the faculty/staff differ and the extent of the effects of independent variables on dependent variables cannot be determined. This could be the result of the small sample size, or the use of too short a survey form.

Financial Aid Category

Questions regarding financial aid included concerns regarding a lack of money to

meet expenses, not receiving enough money from home, saving enough money for social events, immigration work restrictions, the limited amount the U.S. dollar will purchase, finding part-time work, unexpected financial needs, money for clothing, costs of an automobile, finding employment between college terms, and finding jobs that pay well.

Research questions number one related to students' perceptions, and research question number three related to the faculty/staffs' perceptions, asked that adjustment problems be identified, but the responses indicate that the financial aid category creates only a minor problem for all four groups of respondents. The faculty/staff mean of 2.00 and the student mean of 2.01 indicate that financial considerations are regarded as minor problems. The Texas staff and student mean of 2.08 reveal a minor problem as perceived by this group as does the mean of the California faculty/staff and student mean of 1.91. Tables 53, 54, 55 and 56 reflect the scores for this category.

Table 53 Faculty/Staff Financial Mean Report

University Faculty/Staff	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
California	1.9286	14	.9169
Texas	2.0333	30	.9994
Total	2.0000	44	.9645

Table 54 Student Financial Mean Report

University Students	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
California	1.9053	92	.7194
Texas	2.0924	123	.6668
Total	2.0124	215	.6944

Table 55 Texas Faculty/staff and Students Financial Mean Report

Faculty/Staff Student	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Faculty	2.0333	32	.9994
Student	2.0924	123	.6668
Total	2.0809	153	.7403

Table 56 California Faculty/staff and Students Financial Mean Report

Faculty/Staff Student	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Faculty	1.9286	14	.9169
Student	1.9053	92	.7194
Total	1.9084	106	.7434

Research question number five, as to how the groups differ, is addressed with the use of a paired sample t-test procedure reflected in the tables. The analysis of the faculty/staff means for financial aid indicates no statistically significant difference in the means for the finance category. The student means do reflect a statistically significant difference using a paired sample t-test procedure. There was not a statistically significant difference between the faculty/staff and students at the Texas school or the California school.

The faculty/staff means are higher than the student means again. This consistent phenomenon of higher faculty/staff means is worthy of attention in another study. The significant difference in the student means for finances is interesting because the mean in Texas is higher even though the total costs of tuition, room, board, and other expenses is considerably less per year than at the California school. More of the students in California, however, are attending school on scholarships. In fact, only 5% of the students at the Texas school indicated they were on scholarship while approximately 11% of the students in California indicated that they were on scholarship which might be a

reason the mean is significantly smaller at this school. Finances pose little problem to these groups.

When a multiple regression technique was applied to the student group for the financial aid category, the F value was 1.172 (p = .320), indicating no statistical significance in the financial category for the students, and an inability of the independent variables to explain any effects within the regression. Therefore, research question number two regarding how the students differ and the extent of the effects of independent variables on dependent variables cannot be determined.

This category was not statistically significant when the regression model was run by category. Only questions 30, 62, 96, and 127 were statistically significant when the regression was run in the question-by-question model. Students in Texas are concerned about matters related to expenses and immigration work standards. Japanese students were also concerned about immigration work standards. Students in the U. S. for less than a year and students from Hong Kong were concerned about the costs of an automobile in the U. S. This concern may only express a general concern about the cost of an education in the U.S. because automobiles in the U.S. are cheaper to obtain than in any of the three Asian countries of Japan, Hong Kong, and Taiwan. In general, however, finances are not a significant problem for students attending these universities. The other coefficients were not significant.

When a multiple regression technique was applied to the faculty/staff group for the financial aid category, the F value was .980 (p = .42.9), indicating no statistically significant difference in the financial category for the faculty/staff, and an inability of the independent variables to explain any of the effects within the regression. Therefore,

research question number four regarding how the faculty/staff differ and the extent of the effects of independent variables on dependent variables cannot be determined. This could be the result of the small sample size, or the use of too short a survey form.

Placement Services Category

Questions regarding placement services included issues related to finding a job upon returning home, not having enough time in the U.S. for study, trying to extend the stay in the United States, becoming a citizen of the United States, changes in the home government, a desire to not return to the home country, uncertainties in the world today, the desire to enroll at another college, the U.S. education not being what was expected, insufficient help from the placement office, staying in the U.S. and getting a job, and wondering if a U.S. education is useful back home.

Research questions number one related to students' perceptions, and research question number three related to the faculty/staffs' perceptions, asked that adjustment problems be identified, but the responses indicate that the placement services category creates only a minor problem for all four groups of respondents. The staff mean of 2.07 indicates that the problems with placement services are a minor problem. The student mean of 1.96 indicates that placement issues are a minor problem for this group. The Texas faculty/staff and student mean of 2.04 reveals a minor problem The California faculty/staff and student mean of 1.88 reveals a minor problem for this group. Tables 57, 58, 59, and 60 reflect the scores.

Table 57 Faculty/Staff Placement Mean Report

University Faculty/Staff	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
California	1.8571	14	.8644
Texas	2.1667	30	1.0854
Total	2.0682	44	1.0207

Table 58 Student Placement Mean Report

University Students	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
California	1.8878	92	.5704
Texas	2.0106	123	.5981
Total	1.9581	215	.5882

Table 59 Texas Faculty/staff and Students Placement Mean Report

Faculty/Staff Student	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Faculty	2.1667	30	1.0854
Student	2.0106	123	.5981
Total	2.0412	153	.7182

Table 60 California Faculty/Staff and Students Placement Mean Report

Faculty/Staff Student	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Faculty	1.8571	14	.8644
Student	1.8878	92	.5704
Total	1.8838	106	.6121

Research question number five, as to how the groups differ, is addressed with the use of a paired sample t-test procedure reflected in the tables. The analysis of the means for regarding placement services indicates no statistically significant differences in the means of the faculty/staff or students for the placement category. There was not a statistically significant difference between the faculty/staff and students at the Texas school or the California school. The means are relatively close with no statistically significant differences, but also reveal that the problem of placement is a minor problem.

When a multiple regression technique was applied to the student group for the placement services category, the F value was .676 (p = .692), indicating no statistical significance at the .10 significance level for the placement category for students. The independent variables cannot explain any effects within the regression. Therefore, research question number two regarding how the students differ and the extent of the effects of independent variables on dependent variables cannot be determined.

This category was not statistically significant when the regression model was run by category. Only questions 31, 65, and 98 were statistically significant when the regression was run in the question-by-question model. Students in Texas are concerned about changes in the home government related to question 65. Hong Kong, Japan, and Taiwan have all had significant issues related to change in government within their countries in recent years. Hong Kong has returned to be under the rule of the Peoples Republic of China, a communist nation, after having been a British protectorate for over 100 years. Taiwan has experienced a major change in the ruling party recently when for the first time in its history a minority party won the presidential election in that country. Japan has been confronted with economic problems that have caused a change in the ruling party of that country also. These may be the reasons for this concern among the students in Texas, which again is where Asians are in the majority.

Students in Texas also have a concern about enrolling at another college related to question 98, which may refer to question 36 in the admissions category concerned with not attending the college of their first choice. However, it might also indicate a desire to continue post-graduate work at another school. The other coefficients were not significant.

When a multiple regression technique was applied to the faculty/staff group for

the placement services category, the F value was .965 (p = .437), indicating no statistically significant difference in the placement category for the faculty/staff at the .10 significance level. The independent variables cannot explain any effects within the regression. Therefore, research question number four regarding how the faculty/staff differ and the extent of the effects of independent variables on dependent variables cannot be determined. This could be the result of the small sample size, or the use of too short a survey form.

A Synopsis of the Categories

The following synopsis condenses the data into a broader picture form designed to further associate the research questions with the data analysis methodology. This is true of research question five related to comparing how the students' problems differ with the faculty/staff perceptions of those problems. Table 61 indicates whether or not the group comparison of the means reflected a significant difference in the various groups.

An examination of this table shows that the faculty/staff at the two universities differed in two areas including the social activities and living-dining categories. The students, however, agreed only on the placement category. The comparison of the faculty/staff and students in Texas show they agreed on four of the categories and disagreed on seven of the categories. In California, the faculty/staff and students agreed on five categories and disagreed on six categories. By disagreed, it is meant that their was a significant difference in the mean scores of these groups.

Evaluating the over-all mean in comparison to the numerical data is important. There is a wide range of difference in mean scores and rankings from group to group. This possibly reflects the comments made concerning students, or for that matter

faculty/staff, having different needs with which they must cope in their particular school.

Possibly the environment and location of the school influences these means also.

Table 61 Group Mean-Category Significance Comparison

Category	Faculty/Staff Comparison	Student/Student Comparison	TX Staff/ Student Comp.	CA Staff/ Student Comp.
Admissions	No	Yes	Yes	No
Orientation	No	Yes	No	Yes
Records	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Social Activities	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Living-Dining	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
English	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Health	No	Yes	No	No
Religion	No	Yes	Yes	No
Financial	No	Yes	No	No
Placement	No	No	No	No
Student Activities	No	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note. Yes indicates a significant difference for the means exists at the 10% level. No indicates there is no significant difference in the means.

Table 62 presents the mean rankings from 1 to 11 for each of the four groups.

There is considerable difference between each of the four groups on how the 11

categories are ranked by mean scores. The English and financial categories appear in

three of the four groups top three rankings. The living-dining, social-personal, and

placement categories appear in two of the four groups "top three" rankings. The top three

rankings share the greatest number of common categories. The other categories are

relatively scattered throughout the remaining eight ranking places for each of the four

groups. These rankings also reflect the differences between these groups.

Table 62 Mean Rankings

RANKING	All Faculty/Staff Category & Mean	All Student/Student Category & Mean	TX Faculty/Staff and Student Category & Mean	CA Faculty/Staff and Student Category & Mean
1	English 3.07	Financial 2.01	English 2.40	Financial 1.91
2	Living-Dining 2.64	Placement 1.96	Financial 2.08	Placement 1.88
3	Social Activity 2.48	English 1.91	Living-Dining 2.05	Social Activity 1.72
4	Student Activity 2.23	Records 1.80	Placement 2.04	Admissions 1.69
5	Admissions 2.07	Health 1.77	Social Activity 2.00	Records 1.69
6	Placement 2.07	Social Activity 1.77	Student Activity 1.94	English 1.68
7	Records 2.0 5	Admissions 1.76	Records 1.94	Living-Dining 1.62
8	Financial 2.00	Living-Dining 1.72	Admissions 1.91	Health 1.62
9	Religion 1.91	Student Activity 1.70	Health 1.91	Orientation 1.61
10	Health 1.86	Orientation 1.70	Orientation 180	Student Activity 1.58
11	Orientation 1.82	Religion 1.54	Religion 1.77	Religion 1.27

Table 63 shows the means for both Texas students and California students for all

11 categories. To help interpret the numbers, recall that a mean of 1 to 1.5 indicates "no

problem," a mean of 1.5 to 2.5 indicates a "minor problem," a mean of 2.5 to 3.5

indicates a "moderate problem," and a mean of 3.5 or higher indicates a " major

problem." The rating for all students in all categories is as only a minor problem. This

reflects how well adjusted these students are as individuals or how well serviced they are

by the respective institutions. Note that the means for the students in Texas are always

higher in each category than the mean for the California students.

