To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Harmohinder Paul Singh entitled "A Survey of Socioeconomic Problems and Nonreturn of Selected Foreign Graduate Students at the University of Tennessee." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education with a major in Curriculum and Instruction.

Anand Malik, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

Thesis
76d
.S546
cop.2

A SURVEY OF SOCIOECONOMIC PROBLEMS AND NONRETURN OF SELECTED FOREIGN GRADUATE STUDENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Education

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Harmohinder Paul Singh

August 1976

1288365

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Let me express my thanks to all the foreign graduate students. Without their cooperation, the study would not have been possible. It would be very insincere to exclude anyone who helped to make it possible to complete the lengthy task of writing the dissertation. Among the many persons who were important for completion of the study, the paramount importance is owed to Dr. Anand Malik, major professor on the Committee and Dr. William E. Cole, John R. Ray and Charles A. Chance, who guided, suggested and made comments and eventually made it possible to complete the program. They were invaluable throughout the total experience of the doctoral program. I feel deeply indebted to them all.

I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. Jerry Bellon. Without his encouragement and guidance, it would never have been possible to even get into the program. Further, I feel greatly thankful to Dr. W. C. Murphy, Dr. Alfred Grant, and Dr. Paul C. Burns, who also spent their invaluable time to read the draft and give many suggestions. Acknowledgments are made to Dr. Kermit J. Blank and Dr. Robert Howard who encouraged me to finish the program. I feel highly grateful to my parents and particularly to my eldest brother who gave partial financial support, encouragement and advice to finish the program. Lastly, acknowledgment is made to the typist, Mrs. Anita Bosau, for her patience to type from the manuscript and she did a very good job.

ABSTRACT

Purpose. The purpose of the study was explanatory and more specifically to describe, analyze, and ascertain the attitudes of foreign graduate students at The University of Tennessee at Knoxville anent to the following aspects:

1. To examine the general characteristics, background information, and reason for coming to the United States.
2. To analyze the interaction among conationals.
3. To examine the academic, social, personal, and economic problems.
4. To find out the source of financial support and expenses for attending school.
5. To estimate the extent of nonreturn of foreign graduate students to home after completion of their studies.
6. To ascertain the extent of use of services provided by the Office of International Student Affairs and comments and suggestions for improvement for the conditions and needs of the foreign graduate students in general.

Method. The study was limited to foreign graduate students from selected countries enrolled at The University of Tennessee for fall quarter, 1975, and the ones who have been in school more than one quarter and have full student visas or have applied for immigrant visas. The sample included twenty-one countries and was restricted to one campus.

The structured and unstructured anonymous questionnaire was used to collect the data. Ninety-four out of 192 completed responses were analyzed which comprised a 48.96 percent response rate. Because the study was limited to one campus and the small sample size, the extropolations were made with much caution. The synopsis of the findings were as follows:

1. A majority of the foreign graduate students came to the United States to get training and degrees in their field and to know how people work in their professions so they could bring home knowledge that would be useful to their countries.
2. Predeparture information came from various sources. Friends and relatives were the chief source, and many found the information was inadequate.
3. Most respondents found their housing by themselves and were living in apartments with the conational near the campus.
4. A majority of the respondents paid and received more visits from the conationals than from American counterparts.
5. Over 70 percent of the students did not have academic problems except in English language deficiency. But the respondents from China, Indonesia, Japan, and other countries had problems in understanding lectures, giving oral reports, taking written examinations, and participating in class discussions.
6. A majority of the students expressed concern over the increased cost of tuition, boarding, and lodging and had difficulty in finding housing near the campus. Students expressed problems in

getting permission to work part-time and discrimination in finding a job.

7. Most respondents did not have many social or personal problems except being unaccepted in a social group and feeling that the different language accent was a handicap in social relations and in discussion with the faculty.
8. A majority of the respondents were supported by parents, relatives, followed by institutional support of graduate assistants. Over 50 percent of the estimated dollar amount of support came from outside the United States.
9. Only 15 percent of the respondents had a part-time job on campus. No one had off-campus jobs during the fall of 1975.
10. A majority of students expressed they have to go back home because they have been unable to change their visas.
11. A majority of the respondents indicated that they would take a job if offered.
12. Many students expressed willingness to seek immigration if the immigration laws allowed them to do so. Above 50 percent also indicated that they would seek training even after completion of their studies.
13. A majority of the respondents utilized orientation, immigration counseling, personal advice, financial aid, and temporary employment. In general the graduate students were well adjusted socially and more or less satisfied with the current situation except the minority who had problems in all areas.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	The Problem	14
	Analysis of the Problem	14
	Purpose of the Study	15
	Assumptions	15
	Limitations	17
	Importance of the Study	17
	Definition of the Terms	19
	Organization of the Study	21
II.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	23
	Literature Dealing with Social Adaptation, Academic and Economic Problems	23
	Financial Resources and Employment among Foreign Graduate Students	30
	Nonreturning foreign students	34
	Summary	41
III.	PROCEDURE	42
	Design of Survey Study	42
	Instrument Selection	43
	Population	46
	Sources of Data	48
	Administration of the Questionnaire	50
	Method of Data Analysis	52
IV.	DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSIONS	53
	Student Characteristics	55
	Reasons for studying in the United States	62
	Academic Problems	63
	Economic Problems	65
	Social and Personal Problems	65
	Financial Situation Status	68
	Sources of support	69
	Education cost	73
	Socioeconomic Status: Return and Nonreturn	75
	Return and nonreturn	76
	Summary	83
	A profile of the respondent	83

CHAPTER PAGE

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 85

Summary 85
Procedure 87
Summary of the findings 89
General characteristics 89
Social interaction among conationals 89
Social, personal, economic, academic problems 90
Source of support, expenses incurred, part-time employment 90
Nonreturn of the foreign graduate student 90
Findings 91
Conclusions 93
Recommendation 98

BIBLIOGRAPHY 102

APPENDICES 109

A 110

B 111

C 112

VITA 124

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Foreign Graduate Students Population at University of Tennessee, Knoxville	47
2.	National Origins of Foreign Graduate Students Chosen as Subjects, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Fall, 1975	49
3.	Total Number of Foreign Graduate Students Chosen and Actually Contacted, University of Tennessee, Fall, 1975	51
4.	Frequency of Response by Country, Foreign Graduate Students, University of Tennessee, Fall, 1975	54
5.	Percentages of Sex and Marital Status of Foreign Graduate Students at University of Tennessee, Fall, 1975	56
6.	Percentages of Visa Status of Foreign Graduate Students at University of Tennessee, Fall, 1975	58
7.	Percentages of Foreign Graduate Students by College of Admission, University of Tennessee, Fall, 1975	59
8.	Percentages of Degree towards Foreign Graduate Students Working, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Fall, 1975	60
9.	Length of Stay at Knoxville of Foreign Graduate Students, University of Tennessee, Fall, 1975	61
10.	Length of Stay in the U.S. of Foreign Graduate Students at University of Tennessee, Fall, 1975	61
11.	Percentage Responses of Academic Situations of All Foreign Graduate Students, University of Tennessee, Fall, 1975	64
12.	Percentage Response of Economic Situations of Foreign Graduate Students, University of Tennessee, Fall, 1975	66
13.	Percentage Response Social and Personal Situation of Foreign Graduate Students, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Fall, 1975	67

TABLE PAGE

14. Source of Support, Foreign Graduate Student, University of Tennessee, Fall, 1975 70

15. Total Dollar Amount of Support Countrywise of Foreign Graduate Students at University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Fall, 1975 71

16. Total Dollar Amount of Support Reported by Foreign Graduate Students, University of Tennessee, Fall, 1975 72

17. Average Expenses in Dollars for Fall Quarter, 1975, for Rent, Food, Utilities, Phone, Cafeteria and Miscellaneous of Foreign Graduate Students, University of Tennessee, Knoxville 74

18. Percentage of Foreign Graduate Students Who Intend to Stay Permanently if Immigration and Naturalization Department Liberalizes the Condition for Immigration at University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Fall, 1975 77

19. Alien Students Who were Adjusted to Permanent Residence Status in the U.S. Under Section 245 Against the Total Adjusted from All Other Categories of Status 78

20. Percentages of Alien Students Whose Visas were Adjusted to Permanent Residence in the U.S. Under Section 245 Against the Total Adjusted from All Other Countries 80

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

It is not unusual to remark that a revolution has taken place in the international education at the global level. The advancement in science and technology has also played a very significant role. Besides the breakthrough in the means of communication and transportation has made it possible for students from different nationalities to study abroad. In fact, hundreds of thousands of foreign students have come to the United States for professional training and higher education. Credit goes to the United National which initiated the creation of the U.N.E.S.C.O. in 1946 (United National Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization), and the Fulbright Act, 1946, in the United States. It was based on the premise of "people speaking to people,"[1] hence people meeting people.

The activities in the areas of international education and cultural exchange have grown to meet the challenges at the global level through the passing of the Fulbright Act, 1946, and later followed by the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act, 1948, (Smith Mundt Act of 1948) and the Point Four Plan for technical aid, 1949.[2] These legislative enactments led to unprecedent growth in exchange students

---

[1]Brickman, W. Williams, "In Retrospect, 1965-1975," Exchange, Vol. XI, No. 1 (Fall, 1975), pp. 31-36.

[2]Ibid.

and other foreign students from the newly independent states in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The passing of the National Defense Educational Act, 1958, and space programs strengthened the interests in the areas of foreign studies. Later in 1961, the enactment of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act (Fulbright Hays Act, 1961),[3] International Education Act (1966), the inauguration of the Peace Corps, involvement of Federal and State governments and private foundations have strengthened the cause of transnational education. The result of all this legislation attracted many international students, scholars and professionals, who in the past used to go to France, England, Germany, Canada, Austria. The manifold increases of foreign students during the period 1945-1965 and later 1966-1975, was labeled by Byers (1971)[4] "Asian Invasion of American Campuses: Why?" and U.S. News (1973)[5] "Flood of Students to U.S.?" and Semas (1975)[6] "Foreign Students: More Coming."

However, the growth of foreign students in the 1970's has slowed to one-fifth of the average rate of the 1960's.[7] Furthermore, the percentage

---

[3]The purpose of the Mutual Education and Cultural Exchange Act (1961) was "to increase mutual understanding between people of the U.S. and the people of other countries by means of educational and cultural exchange and thus assist in development of more friendly and peaceful relations between the U.S. and other countries of the world." Public Law 87-256. Brickman, Exchange, Vol. 11, No. 1 (Fall, 1975), pp. 31-36.

[4]Byers, Philip, "Asian Invasion of American Campuses: Why?" Exchange, Vol. 6, No. 4 (Spring, 1971), pp. 58-70.

[5]U.S. News, "Flood of Students to U.S.?" U.S. News, Vol. 75, No. 16 (November 12, 1973), p. 57.

[6]Semas, W. Philip, "Foreign Students: More Coming," The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. 10, No. 5 (March, 1975), p. 1.

[7]Open Doors, Institute of International Education (1973), p. V forward.

increase in the foreign student population (3 percent, 1973-74) was the lowest ever—down from 4 percent in 1972-73 and from an average rate of 11.3 percent throughout the 1960's.[8]

In fact in order to improve the health of the political, social, economic systems on the global level, transnational education is extremely important and vital. The foreign students who come for education here would certainly help in achieving the goals of mutual understanding and goodwill. In addition, the foreign students represent as "ambassadors" of the newly independent countries, and act as agents of social and economic change through improvement in education in the long run.

Even moreso the increased role of the United States in terms of world leadership has contributed to providing the facilities for transnational education with foreign aid and other resources. No doubt the U.S. is going to dominate the world in science and technology well into the distant future. In order to preserve progress, peace, and prosperity it is of utmost importance to provide financial aid and concern commitments in order to allow the movement of students and professionals and scholars for training from "the third world countries."[9]

A landmark in international education progress was the address by President Lyndon Johnson in September, 1965, at the bicentennial of the birth of James S. Smithson, the English benefactor of the Smithsonian Institute in Washington, D. C. The President affirmed,

---

[8] Open Doors, Institute of International Education Report (1974), p. 1.

[9] Third world countries are those poor countries that need time and technology rather massive foreign aid to build modern developed economies. Time Magazine, Vol. 106, No. 25 (December, 1975), pp. 34-40.

> certain truths are self-evident in every nation on this earth; that ideas, not armaments, will shape our lasting prospects for peace; the conduct of foreign policy will advance no faster than the curricula of our classrooms; and that the knowledge of our citizens is one treasure which grows only when it is shared.[10]

President Gerald R. Ford, May 9, 1975,[11] speaking on the occasion of the 10th Anniversary of the International Exchange said,

> It has been my experience that there is absolutely no substitute for person to person relationships. . . . In the past few years we have seen the world grow more and more interdependent because of scientific, economic and political developments, but our understanding of each other has not always moved as rapidly. This is changing . . . people everywhere are recognizing the common goals, the hopes and even dreams that unite us . . . in all parts of the globe.

Even the Secretary of State, Henry A. Kissinger, honoring Senator J. William Fulbright, December 16, 1974, said:[12]

> The Fulbright Exchange Act was an expansive concept founded upon global vision. It has grown to meet new realities. A program which once promoted the solidarity of the West now sustains exchanges between the U.S. and 122 countries around the globe. It expressed, it helps us to master the growing interdependence of the world.

These opinions and ideas undoubtedly advocate and visualize the importance of a "World Economic Order" and increased global interdependence. In 1975, 16 scholars from the Hazen Foundation of New Haven, Connecticut, completed a two-year study, to develop common wide-angled and long-range goals on current world conditions. The title of the Report, "Reconstituting the Human Community" explains in one paragraph:

---

[10] Exchange, Vol. 11, No. 1 (Summer, 1975), p. 32.

[11] Ibid., front page.

[12] Ibid., p. 31.

> There is a need for new humanism beyond the superficial unity that is imposed upon men by global communication systems. We cannot be kept together to build a new future unless we are linked to our fellowman by more than survival instincts. Why not each of us have a new moral vision or new philosophy of history capable of giving us at least some notion of where we may be going and some sense of the value of our place in the changing world in which we live.[13]

One may agree with the scholars that a new humanism is vital. But the problem is how to bring about such a great breakthrough in establishing a visionary humane society. How could the people from different nationalities move towards understanding a common humanity? Can American leadership architect a course of action towards building a world community which is economically viable enough to reduce the danger of world confrontation and yet modest enough to be within the limits of tolerance imposed by prevailing fears and prejudices?

Unequivocally there is no ready solution to this dilemma, but there is hope which basically depends upon the promise of education, narrowing the gap between the needs and capabilities of the U.S. and reducing the tension of fears and prejudices which affect these nations.

> The reality is that the gap between the so-called advanced and backward nations is not closing, but on the contrary is increasing with the passage of time and it wouldn't close as long as the contemporary pattern of international distribution of wealth and power continues.[14]

---

[13]Fulbright, W. J., "The Creative Powers of Exchange," Exchange, Vol. XI, No. 1 (Summer, 1975), p. 4.

[14]Couloumbis, A. Theodore, "The Gap between Rich and Poor, Reassessing the Meaning and Process of Development," Intellect, Vol. 10, No. 2371 (January, 1976), pp. 294-97.

A giant step would be educating the developing nations through the utopia of world education—particularly a broad education across national boundaries—which may heighten the depth of human wisdon, sympathy and perception. Education, nevertheless a sluggish process but a very powerful force, can only save the world community from catastrophe.

The purpose of international education is to move above narrow conventionalism and make concerted efforts to expand the scope of human, moral, and intellectual potentialities, so as to close the gap between "the Haves" and "the Have-nots." Perhaps such a goal can be achieved through persuasion instead of force, cooperation rather than competition, and not for the purpose of gaining dominance for a nation or ideology, but to allow every society to develop its own concepts of public good and individual fulfillment.

In addition to exchange programs, hundreds of thousands of international students, who for the last thirty years have received education, have contributed to the social and economic development of their countries. However, those who come for higher education have to go through many tribulations and difficulties during their sojourn. The foreign students who face more socioeconomic and academic problems result in negative attitudes towards the host country. Morris (1956)[15] verified the U-curve in the degree of satisfaction shown during sojourn.

---

[15]Morris, T., "National Status and Attitudes of Foreign Students," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. XII (1956), pp. 20-25.

Selltiz et al. (1962)[16] suggested to study long-term effects on foreign students' attitudes while in the U.S. and even when they leave the country, found evidence of the U-curve. While returning home they might seem to indicate the U-curve pattern in "readjustment and reacculturization."

However, Klein et al. (1970) in their survey study concluded: "As the painful facts of adjustments of foreign students are uncovered, the greater the difficulty in assessing the position that would lead to evaluation of the problems of the international students."[17]

In recent years with spiraling cost of attending university and decreasing scholarship aid there is concern whether or not foreign students can continue school. Above all is the restriction imposed in 1974 by the Immigration and Naturalization Service on part-time and summer jobs. This has created a confusion among the minority foreign students who compensated part of their expenses as host students. Only wealthy students will be able to get education, which is quite contrary to the philosophy of equality of opportunities in education in the U.S. Thus the less wealthy students are likely to face more hardships in the adjustment process during the sojourn, rather than finding solutions for adjustment problems.

---

[16]Selltiz, C., and Cook, S. W., "Factors Influencing Attitudes of Foreign Students towards the Host Country," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. XVIII (1962), pp. 7-23.

[17]Klein et al., "The Foreign Student Adaptation Program," Exchange, Vol. VI, No. 3 (Winter, 1971), pp. 70-90.

The continuous growth of foreign graduate students provides both benefits and problems. In case the universities fail to solve some of the serious problems, transnational education would do more harm than good. The pivotal problem is the financial one, followed by academic social adjustment during the sojourn.

Social adjustment brings about positive attitudes towards the host country and at the local and regional areas. But basic to all other issues is the nature of financial problems. Increased cost and stiffening immigration regulations might jeopardize the goals of equality of opportunity of education. It may not help in strengthening mutual respect and understanding between the local community and the international community.

