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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

From time immemorial contacts between peoples and races have been an integral part of the life of man. These have been of various sorts—warlike, political, economic, and cultural. Extensive student travel is not found until one turns to the civilisation of the Greek states.¹ Socrates asserted that many of the students who flocked to the side of the early Sophists in Athens were foreign: "The most of Protagoras' followers," he said, "seemed to be foreigners."²

With the rise of such universities as those at Salerno, Bologna, Montpellier, Paris, and Oxford, students as well as teachers travelled from many lands to satisfy intellectual curiosity. Haskins states: "This student class is singularly mobile and singularly international... Bologna has its English archdeacons and German civilians, Paris its clerks from Sweden and Hungary, as well as from England, Germany, and Italy."³

Students from abroad came to study in American colleges at a very early

period in American history. In 1784, Francisco de Miranda came from South America to study at Yale. Yung Wing was the first Chinese to graduate from an American college (Yale, class of 1854). The United States Bureau of Education reported 13,673 foreign students in 1904. Figures by selected years showing the increase of foreign students in the United States are given below.

### TABLE I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1923-24</td>
<td>6,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-31</td>
<td>9,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934-35</td>
<td>5,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939-40</td>
<td>6,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944-45</td>
<td>6,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-47</td>
<td>11,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-48</td>
<td>17,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948-49</td>
<td>26,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-51</td>
<td>29,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-52</td>
<td>31,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---


5Ibid., 8

6Cieslak, p. 9.
According to the annual census of foreign students in the United States, student exchange increased tremendously during the period 1930-1955. There were 9,683 foreign students studying here in 1930-31, and 33,647 in 1955 representing an increase of over three hundred per cent, while the number of American students increased about one hundred per cent.\(^7\)

Increases in the number of the "students from countries whose cultures differ markedly from our (American) own,"\(^8\) have been encouraged in recent years by the emphasis on scientific achievement in America and by the contact of American citizens with the people of other lands during World War II.\(^9\) The total number of foreign students in the United States in 1956 was 43,309; of these, 13,301 or thirty per cent were from the Far East, twenty-three per cent from Latin America, fifteen per cent from Europe, fourteen per cent from Canada and Bermuda, and thirteen per cent from the Near and Middle East.\(^10\)


During the academic year 1957-58 there were 43,391 foreign students in the United States from 115 nations and political areas of the world.\textsuperscript{11}

For the school year 1958-1959, 47,245 foreign students were reported at American colleges and universities as compared with 33,617 in 1955.\textsuperscript{12} During the academic year 1959-1960, 48,486 foreign students from 141 countries and political areas were enrolled at 1,712 institutions of higher learning in the United States. This is a 2.6 per cent increase over the period 1958-1959. Among the foreign students in the United States in 1959-1960, thirty five per cent were from the Far East and nineteen per cent from Latin America. The Near and Middle East accounted for 14.7 per cent; thirteen per cent are from Europe and twelve per cent from North America.\textsuperscript{13}

As in previous years there were more students in the United States from Canada than from any other foreign country. These 5,679 Canadian students constituted twelve per cent of the total foreign student population and the largest number in the history of academic exchanges to come to the United States from one country.\textsuperscript{14} Chinese students constituted nine per cent of the total


\textsuperscript{14}Ibid., 7.
population or 4,516. The number of Chinese students included persons from Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Macao, as well as those from the mainland. India sent the third largest number of students—3,772 or eight per cent of the total.15

Iran which was listed sixth in 1958-1959 with 2,104 (4.6 per cent) of the total, was listed fourth in 1960. Presently there are 2,507 Iranian students or five per cent of the student population in this country. Korea, listed fifth this year (1960), showed an increase of only three students for a total of 2,474. A substantial decrease in the number of students was reported for Cuba: 1,645 students last year compared with 935 students this year. Japan, the Philippine Islands, Mexico, Venezuela, Greece, the United Kingdom, Germany, Columbia, Iraq, France, and Jordan all showed minor decreases in the number of students reported.16

15Ibid.

16Ibid.
TABLE II
FOREIGN STUDENTS IN THE UNITED STATES, BY LEADING NATIONALITY GROUPS, 1960

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total per Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>5,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>4,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>3,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>2,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>2,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1,722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


From 1784 to 1960 the foreign student population in the United States has increased tremendously. The vast influx of foreign students, especially after World War II, "has stimulated interest in the mechanisms and consequences of exchange, particularly in the United States where for several years the number of foreign students enrolled in institutions of higher education has exceeded 30,000."17

17Richard D. Lambert and Marvin Bressler, Indian Students on an American Campus (Minneapolis, 1956), p. v.
Foreign students who come from countries with markedly different cultural traditions are both absolutely and proportionately more numerous.\(^{18}\) Cora Du Bois asserted that the great increase of the foreign student population in the United States, coupled with their diversified cultural traditions, as well as "the marked development of interest in foreign relations have broadened and sensitized Americans to the whole field of student exchange."\(^{19}\) Thus, several private organizations have been established in the United States that are concerned in some way with the influx of foreign students. The objectives of the various organizations include the promotion of international friendship and understanding; the transmission of skills essential to programs of technical assistance and national development, and cultural contact within the framework of hospitality.

The Committee on Friendly Relations Among Foreign Students was the first organization created solely to give personal help to foreign students on an extensive scale. It was organized in 1911 in cooperation with the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations. The Committee's best-known activity is its Port of Entry Service.\(^{20}\) Its "concern is that the incoming student have a feeling of confidence and a sense of security."\(^{21}\) From time to time

\(^{18}\) Du Bois, p. 10
\(^{19}\) Ibid.
\(^{20}\) Cieslak, p. 10
\(^{21}\) Ibid., 11.
the committee has carried on additional activities that warrant some attention. These include setting up a model program of home hospitality and a social center in New York, and acting as a general counseling and information bureau. 22

The Institute of International Education opened its doors on February 1, 1919, in New York City, with Stephen Duggan as its first director. The work of the Institute has been characterized by an expanding concept of its role in furthering international understanding. This organization has been responsible for the development of the office of the Foreign Student Adviser on college campuses in the United States. 23

The Institute of International Education has established a Department for East-West Exchanges, which has administered a program involving scholars from Poland and Yugoslavia. 24 This organization claims credit for the continuation of a pilot project involving the evaluation of the credentials of graduate students who apply independently to member schools of the Association of Graduate Schools in the Association of American Universities. 25

Though now defunct, the International Institute of Teachers College, Columbia University, during its operation from 1923 to 1938 showed how an

---

22 Ibid.

23 Ibid., 12.


25 Ibid.
American institution of higher learning could adapt its organization and program to fit the needs of foreign students. The main purposes of the International Institute were:

(1) to give special assistance and guidance to the increasing body of foreign students enrolled in Teachers College;

(2) to conduct investigations into educational conditions, movements and tendencies in foreign countries; and

(3) to make the results of such investigations available to students of education in the United States and elsewhere.

The National Association of Foreign Student Advisers developed from a series of meetings on international student exchanges called by the Institute of International Education in cooperation with the Department of State in 1942, 1946, and 1947. This Association works essentially as a liaison organization among the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice, the Department of State's Office of Educational Exchange, and institutions of higher learning.