Table 63 Student Problem Rating

CATEGORY	TEXAS STUDENTS	CALIFORNIA STUDENTS
Admissions & Selection	1.83	1.67
Orientation Services	1.82	1.54
Academic Records	1.92	1.65
Social-Personal	1.83	1.68
Living/Dining Services	1.86	1.53
Health Services	1.92	1.58
Religious Services	1.69	1.34
English Language	2.15	1.57
Student Activities	1.84	1.51
Financial Aid	2.09	1.91
Placement Services	2.01	1.89

Table 64 shows the means for both the Texas faculty/staff and California

faculty/staff for all 11 categories. The mean score is recorded for the appropriate school

in the appropriate column. Only the rating of the faculty/staff at the Texas school for

English is higher than a minor problem and it is a moderate problem. However, almost all

the means of the faculty/staff at both universities are higher than the means of the

students at that university. The means of the students in Texas for orientation services,

health services, and financial services are higher than the means of the faculty/staff, but

only a .066 average higher. Orientation service has the greatest range of 1.2 between the

two groups. Only one category, placement services, is higher for the California students

than the California faculty/staff and that only a .04 difference. These numbers do not reflect a great difference between the groups. It is also interesting to note that the Texas faculty/staff member means are higher in all but one of the categories. That category is orientation services. This is due largely because the faculty/staff at the Texas school have a greater exposure to the international students than do the faculty/staff at the California school.

The fact that the faculty/staff means are higher than the student means is an ideal circumstance since the faculty/staff will respond to the needs of the international students based upon their perceptions of the problems that these students experience. As long as this remains true for both of these universities, it is likely that the means of the students will remain in the minor problem area.

Table 64 Faculty/Staff Problem Rating

CATEGORY	TEXAS FACULTY/STAFF	CALIFORNIA FACULTY/STAFF
Admissions & Selection	2.17	1.86
Orientation Services	1.70	2.07
Academic Records	2.07	2.00
Social-Personal	2.70	2.00
Living/Dining Services	2.83	2.21
Health Services	1.90	1.79
Religious Services	2.07	1.57
English Language	3.40	2.35
Student Activities	2.33	2.00
Financial Services	2.03	1.93
Placement Services	2.17	1.85

Research question number two regarding the effect of the independent variables upon the dependent variables are reflected in Table 65 comparing the influence (or effect size) associated with the independent variables in the student regressions. The university a student attends was significant in 7 of 11 of the dependent variables. These included the orientation, living-dining, health, religion, English, student activities, and financial aid categories. Time at the university was significant in 4 of 11 categories including the admissions, academic records, health, and English categories. Being a student from Taiwan was significant in 8 of the 11 categories including the admissions, orientation, academic records, social-personal, living-dining, health, religion, and English categories.

Being a student from Japan was significant in 7 of 11 of the categories. Being from Japan was significant for the academic records, social-personal, living-dining, health, religion, English, and student activities categories. Being from Hong Kong was significant in 6 of the 11 categories including the admissions, orientation, academic records, social-personal, English, and student activities categories. Gender was significant only in one category for men and that was the religion category. Marital status was never a significant variable.

The independent variables had no effect on the placement services category. Financial aid was only a slightly greater problem for the students in Texas than those in California, but was not significant for any other category. The English language category was always significant except for gender and marital status indicating its relative importance to international students at both universities. All of the other categories indicated significance for some of the independent variables. No consistent pattern can be observed except that students from Taiwan, Japan, and Hong Kong have more problems with these categories than students from other countries. This can be explained by the need for more adaptation by Asian students to the American culture than students from western countries. Also, students in Texas have more problems than students from California. This is explained by two factors including lower English language proficiency and a larger number of students from Asia in attendance at the school.

Table 65 Student Estimated Coefficients Significance Comparison

VARIABLE	SCHOOL	TIME 1 YEAR	TAIWAN	JAPAN	HONG KONG	GENDER	F	Adjusted R²
COLLECTIVE	.185***	.118*	.205**	.193**	.209**		4.432	.101
ADMISSIONS		.216***	.240**		.212*		3.180	.067
ORIENTATION	.151**		.356***		.277**		4.308	.096
ACADEMIC RECORDS		.260***	.249*	.235*	.255*		4.061	.091
SOCIAL-PERSONAL			.283***	.185*	.248**		1.962	.031
LIVING-DINING	.226***		.262**	.196*			4.255	.096
HEALTH	.211**	.175**	.230*	.340***			4.715	.108
RELIGION	.255***		.271**	.200*		.140*	4.332	.098
ENGLISH	.357***	.252***	.309**	.617***	.561***		12.175	.268
ACTIVITIES	.222***			.201*	p= .027 B=.295		3.871	.086
FINANCIAL AID	.241**						1.172	.006
PLACEMENT							.676	-.011

Note: Statistically significant— * = .10 level; ** = .05 level; *** = .01 level.

Research question number four regarding the effect of the independent variables upon the dependent variables are reflected in Table 66 comparing the faculty/staff independent variables influence on each of the dependent variables with the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels of significance appropriately marked. Estimated coefficients are also listed to indicate the size of the effect, specifically telling how much higher an individual's score is when the effect is present. The university that a faculty/staff member was

employed by was significant in 4 of the 11 categories including the social-personal, living-dining, religion, and English categories. It was not significant for the admissions, orientation, academic records, health, student activities, financial aid, and placement categories. The position of the faculty/staff member was significant only for the English and financial aid categories. Gender was significant only for the social-personal and living-dining categories. Having lived or worked abroad was never significant. Female personnel from the Texas school perceived the problems of the social-personal and living-dining categories as a greater problem for international students. Personnel at the university in Texas perceived the English language to pose a greater problem for international students. Personnel at the California school perceived that financial aid was a greater problem for international students.

Table 66 Faculty/Staff Estimated Coefficients Significance Comparison

VARIABLE	SCHOOL	POSITION	GENDER	F	Adjusted R²
SOCIAL-PERSONAL	.896***		-.697**	3.376	.203
LIVING-DINING	.832***		-.493*	2.970	.155
RELIGION	.788**			1.402	.036
ENGLISH	.781***	.591**		6.599	.342
FINANCIAL AID		-.596*		.980	.091

Note: Statistically significant— * = .10 level; ** = .05 level; *** = .01 level.

In summary, the faculty/staff at both universities are in more agreement concerning the problems of the international students than the international students are themselves. The means of the faculty/staff at both schools are higher than the means of the students indicating that personnel at both schools perceive the problems of

international students to be greater than the students themselves. The lower means of the international students indicate how well adjusted to life on a university campus in the U.S. these students appear to be. It is likely that the programs for international students are meeting the needs of these students. The higher means of the faculty/staff may result in their providing greater services for the international students that actually help decrease the means of the students to decrease. This condition is not what was expected to be found, but represents an ideal situation.

The students at these two universities generally consider the problems that they encounter to be minor problems although there are significant differences between these two universities. The students are well adjusted to the American culture, the English language, and to the campus community. The faculty/staff consider their problems more intense likely giving to a greater responsiveness to the needs of these students that has led to a lessening of the perceptions of problems on these campuses for the international students.

Research Question Conclusions

Research Question One: *What adjustment problems do international students enrolled in a college or university in the U.S. experience?*

The international students collectively ranked financial problems as the most serious problem that they encounter, although the mean of 2.01 indicates that finances are a minor problem for them. None of their problems, in fact, were ranked higher than a minor problem.

Placement was the next area of difficulty for students with a mean of 1.96. The English mean was 1.91. Religion had the lowest mean of 1.54. (Refer to table 61 for a

complete listing of the rankings and means for each of the dependent variables.) Even though there were significant differences between the two groups of students for all of the dependent variables except placement, the rating of any given problem was never higher than a minor problem for the combined groups except for finances.

When comparing these finding to those of other researchers, Green (1998) ranked English, placement services, and academic records as the three most troublesome problems for international students while Abu-Ein (1993) ranked finances, placement services, and social activities as the three top problems of international students. Fitzgerald (1998) ranked English, finances, and living-dining services as the three most troublesome problems of international students while McCoy (1996) ranked finances, placement, and English as the top three ranked categories for this study. Harre (1995) ranked financial aid, placement services, and social activities as the three highest ranked categories in that order.

McCoy's (1996) study and this study's top three rankings agree even in order. The order of the rankings with the other studies may be different. However, there is at least one area different in five of the six studies in question. The differences suggest that the problems perceived by international students may be the result of conditions other than being an international student. The problems may not even be college related. Also, the means of this research are generally lower than the means found in the other research projects. Does this difference speak to conditional differences as opposed to differences with international students? That topic would be a possible research question for another study.

In this study, however, the means of the Texas students were always higher than

the means of the students from California, but only the English, placement, and financial categories crossed a rating level change from a minor problem rating to a moderate problem rating. The moderate problem means were low except for the English category. There does appear to be a more serious problem for the Texas students with the English language. This problem level is most likely attributed to the fact that many of the Texas students come to their university with limited English skills seeking language instruction to prepare themselves for their academic pursuits.

Simply stated, these results suggest that the students at these universities appear to be well adjusted to university life and the American culture. Additionally, the universities appear to be meeting most of the needs of these students. The differences in the perceptions of the students and the faculty/staff are a non-issue because the student means are lower than the faculty/staff mean indicating the student perception of problems for each of the categories is less of a problem than rated by the faculty/staff.

Research Question Two: *To what extent does gender, marital status, country of origin (Taiwan, Japan, Hong Kong), time at the university under one year, and what university the student attended explain the variation in the student's perceptions of their adjustment problems?*

In most cases, a very small percentage of the variance in student responses could be explained by the quantitative data, but the largest amount of variance, 27%, was found in the English language category. From 2% to 11% of the variance could be explained by all other categories. Time at the university, country of origin, and what university the students attended were the most significant contributors for this category, and explain the largest proportion of the variation. The marital status and gender of the students

contributed very little, if any, to the variation in student responses.

These findings differ greatly from Green (1998) who stated that gender and academic level were the most significant explanatory variables as opposed to the country of origin. Green suggested that being female makes for a significant difference. However, the Green study engaged students from only three countries and experienced a 31% return rate from a total population of 429 students. No mention was made of how many international students were enrolled at the university or why international students other than from the three countries included in the study were omitted from the study. Green (1998) compared these three countries, but not with other countries and that may explain why only Korean students revealed a significant difference from other students. Green also included age, academic level, and time at the university in the model. These independent variables revealed problems of collinearity in my model. Perhaps gender became significant because the other variables experienced the same problem in the Green model. The narrow approach to the study may have biased the findings.