Besides social and financial problems, the "Brain-Drain" problem continues to draw more and more concern all over the world, particularly from the developing countries who are the losers in the exchange. Migration of intellectuals is not a new or recent phenomenon. Dedijer (1967) states "Migration of Scientists is as old as Science."[18] What to do about the problem of "Brain-Drain," would not exclude its inevitability. For at least the past 2200 years people in its power have been doing something about the migration of scientists. "They have policies to promote or prevent it."[19]

---

[18]Dedijer, S., "Early Migration," in Walter Adams "The Brain Drain," The Macmillan Company, New York (1968), pp. 9-28.

[19]Ibid.

Grangberg,[20] studying migration of 60 foremost Greek scientists, found that in spite of the dread and the difficulty of travel outside one's city in those times, a surprisingly large fraction (45 out of 60) had said they had migrated as students, teachers, scholars or researchers. Until about 300 B.C. migration tended to stream to Athens where Plato established the Academy in 388 B.C. and Aristotle the Lyceum in 335 B.C., the long-lived institution of learning and research. Around 300 B.C. migration of scientists switched to Alexandria, which became the center of science, philosophy, scholarship and art of the world.

The universities provided the facilities for research and education and had attracted students from all over the world during the Middle Ages and until now. Foreign students so far have benefited, enriched and stimulated the life of the host countries. In the words of Grubel and Scott (1966),[21] "The social and intellectual life on the campuses receiving foreign students is stimulated which in turn enriches the educational experience of domestic students."

The University of Tennessee Board of Trustees on October 20, 1975, stating the policy on the role of international scholars and students made the following statement:

---

[20]Granberg, A., in Dedijer, S., "Early Migration," Ibid., pp. 13-14. "En Studie Av Migrationen Av Vetenskapsmän under Antiken," The work was done with the support of a student research grant of the Council of Natural Sciences of Sweden.

[21]Grubel and Scott, "The Cost of the College Students Exchange Programs," Journal of Human Resources, Vol. No. 1 (1966), pp. 81-98.

> They add to the breadth and quality of our lives while they are here. Their curricular and extracurricular activities bring fresh ideas and perceptions to our campuses. The presence of foreign scholars reinforces one old conviction that intellectual, economic and social progress knows no national boundaries.[22]

The foreign student population has continued to grow in spite of high inflation and stiffening regulations, it shows the strength and motivation on the part of the foreign students. Semas (1975)[23] reported, "Foreign Students: More Coming." "The Colleges Seek Oil Nations Students," Washington Post (1975).[24] There may be even more difficult times for the less wealthy students as the cost of tuition and boarding goes up and as the public and private foundations reduce financial support. Perkins (1971)[25] states "the professionals who view it with alarm, tend to regard the failures to supply funds for International Education Act of 1966 and other types of financial retrenchment as calamitous if not indeed catastrophic."

Wagar (1971) suggests the solution to the problems to be found in totality rather than on segmental; as,

---

[22]"Board of Trustees Approves U.T.'s International Role," The Link, Vol. 8, No. 3 (December-January, 1976).

[23]Semas, W. Philip, "Foreign Students: More Coming," The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. 10, No. 50 (March 24, 1975), p. 1.

[24]Washington Post, Sunday, Vol. 101 (March 16, 1975), p. 3.

[25]Perkins, James, "International Program of U.S. Colleges and Universities: Priorities for Seventies," International Council for Educational Development (1971), pp. 6-7.

> . . . to see problems and to think out solutions in terms of the interests of mankind as a whole as not in terms of "segmental," interests. . . . We must always strive in terms of single universal family of mankind. Mankind is an ultimate and absolute good. There may be other ultimate and absolute goods. But none of them can be allowed to conflict in any way with our conditional loyalty to mankind.[26]

Statistics show that there were 146,097 foreign students out of which 42.9 percent are graduate students representing 170 nationalities studying in 1508 American colleges and universities in 1972-73[27] and 151,066 foreign students out of which 41.0 percent were graduate students representing 177 countries and enrolled in 1359 U.S. institutions in 1973-74.[28] Nevertheless, the policy on exchange programs favors the graduate student over the undergraduate except where undergraduate training is available. Despite the stable population growth of foreign graduate students, the undergraduates have outnumbered the graduates.

DuBois (1956)[29] in her classic study emphasizes opportunities to graduate students over the undergraduates. Walton (1971)[30] citing the Institute of International Education Committee on Educational Exchange

---

[26]Wagar, W. Warren, History and the Idea of Mankind, 1st ed., Albuquerque, University of New Mexico Press (1971), pp. 216-17.

[27]Open Doors, Institute of International Education Report (1973), p. 8.

[28]Open Doors (1974), p. 5.

[29]DuBois, Cora, Foreign Students and Higher Education in the U.S., I.I.E. Pub., Washington, D.C. (1956).

[30]Walton, J. Barbara, "Research on Foreign Graduate Students," Exchange, Vol. 6, No. 3 (Winter, 1971).

Policy (1961) quotes, "Except where undergraduate facilities are inadequate, students should generally be sent abroad at the graduate level and for highly specialized studies." Further Walton (1971) quotes, the "Committee on Foreign Student Affairs (1964) set up by Education and World Affaris favored graduate students over the undergraduates."[31]

The graduate student, who has been outnumbered by undergraduates, seems quite mature and perhaps faces more difficuties in adjusting in the new milieu. They seem to be confronted with some unique problems during the sojourn at institutions in the U.S.

It is important to note that after finishing school, more and more students prefer to stay longer in the U.S. and perhaps later settle permanently. This has caused a great concern among the "donor" countries as well as the "receiving countries." Under a Carnegie grant, Myres (1967 and 1968)[32] reviewed the literature and methodology of studying "Brain-Drain" and found that Peruvian graduate students in the fields of science, engineering and medicines staying was more a possibility than in other areas of study. More recently in the comprehensive survey regarding "Brain-Drain," Glaser (1974)[33] reported, besides the nonreturn of foreign

---

[31] Open Doors, 1973, p. 8.

[32] Myres, G. Robert, "'Brain Drain,' and 'Brain-Gains.' Comments on the State of Research," Exchange (Spring, 1957), pp. 63-72. Myres, Robert, "Some Thoughts on Foreign Student Nonreturn," Exchange, Vol. 4, No. 2 (Fall, 1968), pp. 45-48.

[33] Glaser, A. William and Christopher, G. Habers, "The Migration and Return of Professionals," International Migration Review, Vol. 8, No. 2 (Spring, 1974) pp. 224-244.

students, the majority of them go back to their home country after completing their studies.

Regarding financial support of foreign students, the general misconception on the part of many Americans is that the majority of the students from other countries are supported by the U.S. In fact, most of them are supported by their parents, their governments, private foundations and international scholarships.

Straub, Jenkins and Eko (1970)[34] in a national survey of international students (1967-68) show 38 percent out of them were fully self-supporting and 18 percent received some support from American educational institutions and 6 percent from the U.S. Government. More recently Stecklein (1974)[35] reported that 47 percent were supported by their families and 26 percent receive institutional support and the rest were supported by their home government, U.S. Government and international agencies.

The future of these nations also depend upon how well these students are trained to share the responsibilities of planning, development and organizing socioeconomic developments. However, the increasing financial problems might jeopardize the very philosophy of transnational education.

---

[34]Straub, S. Jean, Jenkins, M. and Eko, U. Ewa, "Academic Freedom for International Students on American Campuses," Journal of National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, Vol. 33, No. 2 (Winter, 1970), pp. 77-82.

[35]Stecklein, E. John, Study of Foreign Student Employment and Financial Resources, NAFSA, Washington, D.C. (Fall, 1974), p. 3.

I. THE PROBLEM

The primary responsibility of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, is research, instruction and service. Hundreds of foreign students from different countries have benefited from its programs during the last thirty years. Foreign students continue to enrich and stimulate the social and intellectual life of the university community. Therefore, the university community and foreign students interaction enhances a mutual awareness of respective values and cultures, thus showing concern for their problems. The intent of the present survey is to identify, analyze and describe the problems of the foreign graduate students at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

II. ANALYSIS OF THE PROBLEM

In an effort to ascertain the major problems of the foreign graduate students, special attention was given to the following areas.

1. To analyze the background and characteristics of the foreign graduate students.
2. To ascertain the reasons and goals for coming to school in the United States, particularly to The University of Tennessee.
3. To determine the incidence of interaction of conationals, among American students and other foreign students.
4. To identify their social and personal problems.
5. To analyze the gravity of academic and economic problems; whether students have really to undergo "cultural shock."

6. To analyze the source of support, employment on-campus and off-campus while they are in school. To compile the dollar amount of support received from within the U.S. and outside the U.S.
7. To ascertain the use of services provided by the local Office of International Students Affairs.
8. To estimate the number of foreign graduate students likely to stay temporarily or permanently after completion of their studies.

III. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The primary objective of the present survey was to identify, describe and analyze the characteristics, and social, academic, economic problems of the foreign graduate students of The University of Tennessee at Knoxville. The survey study was designed to ascertain the sources of financial support, employment and liklihood of staying in the U.S. after completion of their study at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

IV. ASSUMPTIONS

1. In order to examine the adaptation process, academic and social financial problems, it is essential to conduct the survey within the framework of multidisciplinary principles such as anthropology, economics, education, psychology, sociology and other related fields.

2. The foreign graduate students from different nationalities who are conditioned by cultural values, norms, modes, traditions, personal

traits and environmental factors at home expect, and to some extent are prepared, to face many problems.

3. The researcher constructed a questionnaire with most of the questionnaire taken from previous studies which will yield the data regarding the characteristics, adaptation process, academic, social and financial problems.

4. The Office of the International Students Affairs (ISA—which was used to obtain selected data) will provide the valid data in lieu of the part-time and off-campus employment.

5. The academic, social, financial and brain-drain problems will be ascertained while surveying the graduate students from selected countries at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

6. One of the difficulties is to be able to estimate the extent of brain-drain and how to define the point at which it occurs. One acceptable way of agreement will be to say those who do not plan to go back to their home countries immediately after graduate can be categorized as nonreturnees.

7. The behavior and adjustment of individual foreign graduate students is difficult to determine without reference to cultural background. One may perceive a student from Southeast Asia, quiet, polite, and submissive, more concerned with digesting the content materials of the subject, but not social. In their cultures there is a saying "Silence is golden," and in China, "If you open your mouth you cannot think."

V. LIMITATIONS

1. The survey study was limited to foreign graduate students at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Those students who had been in school one or more quarters were included in the sample.
2. No effort was made to do a comparative and evaluative study regarding the foreign graduate students on other campuses in the U.S.
3. As there were few students from European countries at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, they were dropped from the sample.
4. There were not many graduate students from Africa and Latin America who were in school during Fall, 1975, thus the sample was representive of selected countries.

VI. IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

One may be curious as to the responsibility of the university community towards the foreign students, particularly the graduate students. To quote Mueller,[36]

> Foreign students are away from home. It is for this reason that every opportunity as well as every difficulty which they encounter will be exaggerated; and, for this reason, too, the university is wise to assume a moral and almost a parental responsibility for their welfare.

---

[36]Mueller, H. Kate, Student Personnel Work in Higher Education, Hougton Mifflin Company, Boston (1961), p. 487.

The university is the institution above all which is universal. Moreover, the oldest tradition of the university is international in character. The foreign students are just students with all local students. As earlier stated in the introduction by the trustee (see footnote 22) the foreign students add to the breadth and quality of life while in school. They also stimulate the social and intellectual life. President Lyndon Johnson,[37] "Knowledge grows when shared"; President Gerald R. Ford,[38] "No substitute for person to person relationship."

With the passage of many legislations; Fulbright Act 1946, Educational Exchange Act 1948, Fulbright Hays Act 1961, and 1966 Act, the unrelenting growth of international students has resulted in many problems in the areas of academic, social, economic, financial, employment and brain-drain. While the legislation provides sufficient grounds regarding the need for higher education and professional training to the foreign students, consequently ways should be found to help solve the problems.

Therefore, it is necessary to investigate the severity of the problems and conditions of the foreign graduate students at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. From the data collected, strategies can be developed for improvement of the conditions of graduate students. The survey should provide valuable information which can be used for administrative and policy purposes.

---

[37] Exchange, op. cit, p. 31.

[38] Ibid., front page.

VII. DEFINITION OF THE TERMS

"Brain-Drain." The term means immigration, transfer of intellectual elites or trained professionals from the developing countries to the developed countries.

Intellectual elite. A person having advanced academic and professional training or education, improvement in intellectual curiosity and a very valuable and contributing member towards society.

Foreign graduate student. A "subject" representing any country who has been at The University of Tennessee at least over one quarter or more and is registered student in school during Fall, 1975.

Student visas.[39] A F-1 visa, temporary visa issued exclusively for the purpose of studying. Students are supposed to return home after terminating their study but have an option of changing to immigrant status. Many students manage to change visa status after completion of study.

Exchange visitor visa.[40] It is also known as a J-1 visa; the term allows a period of 18 months to work after completing study but requires individual to return home for at least two years before immigrating. Under some circumstances the requirement can be waived.

---

[39]Myers, G. Robert, "International Education Emigration and Nation Policy," Comparative Education Review, Vol. 17 (February, 1973), p. 76.

[40]Ibid.

Adjustment of status.[41] A term means acquisition of permanent residence in the United States by adjustment of status while in this country as well as admission to the U.S. with an immigration visa issued abroad by American consulate officers.

The Fourth World.[42] The term means the poor countries of the world, as distinguished from the oil-rich countries of the Third World: "Fourth World"—they comprise nearly one billion people in some 40 underdeveloped nations in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

The Third World.[43] The term means technically less advanced nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, generally characterized as, in addition to being poor in money income, poorly fed and largely agrarian. The nations also tend to have a high rate of illiteracy and disease, rapidly growing populations, and new, relatively inexperienced and unstable governments.

Permanent resident.[44] The term means status of having been lawfully accorded the privilege of residing permanently in the U.S. as an immigrant in accordance with immigration laws.

---

[41] Annual Report, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Dept. of Justice, Washington, D.C. (1974), p. 7.

[42] The World Book Yearbook, Field Enterprises Educational Corporation, Chicago (1976), p. 585.

[43] Harris, T. William, The New Columbia Encyclopedia, Columbia University Press, New York (1975), p. 2733.

[44] Laws Applicable to Immigration and Nationality, U.S. Government Printing Press, Dept. of Justice, Washington, D.C. (1953), p. 16.

Social adjustment.[45] A process whereby individuals attempt to maintain or further his security, comfort, status, creative inclination in the face of ever changing conditions and pressures of social environment, harmonious relation between oneself and other people requiring understanding of oneself.

Foreign student.[46] A student from a particular culture, studying in and about another culture, referred to as alien student or unrelated pupil.

Underutilization of talent.[47] The term refers to waste through malutilization of talented manpower who reside in developing countries and no doubt results in infinitely greater loss than that which results from migration.

VIII. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The survey study is divided into five chapters. The complete bibliography and set of appendices pertinent to the study are included at the end of the fifth chapter. Chapter I deals with introduction, the problem, analysis of the problem, purpose of the study, assumptions, limitations, importance of the study, and definition of the terms.

---

[45] Good, V. Carter, Dictionary of Education, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York (1973), p. 13.

[46] Ibid., p. 562.

[47] The Committee on International Migration of Talent, The International Migration of High Level Manpower, Praeger Publishers, New York (1970), p. 17.

Chapter II comprises a relevant review of literature. Emphasis is laid on social adjustment, academic, social, economic problems and sources of support, employment and income and expenses, and finally, the "brain-drain." Chapter III provides a detailed account of the design of the questionnaire and the procedure employed for the collection of data. Chapter IV deals with the presentation of analysis of data. Chapter V provides the summary, conclusions and recommendations to the study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In this chapter, a survey of pertinent studies related to social adjustment, personal, academic and economic problems and effects of the conationals will be discussed. Necessary review of the studies pertaining to financial support, part-time employment, and cost attending the university will be discussed. Lastly, the literature dealing with incidence of brain-drain will be discussed. A few studies dealing with manpower losses incurred to the developing countries also will be reviewed.

I. LITERATURE DEALING WITH SOCIAL ADAPTATION, ACADEMIC AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

The innovative and creative exchange programs continue to attract foreign students and have strengthened international education during the last thirty years (1946-1976). Many studies sponsored by the State Department were conducted of foreign students to evaluate the exchange programs and their attitudes. The research on foreign students was mainly concerned to identify the problems and discover the effects of "study abroad," particularly in the United States colleges and universities. These students were studied both from the point of view of their attitude and personality changes towards their host country and personality changes. Many research studies had been sponsored by the Social Science Research Council of the U.S., private foundations and the U.S. State Department. These studies were not only concerned with the

experiences and problems in the U.S. but also with the longitudinal effects even when the foreign students had returned home. Several studies dealing with problems of all students in the U.S. or a particular nationality at a particular campus were conducted.[1]

Many of the studies and literature did not differentiate between the graduates and undergraduates. But in the following studies an attempt was made to compare the problems, experiences, and attitudes of the graduates and undergraduates: Peterson, et al. (1948); Forstat (1951); DuBois (1955); Lambert, et al. (1956); Coehlo (1958); Gezi (1959); Melby, et al. (1961); Kincaid (1961); Seltiz, et al. (1963); U.S. Advisory

---

[1]Beals, et al., No Frontiers to Learning: The Mexican Students in the U.S., Minneapolis, Univ. of Minn. Press (1957). Bennett, et al., In Search of Identity: The Japanese Overseas Scholar in America and Japan, Minneapolis, Univ. of Minn. Press (1958). Chang, H. Bao, "Attitudes of Chinese Students in the U.S.," Sociology and Social Research, Vol. 58, No. 1 (October, 1973), pp. 66-67. Coehlo, V., Changing Images of America: A Study of Indian Student's Perception, Glencoe, Ill. Free Press (1958). Kelman, H. O., "Changing Attitudes through International Activities," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 18 (1962), pp. 67-68. Klein, et al., "The Foreign Student Adaptation Program," Exchange, Vol. 6, No. 3 (Winter, 1971), pp. 77-90. Lambert, et al., Indian Students on American Campus, Minneapolis, Univ. of Minn. Press (1956). Morris, R. T., "National Status and Attitudes of Foreign Students," Journal of Social Issue, Vol. 12 (1956), pp. 20-25. Ibid., The Two-Way Mirror, Minneapolis, Univ. of Minn. Press (1960). Seltiz and Cook, "Factors Influencing Attitudes of Foreign Students towards the Host Country," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 18 (1962), pp. 7-23. Sewell, et al., Scandinavian Students on American Campus, Minneapolis, Univ. of Minn. Press (1961). Vernoff, J., "African Students in the U.S.," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 19 (1963), pp. 40-60.