---

26 Cieslak, p. 13.


28 Cieslak, p. 15
The number of Catholic organizations working with foreign students are restricted to specific areas of the United States. Some of these organizations and their functions are:

6. Catholic Student's Mission Crusade: hospitality and leadership training.29

Studies have been carried out dealing with various aspects of foreign students in the United States on a national level. Studies referring to the adjustments in America of the students of a particular nationality group include

The American Experience of Swedish Students,30 Personal Adjustment in the


American Culture.\textsuperscript{31} The Western Educated Man In India.\textsuperscript{32} Numerous articles have been written in leading magazines, journals, and pamphlets, covering diversified areas pertinent to foreign students. Some of the topics analysed are "Acculturation of Foreign Students in the United States,"\textsuperscript{33} "Foreign Students are our Guests,"\textsuperscript{34} and, "Foreign Students in America."\textsuperscript{35} Unpublished doctoral dissertations include "The Brazilian Student in the United States,"\textsuperscript{36} and "A Study of the Experiences of Selected Oriental Students in Colleges and Universities in the United States and Implications for Higher Education."\textsuperscript{37} Unpublished Masters' theses include "Some Adjustments of the Vietnamese Students in America as Related to the Westernization Level of Their Fathers."\textsuperscript{38} No

\textsuperscript{31}Franklin Julius Shaw, \textit{Personal Adjustment in the American Culture} (New York, 1953).

\textsuperscript{32}John and Ruth Useem, \textit{The Western Educated Man in India} (New York, 1955)

\textsuperscript{33}P. Loomis and E. A. Schuler, "Acculturation of Foreign Students in the United States," \textit{Applied Anthropology}, VII (Spring 1948), 17-34

\textsuperscript{34}P. J. McNamar, "Foreign Students Are Our Guests," \textit{Shield}, XXXVI (January 1959), 10-11.

\textsuperscript{35}John W. Gardner, "Foreign Students in America," \textit{Foreign Affairs} XXX (July 1952), 637-650.


\textsuperscript{38}Pham Thi Ngo, p. 3.
studies, however, have been found which focus specifically upon cultural contact between foreign students and a particular organization which deals with the hospitality for these students.

This study represents an effort toward the examination of some selected aspects of cultural contact between foreign students and the Christian Family Movement hosts in the Chicago area. The writer wished to learn how CFM families respond to the experience of having students from foreign lands in their homes. He wished to see what special preparation, if any, is given to such matters as meeting the, introducing them to their children, conversing with the, etc...

An additional purpose was to have host couples evaluate the CFM program of hospitality to foreign students and to make specific recommendations for improving this program.

The study tentatively poses the following question: to what extent do the host families prepare themselves to maximize cultural understanding of foreign students guests, e.g., by reading about the visitor's country in advance? In this connection the following hypotheses are tentatively advanced: the greater the attempt to understand the foreign visitor's culture, the more natural and easy is the visiting experience for the hosts; the greater the cultural information of the host family about the background of the visiting student the less the likelihood that the host family will hold an unwarranted stereotype about foreign student visitors; and the greater the communication between CFM International Students Committee and the host family, the less the likelihood of such an unwarranted stereotype.
In 1947, the Christian Family Movement was initiated in Chicago. Concurrently, similar movements developed in New York and South Bend, Indiana. The CFM adopted the Catholic Action procedure of the Young Christian Workers, i.e., OBSERVE, JUDGE, ACT, which is developed during the inquiry section of their meeting.\(^{39}\)

The first objective of the CFM is that the members receive a thorough understanding of what Christ's teachings mean in every day living. In addition, knowledge of the Mass, the Sacraments, and other aspects of being a Christian are considered essential.\(^{40}\) By constantly performing small acts of service and by working zealously to effect a change in their environment, the members seek to bring about a gradual training-through-action.\(^{41}\)

The Christian Family Movement, as of 1960, includes more than 30,000 couples in 150 dioceses in Argentina, Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Columbia, Cuba, Denmark, England, India, Japan, Malta, Mexico, New Zealand, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Puerto Rico, Scotland, Spain, Tanganyika, Uganda, United States, Uruguay, and Venezuela.\(^{42}\)


\(^{41}\)Smith, p. 12.

\(^{42}\)A brochure of the Christian Family Movement, reprinted March, 1958, distributed at the annual CFM convention of August 26-28, 1960 reproduced in Appendix I.
Some of the publications of the CFM include *Annual Inquiry Program*, *For Happier Families*, *Act, A Guide to CFM* and *Apostolate*.\(^3\)

The International Student Committee of the Christian Family Movement was formed in Chicago in 1951. The main purpose of this committee is to provide home hospitality for foreign students of all races and creeds.\(^4\)

The following are some of the steps the Chicago Federation took to set up an *International Students Committee* for the Christian Family Movement.\(^5\)

1. Appointed a Chairman couple for the entire city.
2. Appointed eight or ten couples to serve on the committee as contacts between the CFM couples and the students. The couples were chosen geographically so as to cover the entire city area.
3. Assigned each committee couple to contact two (or more if necessary) CFM regions by giving a three- or five-minute "sales pitch" at a regional meeting.
4. Assigned each committee couple to a neighboring college or university and had them contact the Foreign Student Adviser for a current list of the foreign students enrolled at the school.

\(^3\)Appendix I

\(^4\) *Statement concerning the International Student Committee of the CFM*, undated, obtained from the files of the CFM, reproduced in Appendix II.

5. Suggested that each committee couple entertain a foreign student as soon as possible so they could speak of a "first-hand" experience when they were selling other couples on the idea of entertaining the foreign students.\textsuperscript{46}

The area of hospitality undertaken by the International Committee of the Christian Family Movement is certainly important and noteworthy. Governor G. Mennen Williams of Michigan in his address to the National Association of Foreign Student Advisers asserted that we should "open up our hearts, ourselves and our institutions to our guests who have come to study in our country. Let them see us as we are, the good and the bad. It is of vital importance, I think, that foreign students meet informally and as frequently as their academic regime and personal desires permit, American families in a home environment."\textsuperscript{47}

In 1957 the Congress of Foreign Student Catholic Action agreed that foreign students do need a "home away from home."\textsuperscript{48} The participants at the Congress asserted:

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{46}Ibid.\textsuperscript{.}
\textsuperscript{47}National Association of Foreign Student Advisers, International Educational Exchanges in the Next Decade (New York, 1958), p. 27
\end{flushright}
They (foreign students) are often disillusioned and lonely during their first months in the States. For the most part they are eager to learn about the country. Hospitality should be given in a family atmosphere. People offering hospitality should be ready to accept the student as he is, and to expect him to always act and think just like themselves. The cultures from which the students come are different from that of America. We can learn from them. It was suggested that families offering hospitality might read up on a particular country or area, and invite students from there.49

In the Chicago area there are 2,890 foreign students.50 This number may be considered sufficient to apportion at least one student (Catholic or Non-Catholic) to each CFM family in the Archdiocese of Chicago. Foreign students who pursue studies at local schools and institutions come from various parts of the world. Far removed from their families and friends, many have previously experienced the warm friendship of American missionaries and religious.

The education the foreign student takes home with him will consist not only of the materials he has absorbed from texts, lectures and laboratory experiments. Far more important are the impressions he receives of the American way of life in general and, in particular, the Catholic way of life in the United States. Unfortunately, this extra-curricular experience, for the most part, has not given some foreign students a wholesome impression of this country, and particularly of the Catholic faith in the United States. It is an unfortunate fact that many Catholic students lose their faith during their stay

49Ibid.

in this country. The president of the International Student Committee of the CFM asserted in an open letter that:

Catholic families today are being desperately urged to extend hospitality to foreign students. These students want friends, want to see American Family life, want to know what Americans think. Most of them are lonely. The Catholic foreign students often need spiritual help. It is frightening to note that some seventy per cent of African Catholic foreign students lose their faith in this country. This fact alone seems to indicate that our offer of hospitality then is not a mere act of Christian charity but rather a duty.51

The urgent need for Catholic families to extend hospitality to foreign students was shown in a survey of foreign students, conducted in 1956 by the Foreign Visitors Office of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. The survey was geared to gathering information that would help to improve Catholic hospitality programs for students from abroad. The Foreign Visitors Office sent 6,000 questionnaires to the foreign students studying in non-Catholic Colleges and received about 1,200 replies.52

One of the questions was: Have you received help or hospitality from American Catholic people? A total of 713 students said they had received no assistance from Catholic sources, and many of these asserted that they had been accorded hospitality by Protestant organizations.53

---

51A letter concerning the Detroit International Student Committee of the CFM, February 1959, obtained from the files of the CFM, reproduced in Appendix III.