Abu-Ein (1993) stated that country of origin, marital status, and age are significant factors in accounting for perceptions of adjustment problems, while gender was not. The Abu-Ein findings are consistent with the finding of this study regarding country of origin. However, using age, academic level, and time at the university as independent variables may raise questions regarding collinearity that are not addressed in the Abu-Ein study. Fitzgerald (1998) used a notational approach to the data analysis and did not apply a data analysis procedure such as paired-sample t-tests or multiple regression techniques. Fitzgerald discusses the data on the basis of percentages of students rating a category on the same scale of 1 to 4 used in rating the degree of the

problem in my study. Therefore, a comparison of Fitzgerald's findings to the findings of this study cannot be made. McCoy (1996) found that country of origin, academic level, and marital status were significant in explaining the variance among many of the categories of the MISPI. Again age, academic level, and time at the university in this study indicated problems of collinearity that are not addressed in the study by McCoy. Also, the sampling technique produced a 48% return rate, but the number surveyed included only slightly over half of the international students on the campus. No explanation was provided that adequately explains why the sample was taken in the manor described in the study. Harre (1995) found that neither age, gender, marital status, nor length of stay in the U. S. were significant in explaining the variance in the student responses. The problem of collinearity was not addressed in this study either. The country of origin and academic level did explain the variance significantly for many of the categories in the Harre study. These also differ from this study which further research might prove beneficial to in explaining the differences from study to study. Another interesting study for the future would be a comparison of the findings from research projects using the MISPI.

This study suggests that students from Asian countries, time at the university, and the university attended are the three most significant variables in explaining the variation in student responses. Asian countries influence the variation the most. English must also be considered as a factor in this explanation. English is a dependent variable, but impacts both the independent variables and other dependent variables. Another study addressing the influence of English on the other dependent variables is needed. It is important that researchers recognize that each university is different. The complexity in researching the

problems of international students influences the findings. Problems exist in varying

degrees for international students related to the services provided them by the universities.

Thus, every university needs to conduct

research among international students on their own campus.

Research Question Three: *What perceptions do university faculty and staff hold*

concerning the types of problems encountered by international students in the United

States?

There was a significant difference in the means for only the social activities and

living-dining categories between the faculty/staff groups. The faculty/staff group means

were not different for eight of the categories. Basically, the faculty/staff groups agreed

with each other concerning the amount of difficulty a given category provided for the

students. The faculty/staff groups viewed English as the greatest problem for

international students (refer to table 61 for the faculty/staff rankings of the categories.)

The orientation category was viewed as the least problematic variable. Walker (1998)

suggested that faculty and staff considered international students well adjusted. He also

indicated that the faculty and staff perceptions of the problems and feelings of

international students differed based on the size of the institution, gender, age, degree

obtained, and religious affiliation of the respondent. These findings differ from the

findings of this researcher, but it must be stated that Walker conducted a research

involving a much larger number of universities although the number of useable responses

was just 23 more than this study. The issue is that these perceptions differ from those of

the students and to what extent they differ.

Research Question Four: *To what extent does gender, whether or not a person has lived or worked abroad, position at the university, and what university the individual works at explain the variation in the university personnel's perceptions of internationals students adjustment problems?*

In most cases, a small percentage of the variance in faculty/staff responses could be explained by the quantitative data, but the largest amount of variance, 42%, was found in the English language category. This variance is attributed to what school the faculty/staff member worked at and what position that person held at the university. Faculty members considered the problem of the English language for international students a much more serious consideration than did staff members. That is explained by the fact that the level of English proficiency demanded in a classroom is much higher than in everyday conversations that occur between international students and staff members. Also, the students in Texas enter the school at a much lower level of English proficiency than do the students in California. Thus the perceptions of the faculty/staff in Texas would be expected to differ from those in California because students in Texas have a much more difficult time with English than do the students in California. A variance of 20% can be explained for the social-personal category, and 15% of the variance for university personnel can be explained for the living-dining category. The university the faculty/staff member worked at was significant in all three of the above categories. Being a female faculty/staff member was significant in the social-personal and living-dining categories. Perhaps female faculty/staff members are more acutely aware of living-dining conditions than are male faculty/staff members because of their traditional roles in the family. This may also be true of the social-personal category. Having lived or

worked abroad was not significant in any category. There are no other studies that use the MIAPSPI to which this study can be compared.

Research Question Five: *To what extent do the perceptions of these adjustment problems differ between international students and university personnel?*

In comparing the means of the faculty/staff with the students the means of the faculty/staff were consistently higher than the means of the students. The rankings are considerably different for the faculty/staff and students. The faculty/staff and student groups rated only two of the same categories out of the 11 total categories in the top six. (Refer to table 61 for comparison.) This poses a problem for both universities because the perceptions of problems are considerably different between the faculty/staff and students, but is minimized in importance by the fact that most are given a minor problem rating, and also by the fact that most of the student means are lower than the faculty/staff means.

English is the problem the faculty/staff identify as the largest with a mean of 3.07-- more than a point higher than the students. The English category is rated as a moderate problem by the staff. The students rated English as a minor problem. That difference is statistically significant. The living-dining category was ranked second by the faculty/staff, but eighth by the students with a mean difference of .92. This too was statistically significant. There was a .71 difference in the social-personal category, a .53 difference in the student activities category, a .37 difference in the religion category all of which are statistically significant. A .31 difference in the admissions category and a .25 difference in the student records category are not statistically significant. The health category was .09 different, the orientation category was .12 different, the placement category was .11 different, and the financial category means was only .01 different. None

of these differences were statistically significant.

In terms of statistical significance, the faculty/staff and students in Texas differed in seven of the categories while the faculty/staff and students in California differed in six of the categories. Since most of the means of the students are lower than the faculty/staff, it is possible that faculty/staff members are overly concerned with the problems of the international students. It is also possible that the university programming at both of these schools adequately meet the needs of these students. The faculty/staff groups may be unaware of the comprehensive nature of the programming provided by the International Student Offices on these campuses.

The student groups differ significantly on all but one of the categories even though the different means crossed a rating level only in the English and placement categories. Much of this difference can be explained by the demographic differences of the two groups. The conclusion this researcher draws is that the faculty/staff groups are largely uninformed concerning the perceptions international students have of their own problems. That might be the result of a limited personal involvement with these students.

Qualitative Data Summary

The MISPI and MIAPSPI provide an opportunity for respondents to express their opinions regarding three open-ended questions asked at the end of the surveys. The questions are somewhat different for the faculty/staff than for the students. The responsiveness of the participants to these questions reflects their high level of interest in this topic. The faculty/staff responses will be discussed first followed by a discussion of the student responses.

Staff

There were a total of 30 respondents from the Texas school, but only 23 respondents answered any of these questions. Question number one asked the faculty/staff to list what three programs were currently functioning well at the school. The intensive English program (IEP) at the university in Texas was referred to ten times as functioning well by the faculty/staff of the school. The conversation partners program, international student associations, student ministry, and host family programs were referred to in excess of five times as functioning well. The orientation program and international office were referred to four times in this manner. A total of 15 different programs or activities were said to be functioning well at the school by at least one respondent.

The California school had 14 respondents and six of them did not answer these questions, which may be a factor in the limited number of times programs are referred to by the faculty/staff. The orientation program at the California school was referred to three times as functioning well, but, out of a total of nine programs referred to, the orientation program is the only area referred to by more than one respondent.

The second question asked the faculty/staff to identify as many as three programs that needed improvement or new programs that could be initiated. Few respondents referred to more than one program in their response to this question. Transportation and food quality were referred to four times each. A total of 19 programs or problems were mentioned, but all received only a single voice. Some of those programs included the host family program and conversation partner program. Others recommended forming study groups, involving more Americans to interact with international students, and educating

the American students to be more culturally sensitive.

The California school reflects the same types of responses from the faculty/staff with only one of seven programs referred to receiving more than a single mention. Three faculty/staff members recommended that an IEP be started on the campus. Other programs referred to included organizing a cultural day, establishing a buddy system, improving counseling for international students, and centralizing the international student program.

The third question asked the faculty/staff to make comments regarding any other topic of interest to them not referred to in the survey. The Texas school had a few responses to this question most of which were incorporated into the responses to question number two. The faculty/staff at the California school mentioned three times that their experience with international students was limited.

A few typical comments from the faculty/staff are listed below.

A California staff member stated: "The international students I have come in contact with are very independent, self-assured, and ask for help when they need it."

A Texas staff member suggests that "more orientation for those Americans who interact with international students" is needed.

Another staff member from Texas states that "the international students try to stay together. I understand this, but effort should be made by students and faculty to be involved with them."

Similarly, another staff member suggests that, "one of the major problems in building a strong community is Americans not being able to see "the big picture' which is overseas as well. Therefore, more efforts should go toward helping American students

overseas as well. Therefore, more efforts should go toward helping American students realize the environments that other international counter-parts are from."

A professor from Texas says, "The ones I happen to have had in class seem well-satisfied and present no real problems."

One of the most interesting comments made came from Texas, but reflects the general attitude of all faculty/staff respondents at both schools. This staff member said, "I think the staff of the International Office have a great heart for the people they work with. Students who come here really feel welcome."

Students

Question number one asked the students to list three programs that were most helpful to them as international students. There were 36 categories of responses in Texas, 18 of which were referred to only once or twice. These responses included a mention of the campus security, night classes, academic program, international day, the student center, telephone services, financial aid, small classes, and the home stay program. Another nine programs were referred to a maximum of five times. These programs included: student field trips, student retreats, the cafeteria, the soccer team, church activities, the medical center, and various international associations. The programs that received the largest response included 30 students who mentioned the conversation partners program, 25 students who mentioned the IEP, 20 students who mentioned the shopping or bank trips, 16 students who mentioned the international office, 12 students who mentioned both chapel and student activities, and eight students who mentioned the orientation program. These were the programs considered helpful in Texas by the 123 students who participated in the survey.

There were 21 programs mentioned in California, 15 of which were mentioned fewer than three times, three of which were referred to five to eight times, and three of which were referred to in excess of 15 times. The library, computer lab, and writing centers were mentioned from five to eight times. The International Office, the Career Services Office, and faculty advising were referred to in excess of 15 times by students. These were the programs considered helpful in California by the 92 students who participated in the survey.

The second question asked the students what new programs should be initiated or what existing programs need improvement on the campuses. There were 37 areas mentioned by Texas students. The most noteworthy responses included improving campus food services, providing cultural tips for international students, and involving more Americans in international programs. These areas were mentioned in excess of 15 times. Transportation was mentioned seven times as well as the suggestion that more weekend activities be planned for the students in Texas.

The students in California want more work opportunities and better counseling services. These areas were mentioned in excess of 10 times. There were 18 areas mentioned with ten of the areas being mentioned less than four times. Parking, more immigration information, better health services, cheaper tuition, and better food were all mentioned from four to six times.

The third question of asked the students encouraged them to list the people to whom they go for advice most frequently. Students were asked to list three important advisors. The over-whelming response at both schools included family, faculty, fellow students (friends), and the International Office. The majority of the students at both

schools listed these groups as the three most important advisors to their academic and personal life. Mention was made of coaches, American students, church members, academic departments, and mentors less than five times each. What is evident is that international students have a definite support system on which they rely heavily for advice.

A Japanese student in Texas wrote that, "Even though I'm Japanese, everyone is kind and help me to better way here."