Commission (1966).[2] The findings of these studies indicated the majority of foreign graduate students did not have overwhelming problems with academic performance, financial support, and courses of study. Furthermore the graduates usually come to the U.S. with clear cut purpose such as getting a degree or professional training in their fields of study. Most of the graduate students were satisfied with the sojourn. But a few complained about homesickness and discrimination at social events.

Sharma (1969)[3] who compiled the results of a survey from 322 major educational institutions among Indian students found out, despite some academic problems, that they can adjust quite well during their sojourn.

Ibrahim (1970,[4] studying Arab students, found: (1) the more interaction between members of different nationalities the more likely mutual favorable attitudes will develop. Newcomb, Solomon, Festinger, and Homans suggested that a person who interacts more with each other tend to like one another on an interpersonal level, and can get along

---

[2]Peterson and Neumeyer, "Problems of Foreign Student," Sociology and Social Research, Vol. 32 (1948), pp. 787-92. Forstat, Reisha, "Adjustment Problems of International Students," Sociology and Social Research, Vol. 36, No. 1 (1951), pp. 25-30. DuBois, Cora, "Foreign Students and Higher Education in the U.S.," Washington, D.C., American on Education (1956) and 2nd ed. (1962). Lambert, et al., Ibid. Coehlo, V., Ibid. Gezi, K.I. Melby et al., Kincaid H. V. in Walton, Barbara, "Research on Graduate Students," Exchange, Vol. 6, No. 3 (Winter, 1971), pp. 17-29. Operation and Policy Research, "Foreign Students in the United States: A National Survey," Exchange (Spring, 1966), pp. 30-32. Seltiz, et al., op. cit. pp. 7-23.

[3]Sharma, D. Keshav, "Indian Students in the U.S.," Exchange (Spring, 1969), pp. 43-59.

[4]Ibrahim, E. Saad, "Interaction, Perception and Attitudes of Arab Students towards Americans," Sociology and Social Research, Vol. 55, No. 1 (October, 1970), pp. 29-46.

better together. Cross cultural interaction enhances learning and leads to positive perception and positive attitudes towards themselves and fewer difficulties in adjustment process.

Klein, et al. (1971)[5] conducting a longitudinal study about the Asian students at the University of Wisconsin reported that despite some problems, many students make it successfully through the years and earn high esteem and affection from colleagues and friends. There were hardly any deeply moving interpersonal encounters with Americans. The minority foreign students experienced several social and psychological problems and continued their stay or when necessary returned home with a sense of dignity and worth. The study did not suggest that foreign student problems were minimal.

To quote:

> Behind their facades of academic progress, we find many students unfortunately walled off from American life, existing from day to day with the despairing sense of drudgery. The more we uncover the painful facets of adaptation most foreign students make in the United States, the more difficult it is for us to take any position that would lead to the glossing over foreign student problems. Perhaps the best progress can be made by shifting our focus from the foreign aspect of the foreign student process to the human aspect.[6]

Gaither and Griffin (1971)[7] conducted a survey of the foreign students at The University of Tennessee (Knoxville) regarding the

---

[5]Klein, H. Marjorie, et al., "The Foreign Students Adaptation Program: Social Experiences of Asian Students in the U.S.," Exchange, Vol. 6, No. 3 (Winter, 1971), pp. 77-90.

[6]Ibid.

[7]Gaither, H. Gerald and Griffin, C. Anthony, "The International Students at The University of Tennessee," Office of Institutional Research, A Report, Vol. XII, No. 1 (July 12, 1971), pp. 1-16.

information about the attitudes, participation in campus extracurricular activities, library, the student center, international house, residential pattern; they reported the adjustment problems for younger international students were minimal as compared to the older student who has a greater adaptability problem with his host milieu, the older students tended to be more insular and less interactive with the domestic students. Johnson (1971)[8] comparing the problems of foreign students to the domestic students at The University of Tennessee reported they did not have many problems except English language, homesickness, an ability to manage financially and that most of them spent their time alone, and with their spouses, and with the compatriots. Many adjustment problems were solved through the services of the Office of the International Students Affairs and International House staff.

Gabriel (1973),[9] conducting a survey of the foreign students at Purdue University, found that the majority of them were well equipped academically, yet they experienced language difficulties in understanding lectures, writing term papers and expressing ideas correctly in the first year of study. These difficulties were significantly less frequent after one year.

---

[8]Johnson, C. Dixon, "Problem of Foreign Students," Exchange, Vol. 7, No. 2 (Fall, 1971), pp. 61-68.

[9]Gabriel, L. Rhodelia, "Characteristics of Foreign Students on an American Campus," Journal of National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, Vol. 35, No. 4, (Summer, 1973), p. 184.

Moghrabi (1972)[10] in a comprehensive study of problems of the foreign students at the University of Nebraska concluded:

1. Difficulties with English language was most prominent.
2. Language difficulties regardless of the number of years of preparation were indicative of poor language instruction.
3. Graduate students scored well but below their American colleagues on the GRE. However, most of them completed their program successfully.
4. Financial difficulties did not seem to be a concern for the majority of the students.
5. Emotional anxiety was apparent because of frustration from lack of social life.
6. Some of the students sponsored by the U.S. were misinformed about the working of American educational system.
7. Linguistically poor students often have emotional anxiety which disturbs not only the student but also those who are involved in his instruction.

Hagey, et al. (1974),[11] in a survey of Middle East students attending colleges in Oregon during 1967-68 reported that foreign students on our campuses have problems in the academic, social and financial aspects and often need help not generally available.

---

[10]Moghrabi, Kamel, "Educating Foreigners in the United States," Improving College and University Teaching, Vol. 20, No. 4 (Autumn, 1972), pp. 329-32.

[11]Hagey, A. R. and Hagey, Joan, "Meeting the Needs of the Students from Other Cultures," Improving College and University Teaching, Vol. 22, No. 1 (Winter, 1974), pp. 42-43.

Two government supported studies on foreign students' problems differentiated among the graduates and undergraduates. Kincaid (1961)[12] indicated that 70 percent of the graduate students have no overwhelming problems with English competence, financial support, housing, courses of study and grades.

Operation and Policy Research (1966)[13] conducted a comprehensive study for the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs supported the findings of Kincaid, namely, graduate students have fewer social, academic and economic problems and favored concrete educational goals rather than getting to know Americans. Also they have more confidence in their ability to read, write and understand English and less satisfied with housing. There was no significant difference between the graduates and the undergraduates in contrast to some other similar studies.

Selby and Woods (1966)[14] studying graduates at Stanford, reported that the major preoccupation of foreign students at "high-pressured institutions" was keeping up academically and their success in this area the major determinant of the student's adjustment. However, the pressure to achieve prevented the development of close and personal relations with American students or others in the university community.

---

[12]Kincaid, V. Harry, "A Preliminary Study of the Goals and Problems of the Foreign Students in the U.S.," from Walton, Barbara, "Research on Foreign Graduate Students," Exchange, Vol. 6, No. 3 (Winter, 1971), p. 20.

[13]Operations and Policy Research, op. cit., pp. 30-32.

[14]Selby, A. Henry and Woods, M. Clyde, "Foreign Students at High Pressured University," Sociology of Education, Vol. 39, No. 2 (Spring, 1966), pp. 138-54.

II. FINANCIAL RESOURCES AND EMPLOYMENT AMONG FOREIGN GRADUATE STUDENTS

In previous reviews of the studies, though it was understood the students face financial problems but were not too alarming. Recent surveys indicated the soaring cost of tuition and living expenses made it difficult for parents to supplement the college/university of the domestic students. It might be even worse for the foreign students, because of the following: decreasing scholarship grants, fewer fellowships and sponsorships by state and national institutions and foundations. Carnegie Commission in 1973[15] reported the expenditures on Fulbright Scholarships and Agency for International Development grants—the major sources of federal support for foreign students—have leveled off. Moreover, the foreign students have been adversely affected by increased flow of student aid to minority groups and by recent sharp increases in tuition fees for out-of-state students at public institutions and suggested such diminution in opportunities for foreign students is undesirable.

Most of the people in America believed that the foreign students who undertake study in the U.S. were supported by the U.S. Government. Moreover, the belief is held that they take away jobs from their American counterpart domestic students, which of course, was not true.

---

[15]Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, College Graduates and Jobs; Adjusting to New Labor Market Situation, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company (1973), p. 183.

Straub (1970)[16] in a national survey found that 6 percent of the students received support from the U.S. Government and 5 percent from their own government and the majority were self-supporting.

Regardless of the financial support and summer employment question, the population of foreign students studying at American campuses increased every year. It seemed like a bullion market. Increased financial support in some years boosted the foreign studies and slashing of funds resulted in decreased enrollment activity. The population of the developing countries had been increasing more rapidly and the number of foreign students also increased, in fact, the financial support decreased. Smith (1970)[17] presenting a position paper to ease the restriction on employment of foreign students stated:

> The financial squeeze on foreign students in the 1970's is aggravated by the tightening of government regulations which inhibit the ability of students to earn any substantial part of their educational expenses.

Expressing concern over the restriction imposed by the U.S. State Department for those holding student visas and difficulties faced by them in getting the permission to work part-time and vacation employment, Nelson (1975)[18] stated:

---

[16]Straub, et al., "Academic Freedom for International Students on American Campuses," Journal of National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, Vol. 33, No. 2 (Winter, 1970), pp. 77-82.

[17]Smith, H. Eugene, Crucial Issues in Foreign Students Education, Univ. of Colorado (NAFSA by Donald N. Nelson) (Spring, 1975), p. 20.

[18]Nelson, N. Donald, Crucial Issues in Foreign Students Education, NAFSA (Spring, 1975), p. 21.

> Such policies would restrict educational opportunities in the U.S. to the economic elites in foreign countries—a phenomenon which is in complete contradiction to the generally accepted educational philosophy of most American academic institutions.

In order to assess the extent of foreign students involved in employment and sources of support, Stecklein (1974)[19] conducted a institutional and individual survey among the foreign students at U.S. campuses and provided some interesting information and conclusions:

1. A substantial part (50 percent) of the support for the foreign students comes from sources outside the United States.
2. U.S. educational institutions represent the second major source of support, which was about one-third of the total dollar amount of foreign students' support.
3. Foreign government, U.S. Government agencies, private foundations all combined account for one-fifth of the total dollar amount of support.

Edgerton (1975)[20] commenting on the collection of accurate data on foreign students by the joint effort of American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Administrators Officers (AACRAO), Institute of International Education (IIE) and National Association for Foreign Students Affairs (NAFSA) reported that they would have better information about the sources of income and the approximate dollar value of those incomes and their plans upon returning home. The results are still unpublished.

---

[19]Stecklein, E. John, et al., Study of Foreign Students Employment and Financial Resources, NAFSA, Washington, D.C. (Fall, 1974), pp. 1-132.

[20]Edgerton, B. Wallace, "News Release," IIE (June 20, 1975), pp. 1-3.

The cost of education in the U.S. colleges and universities had increased rapidly. Magarell (1976)[21] the cost of educating was up 42 percent in a decade; that was in constant dollars after adjustment for inflation. Government data projects further rise of cost, 32 percent, in the next ten years.

However, these projections seemed quite low. In fact, the big boosts in tuition cost in the U.S. colleges and universities are expected during the bicentennial year. The boost in tuition might go up by 8-12 percent in 1976. It is important to say that the upsurge in tuition cost would follow by increased room and board cost. Thus, higher education and professional training would only be available to the rich elite, which would be quite contrary to the constitutional right of the equality of educational opportunity. Besides the gap between "the Have-not" and the "Haves" would increase further leading to more prejudice and hostility.

The foreign students, particularly the poor minority would suffer the most with these continuing trends. Increased financial problems would result in increased social, academic, personal and adaptation problems during the sojourn. Unfortunately these are not the only problems. There had been a growing concern among the developing countries of being robbed of their professionals because many do not go back after finishing education.

---

[21]Magarell, Jack, "The Cost of Education Up," The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. 12, No. 4 (March, 1976), p. 5.

Nonreturning Foreign Students

A serious charge was leveled against the United States' Exchange program that it induces many foreign students to remain as immigrants. Thereby, the investment made prior to coming into the U.S. and services rendered if stayed in their home country resulting loss of social infrastructure, resulting in slow growth, development and welfare of these countries. In fact, the reality was that neither the Immigration laws were so strict nor did the developing countries have the resources to absorb the highly educated professionals, particularly in Southeast Asia. During the 1960's and early 1970, studies have been undertaken to estimate the brain-drain or the talent migration and some interesting evidence was found. To grasp the greater perspective and understanding of "brain-drain," it was important to define it. The term "brain-drain" itself suggested the loss of vital human resources without compensation.

The 1965 Immigration law made it easier for the professionals, scholars, students to seek immigration to this country from all over the globe. By 1966, the talent migration had become an important "issue" to be investigated. During 1967 and 1968 the Senate hearings were held to explore the loss of professional talent, particularly from the developing countries and with the Senate subcommittees' recommendation on legislation was introduced but without passage. However, an amendment of 1965

Immigration Law was passed arresting the migration of Exchange visa holders in 1970.[22]

It was a major step towards slowing down the talent migration, particularly for the exchange students. Ritterband (1970)[23] suggested the intent of legislation for educational exchange is to facilitate education but not create extra-legal immigration. Though the legislation did not achieve its end, yet the initial relationship between visa and migration intentions appears to indicate the law did work.

In order to estimate the extreme nature of the brain-drain problem, Adams (1968)[24] reported that there were 43,000 scientists and engineers "many" of whom came from less developed countries, who immigrated to the U.S. during 1949-61. In 1964-65, some 11,000 interns and residents in U.S. hospitals (out of a total 41,000) were graduates of foreign medical schools and more than 8,000 came from developing nations.

---

[22]U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on the Judiciary, Hearings on International Migration of Talent and Skills, 90th Congress, 1st Session, March 6 and 10, 1967; U.S. House Committee on Government operations, "Hearings on the Brain-Drain of Scientists, Engineers and Physicians from the Developing Countries into the United States," 90th Congress, 2nd Session, January 23, 1968; U.S. Committee on Government Operations, Scientific Brain Drain from Developing Countries, H.R. 1215, 90th Congress, 2nd Session, March 28, 1968, report 23, the 1970 Amendment is Public Law, 91-225 91st Congress, 1st Session, April 7, 1970.

[23]Ritterband, Paul, "Law Policy and Behavior: Educational Exchange Policy and Student Migration," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 76, No. 1 (July, 1970), pp. 71-82.

[24]Adams, Walter, The Brain-Drain, The Macmillan Company, New York (1968), p. 1.

Dedijer (1967)[25] reviewing the history of brain-drain stated though there have been a few historical studies on the aspects of migration of "scientists"[26] but nevertheless, "the migration of scientists is as old as science."

Oteiza (1968)[27] discussed the characterization and conceptualization of the brain-drain problem, why people migrate and based his theory on the differential of "push and pull" migration.

Johnson (1968),[28] and in his earlier essay (1965), "The Economics of Brain Drain," had taken a cosmopolitan view about the transfer of educated elites and suggested brain-drain was a trivial problem; and suggested the noninterference of movement among the "intellectual elites" all over the world would provide the grounds for free play of "market" and promoting growth, beneficial to the world community.

Adams and Dirlam (1968)[29] reported on the final analysis of the brain-drain which was an index of structural maladjustments in both "sending" and receiving countries. In the case of the latter, it

---

[25]Dedijer, Stevan, "Early Migration," p. 9.

[26]"Scientist" anyone identified by modern historian of science to have contributed to the development of present day science, or anyone who produced systematic knowledge.

[27]Oteiza, E., "A Differential Push-Pull Approach," Adams, The Brain-Drain, pp. 128-134.

[28]Johnson, G. Harry, An "Internationalist" Model, The Brain-Drain, pp. 69-91.

[29]Adams, Walter and Dirlam, B. Joel, "An Agenda for Action," Essay in The Brain Drain, The Macmillan Co., New York (1968), pp. 247-283.

indicated an inelastic supply of certain talents and skills based in part on the monopolistic entry restrictions, faulty and inadequate foreign aid and technical assistance to other countries. Among the "sending" countries, the "brain-drain" may be the index of retarded development. In fact, it was simply the symptom of disease rather than disease itself; effective policy, therefore, must be directed to the roots of the problem rather than surface manifestations.

Myers (1967)[30] pointed out in order to analyze the brain-drain the important task of identifying reasons for international flows and assessing the impacts of such movements a consensus had to be arrived to clarify the basis of definition and measurement methods and to design research in such ways that it will provide answers relevant to the essential questions. It would be difficult to agree on definitions of the "brain-drain" either nonreturn among continuum or a probability scale or even the scale or both. Bowman and Myers[31] provided another method of assessment of costs and benefits associated with migration from a particular country by "human capital" approach. Myers (1973)[32] in a longitudinal case study of the Peruvians trained in the United States found that losses through nonreturn and undecided categories of doctoral students were over represented in the sample. Perhaps 30 out

---

[30]Myers, G. Robert, "The Brain-Drain and Foreign Students Nonreturn," Exchange (Spring, 1967), U.S. Advisory Commission on International Education.

[31]Ibid.

[32]Myers, Robert, "International Education, Emigration and Nation Policy," Comparative Education Review, Vol. 17 (February, 1973, pp. 71-90.

of 55 doctorates will remain permanently abroad. Regarding the loss, the lower socioeconomic status students without assurance of jobs in Peru and immigrant visa obtained before leaving Peru at undergraduate level are more likely to stay permanently in the U.S. Further, to adopt an economic framework and thinking in terms of human capital losses and gains, Myers reported that total losses per person runs between U.S. $20,000-50,000 considering the foregoing earnings as well as direct costs. "It is interesting to observe that the students most apt to immigrate to the United States are those in whom Peru has invested the greatest money directly or indirectly."