52Our Sunday Visitor (Indiana), July 7, 1957), p. 3

53Ibid.
A total of 1,631 students said they had been helped by American Catholics, but that this hospitality consisted chiefly in friendship from individual Catholics, and not from organizations. To the question of whether they would like additional help or hospitality from American Catholics, 66% of the students replied that they would. The foreign students who had no previous contact with a Catholic organization in the United States felt that Protestants are much more interested in the foreign student's welfare than Catholics are.54

Senator William J. Fulbright informed the National Association of Foreign Student Advisers that "student exchange is a cultural program; it is not primarily a propaganda service."55 Nevertheless, besides its cultural contributions, the exchange of persons, and especially of students, has greatly helped the cause of the United States in the present ideological struggle. American relations abroad depend to a large extent on the winning or losing of the cold war.56

The U. S. S. R. understands the propaganda value of an intellectual who says: "I know. I was there and saw for myself." In 1956, Kenneth Holland, president of the International Institute of Education, told representatives at

54Ibid.

55Eugene K. Culhane, "Student Visitors are V. I. P.'s," America, XCV (May 1956), 199.

56Ibid.
the National Association of Foreign Student Advisers at their annual conference in Washington, D. C., that Communist China brought back 10,000 overseas Chinese from the Malayan area alone for study in China. What is the United States doing to match these efforts on the cultural front?57

57Ibid.
CHAPTER II

METHODS AND TECHNIQUES

Gathering the Data

The research data in the present study were gathered mainly through the use of the questionnaire technique. A group of 140 CFM families of the Chicago area, affiliated with the International Students Committee of the Christian Family Movement, constituted the universe of study. The 140 CFM members were all considered "active" by the International Students Committee of the Chicago Christian Family Movement. The participants were supplied questionnaires by mail and requested to answer all questions, returning them to the writer. A stamped, self-addressed return envelope and a covering letter1 (Appendix IV) accompanied each questionnaire mailed. The writer received the addresses from the president of the International Students Committee of the Chicago Christian Family Movement.

The questionnaire was in part formulated in consultation with four CFM couples (who did not, of course, receive the questionnaire). Secondary sources consisted mainly of library material, books, periodicals, articles, and files of the Christian Family Movement.

The questionnaire2 (Appendix IV) is divided into five sections. The specific areas are not stipulated directly, for questions pertaining to

1Appendix IV
2Appendix IV
cultural knowledge, attitudes of the person(s) answering the questionnaire, motivations for inviting foreign student visitors, are interspersed among the various sections.

The first nineteen questions dealt with characteristics of the respondents; year of, and reasons for, joining the CFM; educational status of children; nationality-descent; formal education of CFM host couples; occupational status; kind of course pursued in high school; major subject(s) in college; degrees attained in college; and the extent of Catholic education. In addition, the respondents were asked if they had ever invited foreign students into their homes, and to state whether or not they considered the receiving of foreign students into American Catholic homes one of the most important functions of the CFM program. Families who had not invited foreign students into their homes were requested to return the questionnaire answered to this point.

The second section of the questionnaire was divided into two subsections: Subsection A (Invitation) and Subsection B (Preparation). Subsection A dealt with the manner in which CFM families extended invitations to foreign students. Specific questions were asked concerning the number of foreign students who came to CFM homes, the number ordinarily invited, and the means of transportation. Further questions were posed concerning the number of foreign students invited in the last twelve months, and the number of invitations accepted. With regard to the manner of inviting foreign students, three categories were presented: (1) by writing to them; (2) by calling; (3) through an intermediary. The CFM families were asked to submit reasons, if any,
given by the foreign students who did not accept the invitations and the reasons they (CFM families) thought promoted acceptance of their invitations on the part of those who did come to their homes. Subsection B was concerned with the degree of preparation, if any, given by CFM families to such matters as making a special effort to learn something of the foreign student's homeland, the type of recreation the foreign student indulged in, the amount of time the foreign student spent in the United States, and the religion of the foreign student visitor. In the preparation of food the respondents were requested to state if they turned to other CFM families for advice. Opinions of CFM families in the sample were sought with regard to the problem of the food served.

The third section of the questionnaire dealt with some specific responses of the CFM families in relation to the experience of having foreign student visitors in their homes. Questions were posed concerning particular concerns, if any, of the host couples with regard to foreign student guests, difficulties in using names, and the manner of addressing the foreign student visitor on first meeting. The CFM families in the sample were asked if they showed the foreign student guest around the house on the first visit, if this "tour" included the kitchen, if they introduced the children to the foreign student guest, whether or not they avoided the use of "slang", and spoke more slowly and carefully than usual. In the choice of topics for discussion, the CFM couples were requested to check whether they introduced topics of primary interest to the visitor, or attempted to balance the topics accordingly. Further questions were posed as to whether or not the host couples inquired
about the foreign student's country, customs, field of study, and family. The respondents were also asked if they themselves and guest made critical but true remarks of the United States, the foreign student country, and the Catholic Church (in its human aspects) that they felt were justified.

The fourth section of the questionnaire concerned the follow-up after the foreign student visited the CFM family. Questions were asked if the foreign student was invited again, if the host families sent holiday greeting cards to the foreign students who had visited them, and if they heard from the foreign student after the visit.

The fifth section of the questionnaire pertained to the evaluation of the CFM program of hospitality to foreign students by the host couples, and invited the respondents to make specific recommendations for improving this program.

**The Pretesting of the Questionnaire**

The original questionnaire was pretested in Detroit, Michigan. Addresses were received from the president of the International Student Committee of the Detroit Christian Family Movement. Twenty-one CFM families of the Detroit area were sent questionnaires in the pretest. A stamped, self-addressed envelope, and a covering letter accompanied each questionnaire mailed. Thirteen questionnaires (61.9 per cent) were returned to the author. Based on the returns, final changes in the wording of the questionnaire were made.

Questions 9 and 12b of the final questionnaire were combined in the pretested study. The respondents in the pretested sample were confused with the proximity of the two categories, namely; formal education completed by husband.
and the exigency of Catholic education. Confusion also arose between questions 13 and 17. With the separation of the categories, the possibility arose for the inclusion of additional questions 10, 11, 12a, 14, 15 and 16. These additional questions augmented and synchronized the data pertinent to the educational status of the CFM families in the sample. Thus questions relating to the kind of course pursued in high school, major subjects in college, and holders of college and university degrees were included. Other questions not included in the pretested questionnaire were numbers 27, 65, 66a, 67b, 68, 69a, and 69b. A question related to questions 28 and 29 was omitted from the final instrument.

Returns of the Questionnaire

The final questionnaires were then mailed. Within the interval of one month, over half the 140 questionnaires were returned to the writer. At that time a follow-up was made by means of a post card. The follow-up was estimated to account for 10 per cent of the total returns. An exact check was not recorded.