Another student from Brazil attending school in Texas writes, "The international office offers very good support for internationals."

A student from Taiwan in Texas says: "The program 'Conversation Partners' helps me to make many American friends."

In California, an Italian student states that he "would like to get more involved in the American activities especially outside of class." He also likes the fact that "the library is always open."

A male student from Switzerland studying in California states, "I guess the biggest problem I have as someone coming from Europe is to understand Americans and especially their attitudes."

A Japanese California student wrote: "My school's International Student Office has been fantastic in providing me a ton of useful information some of which I didn't even know I needed." Finally, a student from Turkey studying business in California said that the school "should open an international language program. They will make a ton of money."

Students, of course, had criticisms of both schools including curfew, cafeteria food, and many of the typical complaints that American students have at school. An observation that one student in California from Hong Kong made is that "international students should not have separate events. This only increases the gap between them and U.S. students." The responses made were of a positive nature by the students and the faculty/staff. No one seemed to have an "axe to grind" or an unfair criticism. Comments were made in a generally supportive way.

Summary

In summarizing this chapter, the introduction to the chapter discussed the purpose of this study and the two quantitative data methods used in analyzing the data. The chapter then discussed the 11 categories of the MISPI and MIAPSPI by describing the paired sample t-test used to compare the means of the group and the multiple regression technique used to determine the significance level and explain the variance in a given model for each category. Next, tables are provided in the synopsis that condense the 11 categories of both the MISPI and MIAPSPI to provide a broad picture of the research related to each of the research questions. Following this discussion, a research question by research question analysis concludes the synopsis. Then, a review of the qualitative responses of students and university personnel are discussed followed by this summary of the chapter.

Chapter V

Findings, Recommendations, and Conclusion

American universities have accepted international students into their community and by doing so have assumed the responsibility for meeting the unique needs of these individuals. The growing number of international students, in turn, places a burden on the university to evaluate its programming, services, and policies for these students in order to determine if the university is properly responding to the presence of international students in the community. Such an evaluation is necessary because international students are confronted with numerous problems as sojourners in the United States. Faced not only with their personal problems or the problems of daily living that all people encounter, international students are also confronted with the problems of culture shock. There is much added stress in the lives of international students as a result of living in an unfamiliar culture as Dulebohn (1989) suggests. However, Pfaffenroth (1997) expresses the seriousness of this call for evaluation when he suggests that "if Americans wish to maintain a global presence and global influence, it is time our institutions of higher education think seriously and systematically about what they want to do with their international students" (p. 7). Parr (1992) expresses another reason for the importance of such an evaluation when he states, "Implicit in the research on international students is the theme that they represent a consumer contingent that deserves comprehensive services and support" (p. 20), but universities "have not been fully responsive to the needs of these students" (p. 20). From an institutional self-interest perspective, schools need to do more than "academic merchandizing" with these students because international students will seek institutions that provide customer service along with a

159

quality education.

At the same time, international students must assume some responsibility for themselves because frequently from their country's perspective, if they fail in their educational endeavors they have only themselves to blame. This research indicated that international students are confronted with issues inside and outside of the classroom that are relevant to their success as students. Language is just one issue that is relevant both inside and outside of the classroom. There is also the problem of culture shock including the emotional and physical stresses that it places upon students sometimes inclusive of the feelings of social isolation, loneliness, depression, and anxiety. These problems are sometimes so intense that they can lead to emotional problems that become serious threats to the health of the individual as Pedersen (1991) suggests. There are, furthermore, the problems of cross-cultural relationships, financial difficulties, and even immigration issues that these students experience during their sojourn in the United States. The importance of this research then is that it has provided these two universities with the opportunity to evaluate their effectiveness in working with international students, and it gave international students an opportunity to express their concerns to the universities. It also adds to the literature about the experiences of international students attending American universities. Although there have been many studies of international students conducted, it is obvious that many question remain that need to be answered.

Purpose and Significance

The purpose of this study was three-fold. This study first attempted to identify what adjustment problems international students have while attending two American institutions of higher learning. After identifying these problems, the study explored the

extent to which various factors helped explain the variance in responses to a given problem. The third purpose of this study was to identify the perceptions that university personnel working directly with international students have regarding the severity and nature of the adjustment problems of internationals students, and compare these perceptions to the perceptions of the students at the institutions at which faculty/staff members work.

What makes this study unique is that few studies have compared the perceptions of university personnel with the perceptions of international students. In addition to this, this study attempted to determine how well university personnel perceive the problems of international students and how those perceptions relate to the perceptions of the international students. The multiple regression portion of the study is unique in the fact that it took into consideration the problem of collinearity by eliminating independent variables related to age that possibly influenced the ability to measure accurately the effect of the age related independent variables upon the dependent variables. Other studies do not explain how the problem of collinearity was dealt with which may explain why there is such a wide range of differences in findings from study to study.

Instrumentation

This largely quantitative study used a survey instrument named the Michigan International Student Problem Inventory (MISPI) (see Appendix A). The instrument consists of 11 categories and 132 item questions (see Appendix B) utilizing terminology common to student services. A second instrument adapted from the MISPI was used with the relevant faculty/staff at the two universities studied to measure faculty/staff perceptions of the problems of international students. This instrument, the Michigan

International Advisor Perception of Student Problem Inventory (MIAPSPI) (see

Appendix C), consists of only one question each representing the 11 categories found

within the MISPI. The shortened questionnaire was used because the 132 items on the

MISPI are too detailed for university personnel to respond to specifically. For example,

the MISPI asks students to rate their concerns about political discussions, but it is

unlikely that university personnel would have such a detailed knowledge of students.

At the end of each instrument, international students and university personnel

were asked to respond to three open-ended questions concerning what programs,

activities, services, and policies currently exist to meet the needs of international students

on their campuses as well as to suggest additional programming needs at the university.

These data were categorized by reoccurring themes.

There is a need to revise the MISPI so that factors such as whether or not

international students have lived or worked abroad before pursuing an academic course of

study can be identified. Also it is important to determine whether or not these students

speak languages other than their native language and English. Such factors may influence

the responses of these students and comparing their responses with other students who

have not lived abroad or who do not speak other language may lead to interesting

findings. Other changes are also needed. Also, the MIAPSPI needs to be expanded to

include three questions per category in order to improve the quality of the instrument.

The Sample

The sample consisted of international students and faculty/staff members who

work directly with these students from two universities. There were 123 students and 30

faculty/staff members from a university in Texas who responded to the survey. There

were 92 students and 14 faculty/staff members from a university in California who responded to the survey. The return rate for the students in Texas was 50.6% while the return rate for the California students was 52.8%. The return rate for the faculty/staff in Texas was 60% while the return rate for the California faculty/staff was 70%.

Data Analysis

The data were first analyzed using a paired sample t-test comparing the means of the students, faculty/staffs, and faculty/staff and students of a given university. The problems of international students were ranked according to their importance by use of the mean scores. These data were then compared with the data collected from the university personnel to identify differences in the perceptions of these two groups. The data were also analyzed using multiple linear regression techniques that estimated the effects of the seven independent variables on the 11 dependent variables that made up the MISPI. The advantage of using a multiple linear regression technique is that the variance in student and faculty/staff responses can be explained while controlling for each of the independent variables, thereby allowing the researcher to estimate the effect that each independent variable had on the different dependent variables.

Limitations

The population was a limitation of the study. That population included only international students enrolled in, or faculty/staff personnel working at, one of two private universities. The study was further limited by the use of only non-native English speaking international students in the sample. Only students enrolled in the fall of 2000 were used as participants in the study, and the students were required to use the English language, which is not their first language, to respond on the questionnaire. Finally, there

were individual differences among the international students themselves that were not the focus of this study.

Findings

The findings of this study indicate that the international students at these two universities consider the problems associated with the 11 categories of the MISPI as only minor problems. The student means were consistently lower than those of the faculty/staff in all 11 categories, but, with the exception of the English language category, the faculty/staff also thought the problems of international students were only minor in nature. This finding suggests that both of these universities are meeting many of the needs of these students through their policies, programs, and services. If that is not the case, then it must be assumed that the students are just better adjusted than students surveyed in other studies that reflect higher mean scores than the ones in this study. It was assumed, however, that the student means would be higher than the faculty/staff means. That the faculty/staff means were higher was an unexpected finding, and encourages further study in comparing multiple numbers of schools of varying types with one another to determine if the lower means are a result of differences between schools.

Another finding of this study was that the students in Texas consistently posted higher mean scores than the California students. The country of origin most often explained the variance in the responses of the students, but it would have been preferable to have a similar number of students from one country at both schools studied. Since the school in Texas has a far greater number of Asian students, it would be advisable for the Texas school to evaluate the specific needs of these groups of students. What university the student attended often explained the variance in the responses of the students.

Time at the university, under one year, was another variable that explained some of the differences in the responses of the students. It appears that no matter the age or academic level of the student, students who are new to a school encounter more problems than students who have attended the school for a longer period of time.

One of the most important findings of this study was that universities are different from one another in how both international students and faculty/staff perceive the problems of international students. That the school in Texas consistently scored higher means than the school in California would indicate this, and is accurate for both the student and faculty/staff groups. A conclusion that could be drawn then is that all schools needs to evaluate their own international student policies, programs, and services.

Recommendations

There are numerous recommendations that can be made as a result of conducting this research. Assisting students with language support would seem to be an important step these universities can take on behalf of the students because the combined mean scores for the English language category were among the highest of any of the 11 categories evaluated in this study. By reducing problems related to the category thought most problematic to the combined student and faculty/staff, the universities can assist these students in becoming more independent and more successful in their academic endeavors. Conversation Partner programs, "buddy" programs, tutoring programs, an intensive English program, and more interaction with American students could provide the support the international students need in English.

Since the mean scores for the financial aid category were also among the highest of all categories, providing more financial support through work-study programs and

scholarships would help the international students enormously. However, providing jobs on campus would also assist the students. Practical training programs could enhance the experience of the international students as well as assist them in reducing the financial burden of attending an American university.

The mean scores of the placement services category were also relatively high indicating that, for these students, their future is of great concern. Assisting students in finding jobs when they return to their home country is not always a practical matter for the university staff. However, students seeking to become immigrants to the U. S. or desiring to transfer to another school could be better served with more comprehensive information provided by the International Student Offices, and thus address another one of the categories of greater concern to the students.

The universities should attempt to tailor its assistance to students based upon the country of origin of the students, and the time the students have spent at the university because these independent variables in this study accounted for much of the variance in most of the categories. Adapting to the needs of these different characteristics of students should result in eliminating some of that variance, and improving the quality of life of the international students.

It became evident to this researcher upon reflecting on all of the quantitative and qualitative data that, although international students are different in many ways from their American counterparts, they are also very similar in many ways. The data indicate that grouping international students into one broad category is potentially misleading because these students, even from the same country, have different opinions, concerns, cultural problems, and objectives for their education. The International Student Offices would

serve these students best my responding to the individual needs of the students and identifying these individuals as important customers in the education system of the school. This is important because there can be no clear definition of what problems international students have because some problems are problems of personality, some of culture, and some of individual preference. Also, institutions are different and thus the problems at a given institution are different, necessitating the evaluation of each institution's programming for international students.