Das (1969),[33] studying the effects of foreign students not returning to their home and the national loss of professionals reported:

1. Foreign students who have studied in the U.S. for 2 or more years are less likely to return.
2. Younger students are less likely to remain in the U.S. after completion of their studies.
3. Students working towards Master's degree are likely to return home.
4. Married students whose families remain at home are less likely to stay in the U.S.
5. Majority of the students from the developing countries are less likely to stay in the U.S.

More recently, the National Science Foundation (1973)[34] conducted a study of the characteristics and attitudes of the scientists and

---

[33]Das, Man Singh, "Effect of Foreign Student's Attitudes towards Returning to the Country of Origin on the National Loss of Professional Skills," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University (1969), Microfilm, pp. 168-169.

[34]National Science Foundation, Immigrant Scientist and Engineers in the U.S., Washington, D.C. (1973), pp. 1-101.

engineers in the U.S. and reported 57,000 scientists and engineers who immigrated to the U.S. in 1966-70 prompted questions as to the benefit to the U.S. and the implication for the countries of origin.

Bayer (1973),[35] in his research study estimated that between one-third and one-half of the foreign students enrolled in American colleges and universities eventually enter the domestic labor force. Such a substantial retention of foreign students after completion of the degree had not been discouraged, largely because of the native supply of trained manpower had not been adequate enough to meet domestic demands or needs. Carnegie Commission (1973)[36] reported there was potential for increased immigration of scientists and engineers who have received degrees in the U.S. and estimated 5-10 percent of new doctors of science and engineering plan employment in a foreign country upon receipt of the degree.

Oh (1973)[37] conducted an extensive survey among Southeast Asian countries, China, Hong Kong, Formosa, Japan, Korea, and India, and reported that if the brain-drain is composed of those who do not leave the United States immediately after graduation, the nonreturn rate for all the nationalities surveyed was 77.8 percent. If the brain-drain was composed of those who acquired immigrant visas, the nonreturn for the survey as a whole was 38.6 percent. Oh, predicted under the

---

[35] Bayer, E. Alan, "Foreign Students in American Colleges: Time for Change in Policy and Practice," Research in Higher Education, Vol. 1, No. 4 (1973), pp. 389-399.

[36] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, College Graduates and Jobs: Adjusting to New Labor Market Situation, New York, McGraw-Hill (1973), p. 181.

[37] Oh, K. Tai, "A New Estimate of the Student Brain Drain from Asia," International Migration Review, Vol. 7, No. 4 (Winter, 1973), pp. 449-456.

socioeconomic conditions prevailing in Asia and America, nearly 60 percent of Asian students entering the U.S. will remain for a significant amount of time after graduation.

Kalra (1974)[38] in his article pointed out that developing countries have accused developed countries of "deliberately draining other countries' professionals."

Glaser, et al. (1974)[39] compiling the results of the multinational comparative survey study under the auspices of the UN Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) were concerned about migration and the nonreturn of professionals from the developing countries who study in developed countries, concluded:

> There is a clear cut tendency for developing countries to regain or lose abler persons more than others. A number of highly specialized persons are lost after education abroad viz. bacteriologists, biochemists, engineers, physicists, chemists, etc. There is no tendency for developing countries to lose all their narrow specialists.

Quigg's (1974)[40] newsletter on brain-drain quoting the report prepared for the UN Committee on Science and Technical Development reported 16,492 scientists and engineers, physicians who immigrated to the U.S. in the 1970's, 70 percent came from the developing countries.

---

[38]Kalra, R. M., "Brain-Drain from Developing Countries," Improving College and University Teaching, Vol. XXII, No. 1 (Winter, 1974), pp. 41 and 48.

[39]Glaser, A. William, and Habers, G. Christopher, "The Migration and Return of Professionals," International Migration Review, Vol. 8, No. 2 (Spring, 1974), pp. 227-244.

[40]Quigg, W. Philip, "World Environmental Newsletter," Saturday Review World (June, 1974), p. 36.

Brain-drain was largely confined to a dozen countries: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, China, India, Iran, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippine, South Korea, Sri-Lanka, Turkey; and the flow distributing entirely among Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Great Britain and the USA. Hence, the review of literature and research appeared to indicate the nature of brain-drain problem and increased concern during the last three decades.

III. SUMMARY

The purpose of this chapter was to review the literature and research constructed regarding the social, academic, economic problems, interaction of conationals, sources of support, part-time employment, cost of schooling, nature of brain-drain and capital losses incurred in case of nonreturn of foreign graduate students. Therefore, this chapter provided the groundwork for undertaking a survey study among the foreign graduate students at The University of Tennessee.

The next chapter deals with the design, construction of the questionnaire, procedure, population, selection and collection of data.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the questionnaire construction, population selections, procedures employed to study the social, economic, academic problems and sources of financial support, part-time and summer employment, and the nonreturn of the foreign graduate students after graduation at The University of Tennessee. The chapter provides the information regarding the population selection, subjects, sources of data, instrument selection, development, testing, and refining of the questionnaire for data collection and method of data analysis.

I. DESIGN OF SURVEY STUDY

The design of the study was descriptive and explanatory survey. The review of the literature revealed numerous research studies, and literature dealing with the social, academic, economic problems, adjustment process, effects of conational sources of financial support, part-time and summer employment, and nonreturn of foreign students after completion of their studies. Many studies did not differentiate between the graduate and undergraduate students. The purpose of this survey study was to identify, describe and analyze the problems of the foreign graduate students at The University of Tennessee. Some information was obtained from the Office of International Student Affairs, but the majority of it was acquired through a questionnaire constructed by the

researcher. The Office of the International Student Affairs is a part of the university administration and provided services to foreign students and assisted them on problems of individual concern. The Office is a liaison agent to the Immigration and Naturalization Service and keeps student's official immigration record, and handles the problems regarding immigration regulation. The Office also coordinates with the Office of Admissions and Records in order to keep the record of academic performance while they are in school. It also provides as mediator in many community volunteer programs for the international students. The staff serves to aid in the international understanding of American way of life. In short, the Office provides myriads of facilities to alleviate some of the serious problems during the sojourn to foreign students. The Office also maintains records on the part-time on-campus, off-campus and summer employment. Some information was compiled from "Annual Reports" published on immigration by the U.S. State Department of Justice and the rest through the instrument developed. It enabled the study to meet the standard criteria for descriptive research.

II. INSTRUMENT SELECTION

The Office of International Student Affairs maintains individual files on foreign students regarding their demographic data, academic performance, and publishes articles from time to time on the enrollment field of study and academic achievement of the foreign students. The Office also maintains the residential addresses of all foreign students.

The information on employment was used from the Office of International Students through the cooperation of the director.[1]

The primary purpose of such record keeping is to provide accurate information which is required by law to be furnished to Immigration and Naturalization Service, regarding the age, sex, nationality, area of study, year of study, number of hours carried during the school year, part-time employment, on-campus or off-campus, summer job if not school, source of support and amount of money available, etc. and Immigration Service is very strict to grant any student permission to work part-time unless the record shows the emergency need for such work. The reliability of the record is dependent upon the manner in which the foreign students fill out the information required by law under oath. But again would depend upon the subjective attitude of the individual at that time. In fact, it is a reliable and accurate record. The majority of the information needed was to be collected directly from the graduate students. The questionnaire developed was taken from various sources of previous survey studies; Peterson, et al.; Gaither, et al.; Das; Johnson; Cohen; Glaser; and Stecklein.[2] To develop the questionnaire

---

[1]It is highly appreciative of Dr. Dixon C. Johnson, Director, International Student Affairs at The University of Tennessee, who provided valuable information and data.

[2]Peterson, et al., "Problems of Foreign Students," op. cit., pp. 787-92. Gaither, et al., op. cit., pp. 1-16. Das, Man Singh, op. cit., pp. 168-169. Johnson, C. Dixon, op. cit., pp. 61-68. Cohen, D. Robert, "The Function of Conationals Group of Foreign Students in New York City," Ph.D. Unpublished Dissertation (1972). Glaser, A. William, op. cit., pp. 168-169. Stecklein, E. John, op. cit., p. 3.

colleagues, locally available foreign graduate students, American friends and faculty members were consulted and their suggestions were adopted accordingly.

Finally, the draft of the instrument was submitted to the chairman and committee members to correct the ambiguities, biases, sequences. Again some changes were made and the questionnaire was ready to be administered.

The instrument was divided into seven parts. Each part was concerned with different aspects of the problems. Part One dealt with background information, goals and interaction among conationals, and domestic or other foreign students. Part Two shed light on the academic problems and Part Three, economic matters. Part Four with social and personal situations, Part Five, source of support, part-time employment, cost and expenses for attending school. Part Six, the nature of nonreturn after completing the studies and the final part, the use of services used by the graduate students. (See Appendix C.)

Most of the questions were structured and checklist type and problems on scale evaluation except the few on sources of support and cost of attending the university and the last question was open-ended to get the reaction from the students if any they feel. Because of the difference in English competence among foreign students, the questionnaire was kept simple and to the point in order to minimize the problem of understanding the items.

1. The treatment of the data was kept to a simple interpretation based on the percentages.

2. Since the questionnaire was lengthy, it was understood that subjects might not return it if mailed, thus efforts were made to contact the students personally and they were requested to fill out the questionnaires at their convenience and later it was picked up by the researcher.

3. The last item in the questionnaire was designed to get the evaluation from the subjects about the instrument.

4. It was decided arbitrarily to divide the sample of graduate students into eight groups based on the number of subjects and the ninth group comprising other countries having one or two subjects.

III. POPULATION

Current statistics indicate that the increase in population of foreign students were steadily declining. The 1972 (IIE) report indicated real decline in population. But 1973 and 1974 (IIE)[3] reports showed the increases of lowest 3-4 percent as compared to dramatic increase in the 1960's. The foreign undergraduate student had always outnumbered the graduate students in the U.S. However, the graduate students have outnumbered the undergraduates at The University of Tennessee. Table 1 shows the total number of foreign students and total foreign graduate students at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. The majority of the foreign graduate students represented Asia, and a few from Africa and Latin America; Europe and North America; Oceania did

---

[3] Open Doors, Report on Institute of International Education. In 1972; foreign students, 140,126 and 1973; 146,097 and 1974; 151,066.

TABLE 1

FOREIGN GRADUATE STUDENTS POPULATION AT
UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE,
KNOXVILLE

Year	Foreign Graduate Students	Total Foreign Graduates and Undergraduates	Graduate Student Percentages
1970-71	203	395	51.39
1971-72	237	455	52.08
1972-73	261	465	56.12
1973-74	316	539	58.62
1974-75	294	547	53.62
1975-76	299	566*	52.82

1. Figures quoted from Open Doors, 1972, 1973 and 1974. (Report on International Education), IIE. pp. 65, 60 and 49 respectively.

2. Orange Peel, June, 1975 (The UT Alumni Paper).p. 1.

*Office of International Student Affairs, Alumni Hall, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee.

not have many students. As reported earlier the Office of International Student Affairs maintains a list of the addresses of foreign students, which was actually a computer printout of the students who registered in advance during the previous quarter. It was also decided to include only those graduate students who have been at The Univeristy of Tennessee one or more quarters. There were 226 foreign graduate students in the Fall, 1975, whose stay was at least over one quarter. It was decided arbitrarily to exclude the European countries and include only the countries from Asia, Africa and South America.

IV. SOURCES OF DATA

Foreign graduate students who had registered in Fall, 1975, and had a stay at The University of Tennessee for one or more quarters constituted the sources of the data. These students were selected from the computer printed copy obtained from the Director, International Student Affairs, University of Tennessee. Table 2 supplies the total number of foreign graduate students to be used as subjects. A covering letter from the major professor was attached to the questionnaire requesting from foreign students an early compliance (see Appendix B). Another covering letter designed to get better response rate and was cosigned by me and the Director, International Student Affairs, University of Tennessee.[4] (See Appendixes A and B.)

---

[4] I am greatly indebted to Dr. Dixon C. Johnson, Director, International Student Affairs, University of Tennessee, for cooperation and advice.

TABLE 2

NATIONAL ORIGINS OF FOREIGN GRADUATE STUDENTS CHOSEN AS SUBJECTS, UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE, FALL, 1975

Country	Population
Brazil	1
China	57
Cambodia	1
Ethopia	2
Hong Kong	12
India	20
Indonesia	8
Iran	22
Iraq	6
Japan	10
Jordan	4
Korea	13
Mexico	1
Nigeria	5
Pakistan	2
Philippine	3
South Africa	2
Thailand	17
Turkey	1
Venezuela	1
Vietnam	4
Total	192

V. ADMINISTRATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Prior to administering the questionnaire, the researcher received approval from his major professor and Director, International Student Affairs which was earlier mentioned in Appendixes A and B. During the third week of October, 1975, a copy of the list of names and addresses of foreign students was obtained from the Office of the International Students Affairs and the subjects were chosen as indicated in Table 2. The researcher began contacting those subjects in the evening at their residences, departments and libraries. The sequence of contact was followed countrywise in Table 2. Some subjects were called in advance so as to be sure they were willing to participate in the survey.

Some subjects were approached in their departments and requested to complete the questionnaire. Those who could not fill up the questionnaire right away were suggested to complete it next day and later picked up by the writer and a couple of them were returned by mail. It took more than five weeks to contact more than 60 percent of the subjects. The cutoff date was November 30, 1975. Until then more than 50 percent of the subjects had filled out the questionnaire. Table 3 provides the actual number of subjects who did not fill out the questionnaire.

TABLE 3

TOTAL NUMBER OF FOREIGN GRADUATE STUDENTS CHOSEN AND ACTUALLY CONTACTED, UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, FALL, 1975

Country	Total Subjects	Actually Contacted	Actually Responded
Brazil	1	1	1
China	57	31	26
Ethopia	2	2	2
Cambodia	1	1	1
Hong Kong	12	8	7
India	20	16	15
Indonesia	8	5	4
Iran	22	14	11
Iraq	6	4	2
Japan	10	7	6
Jordan	4	3	3
Korea	13	9	7
Mexico	1	1	1
Nigeria	5	3	2
Pakistan	2	2	1
Phillipine	3	2	1
South Africa	2	2	2
Thailand	17	12	9
Turkey	1	1	1
Venezuela	1	1	1
Vietnam	4	2	2
Total	192	127	105

VI. METHOD OF DATA ANALYSIS

The next task was to analyze the data. Because of the way most of the items in the questionnaire were structured, with some items being open-ended, it was decided to code all the items which could be transferred on National Computer System Answer Sheet (NCS). While transferring the data, utmost caution was taken and counter checks were made to minimize discrepancies. Some information was transferred on The University of Tennessee Computer Sheet and summary totals were made to get the needed information. The open-ended questions were not answered by many students but those who had comments and suggestions will be discussed in the next chapter.

Item analysis of the data was performed through the State Testing and Evaluation Center, Knoxville, Tennessee. As the computer at the State Testing Center was not geared to give the percentages in decimals and while printing percentages, trunked the decimals. Thus, the percentages were approximated so as to make 100 percent sum total. NCS sheets were purchased from the State Testing and Evaluation Center, Knoxville, Tennessee.

Chapter IV provides the analysis of data and descriptive explanations.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSIONS

The data collected was analyzed to provide more accurate information regarding the characteristics, social, academic, economic problems and the sources of financial support, nonreturn of the foreign graduate students to their homelands after graduating at The University of Tennessee. The data analysis was divided into the following main sections.

1. General characteristics and reasons for coming to the U.S.
2. Interaction with fellow students from their own country and the American students and students from different countries.
3. Academic situations.
4. Economic situations.
5. Social and personal situation.
6. Sources of financial support, part-time employment and summer earnings.
7. Nonreturn of foreign students to home countries after the completion of academic and professional education and finally use of services furnished by the university and local community.

The data analyzed was derived after all adjustments from 94 responses of the foreign graduate students. Thus, the response rate constituted 48.96 percent of the total subjects selected at The University of Tennessee, Fall, 1975. Table 4 provides information about the response rate by country, and sum total.

TABLE 4

FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE BY COUNTRY, FOREIGN GRADUATE STUDENTS, UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, FALL, 1975

Country	Total Graduate Students	Number of Respondents Contacted	Number of Respondents Who Refused to Fill the Questions	Adjusted Number of Questionnaire	Questionnaire Not Fully Answered	Complete Questionnaire After Adjusted	Completed Percentage Response Rate
China	57	31	5	26	3	23	43.35
India	20	16	1	15	1	14	70.00
Indonesia	8	5	1	4	-	4	50.00
Iran	22	14	3	11	2	9	40.90
Japan	10	7	1	6	-	6	60.00
Korea	13	9	2	7	1	6	46.15
Hong Kong	12	8	1	7	1	6	50.00
Thailand	17	12	3	9	1	8	47.05
Other Countries*	33	25	5	20	2	18	54.50
Total All Countries	192	127	22	105	11	94	48.96

*Other countries include: Brazil, Cambodia, Ethopia, Jordan, Mexico, Nigeria, South Africa, Turkey, Philippine, Venezuela, Vietnam.

Eleven responses were dropped from the analysis of the data because of incomplete information.

I. STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

One purpose of the study was to describe the characteristics of the foreign graduate students divided into nine regions arbitrarily, and based on the majority of foreign graduate students from different countries.

Data analysis about the background information was provided into different tables of the following items:

1. Country of origin.
2. Sex
3. Marital status and age.
4. Visa classification.
5. Religion classification.
6. College of admission and degree for which working at The University of Tennessee.
7. Length of stay at The University of Tennessee.
8. Length of stay in the United States.

Data summarized in Table 5 provides the information about sex and marital status of the foreign graduate students at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. The composite percentage of foreign graduate students indicate 86 percent were male and 14 percent female and 52 percent single, 45 percent married and 3 percent divorced.

TABLE 5

PERCENTAGES OF SEX AND MARITAL STATUS OF FOREIGN GRADUATE STUDENTS AT UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, FALL, 1975

Country	Sex		Marital Status			
	Male	Female	Single	Married	Divorced	Widow
China	86	14	56	44	-	-
Hong Kong	100	-	50	50	-	-
India	100	-	71	29	-	-
Indonesia	100	-	25	75	-	-
Iran	88	12	55	45	-	-
Japan	100	-	50	50	-	-
Korea	66	34	34	50	16	
Thailand	75	25	63	37	-	-
Other Countries*	72	28	39	50	11	-
Total All Countries	86	14	52	45	3	-

*Other countries include Brazil, Cambodia, Ethopia, Jordan, Mexico, Nigeria, South Africa, Turkey, Philippine, Venezuela, Vietnam.