Five of the 140 questionnaires (3.5 per cent) were returned to the sender because of faulty addresses. Ninety-seven questionnaires (69.2 per cent) were returned, of which 75 (77.3 per cent) could be used. The other twenty-two questionnaires could not be utilized for the following reasons: (a) eight CFM families among the respondents did not entertain foreign students, representing 8.2 per cent (of 97); (b) seven questionnaires were returned incomplete, representing 7.2 per cent (of 97); (c) five couples (5.2 per cent)
had dropped their membership in the Christian Family Movement; (d) one questionnaire was returned unanswered; (e) one CFM family entertained one student from Puerto Rico and so not a foreign student.

**Characteristics of the Respondents**

Forty-six questionnaires (61.3 per cent of the 75 usable questionnaires) were answered by both husband and wife; six (8.0 per cent) were completed by the husband, and twenty-three (30.7 per cent) were answered by the wife only.

Of the seventy-five families, 20 (26.7 per cent) joined the Christian Family Movement in the years 1951-52, representing the model group. The high number of families joining the Christian Family Movement in 1951-52 may be due to the fact that an additional stimulus was given to the organization by the introduction of the program of hospitality to foreign students at the same period of time. It is worth noting that there had been a gradual increase of members from 1947 to 1952 followed by a lessening of new member families in subsequent years. (Figure 1, page 26).

**Nationality-descent**

An historical explanation may be submitted with regard to the nationality-descent of CFM respondent-families (Table III). The high percentage of CFM families of Irish background may not only be accounted for by the fact that the Irish constitute a very high percentage of the people of the Chicago area, but that this nationality group migrated at an early period to the United States and
Figure 1.

Length of time families have been in C.F.M. by year joined.
spoke the dominant language of this country.  

Professor C. J. Nuesse and Fr. Thomas J. Harte have noted that "this linguistic advantage, coupled with their immigration at an early period, cast the Irish in a role of intermediary between the old Americans and the later immigrant groups." The Irish immigrant, usually a devout Catholic, also tended to establish an identification with America more quickly than other nationality groups.

**Previous Education**

The respondents showed what appears to be a high level of education on the part of CFM members (Table IV, page 29). All seventy-five CFM husbands and wives completed elementary school, and had at least 1-3 years of high school. Sixty-six (88 per cent) of the husbands, and sixty-four (85.3 per cent) of the wives pursued an academic course in high school. Six (6 per cent) of the husbands, and one (1.3 per cent) of the wives followed a technical course. It is worthy of note that even though only three husbands followed a business course in high school, 23 (30.7 per cent) stated that their major subjects in college were Accounting and Business Administration (Table V). Eighteen (24 per cent) of the wives asserted that the Humanities were their major subjects in college (Table VI).

---


4Ibid.

5Thomas F. O'Dea, "The Catholic Immigrant and the American Scene," *Thought*, XXXI (Summer 1956), 256.
### Table III

#### Nationality-Descent of CFM Respondent Husbands and Wives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality-descent</th>
<th>Husbands</th>
<th></th>
<th>Wives</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German-Irish</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German-Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish-Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish-Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both-Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other characteristics of the respondents pertaining to previous education that might be related to the problem would be: the type of college or university degrees held by CFM husbands and wives (Table VII); the number of degrees (Table VIII); educational status of the children (Table IX); and the extent of Catholic education of both husbands and wives (Table X). It is observed that only 11 (14.7 per cent) of the husbands, and 16 (25.3 per cent) of the wives responding have had no Catholic education.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Attainment</th>
<th>Husbands</th>
<th></th>
<th>Wives</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-7 Elementary Grades</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Completed Elementary Grades</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 Years of High School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed High School</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 Years College</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Undergraduate College</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 Years Graduate or Professional</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more Years Graduate or Professional</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE V

MAJOR SUBJECTS IN COLLEGE OF 64* CFM RESPONDENT HUSBANDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Subjects</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics and Natural Science</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting and Business Administration</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>64</td>
<td><strong>99.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 11 Husbands did not attend college.
TABLE VI

MAJOR SUBJECTS IN COLLEGE OF 49* CFM RESPONDENT WIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Subjects</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics and Natural Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Accounting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 26 Wives did not attend college
### TABLE VII

**TYPE OF COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY DEGREES HELD BY CFM RESPONDENT HUSBANDS AND WIVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College or University degrees</th>
<th>Husbands</th>
<th>Wives</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorates</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Degrees</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE VIII

**NUMBER OF DEGREES HELD BY CFM RESPONDENT HUSBANDS AND WIVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Degrees</th>
<th>Husbands</th>
<th>Wives</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 degree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 degrees</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 degrees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE IX
CHILDREN BY EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF CFM RESPONDENT-FAMILIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Number of Children*</th>
<th>Per Cent in Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At Home</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammer School</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or Professional</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Type of School</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>354</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The number of children are from 72 (96 per cent) of the CFM respondent-families. Three (4 per cent) families did not have any children at the time of this study.
TABLE X
EXTENT OF CATHOLIC EDUCATION OF CFM RESPONDENT HUSBANDS AND WIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Husbands Number (N=75)</th>
<th>Husbands Per Cent</th>
<th>Wives Number (N=75)</th>
<th>Wives Per Cent</th>
<th>Total* Number (N=150)</th>
<th>Total* Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Catholic Education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-7 Elementary Grades</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Elementary Grades</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 Years High School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete High School</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 Years College</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed College</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 Years Professional or Graduate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more years Professional or Graduate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Occupation

With regard to occupational classes of CFM husbands and wives, 27 (36.0 per cent) of the husbands fall in the managerial category, representing the highest concentrations; and 66 (88 per cent) of the wives fall in category "housewife or homemaker" (Table XI); hence only 9 (12 per cent) of the wives work outside of the home—1 (1.3 per cent) "full time," and 8 (10.7 per cent) "part time."

Table XI

DISTRIBUTION OF CFM RESPONDENT HUSBANDS AND WIVES BY MAJOR OCCUPATIONAL CLASSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Class</th>
<th>Husbands</th>
<th></th>
<th>Wives</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent (N=75)</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent (N=75)</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent (N=150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife or Homemaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Division of the Sample According to Categories A, B, and C.**

For the purpose of further analysis in Chapter IV, the data of our study are divided into three categories according to education: Category A (both husband and wife had completed four years of college or more); Category B (either husband or wife had completed four years of college or more); Category C (neither husband or wife had completed four years of college). It is interesting that the number of husbands and wives in our sample is well divided among the three categories (Table XII).

**TABLE XII**

DIVISION OF THE STUDY ACCORDING TO CATEGORIES A, B, AND C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Couples</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (Both spouses completed College)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Either Spouse Completed College)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (Neither Spouse Completed College)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER III

RESPONSE OF CFM HOSTS TO THE EXPERIENCE OF HAVING FOREIGN STUDENT GUESTS

In this area of the study, an attempt was made to find out how CFM families respond to the experience of having students from foreign lands in their homes: to see what special preparing, if any, is given to such matters as meeting them, introducing them to the children, conversing with them, etc. Further inquiry was made to learn whether or not the host families prepare themselves to maximize cultural information about the background of the visiting foreign student, e.g., by reading about the visitor's country in advance, ascertaining the religion of the foreign student (before his arrival to the host's home), etc.

In addition, an effort was made to ascertain whether or not the host's cultural information (about the background of the visiting foreign student) makes his visiting experience with the foreign student more natural and easy.