The research Green (1998) conducted at Biola University indicated that females experienced greater adjustment problems than male internationals students. Although the findings of this research are much different from those of Green (1998), there is a need to more clearly define the differences between male and female internationals students. Abu-Ein's (1993) research included a large number of married students, and 41% of the total students in the study were over 32 years of age. Time at the university, under a year, was the only age related variable that influenced the findings of this study. However, there are issues related to age and marital status that are pertinent to concerns surrounding international student programming and services on university campuses. These need to be identified and responded to throughout the higher education system of the United States. The University of Memphis study by McCoy (1996) indicated that academic level affected the adjustment problems of international students. All of these studies, including this one, suggest the idea that international students are different from American students even though those differences vary from country of origin to country of origin, gender to gender, marital status to marital status, and academic level to academic level. Therefore,

universities must respond to these students differently in an effort to assist them in adjusting to live as a sojourner.

Recommendations for Further Research

Additional studies need to be conducted that evaluate the differences within a given category of the MISPI. For example, a more comprehensive study of the differences between faculty/staff and students world be beneficial. A third study related to the problems that students anticipate having before arriving in the U. S. with the problems they actually encounter would assist universities in preparing students who plan to come to a given university. A fourth study would be a study of American students that would compare the problems of these students with international students to determine whether a particular problem identified by international students simply is a student problem, or in fact, is a problem for international students. Finally, a study could be conducted to determine how much limited English proficiency impacts each of the categories and is part of the problem in and of itself.

Conclusion

Anyone who has spoken personally with an international student immediately detects the severity of the challenge that is faced by these students. The two institutions that are part of this study appear to be meeting the needs of the internationals students on their campuses. International students are contributors to the community and need to be responded to as "first class" participants in the educational process. American educators and students must become more culturally sensitive, must become more involved in the lives of these students, and must over-come a heritage of xenophobia common to the American populace and institutions of higher education. The review of the literature

would indicate that the two private institutions included in this study are exceptionally adept at meeting the needs of international students as compared with many larger schools previously studied.

The quantitative and qualitative data collected for this research indicate that the faculty/staff at both of these universities are aware of the problems and needs of international students. Apparently the students' basic needs are being met even though the deeper emotional needs may be neglected. As such, these universities are confronted with the challenge of improving their programs by refining and expanding the services they offer to their international student bodies. It is evident that the more effectively and efficiently a university responds to the needs of the students, the fewer problems and the lesser degree of intensity problems seem to be as perceived by international students. Every university and every group of international students differ, however, and must be responded to individually. It is impossible to generalize the findings of a study containing such a complex set of variables. The problems of international students may simply be the problems of students or the problems of humanity in general. More studies need to be conducted that address these issues before any generalizing of the findings will be possible. However, research can assist institutions in assessing their own problems and provide direction for the institution in serving the needs of the international student.

References

Abu-Ein, M. M. (1993). A study of the adjustment problems of international students at Texas Southern University. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas Southern University, Houston, TX.

Adler, P. (1975). The transitional experience: An alternative view of culture shock. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 15(4), 23-40.

Asuncion-Lande, N. C. (1975). A program guide for a re-entry/transition seminar-workshop. Washington, DC: NAFSA.

Bourget-Tactuk, J. R. (1998). Relationships among expectations of reentry problems of international students living in on-campus apartments and off-campus housing at Andrews University and selected student characteristics. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

Butler, W. R. (1992). Beyond re-entry: The age of emerging global international student and scholar. In McIntire, D. & Willer, P (Eds.). (1992). Working with international students and scholars on American campuses. (pp. 71-98).Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Inc.

Charles, H. & Stewart, M. A. (1991, October). "Academic advising of international students." Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 19 (4), 173-182.

Chwee, L.C., Jiansan, D. & Perez, M. A. (1998). "Validation of the East Asian student stress inventory (EASSI)." American Journal of Health Studies, 14 (3), 153-161.

Cho, S. (1988). A cross cultural study of factors that predict stress among international college students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO.

Constantinides, J. (1992) Academic challenges and opportunities. In McIntire, D. & Willer, P (Eds.). (1992). Working with international students and scholars on American campuses. (pp. 1-25). Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Inc.

Davis, T. M. (1999). Open doors. New York, NY: Institute of International Education.

DeArmond, M. M., & Stevenson, J. H. (1992). Health care for international students. In McIntire, D. & Willer, P (Eds.). (1992). Working with international students and scholars on American campuses. (pp. 26-43). Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Inc.

Denney, M. (1986). Going home: A workbook for reentry and professional integration. Washington, DC: NAFSA.

Dulebohn, J. H. (1989). A historical survey and an overview of culture shock. Unpublished master's thesis, Department of English. Central Missouri State University, Warrensburg, MO.

Ferraro, G. (1990). The cultural dimension of international business. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Fitzgerald, V. F. (1998). The identification of problems in academic and social support systems by international students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA.

Greene, A. L. (1998). Adjustment problems perceived by Taiwanese, Korean, and Japanese international students at California State University, Fullerton. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Biola University, La Mirada, CA.

Harju, B. L. & Long, T. E. (1998, March). "Cross cultural reactions of international students to US health care." College Student Journal, 32 (1), 112-121.

Harre, P. A. (1995). Problems perceived by international students attending Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL.

Hayes, R. L, & Lin, H. R. (1994, January) "Coming to America: Developing social support systems for international students." Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 22 (1), 7-17.

Johnson, K. A. (1993, April 14). "Q-Methodology: Perceptions of international student services in higher education." A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.

Khoo, P. L. S. & Abu-Rasain, M. H. (1994). Counselling foreign students: A review of strategies." Counselling Psychology Quarterly, 7 (2), 117-132.

Kim, S. H. & Sedlacek, W. E. (1995) "International students: Distinguishing noncognitive variables form social interaction patterns. Research report no. 8-95." A paper presented to the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs, University of Maryland, College Park, MD.

Kohls, R. (1984). Intercultural training: Don't leave home without it. Washington, DC: Sietar.

Ladd, P. & Ruby, R. (1999, July/August). "Learning style and adjustment issues of international students." Journal of Education for Business, 74 (6), 363-368.

Larbi, R. K., (1990). Student advisors' perceptions of social adjustment among international students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK.

Lee, Wanda M. L. & Mixson, R. J. (1995, January). "Asian and Caucasian client perceptions of the effectiveness of counseling." Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 23 (1), 48-57.

Levitov, P. S. (1992). Legal issues affecting international students. In McIntire, D. & Willer, P (Eds.). (1992). Working with international students and scholars on American campuses. (pp. 44-70). Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Inc.

Levy, S. R. (1990, October). "Challenges and limits: A view from a chief student affairs office." Counseling Psychologist, 18 (4), 614-619.

Lin, J. C. & Yi, J. K. (1997, December) "Asian international students' adjustment: Issues and program suggestions." College Student Journal, 31 (4), 473-480.

Mau, W. C. & Jepsen, D. A. (1990, April). "Help-seeking perceptions and behaviors: A comparison of Chinese and American graduate students." Journal of Multicultural Counselling and Development, 18 (2), 94-106.

Mallinckrodt, B. & Leong, F. T. L. (1992, January). "International graduate students, stress, and social support." Journal of College Student Development, 33, 71-78.

McCoy, M. A. (1996). A study of the self-perceived problems among Asian students at the University of Memphis. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Memphis, Memphis, TN.

McIntire, D. & Willer, P (Eds.). (1992). Working with international students and scholars on American campuses. Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Inc.

Mooney, R. L., & Gordon, L. V. (1950). The Mooney problem check list. College form C. New York: The Psychological Corporation.

Negash, W. (1988). Determinants of non-return within the international student community in the United States. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.

Neuberger, C. G. (1992). Working with international students on our campuses. In McIntire, D. & Willer, P (Eds.). (1992). Working with international students and scholars on American campuses. (pp. 99-118). Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Inc.

Ninggal, M. T. (1998). The role of ethnicity among international students in adjustment to acculturative stress. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI.

Oberg, K. (1954). "Culture shock." Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merril Series in Social Sciences.

Oberg, K. (1960). "Culture shock: Adjustment to new cultural environments." Practical Anthropology, 17, 177-182.

Optimizing health care for foreign students in the United States and American students abroad. (1989). Washington, DC: NAFSA.

Pai, H. C. (1996). Reentry difficulty, life satisfaction, and psychological well-being of Taiwanese students who have returned from the United States. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL.

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: Multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. Journal of Retailing, 64 (Spring), 1240.

Parr, G., Bradley, L. & Bingi, R. (1992, January). "Concerns and feelings of international students." Journal of College Student Development, 33, 20-25.

Pedersen, P. (1995). The Five Stages of Culture Shock. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Pedersen, P. B. (1991, January). "Counseling international students." Counseling Psychologist, 19 (1), 10-59.

Petress, K. C. (1995, March). "Coping with a new educational environment: Chinese students' imagined interactions before commencing studies in the U.S." Journal of Instructional Psychology, 22 (1), 50-64.

Pfaffenroth, S. B. (1997, June). "Clarifying institutional policy toward international students: A community college self-study model." A paper presented in Issues of Education at Community Colleges: Essays by Fellows in the Mid-Career Fellowship Program, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ.

Ping, C. J. (1999). An expanded international role for student affairs. In J. C.

Dalton (Ed.), <u>Beyond borders: How international developments are changing student

affairs practice</u> (pp. 13-22). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Ponterotto, J. G. & Baluch, S. (1998, July). "The Suinn-Lew Asian self-identity

acculturation scale (SL-ASIA): Critique and research recommendations." Measurement

& Evaluation in Counseling & Development, 32 (2), 109-125.

Porter, J. W. (1962). The development of an inventory to determine the problems

of foreign students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University,

Lansing, MI.

Porter, J. W. (1993). Michigan international student inventory: The manual.

Printed by John W. Porter: Michigan State University, Lansing, MI.

Roper, R. J. (1995). Actual and ideal functions of the chief student affairs officer

in small private religious colleges as perceived by presidents and chief student affairs

officers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA.

Sandhu, D. S. & Asrabadi, B. R. (1991, April). "An assessment of psychological

needs of international students: Implications for counseling and psychotherapy." A paper

presented at the American Association for Counseling and Development, Reno, NV.

Sandhu, D. S. & Portes, Pedro R. (1996, January). "Assessing cultural adaptation:

Psychometric properties of the cultural adaptation pain scale." Journal of Multicultural

Counseling & Development, 24 (1), 15-26.

Sarkodie-Mensah, K. (1992, September). "Dealing with international students in a

multicultural era." Journal of Academic Librarianship, 18 (4), 214-216.

Sarkodie-Mensah, K. (1998, Summer). "International students in the U.S.: Trends, cultural adjustments, and solutions for a better experience." Journal of Education for Library and Information Science, 39 (3), 214-221.

Sharma, D. (1999). "Living by leaving behind." In A. Garrod & J. Davis (Eds.), Crossing customs (pp. 53-72). New York: Falmer Press.