Table 6 indicates the visa classification among the foreign graduate students at The University of Tennessee. Seventy-eight percent were holding F-1 student visas, 13 percent J-1 exchange visitor, 2 percent J-2 exchange visitor and 6 percent immigrant visas.[1]

Summary of Table 7 shows the percentages of the foreign graduate students by college of admission and degree towards which they were working during Fall, 1975, at The University of Tennessee. Thirty-seven percent were in the Engineering field; 20 percent, Agriculture; 19 percent, Liberal Arts; 13 percent in Business Administration; 7 percent in Education; 2 percent Home Economics and 2 percent intercollegiate.

Table 8 provides the information regarding the degree of work; 65 percent were in the Master's degree program and 35 percent in the doctoral programs.

Table 9 was indicative of the length of stay of foreign graduate students in percentages at The University of Tennessee, and in the U.S. during the Fall, 1975. Thirty percent of the students were in school at The University of Tennessee under one year, 40 percent under two years, 9 percent under three years, 7 percent under four years and 14 percent under and above 5 years stay.

Table 10 provides the percentage of graduate students who had been in the U.S.; 16 percent under 1 year, 39 percent under two years, 13 percent under three years, 4 percent under five years and 28 percent under five years and above were in the U.S. during Fall, 1975.

---

[1] F-1, J-1 and J-2 student visas were explained in Chapter I, in the Definition of terms.

TABLE 6

PERCENTAGES OF VISA STATUS OF FOREIGN GRADUATE STUDENTS AT UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, FALL, 1975

Country	Visa Classification						Remarks
	F-1	F-2	J-1	J-2	Resident Alien	Others if Any	
China	86	-	9	5	-	-	
Hong Kong	84	-	16	-	-	-	
India	92	-	-	-	8	-	
Indonesia	50	-	50	-	-	-	
Iran	100	-	-	-	-	-	
Japan	83	-	17	-	-	-	
Korea	66	-	-	-	17	-	1% omitted
Thailand	75	-	13	-	12	-	
Other Countries*	50	-	29	5	16	-	
Total All Countries	78	-	13	2	6	-	1% omitted

*Other countries include: Brazil, Cambodia, Ethopia, Jordan, Mexico, Nigeria, South Africa, Philippine, Venezuela, Vietnam.

TABLE 7

PERCENTAGES OF FOREIGN GRADUATE STUDENTS BY COLLEGE OF ADMISSION, UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, FALL, 1975

Country	N	Agr.	Arch.	Bus. Admin.	Com.	Edu.	Engr.	Home Ec.	L/Arts	Planning	Inter-collegiate
China	23	8	-	18	-	4	34	8	6	-	-
Hong Kong	6	33	-	16	-	16	16	-	17	-	-
India	14	14	-	8	-	-	50	-	21	-	7
Indonesia	4	-	-	25	-	50	-	-	25	-	-
Iran	1	22	-	-	-	5	66	-	6	-	-
Japan	6	-	-	-	-	-	100	-	-	-	-
Korea	6	33	-	16	-	16	33	-	-	-	-
Thailand	8	25	-	-	-	-	25	-	12	-	25
Other Countries*	18	38	-	22	-	5	17	-	13	-	-
Total	94	20	-	13	-	7	37	2	19	-	2

*Other countries include Brazil, Cambodia, Ethopia, Jordan, Mexico, Nigeria, South Africa, Philippine, Venezuela, Vietnam.

TABLE 8

PERCENTAGES OF DEGREE TOWARDS FOREIGN GRADUATE STUDENTS WORKING, UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE, FALL, 1975

Country	MA	MBA	MS	MSSW	Others	ED.S	ED.D	Ph.D	DBA	Others
China	4	8	66	-	-	-	-	22	-	-
Hong Kong	-	-	50	-	-	-	16	34	-	-
India	-	-	58	-	-	-	-	42	-	-
Indonesia	-	-	50	-	-	-	-	50	-	-
Iran	-	-	66	-	-	-	-	34	-	-
Japan	-	-	50	-	-	-	-	50	-	-
Korea	-	-	50	-	-	-	17	34	-	-
Thailand	12	-	63	-	-	-	-	25	-	-
Other Countries*	5	11	56	-	-	-	-	28	-	-
Total All Countries	3	4	58	-	-	-	5	30	-	-

*Other countries include: Brazil, Cambodia, Ethopia, Jordan, Mexico, Nigeria, South Africa, Philippine, Venezuela and Vietnam.

TABLE 9

LENGTH OF STAY AT KNOXVILLE OF FOREIGN GRADUATE STUDENTS, UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, FALL, 1975

	Percentages*
Under 1 year	30
Under 2 years	40
Under 3 years	9
Under 4 years	7
Under 5 years and above	14

*1 percent omitted.

TABLE 10

LENGTH OF STAY IN THE U.S. OF FOREIGN GRADUATE STUDENTS AT UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, FALL, 1975

	Percentages
Under 1 year	16
Under 2 years	39
Under 3 years	13
Under 4 years	4
Under 5 years and above	28

Reasons for Studying in the United States

In order to identify the reasons of study in the U.S. of the foreign graduate students, a structured eight item question was designed and students were asked to check four reasons for coming to the U.S. The majority (60 percent and above) from each country reported they came to get training in their field; came to get a degree in their field; finding how people work in their profession; and finally, bringing home knowledge that will be of some use to their country. A few students checked these reasons, "To settle permanently in the U.S.," "To improve their specialty," "To experience social and academic life."

In order to study the effects of conationals, the subjects were asked whether they had a friend or relative at Knoxville and what was the source of predeparture and whether the information was sufficient. More than 42 percent reported that they had a friend at The University of Tennessee and 41 percent from each country reported the predeparture information was inadequate which was somewhat similar to the percentages of responses from all countries.

Fifty-two percent of the subjects from different countries and sum total indicated that they found the place to live by themselves except in the case of Chinese and Korean. They obtained and sought help from a conational. When the students were asked how often they keep in touch with home and how often they get a letter, read the newspaper, weekly, hardly one-third of the total subjects have weekly and biweekly contacts, whereas in the case of the Chinese, Iranians and Hong Kong, the incidence of contact at home was above 50 percent. The majority of

the percentage of subjects from each country reported they spent their free and leisure time with their countrymen except 42 percent Indian and 44 percent Iranian spent their time with American counterparts.

Further, the responses showed that there were more weekly visits between the students from the same country than between the students from the host country, except in the case of Indian and Iranian students who were equal in visiting American counterparts. American students were visiting at least on a monthly basis; nevertheless, the incidence of visits from subjects to American students were more or less once a quarter. Maybe the foreign graduate students paid visits to host students only when they needed them desperately.

It was obvious that the majority of these students try to maintain friendship and social relations with their compatriots during their sojourn in the U.S. However, if there were more visitations among the foreign students and host country students, there might be more likelihood of cordial relationship and less likely hostile attitudes towards each other and they might encounter few frustrations, tensions, difficulties, and favorable attitudes during the sojourn.

II. ACADEMIC PROBLEMS

When the data was analyzed from all the countries as in Table 11 which shows that the majority of the foreign graduate students did not have many academic problems. However, foreign graduate students from China, Iran, Korea, Japan and Hong Kong indicated problems in giving

TABLE 11

PERCENTAGE RESPONSES OF ACADEMIC SITUATIONS OF ALL FOREIGN GRADUATE STUDENTS, UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, FALL, 1975

N = 94

Items	Very Much A Problem	Much A Problem	A Problem	No Problem	Omitted
1. Understanding lecture	-	3	28	68	1
2. Understanding textbooks	-	1	11	88	-
3. Giving oral reports	5	7	30	58	-
4. Writing reports	1	4	23	72	-
5. Using the library	-	2	9	89	-
6. Understanding registration procedures	-	2	22	76	-
7. Transfer of credits	3	2	26	68	1
8. Understanding written test and examinations	-	-	23	75	2
9. Inadequate counselling	-	4	28	68	-
10. Examination methods	-	1	20	79	-
11. Competing with American students	-	2	22	76	-
12. Getting acquainted with American education method	1	2	14	81	2
13. Experiencing English deficiency	5	8	28	58	1
14. Class discussion	5	8	28	58	1
15. Case studies	2	3	24	70	1
16. Guest speaker	4	3	20	72	1
17. Field trips	2	2	11	84	1

oral reports, understanding written examinations, class discussions, experiencing English deficiency and inadequate counseling. It was important to note that the majority of foreign graduate students did not have many academic problems at The University of Tennessee during Fall, 1975.

III. ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

Table 12 provides the summary of the economic problems of the foreign graduate students at The University of Tennessee, Fall, 1975.

The analysis of the data indicated that the foreign graduate students had some problems in this area even when item analysis was conducted, countrywise as well as sum total. The majority percentage of the subjects reported a problem of increasing high cost of tuition, higher boarding and lodging cost. The difficulty in finding adequate housing facilities near the campus was quite obvious. Forty-one and 43 percent indicated a problem in getting permission for part-time work and discrimination in finding a job, respectively.

IV. SOCIAL AND PERSONAL PROBLEMS

In this section the foreign graduate students were asked to respond to a fourteen-item questionnaire. The majority of them, as reported in Table 13, did not have a problem in most of the social and personal situations except being accepted in social groups and difficulty in discussion with the faculty due to different accents. It was contradictory because many previous studies showed that foreign students

TABLE 12

PERCENTAGE RESPONSE OF ECONOMIC SITUATIONS OF FOREIGN GRADUATE STUDENTS, UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, FALL, 1975

N = 94

Items	Very Much A Problem	Much A Problem	A Problem	No Problem	Omitted
Change of money value through exchange	4	3	22	68	3
Inadequate funds to continue school	9	8	30	51	2
Increasing high cost of tuition fee	14	10	50	24	2
Difficulty in finding adequate housing near the campus	10	6	42	40	2
Higher boarding and lodging cost	12	17	48	20	3
Housing without racial/ religious discrimination	3	2	13	80	2
Securing permission for part-time work	14	12	42	29	3
Discrimination in finding part-time job	4	11	44	38	3

TABLE 13

PERCENTAGE RESPONSE SOCIAL AND PERSONAL SITUATION OF FOREIGN GRADUATE STUDENTS, UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE, FALL, 1975

N = 94

Items	Very Much A Problem	Much A Problem	A Problem	No Problem	Omitted
1. Accepted in social group	4	2	48	41	5
2. Welcome at campus function	2	1	19	75	3
3. Finding suitable dates	8	8	25	47	12
4. Rejected by Americans of other sex	3	4	22	58	13
5. Worship group for own religion	2	2	16	77	3
6. Discrimination at athletic or extra-curricular activites	2	0	16	75	7
7. Strangeness of American customs	1	1	30	65	3
8. Leisure time activities	2	5	30	60	3
9. Personal friendship with Americans	4	2	29	60	5
10. Personal friendship with other foreign students	1	4	32	58	5
11. Language skills or different accents as a handicap in social relation	4	2	45	46	3
12. Getting along with faculty member	2	2	28	64	4
13. Difficulty in discussion with faculty due to different accent	13	47	32	6	2

have difficulties at social and personal levels during their sojourn of study. It might be the case that foreign graduate students did not want to respond to these questions because they might feel it would offend the local, state, and national community. The majority of the subjects (above 50 percent) rated themselves as moderately high in terms of language skills, reading, writing, and listening. But 46 percent reported moderately high speaking proficiency in English, and 31 percent rated themselves moderately low.

The pressure of achievement prevented further development of close personal and social contact with American students. The structure of academic life precludes social activities and social contact. Therefore, one had to look at the adjustment process from a different aspect. Because of the nature of this small sample under study, conservative interpretations are made.

V. FINANCIAL SITUATION STATUS

The graduate students were asked to report the estimated dollar amount and percentage of their total support that came from 10 listed sources. They were asked to indicate whether they were fully supported or partially self-supported or have applied for loan and amount sanctioned during the fall quarter, 1975. They were also asked to report the total expenses incurred during the quarter and all other boarding, lodging, and miscellaneous expenses. Though it was quite tedious to calculate all the expenses itemwise, but still the response was fairly good.

Sources of Support

Analysis of the data concerning the status of financial support indicated that 55 percent of the foreign graduate students were fully supported, 38 percent partially self-supporting, and the rest of them had some other means of support to finance schooling.

In order to explore the accuracy of the sources of financial support the foreign graduate students were asked to furnish the kinds of sources of financial support and percentages of such support. Analysis of the data indicated 17 percent have scholarships; 1 percent have fellowships; 12 percent were research assistants; 7 percent were teaching assistants; and 11 percent were graduate assistants. Fifty-two percent were self-supported by other sources.

The total dollar amount of support from various sources is indicated in Table 14, the frequency of financial support countrywise and dollar amount in Table 15. They give somewhat different figures of support, though similar in nature.

In order to find out the total amount of dollar support countrywise and itemwise, see Table 15 which provided total dollar amount of support from various sources. Later, Table 16 shows the dollar amount of support from within the United States and outside the United States. The figures portended themselves, showing that more than half of the sum came from outside the United States.

Analysis of the data on other items in this section showed that 84 percent did not have either part-time on-campus or off-campus jobs. Fifteen percent reported they had some kind of on-campus,

TABLE 14

SOURCE OF SUPPORT, FOREIGN GRADUATE STUDENT,
UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, FALL, 1975

Source of Support	China	India	Indo-nesia	Iran	Japan	Korea	Hong Kong	Thai-land	All Other Countries	Total	Percen-tage
1. Parents or Relatives	11	3	-	6	-	3	2	5	5	35	37.2
2. Scholarship and Fellowship grant-in-aid from home government.	1	-	2	-	2	-	1	1	4	11	11.8
3. Scholarship and Fellowship from U.S. Gov't.	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	1	4	4.2
4. Scholarship from private agency or foundation	1	2	-	-	- 4	-	-	-	1	8	8.5
5. Assistantship fellowship the university	9	7	-	2	-	3	1	1	2	25	25.5
6. Other types of on-campus job	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1.0
7. Loan from within US	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. Loan from home country	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.0
9. Savings from home country	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	3	3.1
10. Savings from summer earnings	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	7	7.4
Total	23	14	4	9	6	6	6	8	18	94	

TABLE 15

TOTAL DOLLAR AMOUNT OF SUPPORT COUNTRYWISE OF FOREIGN GRADUATE STUDENTS AT UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE, FALL, 1975

	China	Hong Kong	India	Indonesia	Iran	Japan	Korea	Thailand	All Other Countries*	Total
Parents/relatives	12,010	1,200	4,290	-	6,710	100	2,550	6,040	5,095	37,325
Scholarship/fellowship grant-in-aid from home government	1,200	1,400	-	2,500	-	3,600	150	1,395	6,770	7,015
Scholarship/fellowship U.S. Government	-	-	-	945	-	-	-	975	-	1,920
Scholarship from private agencies, foundations	-	-	2,700	-	-	450	-	-	1,500	4,650
Assistantship/fellowship from the university	6,960	700	8,460	-	1,600	4,858	3,050	750	4,100	30,478
Other type of on-campus job	140	-	560	-	-	-	-	-	705	1,405
Loans from within the US/UT	300	-	-	-	-	-	600	-	250	1,150
Savings from summer earnings	1,360	1,170	2,000	200	200	-	-	-	1,875	6,805
Loans from home country	-	1,100	-	500	500	-	-	-	-	2,100
Savings from home country	-	-	-	300	1,500	-	-	-	580	2,380

* Other countries include Brazil, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Jordan, Mexico, South Africa, Phillipine, Venezuela and Vietnam.

TABLE 16

TOTAL DOLLAR AMOUNT OF SUPPORT REPORTED BY FOREIGN GRADUATE STUDENTS, UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, FALL, 1975

Source of Support	Total Dollar Amount of Support
Funds from within the U.S.	
Scholarships from the U.S. Government	$ 1,920
Scholarship from the private agency/ foundation	4,650
Assistantship or fellowship from the University of Tennessee	30,478
Other types of on-campus job	1,405
Off-campus job	0
Loans from within U.T.	1,500
Savings from the summer earnings	6,805
Total	$46,758
Funds from outside the U.S.	
Parents/relatives	$37,325
Scholarship/fellowship grant-in-aid from home government	7,015
Loan from home government	2,100
Savings from home country	2,380
Total	$48,820

part-time jobs. Eighty-seven percent of the graduate students did not apply for loans or have such loans.

While making extropolations on the basis of the small population in this survey of foreign graduate students, a conservative outlook was taken into consideration. The primary source of financial support reported in the survey study of foreign graduate students was parents and relatives followed by assistantships, U.S. Government, foreign governments, and private agencies and summer employment and loans in subsequent order.

Education Cost

Cost figures reported by the subjects were summarized as the average total estimated cost for fall, 1975, from nine regions and sum total of regions. Table 17 supplies information about the rent, food, utilities, cafeteria, and other miscellaneous expenses as in Appendix C. The average estimated expenses during fall, 1975, were $748 per student (including families in some cases) which seem to be quite genuine. Tuition cost was not included in the total figures. If the quarterly tuition cost were added to average living cost it would run into $1,193, excluding books and supplies. The Graduate Studies Catalogue for 1976 has mentioned $4,400 for one academic year.[2]

Stecklein (1974)[3] reported total academic quarterly cost in a quarter system institution $5,253 or $5,379 depending upon whether living in the residence hall or apartment, respectively. When the total quarterly

---

[2]The University of Tennessee Record, "Graduate Studies" (1976), p. 12.

[3]Stecklein, op. cit., p. 3.

TABLE 17

AVERAGE EXPENSES IN DOLLARS, FOR FALL QUARTER, 1975, FOR RENT, FOOD, UTILITIES, PHONE, CAFETERIA AND MISCELLANEOUS OF FOREIGN GRADUATE STUDENTS, UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE

	Total Board and Lodging*	Total Miscellaneous Expenses**	Total
China	447.00	84.00	531.00
Hong Kong	599.00	149.00	748.00
India	657.00	155.00	812.00
Indonesia	665.00	86.00	751.00
Iran	713.00	113.00	826.00
Japan	739.00	220.00	959.00
Korea	556.00	192.00	748.00
Thailand	576.00	125.00	702.00
Other Countries	647.00	164.00	810.00
Average Total All Countries	610.00	138.00	748.00

*Total board and lodging include expenses of room/apartment rent, food, utilities, phone, other food, cafeteria.