In all, 1,148 foreign students were guests of CFM respondents. Seven hundred and fifteen were males (Table XIII), and 433 were females (Table XIV). The average number of foreign student guests per CFM host family was 15.2; males averaging 9.5 and females 5.7 per family. Eighteen (24.0 per cent) CFM families were hosts to less than two male foreign students (Table XIII) while 22 (29.3 per cent) of the families were hosts to less than two female foreign students (Table XIV).

Other characteristics investigated in this section of the study were:
number of foreign students ordinarily invited at a time (Table XV); number of
invitations extended by CFM families to foreign students in the last twelve
months (Table XVI); number of invitations accepted by foreign students in the
last twelve months (Table XVII).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of student guests in visits per family.</th>
<th>Total CFM Host Families per category</th>
<th>Total Male foreign student guests</th>
<th>Mean number of students invited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not invite male foreign students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Student Guests per family Visits</td>
<td>Total CFM Host families per category</td>
<td>Total female foreign student guests</td>
<td>Mean number of students invited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not invite female foreign students</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XV

TOTAL NUMBER OF CFM HOST FAMILIES, BY NUMBER OF FOREIGN STUDENTS INVITED AT A TIME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of foreign students ordinarily invited at a time*</th>
<th>Number of CFM families who extended invitations per category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Categories as given by respondents
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of times invitations were extended*</th>
<th>Number of CFM families per category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Categories as given by respondents
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of times invitations were accepted*</th>
<th>Number of CFM families per category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Categories as given by respondents
Preparation in Relation to Host's Visiting Experience

In respect to the analysis of special efforts on the part of CFM hosts, questions 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 39, and 40 of the questionnaire were taken into consideration. These questions dealt with the type of special preparation, if any, made by the host families before the arrival of the foreign student guest.

It is observed (Table XVIII) that 64.5 (65.4 per cent) of the host families made some special effort to learn something about the foreign student's country. There is a direct relationship between this type of preparation (on the part of CFM hosts) and whether the visiting experience of the host was thought to be natural and easy. Thus a relationship between questions 30 (preparation pertaining to foreign student's country) and 56 (concerning difficulty in selecting topics for conversation) showed that of the families who made special effort to learn something about the foreign student's homeland, 76.4 per cent did not find any difficulty in selecting topics for conversation; 75 per cent of the families who did not prepare did find difficulties.

1Appendix IV

2An example of one of the above questions is: "When your invitation is accepted do you try to learn the amount of time the foreign student has spent in the United States?" Three categories were presented to the respondents: 1. always, 2. sometimes, and 3. never. In the analysis of those questions, categories "always," and "sometimes" were considered to be positive, and category "never" was regarded to be negative (Appendix C, pages and of the questionnaire).
TABLE XVIII
TYPES OF PREPARATION ASSOCIATED WITH THE VISITING EXPERIENCES OF CFM HOSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of preparation before foreign student's visit</th>
<th>Prepare</th>
<th>Do Not Prepare</th>
<th>Total in Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign student's homeland</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time student spent in United States</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing of Children</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Three (4 per cent) of the CFM families had no children at the time of this study. Nine (12 per cent) of the hosts submitted "no answer."

A further comparison was made between question 33 (preparation pertaining to recreation) and 41 (whether or not the visit of the foreign student caused the host any particular concerns). Among the 22 families who had learned the type of preferred recreation of the foreign student guest (before his arrival to the home), 11 or 50 per cent (of the host families) had some "particular concerns." Among the families who did not prepare 25 (51.1 per cent) had some "particular concerns," about the visit of the foreign student.

With the exception of special effort to learn about the foreign student's homeland (question 30) and type of recreation (question 31), which show a direct relationship to the visiting experience of CFM hosts, other preparation
pertaining to the length of time the foreign student spent in the United States (question 32) and the religion of the foreign student guest (question 34) did not seem to affect the ease of the visiting experience of the host. Thus a relationship in the sample was made between (question 32) length of time the foreign student spent in the United States and (56) selecting topics for conversation. Among the CFM hosts who tried to learn the length of time the foreign student spent in the U. S., 22 (56.1 per cent) of the CFM hosts found the visiting experience easy, and 17 (43.6 per cent) found it to be difficult. Among the CFM hosts who made no inquiry about the length of time the foreign student had spent in the U. S., 18 (62.1 per cent) considered the visiting experience to be easy, and 11 (37.9 per cent) judged it to be difficult.

A further comparison was made between questions 34 (ascertaining the religion of the foreign student before his arrival to the guest's home) and 56 (selecting topics for conversation). Of the CFM families who made a special effort to learn the religion of the foreign student visitor before his arrival, 18 (56.1 per cent) thought the visiting experience easy, and 11 (43.6 per cent) thought it difficult. For those CFM hosts who made no special preparation in ascertaining the religion of the foreign student visitor, 20 (57.1 per cent) found difficulty in the visit.

In brief, CFM families who tried to educate themselves (before the arrival of the foreign student visitor) with regard to: (a) the foreign student's country, and (b) recreational preferences of foreign student found the visiting experience more natural and easy than did the families who did not prepare themselves in these two areas. Special preparations pertaining to (c) learning
the length of time the foreign student visitor had been in the United States, and (d) ascertaining the religion of the foreign student (before his arrival), did not seem to augment the degree of easiness of the host's visiting experience.

Thus, it may be reasonably concluded with regard to this study, special preparations on the part of the host family have a bearing on but do not seriously affect the degree of ease of the host's visiting experience. This may be due to certain contributing factors related to the sample such as the high level of education of the respondents noted in the previous chapter (Tables IV-XII), and the high average number (15.2) of foreign student guests per CFM host (Tables XIII and XIV).

Questions of Hosts to Student Visitors

During the visits of the foreign student, 21 (41.3 per cent) hosts addressed their foreign guests by using first name; 25 (33.3 per cent) by using Mr. or Miss and the last name; 19 (25.3 per cent) by using a combination of both the first and the last names. The foreign student visitors, on the contrary, normally address the hosts by using Mr. or Mrs. and the last name in 71 (94.6 per cent) of the cases. During the conversation between CFM hosts and foreign guests, a special effort is made on the part of the hosts to introduce topics of primary interest both to the visitor and to themselves. Forty-one (54.7 per cent) of hosts asserted that they tended to ask about the same number of questions as the foreign student.

Some of the questions asked by CFM hosts during the visit of the foreign student guest included numbers 60, 61, 62, and 63 of the questionnaire.
These questions pertained to the visitor's country, customs, field of studies, and family.³

It is observed (Table XIX) that over 95 per cent of CFM hosts asked questions about the foreign visitor's country, customs, field of studies, and family.

There is a relationship between questions on the above items and whether or not the visiting experience of the host was natural and easy. A comparison of questions 60 (pertaining to the visitor's country) and 56 (concerning difficulty in selecting topics for conversation) showed that among families who asked questions pertaining to the foreign student's country during the visit, 39 (57.3 per cent) did not find any difficulty in selecting topics for conversation, while 29 (42.7 per cent) had some difficulty.

A further comparison was made between questions 61 (pertaining to the visitor's customs) and 56 (difficulty in selecting topics for conversation). Among the families who inquired about the foreign visitor's customs during the visit, 38 (56.7 per cent) had no difficulty in selecting topics for conversation, while 29 (43.3 per cent) had some difficulty.