Shin, H. & Abell, N. (1999, January). "The homesickness and contentment scale: Developing a culturally sensitive measure of adjustment for Asians." Research on Social Work Practice, 9 (1), 45-61.

Siegel, C. (1983, May). "Cultural factors affecting health care for international students: The foreign student advisor's role." A paper presented at the Annual Convention of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, Cincinnati, OH.

Stoynoff, S. (1996, September). "Self-regulated learning strategies of international students: A study of high- and low-achievers." College Student Journal, 30 (3), 329-337.

Stoynoff, S. (1997, March). "Factors associated with international students' academic achievement." Journal of Instructional Psychology, 24 (1), 56-69.

Suinn, R. M. & Ahuna, C. (1992, Winter). "The Suinn-Lew Asian self-identity acculturation scale: Concurrent and factorial validation." Educational & Psychological Measurement, 52 (4), 1041-1047.

Sun, W. & Chen, G. M. (1997, January). "Dimensions of difficulties Mainland Chinese students encounter in the United States." A paper presented at the International Conference in Cross-Cultural Communication, Tempe, AZ.

Thielen, T., & Limbird, M. (1992). Integrating foreign students into the university community. In McIntire, D. & Willer, P (Eds.). (1992). Working with international students and scholars on American campuses. (pp. 119- 135). Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Inc.

Tomkovick, C. & Al-Khatib, J. (1996, January/February). "An assessment of the service quality provided to foreign students at U.S. business schools." Journal of Education for Business, 71 (3), 130-136.

Tsukada, F. A. (1996). Reentry transition: A study of returning Japanese who have studied in American higher education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Hawaii, School of Education, Honolulu, HI.

Walker, D. A. (1998). Student affairs professionals' perception of the concerns and feelings of international students at private, four-year liberal arts institutions. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University, Ames, IA.

Wilson, S. R. (1990). East Asian international students stressors and coping behaviors. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston University, School of Education, Boston, MA

Winkelman, M. (1994, November/December). "Cultural shock and adaptation." Journal Of Counseling & Development, 73 (2), 121-126.

Yi, K. Y. (1989). Symptoms of eating disorders among Asian-American college female students as a function of acculturation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology, Los Angeles, CA .

Ying, Y. W. & Liese, L. H. (1994, December). "Initial adjustment of Taiwanese students to the United States: The impact of postarrival variables." Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 25 (4), 466-478.

Zhong, M. (1996, November) "Chinese students and scholars in the U.S.: An intercultural adaptation process. A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Diego, CA.

Ziegler, R. A. (1997, Spring). "International students and country of origin news." Serials Review, 23 (1), 33-47.

Appendix A

Michigan International Student Problem Inventory
(As devised by John Porter and modified by John Jenkins)

[Responses to this survey are CONFIDENTIAL, and NO student names will be released. Participation in this survey is VOLUNTARY. This is not a test. There are no right and wrong answers.]

STEP ONE: PERSONAL INFORMATION

Directions: Please answer the following questions by circling the number or letter corresponding to your response or by providing the information requested.

1.   In which state do you attend university?

    a. Texas   b.   California

2.   How long have you been attending this university?

    a. Under 1 year   d.   3 to 4 years
    b. 1 to 2 years   e.   4 to 5 years
    c. 2 to 3 years   f.   5 years or longer

3.   What is your country of origin?

_____

4.   How long have you been in the United States?

    a. Under 1 year   d.   3 to 4 years
    b. 1 to 2 years   e.   4 to 5 years
    c. 2 to 3 years   f.   6 years or longer

5.   Visa Status:

    a. J-1   c.   F-2
    b. F-1   d.   M
    e. Other (Please list) _____

6.   Age:

    a. Below 20   d.   25 – 27
    b. 20 – 22   e.   28 – 30
    c. 23 – 24   f.   30 or more

7.   Marital Status:

    a. Married   b.   Single   c. Other

8.   Gender:

    a. Male   b.   Female

9.   What is your native language?

    _____

10. Have you taken or are you taking ESL at your university?

    a. Yes   b.   No

11. What is your declared major or area of concentration? (For example: Business, Education, etc.)

    _____

12. What is your current academic level?

    a. Graduate   b.   Undergraduate

13. What is your primary reason for attending this university?

    a. To obtain university/college transfer credit.
    b. To take courses that lead to employment.
    c. To take courses leading to a degree.
    d. Other (Please list) _____

14. How are your studies and living expenses being financed? (Example: Self, scholarship from home country, scholarship from US government, family support)

    _____

15. How did you learn about this university?

    a.   University advertising
    b.   University reputation
    c.   Family recommendation
    d.   Friend recommendation
    e.   Internet
    f.   Other (Please list) _____

STEP TWO: SURVEY QUESTIONS

Directions: Please read each of the following 132 statements carefully. Circle
either 1, 2, 3, 4.

1.	Circle 1 if the statement suggests	NO PROBLEM.
2.	Circle 2 if the statement suggests a	MINOR PROBLEM.
3.	Circle 3 if the statement suggests a	MODERATE PROBLEM.
4.	Circle 4 if the statement suggests a	MAJOR PROBLEM.

1.	Evaluation of my former school credentials	1	2	3	4
2.	Concern about value of a U.S. education	1	2	3	4
3.	Choosing college subjects	1	2	3	4
4.	Treatment received at orientation meeting	1	2	3	4
5.	Unfavorable remarks about home country	1	2	3	4
6.	Concept of being a "foreign" student	1	2	3	4
7.	Frequent college examination	1	2	3	4
8.	Compulsory class attendance	1	2	3	4
9.	Writing or typing term (semester) papers	1	2	3	4
10.	Concern about becoming too "westernized"	1	2	3	4
11.	Insufficient personal – social counseling	1	2	3	4
12.	Being in love with someone	1	2	3	4
13.	Taste of food in the United States	1	2	3	4
14.	Problems regarding housing	1	2	3	4
15.	Being told where one must live	1	2	3	4
16.	Poor eye sight	1	2	3	4
17.	Recurrent headaches	1	2	3	4
18.	My physical height and physique	1	2	3	4
19.	Religious practices in the United States	1	2	3	4
20.	Attending church socials	1	2	3	4
21.	Concern about my religious beliefs	1	2	3	4
22.	Speaking English	1	2	3	4
23.	Giving oral reports in class	1	2	3	4
24.	Ability to write English	1	2	3	4
25.	Regulations on student activities	1	2	3	4
26.	Treatment received at social functions	1	2	3	4
27.	Relationship of men and women in the U.S.	1	2	3	4

28.	Lack of money to meet expenses	1	2	3	4
29.	Not receiving enough money from home	1	2	3	4
30.	Having to do manual labor (work with hands)	1	2	3	4
31.	Finding a job upon returning home	1	2	3	4
32.	Not enough time in the U.S. for study	1	2	3	4
33.	Trying to extend stay in the United States	1	2	3	4
34.	Getting admitted to U.S. college	1	2	3	4
35.	Registration for classes each term	1	2	3	4
36.	Not attending college of my first choice	1	2	3	4
37.	Relationship with foreign student advisor	1	2	3	4
38.	Leisure time activities of U.S. students	1	2	3	4
39.	Law enforcement practices in the U.S.	1	2	3	4
40.	Competitive college grading system	1	2	3	4
41.	Objective examinations (true-false, etc.)	1	2	3	4
42.	Insufficient advice from academic advisor	1	2	3	4
43.	Being lonely	1	2	3	4
44.	Feeling inferior to others	1	2	3	4
45.	Trying to make friends	1	2	3	4
46.	Costs of buying food	1	2	3	4
47.	Insufficient clothing	1	2	3	4
48.	Not being able to room with a U.S. student	1	2	3	4
49.	Hard to hear	1	2	3	4
50.	Nervousness	1	2	3	4
51.	Finding adequate health services	1	2	3	4
52.	Finding worship group of own faith	1	2	3	4
53.	Christianity as a philosophy	1	2	3	4
54.	Variety of religious faith in the U.S.	1	2	3	4
55.	Reciting in class	1	2	3	4
56.	Understanding lectures in English	1	2	3	4
57.	Reading textbooks written in English	1	2	3	4
58.	Dating practices of U.S. people	1	2	3	4
59.	Being accepted in social groups	1	2	3	4
60.	Not being able to find "dates"	1	2	3	4

61.	Saving enough money for social events	1	2	3	4
62.	Immigration work restrictions	1	2	3	4
63.	Limited amount U.S. dollar will purchase	1	2	3	4
64.	Becoming a citizen of the United States	1	2	3	4
65.	Changes in home government	1	2	3	4
66.	Desire to not return to home country	1	2	3	4
67.	Understanding college catalogs	1	2	3	4
68.	Immigration regulations	1	2	3	4
69.	Lack of knowledge about the U.S.	1	2	3	4
70.	Campus size	1	2	3	4
71.	U.S. emphasis on time and promptness	1	2	3	4
72.	Understanding how to use the library	1	2	3	4
73.	Too many interferences with studies	1	2	3	4
74.	Feel unprepared for U.S. college work	1	2	3	4
75.	Concerned about grades	1	2	3	4
76.	Sexual customs in the United States	1	2	3	4
77.	Homesickness	1	2	3	4
78.	Feeling superior to others	1	2	3	4
79.	Bathroom facilities cause problems	1	2	3	4
80.	Distances to classes from residence	1	2	3	4
81.	Relationship with roommate	1	2	3	4
82.	Dietary problems	1	2	3	4
83.	Need more time to rest	1	2	3	4
84.	Worried about mental health	1	2	3	4
85.	Having time to devote to own religion	1	2	3	4
86.	Spiritual versus materialistic values	1	2	3	4
87.	Doubting the value of any religion	1	2	3	4
88.	Understanding U.S. "slang"	1	2	3	4
89.	My limited English vocabulary	1	2	3	4
90.	My pronunciation not understood	1	2	3	4
91.	Activities of international houses	1	2	3	4
92.	U.S. emphasis on sports	1	2	3	4
93.	Problems when shopping in the U.S.	1	2	3	4

94.	Finding part-time work	1	2	3	4
95.	Unexpected financial needs	1	2	3	4
96.	Money for clothing	1	2	3	4
97.	Uncertainties in the world today	1	2	3	4
98.	Desire enrolling at another college	1	2	3	4
99.	U.S. education not what was expected	1	2	3	4
100.	Differences in purposes among U.S. colleges	1	2	3	4
101.	Difference in U.S. and home education systems	1	2	3	4
102.	Not being met on arrival at campus	1	2	3	4
103.	College orientation program insufficient	1	2	3	4
104.	Trying to be student, tourist, "ambassador"	1	2	3	4
105.	Attitude of some toward "foreign" students	1	2	3	4
106.	Doing laboratory assignments	1	2	3	4
107.	Insufficient personal help from professors	1	2	3	4
108.	Relations between U.S. students and faculty	1	2	3	4
109.	U.S. emphasis on personal cleanliness	1	2	3	4
110.	Not feeling at ease in public	1	2	3	4
111.	Attitude of some U.S. people to skin color	1	2	3	4
112.	Finding a place to live between college terms	1	2	3	4
113.	Changes in weather conditions	1	2	3	4
114.	Lack of invitations to visit in U.S. homes	1	2	3	4
115.	Feeling under tension	1	2	3	4
116.	Service received at health center	1	2	3	4
117.	Health suffering due to academic pace	1	2	3	4
118.	Criticism of homeland religion	1	2	3	4
119.	Accepting differences in great religions	1	2	3	4
120.	Confusion about religion and moral in the U.S.	1	2	3	4
121.	Insufficient remedial English services	1	2	3	4
122.	Having a non-English speaking roommate	1	2	3	4
123.	Holding a conversation with U.S. friends	1	2	3	4
124.	Activities of foreign student organizations	1	2	3	4
125.	Opportunities to meet more U.S. people	1	2	3	4
126.	Concern about political discussions	1	2	3	4

127.	Costs of an automobile	1	2	3	4
128.	Finding employment between college terms	1	2	3	4
129.	Finding jobs that pay well	1	2	3	4
130.	Insufficient help from placement office	1	2	3	4
131.	Staying in the U.S. and getting a job	1	2	3	4
132.	Wonder if the U.S. education is useful back home	1	2	3	4

STEP THREE: COMMENTS

Directions: Please answer the following questions.