**Miscellaneous expenses include recreation, clothing, laundry, insurance, car payments, furniture, T.V., stereo, and others.

cost for attending the univeristy was calculated, it came to be $1,161.65, which is reasonable according to foreign students' standards.

In this section one question was designed to find out what they would do if the cost of education and living keep on going up. The majority response (63 percent) was to find a job if not working. Sixty-eight percent indicated they would lower the standard, and 42 percent would seek more grants and scholarships.

VI. SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS: RETURN AND NONRETURN

This part of the questionnaire dealt with parents' occupation and socioeconomic status, estimated annual income in American dollars, employment of the students prior to coming to the U.S. whether accompanied by family—wife or children, reasons for returning home after completion of school, intentions of staying in the U.S., seeking further training, prospects of having difficulty in locating a job on return to their home country.

Many students did not respond to the item of parents occupation, thus no analysis was made. The distribution of socioeconomic status was 7 percent, upper class; 15 percent, upper middle class; 53 percent, middle class; 13 percent, lower middle; and 12 percent, lower class. Sixty-nine percent of the respondents checked their parents' annual income between $1,000 and $2,999 and 21 percent between $7,000 and $11,999. Fifty-three percent indicated they were employed before coming to the U.S. Twenty-nine percent of respondents stated their families and children are already with them.

Return and Nonreturn

When asked to check the reasons why they had to go back home after completion of their studies, 32 percent said they were unable to change visa status; 28 percent had families and relatives at home; 21 percent had scholarships requiring their return to home country and 5 percent were unable to find jobs. Another question asking the subjects about their staying in the U.S.; 24 percent reported greater economic, social, and political freedom; 9 percent, unlikely to find a job back home; 12 percent, greater economic reward, 20 percent gave other reasons; 7 percent, better living conditions; and 25 percent omitted.

When asked to indicate whether they could seek professional training after finishing their studies, 14 percent gave negative responses and the rest were willing to continue. Further, they were asked if they were offered a job in the U.S. would they accept: 30 percent said unlikely, 1 percent omitted and the rest indicated they would likely accept.

Finally, another question sought to find out whether the subject would like to settle permanently if immigration and naturalization conditions are liberalized: 45 percent said unlikely and the rest of them said likely, except 1 percent omitted. When the percentages for different regions were analyzed, a majority of them indicated they would not stay except in the case of India, China, Thailand, and Iran as shown in Table 18. While comparing the figures in Table 19 which provides a summary of aliens who adjusted to permanent residence status during

TABLE 18

PERCENTAGE OF FOREIGN GRADUATE STUDENTS WHO INTEND TO STAY PERMANENTLY IF IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION DEPARTMENT LIBERALIZES THE CONDITION FOR IMMIGRATION AT UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE, FALL, 1975

	Percentage				
Country	Very Much Likely	Much Likely	Likely	Unlikely	
China	8	-	47	43	
Hong Kong	16	16	-	66	
India	57	14	21	7	
Indonesia	25	-	-	75	
Iran	11	22	22	44	
Japan	-	-	-	100	
Korea	-	-	16	66*	16% omitted
Thailand	25	12	25	37	
Other Countries	16	-	22	61	
Total All Countries	19	7	26	45	*1% omitted

TABLE 19

ALIEN STUDENTS WHO WERE ADJUSTED TO PERMANENT RESIDENCE STATUS IN THE U.S. UNDER SECTION 245 AGAINST THE TOTAL ADJUSTED FROM ALL OTHER CATEGORIES OF STATUS

	*Alien Students Whose Visas Were Adjusted to Permanent Residence in the U.S.							
	1971		1972		1973		1974	
Country	Student	Total	Student	Total	Student	Total	Student	Total
China and Taiwan	3,271	6,399	2,943	7,259	2,011	6,739	2,290	6,206
Hong Kong	28	348	192	505	320	643	367	660
India	2,995	6,144	2,940	7,810	1,332	4,823	1,703	3,962
Indonesia	8	172	64	217	44	157	37	161
Iran	490	1,313	665	1,980	802	1,900	878	1,549
Japan	314	1,364	308	1,818	288	1,936	291	1,840
Korea	975	3,838	1,011	4,238	811	3,660	775	2,983
Thailand	303	574	499	1,137	570	1,259	689	1,128
Other Countries	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	8,384	20,152	8,622	24,964	6,178	21,117	7,030	18,489

*Figures quoted were taken from the "Annual Report" (1971, 1972, 1973, and 1974) published by U.S. State Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

the years 1971, 1972, 1973, and 1974 it was found that trend of foreign students who stay in the United States is on the increase except for slight drop in 1973[4] (see Tables 19 and 20). It might be due to recession in the U.S. economy which lead to a decreased stay-on of foreign students. Johnson (1968)[5] has mentioned the causes of migration due to "push and pull" factors. If the "pull" factors are not favorable there might be "push" factors to force the foreign students to go back. But the "irony" of the situation is, the state of affairs in the developing countries is not that good. The state of economy all over the world is bad. When the students chose to stay on permanently, income, quality of life and facilities for research, more economic, social, and political freedom were the main features of attraction in the U.S. This was not peculiar because of human desires to immigrate where there is greater economic security and other facilities. If such is the case, there is a question of how to keep the migration of "intellectual elite" in balance without impairing the growth of developing countries. These questions will be discussed in the next chapter.

The last part of the questionnaire was designed to ascertain the use of services provided by the Office of International Students Affairs, The University of Tennessee at Knoxville, to the foreign graduate

---

[4] Annual Report, 1971, 1972, 1973 and 1974. Published by the U.S. State Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., pp. 33, 31, 33 and 33 respectively.

[5] Johnson, op. cit., p. 69-91.

TABLE 20

PERCENTAGES OF ALIEN STUDENTS WHOSE VISAS WERE ADJUSTED TO PERMANENT RESIDENCE IN THE U.S. UNDER SECTION 245 AGAINST THE TOTAL ADJUSTED FROM ALL OTHER CATEGORIES

Country	Percentage			
	1971	1972	1973	1974
China and Taiwan	51.11	40.54	29.84	36.89
Hong Kong	8.00	38.01	49.76	55.60
India	48.74	37.64	27.61	42.98
Indonesia	4.65	29.49	28.02	22.98
Iran	37.31	33.58	42.21	56.68
Japan	23.02	16.94	14.87	15.81
Korea	25.40	24.56	22.15	25.98
Thailand	52.78	43.88	45.27	61.08
Other Countries*	-	-	-	-
Total All Countries	41.60	34.54	29.26	38.02

*Figures not available.

Percentages calculated from the original figures taken from the "Annual Report," Years 1971, 1972, 1973, and 1974, published by U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

students. Data analyzed indicated that the majority of the students have utilized the services about immigration, orientation, personal consulting, and one-third of them have sought advice on financial aid or part-time employment on- or off-campus. Undoubtedly the staff at the foreign student office have shown great patience and perseverance in their efforts to help find solutions for many of the problems. One can visualize such communication taking place at the international level at The University of Tennessee.

Further, the students were asked to check the participation among some of the organizations. Most of the graduate students seemed apathetic. They seemed too busy with their academic work. The majority of the students participated in the World on Parade program, and one-fifth of them participated in their own national association programs.

When asked whether the foreign students were provided information about practical training, the vast majority (93 percent) reported that the international students should be provided information on practical training in the U.S. after graduation. Eighty-eight percent suggested that such information would better enable foreign students to locate jobs in the U.S.

When the subjects were asked to evaluate the questionnaire, 87 percent implied the items were easily understood; 2 percent, difficult; 3 percent, too long; 3 percent, too personal; and 4 percent did not reply at all.

Lastly, in the questionnaire the subjects were given a choice to write, state, and suggest ways to improve the state of affairs of

foreign students. The majority of them did not respond to this item. Some of the suggestions and statements they made were about considering the foreign students more like in-state students, improvement in the international house, more facilities for bringing the people from the university and the local community to lecture and acquaint themselves, and showing more concern for foreign students. Some of the brief statements were as follows:

"A foreign student should be treated as resident after one year of stay and status be changed to in-state as far as the payment of tuition fee is concerned." One of them wrote the tuition fee for foreign students is too much. Others suggested more financial support should be available to the foreign students. Other respondents reported "Collect more funds, donations from people and companies to establish a foreign student fund." Another suggested "maintain the Emergency Loan Fund, it is really a big help."

One respondent wrote, "All foreign students should be allowed to work if they feel the job would not disrupt their studies." Another said, "Do not expect more in a foreign country; everything seems O.K. right now." Another wrote, "Foreign students are all in good shape and don't have any problems."

A number of respondents pointed out the need for information on housing near the campus during the quarter-break. One suggested partial services during the quarter break for foreign students because they have nothing to do during quarter break. Another wrote, "improve orientation, help find housing, arrange to receive new students, arrange to find job after graduation."

A few pointed out the need to organize more participation among the local community and the foreign students. One of them suggested the foreign students should retain their own identity in the sense that they must not destroy their culture and also behave like Romans while in Rome.

Finally, one respondent wrote "the International Student Affair's Office is of great help to students, when and if they need; everyone in the office is very, very helpful, one of the best organizations that I know."

VII. SUMMARY

A Profile of the Respondent

In order to characterize the foreign graduate student at The University of Tennessee, Fall, 1975, who responded to the questionnaire, the typical respondent might be described as follows:

The typical respondent was single (52 percent); male (86 percent); student holding an F-1 visa (78 percent); average age, 27.2 years; a majority representing the Asian Continent pursuing a Master's degree engineering field (37 percent); length of stay at The University of Tennessee under two years (40 percent); came to get degree; had a friend at Knoxville; lived in private apartment and found the place to live by himself; was in touch with family writing a letter twice a week; spent free time with students from his country; and received and paid more visits from and to the students of his own country rather American or other foreign students. It did not seem to indicate that they had any academic problems. There was a minor social and personal problem of

not being accepted in social groups; could speak, read, and write English moderately well. Above 50 percent were supported by parents and relatives, followed by assistantship and scholarships costing $1,161.65 per quarter to attend school and actual average living expenses $748 per quarter; belonged to middle class family—parents within the brackets of $1,000-$2,999 planning to stay longer after completion of the study and might immigrate if Immigration and Naturalization Service liberalizes the immigration laws; they would like to have a job for training. If overall evaluation were to be made, the foreign graduate student was satisfied with the situations except a minority who complained about the high cost of tuition and living expenses and English deficiency. Despite stiffening regulations, it appeared the extent of nonreturn after completion of the studies would continue to fluctuate steadily in the years to come.

A summary of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations is contained in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. SUMMARY

Historically, the international education had been prevalent all around the world, particularly in Europe. Many scholars and students had benefited from the broader intent of international education which included not only aid to the schools and universities of less developing countries, but also fostered communication and understanding among different cultures around the world. In fact, international education has become a joint endeavor to improve understanding among all countries due to the recently growing interdependence of a "World Economic Order."

The international education exchange programs have strengthened the movement of students and scientists. During the 1950's and 1960's, the tremendous upsurge of foreign students and scientists in the U.S. and other European countries opened up a whole new field of research and study. This includes diverse but related studies regarding the foreign students' attitude, how well they learn the language, and evaluating the educational systems of other countries. Most of the research was conducted on attitudinal changes, acclimatization, socioeconomic and personal problems by the U.S. State Department to evalute the impact of the "exchange programs." Thirty years of exchange program innovation has brought the nations nearer to each other. But the most controversial aspect of the international education is the "intellectual

elite" migration which is so-called "brain-drain" or the "brain-gain" from the developing nations to the developed nations. From ancient periods the migration of elites and luring of scholars, artists, and scientists have been an educational and political fact of life. Some highly developed countries such as the U.S., Canada and Austrailia have benefited from attracting skilled or unskilled immigrants and shared some benefits with the developing nations. The controversy of inducing intellectual and professional migration is as old as the science. Nations have passed laws and restricting regulations to inhibit the migration of scientists but professionals still find ways to circumvent these restrictions. The migration pattern of the 1950's, 1960's and 1970's suggests the developing countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America were exporting the cream of professionals, scientists, doctors, particularly to the United States, Canada, Western Europe, and Australia. Many studies on the "brain-drain" indicate that the nonreturn of foreign students after completion of their studies has steadily been increasing with some fluctuations at least for the last fifteen years.

The purpose of the survey study was to identify, describe, and analyze the attitudes of foreign graduate students at The University of Tennessee regarding the following aspects:

1. Characteristics of the students regarding nationality, sex, age, marital status, area of study, degree toward working, length of stay and reasons for coming to the U.S.
2. Interaction with conationals, correspondence with family members at home, traffic of visits among them.

3. Academic problems.
4. Economic problems.
5. Social and personal problems.
6. Sources of support, expenses attending the university, dollar amount of support from different sources, part-time or summer employment, estimated expenses during the fall, 1975.
7. Nonreturn of foreign graduate students immediately after completion of their studies and possibility of staying permanently in the U.S.
8. The use of services provided by the Office of International Student Affairs, and other local community services.
9. Finally, their comments and suggestions about the improvement of the conditions of foreign students.

The primary objective of reviewing research and literature was to provide background information to support the design and content of the questionnaire and to discuss findings from the perspective of the research and literature. It further attempted to identify the crucial problems and implications.

Procedure

The anonymous, structured questionnaire which was developed provided the data for analysis; some information came from the Office of the International Student Affairs; the "Annual Reports" of the Department of Justice and Open Doors (IIE report). In order to prepare the instrument a review of the research was made regarding sociology of problems and

nonreturn of foreign students. Further, colleagues, other foreign graduate students, and faculty members were consulted to delete the equivocal statements and to clarify those items that were unclear. Finally, the instrument was shown to the chairman and other members of the committee for approval. Realizing that the instrument was too lengthy, it was decided to request the subjects to evaluate the instrument. Eighty-seven percent of the respondents reported no problems with understanding the questionnaire.

Later, during the third week of October, 1975, a list of foreign students was obtained from the Director, Office of the International Student Affairs. The names and addresses of the graduate students were marked and counted. The European countries were arbitrarily excluded from the sample. Finally, 192 subjects were chosen. It was decided to contact the subjects at their residences, departments, and library. They were requested to fill out the anonymous questionnaire which had an endorsement letter from the Director, International Student Affairs, and the major professor. One hundred and twenty-seven respondents were contacted; many could not be reached due to incomplete addresses. Lastly, the 94 completed questionnaires were divided into nine regions arbitrarily, coded on NCS answer sheet, and processed through the Office of State Testing and Evaluation Center, Knoxville, Tennessee. The information which could not be processed was transferred to the UTCC data sheet; since sample size was not large, the data was computed manually. The survey study was intended to be descriptive, but a few comparisons were made among the selected countries.

Summary of the Findings

The synopsis of the findings from surveying the foreign graduate students was organized under seven major divisions: characteristics of the student; conational interaction; social academic, economic social and personal problems; sources of support, part-time or summer employment and cost of schooling; nonreturn to home countries, and finally the use of services provided by the Office of International Student Affairs and suggestions and comments, if any.

General Characteristics

Generally speaking, the profile of the foreign graduate student treated as subject during the fall of 1975 was a single male from Asia, age 27.3 years, holding F-1 student visa (86 percent), living in the U.S. and at the University under 2 years, pursuing a Master's degree in engineering, and his reason for coming was to get degree and training, to know how people work in different areas, and bringing home skills that will be of some use.

Social Interaction among Conationals

Most of the students had a friend or relative in Knoxville and felt the predeparture information was inadequate; found the place to live by themselves; lived in private apartment and shared the apartment with conational; spent free time with fellow students from their country; read newspaper and journal weekly; wrote a letter home twice a month; had a social get-together once a week; used vernaculars almost daily; paid and received visits from conational and vice versa weekly; and

discussed the family, social, economic situations with compatriots more than with American counterparts.

Social, Personal, Economic, Academic Problems

It was reported that the majority of them did not have many serious problems except English deficiency and social acceptance in groups. It was unquestionably obvious they had some economic problems.

Source of Support, Expenses Incurred, Part-Time Employment

A typical respondent was self-supported mainly by his parents or relatives, followed by institutional support, hardly any part-time or off-campus employment, and average total expenses $1,161.65 during the fall of 1975.

Nonreturn of the Foreign Graduate Student

A typical respondent belong to the middle class within the income bracket of $1,000-$2,999, was employed before coming to the U.S., willing to work if offered a job, even immigrate if allowed, and hoped to seek further training. It was indicated there would not be any problem of finding a job while returning home. Finally, evaluations of the services utilized from the Office of International Student Affairs were made; most of the respondents reported using the services of orientation, immigration counseling and personal counseling.

II. FINDINGS

1. While evaluating the effects of conationals, it was noted the majority of the respondents did not have friends or relatives but their chief source of predeparture information was obtained from a friend and was inadequate. They were found living in a private apartment near the campus, sharing it with their family, and found the place to live by themselves. The respondents wrote and received letters from home and read the newspaper and the journals from their country once a week. They spent their free time with their countrymen, paying and receiving more visits among themselves during weekend social gatherings, discussing the social, economic, political matters of their countries. When the comparison was made among the countries, more Chinese, Indians, and Indonesians were living with students from their countries while students from Hong Kong, Iran, Japan, Thailand, and other countries lived with their own families. They spent their free time paying and receiving more visits from conationals whereas Indians and Iranians visited with American friends, demonstrating that more interaction with Americans resulted in better adjustment. In fact, Indian and Iranian students are acclimatized very well during their sojourn.

2. Data analysis implied the respondents did not have any problems except English deficiency. But when the comparisons were made, the respondents from China, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Thailand and other countries had problems in understanding lectures, giving oral reports, understanding written examinations, and in class discussions.

3. In the area of economic situations, the respondents did point out the increasing high cost of tuition, higher living expenses, difficulty in getting permission to work, and discrimination in finding part-time jobs. The increasing cost of college and university tuition and expenses has also become a serious problem to the American students.