It is worth noting that among the 39 families who had inquired about the foreign student's country and found no difficulty in conversation, 15 (38.4

³An example of one of the above questions would be: "Do you ask questions about the foreign visitor's field of study?" Three categories were presented to the respondents: 1. always, 2. sometimes, and 3. never. In the analysis of those questions, categories "always," and "Sometimes" were considered to be positive, and category "never" was regarded to be negative.
TABLE XIX

ANSWERS TO SOME SELECTED QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Number in Each Category</th>
<th>Per cent in Each Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>When you are in doubt do you ask your guests to repeat or to spell their names when you are introduced?</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Do you show your foreign student guests around the house when they visit for the first time?</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Does this &quot;tour&quot; ordinarily include the kitchen?</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Do you introduce your children to the foreign guests?</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Do your children help &quot;break the ice&quot; when a foreign student visits your home?</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>In addressing your foreign guests do you find that you speak more carefully than usual?</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Do you try to avoid the use of &quot;slang&quot;?</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>At the table would you consider it impolite for the foreign visitor to take food or drink without a specific invitation to do so?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Represents CFM hosts who had no children at the time of this study
per cent) belonged to Category A (Table XII, page 36). Also, among the 38 families who had inquired about the foreign student's customs, 16 (40.2 per cent) were in Category A (Table XII, page 36); while 7 (18.4 per cent) belonged to category C (Table XII, page 36).

Thus it may reasonably be concluded that for the CFM respondents in this study, information pertaining to the foreign visitor's country, customs, field of study, and family is associated with making the host's visiting experience more natural and easy. In addition, it seems that formal education on the part of the host couple is an ingredient affecting the ease of the host's experience.4

It is quite possible that the choice of questions (not included in the research) posed by the host couple about the foreign visitor's country might have been very selective. Richard D. Lambert and Marvin Bressler have stated that visitors from low-status countries "form their attitudes toward the United States largely as the end product of a "looking-glass" process based on the visitor's perceptions of American attitudes to his country and by extension to him."5 For example, Bressler and Lambert pointed out rather well in a subsequent research that to the Indian student specific subjects (such as caste,
TABLE XIX A

ITEMS OF SOME SPECIFIC QUESTIONS POSED BY CFM HOSTS TO FOREIGN STUDENT GUESTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>CFM hosts who asked about items</th>
<th></th>
<th>CFM hosts who did not ask about items</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor's Country</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor's Customs</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor's field of</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor's Family</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

untouchables, population expansion) "which are associated with colonial status and reactive nationalism" have become matters of sensitivity to the student from India. 6

It is the opinion of the writer that the sociability between the CFM host and the foreign student guest might have been favourably maintained in part by the avoidance of specific "sensitive" questions about the foreign student's country. This equilibrium between host and guest might have been a contributing factor to the host's experience in the direction of being easier and more natural.

Again, it is also possible that the avoidance of "sensitive" questions on the part of the host might reasonably be attributed to the high level of education of the respondents (Tables IV-VIII, XI) and the high average number (15.2) of foreign student guests per CFM host (Tables XIII and XIV).

"Critical Remarks" and Host's Visiting Experience

In the analysis of "critical remarks" and the host's visiting experience, questions 65, 66a, 66b, 67a, 67b, 68, 69a, and 69b of the questionnaire were taken into consideration. These questions dealt with "critical remarks" pertaining to the United States, the foreign student's country, and the Catholic Church (Table XX, page 52).

It is interesting to note that during the visit of the foreign student 67 (89.3 per cent) of the CFM hosts would agree with the foreign guest should he make remarks critical but true of the United States (Question 65, Table XX). On the contrary, 31 (41.3 per cent) of the hosts would be willing to make critical remarks about the foreign student's country that they felt were justified (question 67a, Table XX). Respondents also indicated that they would refrain from first making critical remarks about the Catholic Church, even

---

7Appendix IV

8An example of one of the above questions would be: "Do you yourself make critical remarks about the United States that you feel are justified?" Three categories were presented to the respondents: 1. always, 2. Sometimes, and 3. never. In the analysis of those questions, categories "always," and "sometimes" were considered to be positive, and category "never" was regarded to be negative.
### TABLE XX

AN ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH "CRITICAL REMARKS" AND RELATED TO THE HOSTS' VISITING EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Question</th>
<th>Total in Category</th>
<th>Number in Each Category</th>
<th>Per Cent in Each Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66a</td>
<td>(75)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66b</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67a</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67b</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69a</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69b</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
though 52 (69.4 per cent) would agree with the foreign student visitor should
make remarks critical but true of the Catholic Church in its human aspects
(Question 66, Table XX). Thus there seems to be an earnest effort on the part
of the hosts to refrain from initiating critical remarks concerning the United
States, the foreign visitor's country, or the Catholic Church.

These responses indicate clearly that there is a conscious effort on the part
of the host to maintain a favourable tone during the visiting situation
(between host and guest) by the avoidance of "critical remarks" as far as
possible.

Comparison was made between questions 66a (Do you yourself make critical
remarks about the United States that you feel are justified?) and 61 (whether
or not the visit of the foreign student caused the host any particular concern),
in order to test the effects, if any, of "critical remarks" upon the host's
visiting experience. It was observed that among the CFM hosts who made
critical remarks about the United States that they felt were justified 30
(46.9 per cent) had some "particular concern" about the visit of the foreign
student. Of the hosts who did not make any "critical remarks" about the
United States that they felt were justified, three (25.0 per cent) had some
"particular concern."

Further attention was given to questions 69a (Do you yourself make
critical remarks about the Catholic Church in its human aspects that you feel
are justified?) and 61 (whether or not the visit of the foreign student caused
the host any particular concern), with regard to the effects, if any, of such
"critical remarks" upon the host's visiting experience. Among the CFM hosts
who made critical remarks about the Catholic Church that they felt were justified \( \frac{4}{7} \) \((66\text{ per cent})\) had some "particular concern." For hosts who did not make any such "critical remarks" \( \frac{26}{44.1} \) \( (44.1\text{ per cent}) \) had some "particular concern."

Thus it appears that for the respondents "critical remarks," if made by the host family do affect the ease of the hosts' experience adversely.

**Resume**

Results have tended to indicate that in this study: those who obtained information pertaining to the foreign student's country and the type of recreation the student prefers, do tend to have a more natural and easy experience with the foreign student. Hosts' knowledge of length of time the foreign student spent in the United States and the religion of the foreign student did not seem to "increase" the ease of the hosts during the visit of the foreign student. Questions about the foreign student's country, field of study, customs, or family posed by the host during the visit tend to make the visit a more natural experience for the hosts. Hosts in this study were reluctant to make critical remarks of the United States, the foreign student's country, or the Catholic Church, but were willing to support critical remarks by the foreign guest in the above areas during the visit. "Critical remarks," if made by the host during the visit seem to have an adverse effect on the hosts' experience.
CHAPTER IV

CFM HOSTS' ATTITUDE TOWARD FOREIGN STUDENT GUESTS

In the present chapter, the attitudes of CFM host families toward foreign student guests are reported. An effort was made to see whether or not the host families tend to stereotype all foreign student visitors as sharing a common non-American culture. Any relationship of stereotyping was explored. The extent of communication from the International Student Committee\(^1\) of the Christian Family Movement to the host couple and stereotyping on the part of the host was also considered. The hosts' motivations for inviting foreign students was evaluated. A further analysis was made as to whether or not the visit is more enjoyable to the host if he and the foreign student visitor share the following: (a) the same race, (b) the same educational level, (c) the same social class, (d) the same religion, (e) knowledge about the United States and (f) knowledge about his country. In addition, an examination was made to find out how CFM hosts rank the above factors ("A" through "F") in influencing their judgment that the foreign student guest is a "person like the host" (No. 97).