1.   What programs, policies, activities, or services provided to you by the university are most helpful to you? Please list at least 3 in the space below.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2.   What programs, policies, activities, or services would you like to have offered as a service to you by the university that are not presently offered? Please list at least 3 services that could be helpful to you.

_____

_____

_____

_____

3.   To whom do you most frequently go for help in resolving problems that have confronted you? (For example: counselors, international student advisor, or students from your homeland, faculty, etc.) Please list in order of preference.

(1) _____

(2) _____

(3) _____

Appendix B

MISPI Inventory Statements

(Eleven Categories)

		KEY
U	=	University
T	=	Time under one year
Tw	=	Taiwan
J	=	Japan
HK	=	Hong Kong
MS	=	Marital status
G	=	Gender
*	=	Statistical Significance

There were 77 questions that indicated a statistical significance.

The following reflects the number of times a coefficient was significant.

U = 58,   T = 25,Tw = 24,   J = 33, HK = 26,   MS = 9,   G = 11

Admissions and Selection

		Question Number	
1.	Evaluation of my former school credentials	1	
2.	Concern about value of a U.S. education	2	
3.	Choosing college subjects	3	
4.	Getting admitted to U.S. college	34	
5.	Registration for classes each term	35*	T, Tw, G
6.	Not attending college of my first choice	36*	Tw, J, HG, G
7.	Understanding college catalogs	67*	T, Tw
8.	Immigration regulations	68	
9.	Lack of knowledge about the U.S.	69*	U, T, J
10.	Differences in purposes among U.S. colleges	100*	U
11.	Difference in U.S. and home education systems	101	
12.	Not being met on arrival at campus	102*	U, Tw

Orientation Services

		Question Number	
1.	Treatment received at orientation meeting	4*	T, Tw, J
2.	Unfavorable remarks about home country	5	
3.	Concept of being a "foreign" student	6	
4.	Relationship with foreign student advisor	37	
5.	Leisure time activities of U.S. students	38	
6.	Law enforcement practices in the U.S.	39*	T, Ms
7.	Campus size	70*	U, Tw, J
8.	U.S. emphasis on time and promptness	71	
9.	Understanding how to use the library	72*	U, T, Tw
10.	College orientation program insufficient	103*	U, Tw
11.	Trying to be student, tourist, "ambassador"	104*	U, Tw, J
12	Attitude of some toward "foreign" students	105*	U

Academic Advising and Records

		Question Number
1.	Frequent college examination	7* T, Tw, J, HK, Ms
2.	Compulsory class attendance	8* T, Ms, G
3.	Writing of typing term (semester) papers	9* T, HK
4.	Competitive college grading system	40* T, HK
5.	Objective examinations (true-false, etc.)	41
6.	Insufficient advice from academic advisor	42
7.	Too many interferences with studies	73* U, T
8.	Feel unprepared for U.S. college work	74* T, Tw, J, HK
9.	Concerned about grades	75* T, HK
10.	Doing laboratory assignments	106*U, J
11.	Insufficient personal help from professors	107*U, J, Tw
12.	Relations between U.S. students and faculty	108*U

Social-Personal

		Question Number
1.	Concern about becoming too "westernized"	10
2.	Insufficient personal – social counseling	11
3.	Being in love with someone	12
4.	Being lonely	43
5.	Feeling inferior to others	44
6.	Trying to make friends	45
7.	Sexual customs in the United States	76
8.	Homesickness	77
9.	Feeling superior to others	78
10.	U.S. emphasis on personal cleanliness	109* U, Tw, J, HK, G
11.	Not feeling at ease in public	110* U, J
12.	Attitude of some U.S. people to skin color	111

Living-Dining

		Question Number
1.	Taste of food in the United States	13* Tw, Hk
2.	Problems regarding housing	14* U, Tw
3.	Being told where one must live	15
4.	Costs of buying food	46* U, J, G
5.	Insufficient clothing	47* U, Ms
6.	Not being able to room with a U.S. student	48* U
7.	Bathroom facilities cause problems	79* U, T, Tw, J, HK
8.	Distances to classes from residence	80
9.	Relationship with roommate	81
10.	Finding a place to live between college terms	112* U
11.	Changes in weather conditions	113* U
12.	Lack of invitations to visit in U.S. homes	114

Health Services

1.	Poor eye sight	16*	J
2.	Recurrent headaches	17*	Tw, HK, G
3.	My physical height and physique	18*	Tw, HK, Ms
4.	Hard to hear	49*	U, T, Tw, J, G
5.	Nervousness	50*	U, J
6.	Finding adequate health services	51*	U, J
7.	Dietary problems	82*	U, T, HK, Ms
8.	Need more time to rest	83	
9.	Worried about mental health	84*	U, T, J, Ms
10.	Feeling under tension	115	
11.	Service received at health center	116	
12.	Health suffering due to academic pace	117	

Religious Services

1.	Religious practices in the United States	19*	U, J, Ms
2.	Attending church socials	20*	U, Tw, Ms, G
3.	Concern about my religious beliefs	21	
4.	Finding worship group of own faith	52*	U, Tw, G
5.	Christianity as a philosophy	53	
6.	Variety of religious faith in the U.S.	54*	U
7.	Having time to devote to own religion	85*	U, Tw
8.	Spiritual versus materialistic values	86	
9.	Doubting the value of any religion	87*	U, Tw, J
10.	Criticism of homeland religion	118*	U, HK
11.	Accepting differences in great religions	119*	U, J
12.	Confusion about religion and moral in the U.S.	120*	U, J

English Language

1.	Speaking English	22*	U, T, J, HK
2.	Giving oral reports in class	23*	J, HK
3.	Ability to write English	24*	U, T, J, HK
4.	Reciting in class	55*	U, J, HK
5.	Understanding lectures in English	56*	U, T, Tw, J, HK
6.	Reading textbooks written in English	57*	U, T, J, HK
7.	Understanding U.S. "slang"	88*	U, Tw, J, HK, Ms
8.	My limited English vocabulary	89*	U, T, Tw, J, HK
9.	My pronunciation not understood	90*	U, T, J, HK
10.	Insufficient remedial English services	121*	U, T, Tw
11.	Having a non-English speaking roommate	122*	U, Tw
12.	Holding a conversation with U.S. friends	123*	U, T

Student Activities

1.	Regulations on student activities	25*	HK, Ms
2.	Treatment received at social functions	26*	U, HK
3.	Relationship of men and women in the U.S.	27	
4.	Dating practices of U.S. people	58	
5.	Being accepted in social groups	59	
6.	Not being able to find "dates"	60*	HK
7.	Activities of international houses	91*	U, G
8.	U.S. emphasis on sports	92*	U
9.	Problems when shopping in the U.S.	93*	U, T, J
10.	Activities of foreign student organizations	124*	U, HK, G
11.	Opportunities to meet more U.S. people	125*	J
12.	Concern about political discussions	126*	U, T

Financial Aid

1.	Lack of money to meet expenses	28	
2.	Not receiving enough money from home	29	
3.	Having to do manual labor (work with hands)	30*	U
4.	Saving enough money for social events	61	
5.	Immigration work restrictions	62*	U, J
6.	Limited amount U.S. dollar will purchase	63	
7.	Finding part-time work	94	
8.	Unexpected financial needs	95	
9.	Money for clothing	96*	U
10.	Costs of an automobile	127*	U, T, HK
11.	Finding employment between college terms	128	
12.	Finding jobs that pay well	129	

Placement Services

1.	Finding a job upon returning home	31*	T, J
2.	Not enough time in the U.S. for study	32	
3.	Trying to extend stay in the Untied States	33	
4.	Becoming a citizen of the United States	64	
5.	Changes in home government	65*	U
6.	Desire to not return to home country	66	
7.	Uncertainties in the world today	97	
8.	Desire enrolling at another college	98*	U, T
9.	U.S. education not what was expected	99	
10.	Insufficient help from placement office	130	
11.	Staying in the U.S. and getting a job	131	
12.	Wonder if the U.S. education is useful back home	132	

Appendix C

Michigan International Advisor Perception of Student Problem Inventory

(As adapted from the Michigan International Student Problem Inventory
of John Porter by John Jenkins)

Responses to this survey are CONFIDENTIAL, and NO names will be released.
Participation in this survey is VOLUNTARY.

STEP ONE: PERSONAL INFORMATION

Directions: Please answer the following questions by circling the letter or number corresponding to your response or by providing the information.

1. In which state is the university you work for?

   a. Texas   b.   California

2. How long have you been working for this university?

   a. Less than 1 year   e.   4 to 5 years
   b. 1 to 2 years   f.   5 to 6 years
   c. 2 to 3 years   g.   6 to 7 years
   d. 3 to 4 years   h.   8 or more years

3. What is your position at the university? (Example: Professor, Advisor, Staff)

   _____

4. Age:

   a. Below 20   e.   35 – 39
   b. 20 – 24   f.   40 – 44
   c. 25 – 29   g.   45 - 49
   d. 30 – 34   h.   50+

5. Marital Status:

   a. Married   b.   Single   c.   Other

6. Gender:

   a. Female   b.   Male

7. Have you ever lived in another country besides the U.S.? (Please list where and for how long you lived there.)

   a. Yes   b.   No

8. Does your university host an intensive English program for international students not qualified by TOEFL to enter the academically program? (How many levels are in the program?)

   a. Yes   b.   No

9. Total number of students enrolled at the university? _____

   a. Undergraduate Enrollment: _____
   b. Graduate Enrollment   _____
   c. International Student Enrollment   _____ Undergraduate
                                  _____ Graduate

10. Have you ever received formal training for your job?

   a. Yes   b.   No

11. How many years have you worked with international students?

a. Less than 1year	e. 4 to 5 years
b. 1 to 2 years	f. 5 to 6 years
c. 2 to 3 years	g. 6 to 7 years
d. 3 to 4 years	h. 8 or more years

12. How many countries do international students at the university represent?

a. Below 5	e. 21 – 25
b. 6 – 10	f. 26 – 30
c. 11 – 15	g. 31 - 35
d. 16 – 20	h. 35+

STEP TWO: SURVEY QUESTIONS

Directions: Please read each of the following 11 statements and their descriptions carefully. The descriptions follow the question. Circle 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 as you feel it applies to your perception of how international students feel or think concerning this subject. Some items described are outside of the control of the institution.