4. Data analyzed for social and personal problems suggested there were not any major problems in this area except not being accepted in a social group and difficulty in discussions with faculty due to difference in accent. Generally the foreign graduate students have fewer hardships to acclimatize than the undergraduates. The study explained itself; the respondents did not have many difficulties in adjusting with their milieu during the sojourn. A majority of the respondents rated themselves moderately high in language skills. But when compared with different nationalities, the Chinese and Thais rated moderately low, particularly in speech skill.

5. The summary on the sources of support in dollar amount, total cost, expenses per quarter, and part-time employment were tabulated manually, and indicated that 55 percent were fully supported, 36 percent partially self-supported, 6 percent had other sources of support, and 2 percent omitted.

Information on sources of income showed over 50 percent of the dollar amount of support came from the parents and relatives, followed by assistantships, fellowships, U.S. and home government, private foundations, loans, and summer employment. The estimated average total expenses incurred $1,161.65 during the fall of 1975, average living

living expenses were $748.00 per quarter. It was found that no graduate student was working legally off-campus; a few had jobs on the campus.

6. A majority (53 percent) of the respondents belonged to middle class families, and 29 percent rated their parents' annual income $1,000-$2,999. A majority (53 percent) were employed before coming to the U.S. and satisfied with their job. Thirty-two percent reported plans to return home because they were unable to change their visa, [requiring to return] followed by family and relatives at home and scholarship during their return. Those who were planning to stay in the U.S. gave the reasons of greater economic, social, and political freedom. On the issue of being offered a job, a majority of them preferred to temporary stay. A majority of them indicated plans to stay permanently if Immigration and Naturalization liberalize the condition for immigration. Many respondents would continue to stay after completion of their studies, though the majority (55 percent) pointed out there is no problem in finding a job on returning home.

III. CONCLUSIONS

These are the following conclusions and implications which are derived from the major findings of this study.

1. Foreign graduate students come to the U.S. to get a degree and professional training which would be useful to them and to their own country in social and economic development.

2. Foreign graduate students in general seek help, counseling and guidance from the conationals anent to social adjustment problems

and maintained the kinship spirit of mutual assistance during the period of adversity. Most students utilized the services available from the University community through the Office of International Students Affairs. Many seem to be satisfied with their experience during the sojourn. These students have more interaction among their country-fellows, and not much socialization with American students. It seems to be obvious they enjoyed more their own cultural kinship. Nevertheless, the students from Iran and India are very well adjusted and blended into the American culture. The students from China, Indonesia, Korea, Thialand, and other countries try to keep the tight knit-family pattern even though in a foreign land.

3. The increasing tuition and the room and board costs seem to have a detrimental effect on a minority of foreign students. Such continuous tuition upsurges in education not only affect the foreign students but also the native students. It is also becoming more and more difficult to compete with American students to find part-time jobs. The Immigration Naturalization Service has already started to restrict foreign students allowing permission for part-time work. However, it is going to aggravate the situation of social adjustment. The state of affairs is that a minority of foreign students have all kinds of social, economic and academic problems. Unfortunately, these students keep themselves away from American life and perhaps are living a nostalgic, lamentable and, disappointing life. Many foreign students who make it successfully through their educational experiences do not have many social and personal academic problems and return home with pride, dignity,

and progress. It is very difficult to define the adaptation issue. Perhaps it would be appropriate to study these students from humanistic aspects rather than the foreign students' aspect itself. They are students just like the students of their host country.

4. There is a considerable amount of differences that exist anent financial support. A majority of the foreign students are self-supporting. A greater amount of financial support comes from outside the U.S. The institutional support is in the form of assistantships providing the second major source of financing of university educations followed by federal, international, or foreign governments. The summer employment and part-time work on-campus and off-campus comprise only a small amount of support to minority students. An extrapolation of the data collected in this study on the entire population of 860 in the state would put hardly 10-15 percent foreign graduate students in off-campus jobs during an academic year (excluding immigrants). By similar extrapolations the foreign students really do not take many jobs away from the American students (excluding the assistantships which primarily are awarded on a merit basis). A majority of assistantships go to advanced and doctoral students. The amount of money injected into the local community economy by these foreign graduate students compared with total population of graduate students is quite considerable. The multiplier effect of 50 percent foreign graduate students supported from outside the U.S. can generate locally approximately $500,000 per quarter and $2 million annually. In extrapolation the figures for the State of Tennessee the same effect can run into $8 million, excluding the

undergraduates. The estimated costs of attending the university are, however, lower as compared to the costs mentioned in the U.T. graduate catalogue in 1975-76. Additional increases in tuition and boarding are expected in the fall of 1976. These costs are reaching a point where the students from the Third World Countries can hardly be able to meet their expenses from parents' support. Moreover, the squeeze on the limited enrollment at the graduate level will affect the admission of the foreign students. They would be the first in the scenario to be affected in cuts in institutional support and last in getting admission as long as the natives of Tennessee and America and other minority students are seeking admission. Foreign graduate students will face more financial as well as academic hardships in the years to come.

5. The issue of nonreturn, "brain-drain," "talent migration," professional and scientific drain seems to draw serious attention from all the developing countries. It is difficult to comprise the "brain-drain" issue based on the statistics. The effects of the magnitude of student migration, though quite obvious, in actuality would be impossible to assess, at least over a longitudinal period. It is unquestionable that the immigration of students from the developing countries has increased in recent years, but that does not indicate that a majority of those who study abroad do not return. Despite staying longer after completing their studies a majority of them eventually go back. To conceptualize the problem of "brain-drain" depends upon both the developing and developed countries. In case the developed countries put a tight restriction on immigration of intellectual elites, perhaps the developing

countries have to face serious problems in accommodating these highly trained professionals. However, such a proposition would be contrary to the individual freedom and dignity. As long as the underutilization of talent is kept at minimum levels, it appears to indicate that study abroad will contribute to the economic and social development of all countries.

Since the world is becoming more interdependent in recent years, this problem of "brain-drain" can hardly be blamed on the receiving countries. Perhaps the losing countries will have to develop new strategies to curb the influx of professional elites to the advanced countries. Due to increased growth of foreign students more and more students with advanced professional degrees find it difficult to get a job in home countries. In addition, they find it more economically rewarding and better living conditions in the U.S., inducing them to stay longer and eventually settle permanently.

The magnitude of capital losses during the last 10 years is enormous. Recent figures indicate the total development aid from three countries, Canada, United States, and Britain, stands at $46 billion as compared to the "brain-drain" capital, estimated value of $50 billion. Asia's loss alone accounts for $33 billion.[1] This seems to indicate that capital loss due to talent migration has gone out of proportion, consequently serious thought must be given to having a policy at least

---

[1]Chandra, Parkash, "Balancing the Brain-Drain," Times of India, March 17, 1976, Sunday edition.

arresting the future capital losses through "brain-drain." In the meantime more and more professionals and foreign students with advanced degrees would continue to immigrate in the U.S. Nevertheless, many would return home even after staying longer. The students from Africa and Latin America continue to return while the students from Asia particularly from India, Philippines, China, Korea, Thialand, Iran, and Iraq continue to stay longer for practical training even after completion of their studies. To the contrary, it would be fair to say that the "Third World Countries" would not benefit from the training and education if the talent is underutilized for lack of suitable jobs. However, it must be pointed out that this study considered attitudes of international students, rather than the actual behavior and discrepancy that may exist.

IV. RECOMMENDATION

Despite the fact that a majority of the foreign graduate students did not have many problems in the areas of social, academic, economic, and financial matters, a minority of these students did indicate all sorts of problems during the temporary stay. It would be appropriate to say why not treat these students like other American students. In fact, why not assist these minority students in completing their studies. Some state universities consider the option of in-state tuition for foreign students after one year of school. Tennessee, being recognized as the volunteer state in many respects, perhaps also should provide facilities alleviating the problems of the foreign students.

It is, however, recommended that adequate predeparture information should be provided to the students who plan to join this university and possibly the institutional service abroad through the consular's offices, thus helping to meet the needs of social adjustments. Regarding the English language deficiency, though efforts are made at all levels, the urgent demand is to emphasize the speech skill rather than forcing them to take introductory English where vocabulary might increase but still have the problem of speaking correct English. Emphasis perhaps should be given in discussion through the volunteer services and organizations if possible. In addition to foster the international relations, the university community should take a maximum advantage of the presence of these students from different cultures. There is no match for people talking to people. There ought to be more intiative on the part of American students to encourage the social and personal interaction among all students, and these students could be helped in their social adaptation if they were given opportunity to participate in orientation at state or national level which provides information on the aspects of American life. In order to be well adjusted there is a need for a work-study program. Immigration Naturalization Service, rather than putting restrictions on part-time work, should allow the students to work. They could then, like American students, compensate their school expenses. Anent the "brain-drain" problem more and more bureacratization might not work unless such policies could be adopted that those students who accept any financial assistance either from the "sending" or receiving country should return for a specific period of

time. Moreover the developing countries are beginning to introduce legislations at national and international levels at the United Nations to levy a hefty tax on those who choose to migrate in the developed countries, particularly the doctors, engineers and other professionals.

Minnesota has passed legislation anent the financial conditions of the foreign students. Similar legislation could perhaps be introduced in the State of Tennessee, allowing waiver of nonresident partial or full tuition fees to foreign students limiting the percentage to 1 percent of the total enrollment. The beneficiary ought to return at least 4-5 years, if at all, to choose to migrate to the U.S. Moreover a curriculum perhaps could be designed which is flexible and feasible to the needs and situations of their own countries. The nub of the matter of nonreturn is that the students receive education and training which is appropriate to the American economic system and not necessarily relevant to their own economies. The departments and staff should make a concerted effort toward designing education and training experiences to meet the needs and situations favorable to their economies. Furthermore, the crux of the matter is that energies and efforts should not be consumed in finding out problems but to provide solutions to the problems of these students.

1. Initiate some changes in legislations and government regulations which foster educational programs for foreign students.
2. Explore, through more contact with labor and industry, support for temporary or part-time employment possibilities benefiting these students.

3. Design innovative curriculum and programs suitable to the needs of the foreign students withal their countries.
4. Engage in an effort to provide jobs in their home countries through placement services.
5. Keep in contact with interassociational and national educational institutions and professional societies to provide the feedback on issues and solutions of the problems of the foreign students.
6. Finally, a longitudinal study perhaps could be undertaken at state and national levels through government support to assess and predict the long-term benefits and losses through "brain-drain" which has drawn considerable attention and to suggest some genuine alternatives to such problems.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Walter, The Brain-Drain, The Macmillan Company, New York (1968), p. 1.

Adams, Walter and Dirlam, B. Joel, "An Agenda for Action," The Brain-Drain, The Macmillan Company, New York (1968), pp. 247-283.

Annual Report, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Press (1971), p. 33.

_____, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Press (1972), p. 31.

_____, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Press (1973), p. 33.

_____, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Press (1974), p. 33.

Bayer, E. Alan, "Foreign Students in American Colleges: Time for Change in Policy and Practice," Research in Higher Education, Vol. 1, No. 4, (1973), pp. 389-99.

Beals, A. Ralph, et al., No Frontiers to Learning: The Mexican Students in the U.S., Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press (1957).

Bennett, J. W. and H. Passin, In Search of Identity, Minneapolis, Univeristy of Minnesota Press (1958).

Brickman, W. William, "In Retrospect, 1965-1975," Exchange, Vol. 11, No. 1 (Fall, 1975), pp. 31-36.

Byers, Philip, "Asian Invasion of American Campuses: Why?" Exchange, Vol. 6, No. 4 (Spring, 1971), pp. 58-70.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, College Graduates and Jobs' Adjusting to New Labor Market Situation, New York, McGraw-Hill (1973), p. 183.

Chandra, Parkash, "Balancing the Brain-Drain," Times of India, March 17, 1976, Sunday edition.

Chang, H. Bao, "Attitudes of Chinese Students in the U.S.," Sociology and Social Research, Vol. 58, No. 1 (October, 1973), pp. 66-67.

Coehlo, V., Changing Images of America: A Study of Indian Student Perception, Glencoe, Illinois Free Press (1958).

Cohen, D. Robert, "The Functions of Conationals Groups of Foreign Students in New York City," Ph.D. Unpublished Dissertation, Columbia Univ. (1972), Microfilm.

The Committee on the International Migration of Talent, The International Migration of High-Level Manpower," New York, Praeger Publishers (1970), p. 17.

Couloumbis, A. Theodore, "The Gap between Rich and Poor." Intellect, Vol. 10, No. 2371 (January, 1976), pp. 294-97.

Das, Man Singh, "Effects of Foreign Students Attitudes towards Returning to the Country of Origin and the National Loss of Professional Skill," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Oklahoma State University (1969), Microfilm.

Dedijer, S., "Early Migration," in Walter Adams, The Brain-Drain, The Macmillan Company, New York (1968), pp. 9-28.

DuBois, Cora, Foreign Students and Higher Education, I.I.E. Publication, Washington, D. C. (1956).

Edgerton, B. Wallace, "News Release," Institute of International Education, (June 20, 1975), pp. 1-3.

Exchange, Vol. 2, No. 1 (Summer, 1975), pp. 1-32.

Forstat, Reisha, "Adjustment Problems of International Students," Sociology and Social Research, Vol. 36, No. 1 (1951), pp. 25-30.

Fulbright, J. William, "The Creative Powers of Exchange," Exchange, Vo. 11, No. 1 (Summer, 1975), p. 4.

Gabriel, L. Rhodelia, "Characteristics of Foreign Students on American Campus." Journal of National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, Vol. 35, No. 4 (Autumn, 1972), pp. 329-32.

Gaither, H. Gerald and Griffin, C. Anthony, "The International Students at The University of Tennessee," Office of Institutional Research, A Report, Vol. 12, No. 1 (July, 1971), pp. 1-16.

Glaser, A. William, et al., "The Migration and Return of Professionals." International Migration Review, Vol. 8, No. 2 (Spring, 1974), pp. 224-44.

Good, V. Carter, Dictionary of Education, New York, McGraw-Hill (1973), p. 13.

Granberg, A., in Dedijer S., "Early Migration," pp. 13-14.

Grubel, Herbert G. and Scott, Anthony D., "The Cost of College Student Exchange Program," Journal of Human Resources, Vol. 1, No. 2 (1966) pp. 81-98.

Hagey, A. R. and Hagey Jean, "Meeting the Needs of the Students from Other Cultures," Improving College and University Teaching, Vol. 22, No. 1 (Winter, 1974), pp. 42-43.

Harris, T. William, The New Columbia Encyclopedia, Columbia Univ. Press, New York (1975), p. 2733.

Ibrahim, E. Saad, "Interaction Perception and Attitudes of Arab Students towards Americans," Sociology and Social Research, Vol. 55, No. 1 (October, 1970), pp. 29-46.

Johnson, C. Dixon, "Problems of Foreign Students," Exchange, Vol. 7, No. 2 (Fall, 1971), pp. 61-68.

Johnson, G. Harry, "An Internationalist Model," The Brain-Drain, The Macmillan Company, New York (1968), pp. 69-91.

Kalra, R. M., "Brain-Drain from Developing Countries," Improving College and University Teaching, Vol. 22, No. 1 (Winter, 1974), pp. 43 and 48.

Kelman, Herbert, "Changing Attitudes through International Activity," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 18 (1962), pp. 67-68.

Kincaid, V. Harry, "A Preliminary Study of the Goals and Problems of the Foreign Student in the United States," in Walton, Barbara, Exchange, Vol. 6, No. 3 (Winter, 1971), pp. 17-29.

Klein, H. Marjorie, et al., "The Foreign Student Adaptation Program," Exchange, Vol. 6, No. 3 (Winter, 1971), pp. 77-90.

LaBerge, E. Bernard, "Board of Trustees Approves U.T.'s International Rule," The Link, Vol. 8, No. 3 (Dec.-Jan., 1976).

Lambert, Richard D., and Bressler, M., Indian Students on American Campus, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press (1956).

Laws Applicable to Immigration and Nationality, Dept. of Justice, U.S. Government Printing Press, Washington, D.C. (1953), p. 16.

Magarell, Jack, "The Cost of Education Up," The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. 12, No. 4 (March, 1976), p. 5.

Moghrabi, Kamel, "Educating Foreigners in the United States," Improving College and University Teaching, Vol. 20, No. 4 (Autumn, 1972), pp. 329-32.

Morris, T. Richard, "National Status and Attitudes of Foreign Students," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 12 (1956), pp. 20-25.

Mueller, H. Kate, Student Personnel Work in Higher Education, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston (1961), p. 487.

Myers, G. Robert, "Brain-Drain and Brain-Gains," International Development Review, Vol. 9, No. 4 (December, 1967), pp. 4-9.

_____, "The Brain-Drain and Foreign Students Nonreturn," Exchange, (Spring, 1967), U.S. Advisory Commission on International Education.

_____, Education and Emigration, Study Abroad and Migration of Human Resources, David McKay Company, Inc., New York (1972).

_____, "International Education and Emigration and Nation Policy," Comparative Education Review, Vol. 17 (February, 1973), pp. 71-90.

_____, "Some Thoughts on Foreign Students Nonreturn," Exchange, Vol. 4, No. 2 (Fall, 1968), pp. 45-48.

National Science Foundation, Immigrant Scientists and Engineers in the U.S., A National Report, Washington, D.C. (1973), pp. 1-101, Microfilm.

Nelson, N. Donald, Crucial Issues in Foreign Students Education (NAFSA) (Spring, 1975), Washington, D.C., p. 21.

Oh, K. Tai, "A New Estimate of the Student Brain-Drain from Asia," International Migration Review, Vol. 7, No. 4 (Winter, 1973), pp. 449-56.

Open Doors, A Report on International Exchange, (Institute of International Education), (1969, 1970), pp. 1-7.

_____, Institute of International Education (1973), p. V forward-8.

_____, Institute of International Education (1974), pp. 1-5.

Oteiza, E., "A Differential Push-Pull Approach, Adams, The Brain-Drain, pp. 128-134.

Perkins, James, "International Programs of U.S. Colleges and Universities: Priorites for Seventies," Exchange, Vol. 6 (1971), pp. 6-7.

Peterson, A. James, et al., "Problems of Foreign Students," Sociology and Social Research, Vol. 32 (1948), pp. 787-92.

Quigg, W. Philip, "World Environmental Newsletter," Saturday Review (June, 1974), p. 36.