\(^1\)The International Student Committee of the Christian Family Movement was formed to provide home hospitality for foreign students in the Chicago area and elsewhere (Chapter I).
The 1,148 foreign students who were guests of CFM families in this study came from ten major geographical areas of the world (Table XXI, pages 58, 59 and 60). Far Eastern countries were cited the highest average number of times 25.2 (Table XXI, page 60. Countries in Africa were cited the lowest average number of times 2.2 (Table XXI, page 59). The difference of averages between Far Eastern and African countries (with regard to the number of times cited by CFM hosts) is a reflection of the vast number of foreign students in the United States from the Far East in 1960. The International Institute of Education reported that in 1960 there were 17,175 foreign students from Far Eastern Countries, while students from African countries numbered 1,959.2

STEREOTYPING ON THE PART OF CFM HOSTS

Stereotypes may be defined as "the preconceived notions of persons or groups which tend to define perceptions."3 Stereotypes are also described as the expectations which dominate perceptions.4 Thus a stereotype, as the term is ordinarily used by sociologists and social psychologists, is a rigidly established proposition attributing a characteristic to "all" members of a category.5


4Ibid., 296

Maurice N. Richter, Jr. asserts:

A stereotyped proposition, such as "Wallonians are stupid," involves, explicitly or implicitly, the concept of "all-ness" (All Wallonians are stupid) and the concept of "inclusion" (Wallonians are included among stupid people). The "all" in such a proposition, however, is neither strictly the "all" of generalization nor the "all" of stipulation, but rather an undifferentiated fusion of the two, while the inclusion correspondingly represents neither strictly an empirically determined phenomenon nor one inherent in the stipulated meanings of the categories. No selection is made between these alternatives precisely because the distinction between them is obscured.⁶

Stereotypes are very significant sociologically for at least two reasons. (A) Stereotypes represent "institutionalized misinformation, distorted information, and caricatured ideas of places, peoples, and things, " and (B) stereotypes have "profound influence on the formation of attitudes pertaining to these areas of experience."⁷

In the analysis of the relationship between formal education⁸ of the host families and their degrees of stereotyping, if any, questions 70 and 85 of the questionnaire were taken into consideration.

⁶Ibid., 569-560


⁸Formal education as defined in this study (Chapter II, page 35) is divided into three categories: Category A (both spouses completed 4 years of college or more); Category B (either spouse completed 4 years of college or more); Category C (neither spouse completed 4 years of college).
**TABLE XXI**

**NUMBER OF QUESTIONNAIRES INDICATING FOREIGN STUDENT VISITORS FROM MAJOR GEOGRAPHICAL AREAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical areas</th>
<th>Number of countries cited per questionnaire</th>
<th>Specific countries cited per geographical area</th>
<th>Number of Times Cited</th>
<th>Average No. of times cited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 1 13</td>
<td>Cuba, Haiti, Bahamas, Dominican Rep., Trinidad</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central America</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 2 2 13</td>
<td>Mexico, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Panama, Honduras</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 3 5 21</td>
<td>Argentina, Equador, Chile, Uruguay, Bolivia, Brasil, Columbia, Peru, British Guiana, Others</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical areas</td>
<td>Number of countries cited per questionnaire</td>
<td>Specific countries cited per geographical area</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Average of (mean) times no. of cited times cited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>1 0 1 3 9 9 2 8</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>England</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canary Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other (not specified)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 2 1 3</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tanganyika</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other (not specified)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XXI (continued)
NUMBER OF QUESTIONNAIRES INDICATING FOREIGN STUDENT VISITORS FROM MAJOR GEOGRAPHICAL AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical areas</th>
<th>Number of countries cited per questionnaire</th>
<th>Specific countries cited per geographical area</th>
<th>Number of times cited</th>
<th>Average (mean) times cited per questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Near and Middle East</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 1 4 2 0</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arabia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other (not specified)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far East</td>
<td>0 0 3 2 7 1 4 2 8</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Formosa</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 8 3 5</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ceylon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Goa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A comparison of question 70 (whether or not there is such a thing as national differences in "sense of humor"), and Category A (both husband, and wife had completed four years of college or more), showed that 20 (80 per cent) of the CFM hosts (in Category A) asserted that there were national differences in "sense of humor," while 5 (20 per cent) noted that there were no such differences.  

A similar analysis between question 70 and Category C (neither husband nor wife completed four years of college) indicated that 11 (44 per cent) of the CFM hosts in Category C would have no tendency of stereotyping foreign student guests, while 14 (56 per cent) would have such a tendency.

A further investigation was made between question 85 (whether or not foreign students have basically the same answers for questions asked during their visits to CFM homes) and Category A. Only 4 (22.2 per cent) of CFM hosts in (Category A) noted that foreign student guests have basically the same

---

9 Two categories were presented in question 70: "yes," and "no," followed by the words, "In what way?" The writer holds the position that on the basis of "culture lag," "cultural differences," and "social change," (Ralph Luto, The Cultural Background of Personality, pp. 19-26) there are national differences in "sense of humor."

10 Two categories were also presented in question 85: "yes," and "no" followed by the words: "Please explain." The writer holds the position that a student from a foreign country brings with him his own "idiosyncratic qualities and the distillation of his own life experiences" to the host country. (Cora Du Bois, Foreign Students And Higher Education in the United States, p. 38. Hence foreign students tend not to have the same answers for questions asked during their visits to CFM homes.
answers for questions asked during their visits, while 11 (77.8 per cent) of the
hosts indicated that students from foreign lands would have no such tendency.

A similar analysis between question 85 and Category C showed that 6 (35.3
per cent) of CFM hosts in Category C would show a tendency to stereotyping
foreign student guests, while 11 (64.7 per cent) of the hosts would have no
such tendency.

It appears, then, that the greater the degree of formal education on the
part of the host couple, the less the likelihood that the host family will hold
a stereotype about foreign student visitors.

It is interesting to note some of the comments with regard to "sense of
humor" submitted by CFM hosts. One of the respondents asserted that "what may
be humorous in one locality, may not be in another. This is true within the
United States." Another host couple stated that "we have found even in our own
nationality (Polish) that things said in Polish are funny, but not in English."A respondent who had answered that there was no national differences in "sense
of humor" remarked that "laughing together over a joke or a ridiculous
occurrence is one of the surest means of realizing our 'alikeness.' There
are individual difference, as there are with Americans."

A further effort was made to ascertain the relationship between the degree
of communication from the International Students Committee to the host family
and the degree of stereotyping. In this analysis questions 86 (whether or not
the International Students Committee of the CFM assisted the host in their role
of inviting students in their home) and 70 (whether or not there is such a thing
as national differences in "sense of humor") of the questionnaire were considered.\footnote{Question 88 reads, "Has the International Students Committee of the CFM helped you in your role of inviting students to your home?" Two categories were presented: "yes," and "no," followed by "remarks."}

Among the CFM families who had communicated with the International Students Committee concerning the hospitality of foreign students, 40 (78.2 per cent) showed no tendency of stereotyping foreign student guests, while 11 (21.8 per cent) of the hosts showed some tendency of stereotyping. Among the families who did not communicate with the International Students Committee concerning the hospitality of foreign students, 6 (16.3 per cent) showed a tendency of stereotyping foreign guests, while 7 (53.7 per cent) of the hosts did not.

In addition, comparison was made between questions 88 (whether or not the International Student Committee of the CFM assisted the host in their role of inviting students in their home) and 85 (whether or not foreign students have basically the same answers for questions asked during their visits to the host's home) of the questionnaire.

For those CFM families who had communicated with the International Students Committee concerning the hospitality of foreign students, 33 (82.5 per cent) showed no tendency of stereotyping foreign student guests, while 7 (17.5 per cent) showed some signs of stereotyping. Among the families who did not...
communicate with the International Students Committee concerning the hospitality of foreign students, 4 (50 per cent) showed no tendency of stereotyping foreign student guests, while a similar 4 (50 per cent) showed some signs of stereotyping all foreign visitors as sharing a common non-American culture.