1. Circle 1 if the statement suggests   NO PROBLEM.
2. Circle 2 if the statement suggests a MINOR PROBLEM.
3. Circle 3 if the statement suggests a MODERATE PROBLEM.
4. Circle 4 if the statement suggests a MAJOR PROBLEM.
5. Circle 5 if you are   NOT SURE

1.   **Admission – Selection Problems**   1   2   3   4   5

(Do students understand U.S. education system, admission policies, college catalogs, and purposes of different colleges?)

2.   **Orientation Service Problems**   1   2   3   4   5

(Do students understand relationship with advisor, use of library, U.S. laws, and campus services? Have they had a campus tour or orientation program? Have they experienced prejudice on campus? Do they receive support upon their arrival at the university such as airport pickup services?)

3.   **Academic Records Problem**   1   2   3   4   5

(What do students think of writing assignments, assistance from professors, frequent exams, compulsory attendance, grades, laboratory assignments, and too frequent interruptions from study?)

4.   **Social – Personal Problems**   1   2   3   4   5

(Do students feel lonely, homesick, or confused about the American culture? Do they have trouble making friends with Americans, understanding customs, Feeling inferior or superior?)

5.   **Living – Dining Problems**   1   2   3   4   5

(Do students have problems with dormitory life, roommates, weather, distance to classes, and campus food services?)

6.   **Health Services Problems**   1   2   3   4   5

(Do students have frequent reoccurring medical problems? Do they have difficulty finding medical services? Are they worried or nervous or have mental health problems?)

7.   **Religious Services Problems**   1   2   3   4   5

(Have students experienced religious prejudice, pressure, or confusion about Christianity? Do they have problems with the practice of their own faith?)

8.   **English Language Problems**   1   2   3   4   5

(Do students have problems speaking in class, understanding lectures, slang, or class discussions? Do they feel limited in their English ability? Do they need ESL training?)

9.   **Student Activity Problems**   1   2   3   4   5

(Do students have problems making friends, going shopping, participating in activities, understanding American sports, or dating customs?)

10.   **Financial Aid Problems**   1   2   3   4   5

(Do students have concern about the cost of tuition, books, fees, and other services? Are students concerned about family financial problems, working in the U.S., or money for clothing, recreation, etc.?)

11.   **Placement Services Programs**   1   2   3   4   5

(Are students concerned with working in the U.S., or finding work when they return home? Are they concerned with future college enrollment or changes in home government?)

STEP THREE: COMMENTS

Directions: Please answer the following questions.

1.   What programs, services, activities, or policies of the university are functioning well at the present time? Please indicate at least 3 of such in the space below. (Briefly describe them.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2.   What new programs, activities, policies or services do you think the university can offer to make problems less severe for international students.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3.   If you would like to make other comments about something that is not addressed in this questionnaire please feel free to express yourself below.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix D

June 30, 2000

Dr. John W. Porter
Urban Education Alliance
1547 Fall Creek Lane
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48108

Dear Dr. Porter,

I am a doctoral student at the University of San Diego in San Diego, California. I am seeking your permission to use the Michigan International Student Problem Inventory in my dissertation research. I will be conducting research at two universities. One is in Texas and one in California. It is my plan to conduct this research in September of this year.

I have ordered your dissertation from UMI and hope to receive it this week. I am interested in receiving a copy of the Manual that you prepared for use with the instrument. I will be happy to pay for this Manual if you can provide me a copy of it or if you can refer me to the proper source from which I can secure a copy.

Your permission will be greatly appreciated along with your assistance in these matters. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

John R. Jenkins
1340 Eureka Street #35
San Diego, California 92110
John95@ms3.hinet.net
619-543-1381

Appendix E

<div align="right">

July 10, 2000

</div>

UEA Inc.

John W. Porter, CEO
President Emeritus, Eastern Michigan University
1547 Fall Creek Lane
Ann Arbor, MI 48108

Mr. John R. Jenkins
1340 Eureka Street, #35
San Diego, CA 92110

Dear Mr. Jenkins:

I received your letter dated June 30, 2000, requesting permission to use the Michigan International Student Problem Inventory (MISPI). I am pleased to learn of your interest in the MISPI, which was developed in 1962 and has been widely utilized over the past 38 years by hundreds of doctoral candidates as well as others.

With this letter I do hereby grant you permission to use the Michigan International Student Problem Inventory (MISPI) and to adjust the instrument according to your research design. Copies of the instrument, abstract, published references and manual are enclosed.

However, I would request that you provide me with a copy of your completed abstract and future written articles that may be published. I am still looking forward to conducting further research on the impact of the MISPI instrument and will be drawing upon the experiences of those who have used the instrument over the past four decades.

For your added information, our office has on file a listing of the names of over 80 individuals who have requested permission to use the MISPI instrument since 1963. In addition, we have available the actual letter requests since 1990 from 37 such individuals.

I wish you much success in writing your dissertation on the adjustment problems of international students at several universities.

Sincerely,

Appendix F

Fall, 2000

Dear Colleague:

The attached inventory is part of my dissertation for a doctoral degree in leadership. The study is concerned with the problems of international students, as perceived by international students and school personnel.

The purpose of the study is to determine if there are significant differences in the perceptions of the problems of international students. It explores the differences in perception between: .

1) international students and school personnel;
2) international students by classification as graduate or undergraduate students; gender; age, by country of origin; length of stay in the U.S., major field of study, marital status, and participation in an ESL program.

Please complete the inventory, and return it in the enclosed stamped and self-addressed envelope. Complete anonymity and confidentiality of responses will be maintained.

A drawing will be held after all inventories have been returned. One student will be awarded a $100.00 telephone card and three students will be awarded a pair of tickets for the movies. Just return the registration slip contained within this packet along with the inventory. The slip will be separated from the inventory upon receipt so that anonymity can be maintained. No one will look at or record any information that identifies the inventory as belonging to any specific person.

A summary of the results will be available upon request. Your assistance and cooperation is deeply appreciated. Please return the inventory within two weeks of its receipt. This information is very important to my study, and I appreciate the contribution of your time and effort in this matter. If you have any questions you can contact me at john95@ms3.hinet.net. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

John R. Jenkins
Doctoral Student
University of San Diego

Appendix G

DRAWING REGISTRATION FORM

_____   _____
(Name)   (Date)

_____
                                          _____
                                          (Apartment #)

_____   _____
(Address)   (Telephone)

(This registration form will be separated upon receive from the survey instrument
you completed to assure you of anonymity. University personnel will separate the
form and conduct the drawing on behalf of the researcher who will not have access
to any names or addresses of participants in the study.)

Appendix H

Fall, 2000

Dear Faculty or Staff Member,

The attached inventory is part of my dissertation for a doctoral degree in leadership. The study is concerned with the problems of international students, as perceived by international students and school personnel.

The purpose of the study is to determine if there are significant differences in the perceptions of the problems of international students. It explores the differences in perception between:

1) international students and school personnel;
2) international students by classification as graduate or undergraduate students; gender; age, by country of origin; length of stay in the U.S., major field of study, marital status, and participation in an ESL program.

Please complete the inventory, and return it in the enclosed stamped and self-addressed envelope. Complete anonymity and confidentiality of responses will be maintained.

A drawing will be held after all inventories have been returned. One student will be awarded a $100.00 telephone card and three students or school personnel will be awarded a pair of tickets for the movies. Just return the registration slip contained within this packet along with the inventory. The slip will be separated from the inventory by university personnel so that anonymity can be maintained. The researcher will not have access to this information or to any mailing list of participants at any time. No one will look at or record any information that identifies the inventory as belonging to any specific person.

A summary of the results will be available upon request. Your assistance and cooperation is deeply appreciated. Please return the inventory within two weeks of its receipt. This information is very important to my study, and I appreciate the contribution of your time and effort in this matter. If you have any questions you can contact me at john95@ms3.hinet.net. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

John R. Jenkins
Doctoral Student
University of San Diego

Appendix I

INTERNATIONAL STUDENT SERVICES GUIDE

       The following areas of cooperation will provide the support needed from your office in completing my research for my dissertation project.

- <u>Announce the research project in meetings and gatherings of international students.</u> Encourage their involvement in the study.

- <u>Provide a list (or labels) of all international students names and addresses</u> enrolled in the fall of 2000 as soon as possible in August or September. Place them on the envelopes to be mailed out. Mail out the envelopes after receiving oral confirmation to do so from the researcher.

- <u>Collect returned instruments from students and school personnel.</u> (These will be returned either by hand or by mail. When these have been returned please mail them by Federal Express or UPS. I will provide a date to you after which I would like the instruments mailed. I will also pay for this mailing when you notify me of the amount of the postage.)

  John R. Jenkins
  #60, 3F Kwang Hua South Street
  Hsin-Chu, Taiwan, R.O.C. 300

- <u>Separate the drawing registration from the instrument.</u> (Students who complete the drawing registration and place it in the return envelope will be eligible for a drawing.) Please place the drawing registration forms in a box. After the date I provided for mailing me the instrument please conduct a random drawing by having someone draw four names out of the box.

  There are 4 prizes awarded.

  1) $100.00 (For a telephone card.)   (To be won by a student only.)
  2) $15.00 (For a movie.)   (Students & Personnel are eligible.)
  3) $15.00 (For a movie.)   (Students & Personnel are eligible.)
  4) $15.00 (For a movie.)   (Students & Personnel are eligible.)

  Please contact the winners and distribute the prizes that I will leave with you for the winners.

  Thank you for your cooperation.

Appendix J

California University Permission Letter

In order to maintain the confidentiality of the institution all references to the identity of the university have been omitted from the following letter.

July 24, 2000

Dear John,

This letter is to indicate that you have my permission to conduct research among ____ international students. I understand that you will also interview some of our support faculty and staff. The survey instrument may be conducted by mail or in person as you select.

I will be very interested in seeing the results of your research.

Sincerely,

Associate Vice President for Student Affairs

Appendix K

Texas University Permission Letter

In order to maintain the confidentiality of the institution all references to the identity of the university have been omitted from the following letter.

July 17, 2000

John Jenkins
1340 Eureka St. #35
San Diego, CA 92110

Dear John,

Greetings from the International Office of _____. It was good to learn of your proposed research plans for your dissertation. Your topic is most timely and holds great merit for university international programs. From our experience, it is a complex issue to determine the success of support programs designed to meet those needs.

Due to the potential benefit of such research, this university would be most pleased to participate in your dissertation research. You have permission to conduct research among the international students and support faculty and staff at the university. The survey instrument may be conducted by mail or in person, as you select.

Please contact this office when we may be of further service to you. We look forward to reading the data and specific information you collect. This should serve as a vital tool of evaluation and assessment for our department.

Sincerely,

Director of International Student Services