Ritterband, Paul, "Law Policy and Behavior; Educational Exchange Policy and Student Migration," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 76, No. 1 (July, 1970), pp. 71-82.

Selby, A. Henry and Woods, M. Clyde, "Foreign Students at High Pressured University," Sociology of Education, Vol. 39, No. 2 (Spring, 1966), pp. 138-154.

Selltiz, Claire, et al., Attitudes and Social Relations for Foreign Students in the U.S., Minnesota, University of Minnesota Press, 1956.

Selltiz, C. and Cook, S. W., "Factors Influencing Attitudes of Foreign Students towards Host Country," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 18 (1962), pp. 7-23.

Semas, W. Philip, "Foreign Students: More Coming," The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. 10, No. 5 (March, 1975), p. 1.

Sewell, William H., Scandinavian Students on American Campus, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press (1961).

Sharma, D. Keshav, "Indian Students in the U.S.," Exchange (Spring, 1969), pp. 43-59.

Smith, H. Eugene, Crucial Issues in Foreign Students Education, University of Colorado (NAFSA by Donald N. Nelson) (Spring, 1975), p. 20.

Stecklein, E. John, A Study of Foreign Student Employment and Financial Resources, NAFSA, Washington, D.C. (Fall, 1974), pp. 1-132.

Straub, S. Jean, et al., "Academic Freedom for International Students on American Campuses," Journal of National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, Vol. 33, No. 2 (Winter, 1970), pp. 77-82.

Time Magazine, Vol. 106, No. 25 (December, 1975), pp. 34-40.

U.S. News, "Flood of Students to U.S.?" Vol. 75, No. 16 (November 12, 1973), p.57.

U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on Judiciary, Hearings on International Migration of Talent and Skills, 90th Congress, 1st Session, March 6-10, 1967.

U.S. House Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations. Hearing on the Brain-Drain of Scientists, Engineers, Physicians from the Developing Countries to the United States, 90th Congress, 2nd Session, January 23, 1968.

U.S. House Committee on Government Operations, Scientific Brain-Drain from Developing Countries, HR 1215, 90th Congress, 2nd Session, March 28, 1968, Report 23.

The University of Tennessee Record, "Graduate Studies" (1976), p. 12.

Vernoff, J., "African Students in the U.S.," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 19 (1963), pp. 40-60.

Wagar, W. Warren, "Religion, Ideology, and Idea of Mankind in Contemporary History," 1st ed. Albuquerque, University of New Mexico Press (1971) pp. 216-17.

Walton, J. Barbara, "Research on Foreign Students," Exchange, Vol. 6, No. 3 (Winter, 1971), p. 17-29.

Washington Post, Sunday (March 16, 1975), No. 101, p. 3.

The World Book Yearbook, Field Enterprise Education Corporation, Chicago (1976), p. 585.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

October 28, 1975

TO: The Foreign Graduate Students
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37916

Dear Students:

We believe that a serious financial problem for foreign students in U.S. Universities has resulted from rapidly increasing educational costs and decreasing financial aid, along with more stringent restrictions governing part-time employment, by U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Services. However, it is necessary to obtain extensive up-to-date data to determine the true dimensions of this problem.

In order to assess the financial problems of the Foreign students at UTK, we would appreciate your completing the enclosed questionnaire. This data will help the Office of International Student Affairs to better appreciate the dimensions of the problem and to pursue appropriate solutions.

We shall look forward to receiving your completed questionnaire.

Sincerely yours,

s/Harmohinder Paul Singh

Harmohinder Paul Singh

mt

Enclosure

s/Dixon C. Johnson

Dixon C. Johnson
Director International Student Affairs
201 Alumni Hall

APPENDIX B

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

TO: The Foreign Graduate Students
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee

FROM: Anand Malik
Professor of Philosophy of Education
and International Education
University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Dear Students:

Mr. Harmohinder Paul Singh is doing survey research of the "Socioeconomic Problems" of the foreign students. I shall appreciate if you take some time to fill in the questionnaire please.

Thanks for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

s/Anand Malik

Anand Malik

APPENDIX C

Personal Background Information
(Information provided will be kept strictly confidential)

1. Country of origin _____

2. Sex: ___Male ___Female Age ____

3. Type of Visa: ___F-1 Student ___J-2 Exchange
___F-2 Student ___Others—Immigrant or Permanent
___J-1 Exchange Resident

4. Marital Status: ___Married ___Single ___Divorced ___Widowed

5. Religion: _____(Please specify)

6. College of admission:

___Agriculture
___Architecture
___Business Administration
___Communication
___Education
___Engineering
___Home Economics
___Law
___Liberal Arts
___Any other (Please specify)
_____

7. What degree or professional degree are you working for?

___M.A.
___M.B.A.
___M.S.
___M.S.S.W.
___Others
___ED.S.
___ED.D.
___PH.D.
___D.B.A.
___Others

8. How long have you been at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville?

___Under one year
___Under two years
___Under three years
___Under four years
___Under fives years and above

9. How long have you been in the U.S.?

___Under one year
___Under two years
___Under three years
___Under four years
___Under five years and above

Questionnaire Part (I)

10. What are four reasons for coming to the United States?

___Getting to know the Americans
___Getting training in my field
___Coming here to get degree in my field
___Seeing different parts of the U.S.
___Finding out how people in my profession work here
___Having a chance to live in another country
___Bringing home knowledge that will be of some use to my country
___Any other specific reason (Specify)_____
_____

11. Before you came to U.T. Knoxville, did you have a close friend/ relative here?

Friend: ___ Parents: ___ Brothers/Sisters: ___
Alumni: ___ Others: ___

12. What was the chief source of predeparture information about American culture?

Friend: ___ Parents: ___ Brothers/Sisters: ___
Alumni: ___ Others: ___

13. Did you feel that the predeparture information was quite inadequate for the adjustment process?

___Very much inadequate
___Much inadequate
___Inadequate
___Not inadequate

14. It takes a while to find a new place to live in the community. How did you find your place to live?

___Through the Office of International Student Affairs
___By yourself
___Through a countryman
___Through an American friend
___Other (Please specify)_____

15. Most students, while away from home, manage to keep in touch with what is going on at home. Please check how often you:

	Weekly	Fortnightly	Monthly	Quarterly
1. Get a letter from home	___	___	___	___
2. Write a letter home	___	___	___	___

	Weekly	Fortnightly	Monthly	Quarterly
3. Read a newspaper/weekly of your country	___	___	___	___
4. Read a Journal of your country	___	___	___	___
5. Get together with the fellows from your country at U.T.	___	___	___	___

16. When you have free time, i.e., not studying or in class or at work, how do you usually spend your time?

___1. Alone
___2. With countrymen
___3. With Americans
___4. With other foreign students
___5. Other (Please specify)_____

17. How often do you do the following things?

	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly
1. Use the vernaculars with students from your own country.	___	___	___	___
2. Talk about courses taken				
a. with students from your own country	___	___	___	___
b. with American students	___	___	___	___
3. Discuss the attitudes of faculty members				
a. with students from your own country	___	___	___	___
b. with American students	___	___	___	___
4. Visit room/apartment				
a. of students from your country	___	___	___	___
b. of American students	___	___	___	___
5. Receive visits in your room/apt.				
a. from students of your own country	___	___	___	___
b. from American students	___	___	___	___
6. Go to a movie/restaurant/ dance/show/concert/ or University theatre, etc.				
a. with students from your country	___	___	___	___
b. with students from America	___	___	___	___

	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly
7. Talk about your family/ your country's social/ economic and political problems with students				
a. from your own country	___	___	___	___
b. from America	___	___	___	___

Part II

18. Out of the following academic situations, do you think you have any problem?

	Very much a Problem	Much a Problem	A Problem	No Problem
1. Understanding lectures	___	___	___	___
2. Understanding the textbooks	___	___	___	___
3. Giving oral reports	___	___	___	___
4. Writing reports	___	___	___	___
5. Using the library	___	___	___	___
6. Understanding registration procedures	___	___	___	___
7. Understanding transfer of credits	___	___	___	___
8. Understanding				
a. Essay tests	___	___	___	___
b. Written tests and exams	___	___	___	___
c. Pop quizzes	___	___	___	___
d. Grading objectively	___	___	___	___
9. Experiencing inadequate counseling	___	___	___	___
10. Understanding examination methods	___	___	___	___
11. Competing with American students	___	___	___	___
12. Getting acquainted with American education methods and students	___	___	___	___

Part III

19. How do you feel about the following items dealing with economic situations?

	Very much a Problem	Much a Problem	A Problem	No Problem
Change of money value through currency exchange	___	___	___	___
Inadequate funds to continue school	___	___	___	___
Increasing high costs of tuition fees	___	___	___	___
Difficulty in finding adequate housing near the campus	___	___	___	___
Higher boarding and lodging costs due to increased inflation	___	___	___	___
Finding housing without racial or religious restriction	___	___	___	___
Getting permission for part-time work	___	___	___	___
Discrimination in finding part-time work	___	___	___	___

Part IV

20. Please check your feelings regarding the following social or personal situations.

	Very much A Problem	Much a Problem	A Problem	No Problem
1. Being accepted in social groups	___	___	___	___
2. Feeling welcome at campus functions	___	___	___	___
3. Finding suitable dates	___	___	___	___
4. Feeling rejected by Americans of the other sex	___	___	___	___
5. Finding worship groups for your own religion	___	___	___	___
6. Experiencing discrimination at athletic and extra-curricular activities	___	___	___	___

	Very much A Problem	Much a Problem	A Problem	No Problem
7. Experiencing strangeness of American customs	___	___	___	___
8. Finding leisure time activities	___	___	___	___
9. Experiencing personal friendships with Americans	___	___	___	___
10. Experiencing personal friendships with other foreign students	___	___	___	___
11. Experiencing English deficiency	___	___	___	___
12. Experiencing language skills or different accents as a handicap in social relations	___	___	___	___
13. Getting along with faculty members	___	___	___	___
14. Experiencing a difficulty in discussion with faculty members due to different accent	___	___	___	___

21. How do you evaluate your proficiency in speaking, reading and writing English?

	Very high	Moderately high	Moderately low	Low
Speaking	___	___	___	___
Reading	___	___	___	___
Writing	___	___	___	___
Listening	___	___	___	___

Part V

22. Since you have been in the U.S., indicate your particular status in relationship to your financial situation:

Fully supported ___
Partially self-supported ___
Any other (Please specify) _____

23. If you are receiving any financial assistance, please check the type applicable.

___Scholarships
___Fellowships
___Research Assistant
___Teaching Assistant
___Graduate Assistantship

24. Did you apply for one or more financial aids listed below for Fall, 1975?
(Don't include Teaching Assistants/Research Assistants/Graduate Assistants)

Loan from The University of Tennessee ___Yes
Loans from outside organizations ___Yes
Scholarship or fellowship from U.T. ___Yes
Grants and aids from outside organizations ___Yes

25. If you applied for the above loans, scholarships, grants, etc., how much financial aid approximately did you receive?

Loans $_____ Scholarships $_____ Grants $_____

26. Please indicate the estimated expenses of attending U.T.K. (including boarding, tuition fee, books, travels, other incidental fees, etc.) in Fall, 1975.

Amount $_____

27. What would be the approximate dollar amount and percentage of income from the following sources for Fall, 1975?

Source of Support	Dollar Amount	Percentage of Total Support
Parents or relatives	_____	_____
Scholarship, fellowship, grant-in-aid from home country	_____	_____
Scholarship, fellowship from U.S. Gov't.	_____	_____
Scholarship from private agency or foundation	_____	_____
Assistantship or fellowship	_____	_____
Other type of on-campus job	_____	_____
Loan from within the U.S.	_____	_____
Loan from home country	_____	_____
Savings from home country	_____	_____
Savings from summer earnings	_____	_____

28. If educational and living costs keep on going up every year, what would you have to do due to such increased expenses? Check more than one statement.

___Find work if not working
___Work more hours on present job
___Take second job if possible
___Get additional support from family
___Lower the standard of living
___Borrow from the University
___Other (Specify, if any)
___Borrow from other sources
___Seek grants or scholarship
___Reduce course load
___Return home
___Transfer to college/university with lower cost

29. Where do you live presently (Fall 1975)?

___University dormitory
___Married student apartment
___Private apartment near the campus
___Private apartment away from campus
___Room with common bath and kitchen

30. If you live in an apartment, are you sharing with:

___Your family
___Student from your own country
___American student
___Student from another country
___Other (Please specify) _____

31. Please indicate the estimated expenses for housing and food for the present quarter.

Total expenses for apartment rent and meals $_____
Expenses for apartment rent $_____
Expenses for meals $_____
Additional expenses for food $_____
Expenses for utilities $_____

32. What are your expenses for rent including utility, phone per quarter if you share the unit with others?

$_____

33. How much are the expenses for each month for food and meals prepared where you live presently?

$_____

34. How much do you spend for cafeteria/restaurant meals, snacks, coffee breaks, etc.?

$_____

35. Please indicate the estimated expenses for the present quarter for the following miscellaneous items.

Recreation and entertainment	$_____
Clothing	$_____
Laundry and cleaning	$_____
Insurance (health, auto, life)	$_____
Health (medical and dental, etc.)	$_____
Payment on car	$_____
Furniture or appliances	$_____
T.V., stereo, etc.	$_____
Other expenses: (specify) _____	$_____
_____	$_____
_____	$_____

36. Other than scholarship or teaching assistant, do you have a part-time job during the fall quarter, 1975?

___Yes ___No

37. What is the nature of the employment?

___Professional
___Clerical
___Sales
___Managerial
___Service occupation
___Skilled manual
___Other (specify)
_____

38. How did you find this job?

___Through U.T. employment or placement office
___Through State or local employment services
___Through Foreign Student Advisor's Office
___Through Department Chairman
___Through Academic Advisor
___Through American student/friend
___Through foreign student/friend
___Completely by yourself

Part VI

39. What is your parent's occupation?

_____

40. How do you categorize your socioeconomic status?

___Upper upper ___Upper middle ___Middle ___Lower middle ___Lower

41. How would you rate approximately your parents' annual income in American dollars?

___$1000 - $2999
___$3000 - $4999
___$5000 - $6999
___$7000 - $8999
___$9000 - and above

42. Indicate your job situation prior to your coming to the U.S.

___Unemployed ___Employed If employed, number of years___

(If employed, answer numbers 43-45)

43. Were you satisfied or dissatisfied with your last job?

___Very much satisfied ___Satisfied ___Dissatisfied ___Very much dissatisfied

44. Were you satisfied or dissatisfied with your salary?

___Very much satisfied ___Satisfied ___Dissatisfied ___Very much dissatisfied

45. Are your wife and children living in your home country? Do you expect them to join you in the U.S.?

___Unmarried
___Wife and children already living with me
___Not expect them to join me
___Might join me in 1, 2, or 3 years
___Will join them soon after completion of school

46. If your plan is to return to your home country, please check the appropriate box.

___Scholarship awarded by my grant requiring return
___My family and relatives at home
___Due to prejudice and discrimination exhibited by Americans
___Unable to find a suitable job
___Unable to change my visa requiring my return

47. If you are thinking about staying in the U.S., what is your reason?

___Greater economic rewards
___Better living conditions
___Unlikely to find a job in home country
___Greater economic/social/political freedom
___Another other reason (please specify)_____

_____

48. Do you intend to stay longer in the U.S. after the completion of your study? With your specialized area of study, if offered a job in the U.S., would you accept it for a temporary stay?

___Very much likely ___Much likely ___Likely ___Unlikely

49. In case the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Dept. liberalizes the conditions for immigrations, would you like to stay permanently in the U.S.?

___Very much likely ___Much likely ___Likely ___Unlikely

50. When you finish your degree would you like to seek further professional training?

___Very much likely ___Much likely ___Likely ___Unlikely

51. Do you think with your education and specialized training, when you go back, there would be a problem in finding a job?

___Very much likely ___Much a problem ___A problem ___No problem

52. How do you keep contact with agencies/offices in your country for employment opportunities? Please list.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

Part VII

53. Out of the following services provided by the Office of International Student Affairs at UTK, please check all that you have used.

___Orientation
___Immigration counseling
___Personal counseling
___Academic advice
___Financial Aid advice
___Temporary employment on campus/off campus
___Any other (please specify)_____

54. Do you participate in the following organizations?

	Yes	No
1. Activities of international clubs	___	___
2. Intercom (International Communication Committee)	___	___
3. Host family program	___	___
4. World on Parade Program	___	___
5. Other (please specify)_____		

55. Do you think that the international students should be provided information about practical training in the U.S. after graduation from the U.T.K. campus?

___Yes ___No

56. Do you think foreign students should be assisted in finding jobs in the U.S.?

___Yes ___No

57. Do you agree with the ideology of equality of opportunity in education in the U.S. for all the nationalities of the world?

___Very much agree ___Much agree ___Agree ___Not agree

58. What do you think about these questions?

___Easily understood
___Difficult
___Too personal
___Not too long
___Too much time consuming

59. Please write or state in a brief paragraph the suggestions you would want to make for the foreign students' welfare at U.T.K.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

VITA

Harmohinder Paul Singh was born in Sialkot City West Pakistan; the son of Ajit Singh Sandhu. The family moved to Qadian in Punjab State (India) during 1947, where he attended the primary school and was graduated from D.A.V. High School (Punjab University Chandigach) in 1956. The same year he entered the Sikh National College (and received the intermediate diploma in 1959). Later he worked as a high school teacher for over 3 years. He received the B.A. degree in Economics and Sociology in April, 1968. Later he was selected for training in poultry management science, which he completed in June, 1970. Fortunately, he moved to the U.S. for education and received a B.A. degree from Knoxville College, Knoxville, TN., in Spring, 1971. In Fall, 1971, he was admitted to the Master's program in Education and received the Master of Science degree in Spring, 1972. During Fall, 1973, he was admitted into the doctoral program and was awarded an assistantship in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction and worked with Charles A. Chance in teaching a course in social foundation. In Fall, 1974, he started working with Dr. Alfred Grant in Instructional development and Media Center administrative and management and teaching. During Fall, 1975, he started teaching audiovisual methods and technology course. In Summer, 1976, he worked as instructor at The University of Tennessee. In August, 1976, he was awarded the Doctor of Education degree. He is a member of Phi Delta Kappa and A.P.G.A.