Thus, the greater the degree of communication between the International Students Committee of the CFM to the host family, the less the likelihood that the host family would hold an unwarranted stereotype about foreign visitors.

It is the opinion of the writer that the "remarks" submitted by the respondents with regard to question 88 (whether or not the International Student Committee of the CFM assisted the host family in their role of inviting students from foreign lands) are useful for further research in the area of hospitality among foreign student guests and CFM hosts. Thus, some representative selected responses are submitted according to Categories: A, B. and C.

Category A (Both Spouses Completed College):
The committee has supplied the names of foreign students upon request.
I have met my visitors through this committee.
They made arrangements for French students.
Facilitated each visit from start to finish.
They have provided the contact with the students as well as some background information.

Category B (Either Spouse Completed College):
They have promoted various useful stimuli.
We might not have got around it if I.S.C. had not phoned us.
As a contact—when we want a student we know where to apply so to speak.

Primarily by referring us to Hospitality Center.

Category C (Neither Spouse Completed College):
Sometimes I hesitate to extend my own invitation for reason of proper timing, but when we have been asked by the committee to entertain a visitor, it is always easy to say 'yes.'

The organization does seem to be very useful.

Some Factors Influencing the Hosts' Attitude Toward Foreign Student Guests

Sixty (80 per cent) of CFM hosts asserted that they thought they had provided foreign student visitors with a new experience in opening their homes to them (question 89). Some representative selected remarks given by the host families in relation to the "new experience" are presented according to Categories A, B, and C.

Category A (Both Spouses Completed College):
Introduced some to outdoor charcoal cooking—American style.

Our children are well-behaved. This is contrary to most American children.

They (foreign student guests) have been exposed to a happy American family, and exposure to any happy family is a worthwhile experience.

Ours was the first American home they had been in. They saw our family life—the place of each person in the family—and how we operate.

Category B (Either Spouse Completed College):
They learn that all Americans are not millionnaires.
They learn that the wife works, and prepares the meals without servants.

They learn the dignity of work.

They learn first-hand about the American Catholic family life.

Corrected their evaluation of economic status in that they thought us to be upper class from our possessions, and surroundings.

Most interested in our family set-up, even plumbing facilities, books, progress of education of the children.

Category C (Neither spouse completed college):
Some are amazed that I do all my own housework and have no help in caring for the children. Our home appliances fascinate them.

In as much as we are both physically handicapped it shows we do attempt to live in a normal way.

The first chance to get off the campus and see how an American family lives and works.

Four questions (No. 90, No. 91, No. 92, and No. 93) were presented to the respondents in order to ascertain their motivations for entertaining foreign students. It was found that 51 (68.0 per cent) of the host families entertained visitors from foreign lands, primarily out of a sense of improving United States relations with other countries (Table XXIV). Motivations of secondary importance given by the host couples were: (1) it is good for the children, (2) it is worthwhile for the family, the neighbors, and the country.

The respondents in this study expressed no particular "dislikes" about having foreign students at their homes (question 83), but asserted that certain traits in the students had caused them some difficulty (question 84b). The


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Number of CFM Hosts per category</th>
<th>Per cent per category</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Do you entertain foreign student visitors out of a sense of social obligation to other CFM couples?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Do you entertain foreign student visitors out of a sense of obligation to improving U. S. relations with other countries?</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Do you entertain foreign student visitors for any other motives?</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
greatest obstacle to be surmounted by the host couple was that of understanding the foreign guest. Nine (12 per cent) of the respondents stated that language problems of the foreign visitor caused the greatest difficulty of the visiting experience. Other traits in the foreign guest listed as having caused some difficulties included shyness, timidity, inability to be natural, not dependable, very critical about the U. S. government, and inability to accept certain customs.

To further test CFM hosts' attitude toward foreign student guests, two questions, 81a (whether or not the host couple liked the foreign guests as persons) and 97 (requesting the respondents to rank certain items in influencing their judgment that the student is "a person like the host"), were presented. It is interesting to note that in view of certain traits which had caused the families some difficulty, all 75 of the hosts in answer to question 81a asserted that they have all had foreign students visit them that they really liked as persons.

Forty-eight (64 per cent) of the respondents ranked question 97. An overall ranking (Table XXV) indicated that item (c), "the same educational level,"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Over-all ranking</th>
<th>Category A (Both spouses comp. 4 yrs. of college or more) ** Scores</th>
<th>Category B (Either spouse comp. 4 yrs of college or more) ** Scores</th>
<th>Category C (Neither spouse comp. 4 years of college) ** Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Same ed. level</td>
<td>294 Same Ed. level</td>
<td>104 Same ed. level</td>
<td>74 Same religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Same religion</td>
<td>218 Same religion</td>
<td>76 Knowledge of his country</td>
<td>62 Same ed. level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Ability to speak English</td>
<td>220 Ability to speak English</td>
<td>72 Ability to speak English</td>
<td>62 Ability to speak English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Knowledge of his country</td>
<td>213 Knowledge of his country</td>
<td>70 Same social class</td>
<td>53 Knowledge of his country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Same social class</td>
<td>186 Same social class</td>
<td>63 Knowledge of U.S.</td>
<td>44 Same Social class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Knowledge of U.S.</td>
<td>154 Knowledge of U.S.</td>
<td>56 Same religion</td>
<td>43 Knowledge of U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Same race</td>
<td>84 Same race</td>
<td>36 Same race</td>
<td>26 Same race</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number 1 represents "most important," number 7 "least important."

**Scores were computed on the basis of seven points, ranging in a descending order from the "most important," to the "least important."
was the most important factor influencing the host's judgment that the foreign student is "a person like the host." The item of least importance was (a), "the same race." In addition, separate rankings (Table XXV) were made with regard to Categories A, B, and C. It is observed that CFM hosts who belonged to Category A ranked the items in an identical manner with the "over-all ranking" CFM host couples in Category C considered item (d), "the same religion," to be the most important factor in influencing their judgment that the foreign student is a "person like the host," (Table XXV).

Thus, with regard to this study, it may reasonably be asserted that "the same educational level" is the most important factor influencing the hosts' judgment that the foreign student guest is "a person like the host." The factor considered to be of least importance is "same race" in all categories.

Sixty-two (82.7 per cent) of the hosts in the study expressed the opinion that both the foreign guest and the host families benefit from the visit of a student from a foreign country. The respondents agreed that there was a mutual exchange of ideas during the visiting situation.\footnote{Division of categories is given in Chapter I, Table XII.}

\footnote{Paragraph refers to question 94 of questionnaire (Appendix IV). Question 94 reads: 'In your opinion who benefits most from entertaining foreign student visitors?' Three categories were submitted: (1) foreign student visitor, (2) you, and (3) both.}
It is worth noting (in answer to question 95)\textsuperscript{15} that 40 (53.3 per cent) of the host families asserted that the visit of a student from a foreign country could be made more enjoyable if both host and guest shared the same educational level. A separate examination was made within the three categories A, B, and C. It was observed that families who belonged to Category C would consider the visit more enjoyable if both host and guest shared the same religion (Table XXVI page 72). There seems to be an identical pattern of relationships between Category A (both husband and wife completed four years of college or more) and Category C (neither husband nor wife had completed four years of college) with regard to question 95 (whether or not the visit is more enjoyable, should host and guest share common criteria) and question 97. Thus the most important factor affecting the attitude of CFM hosts in Category A toward the foreign student guest would be "the same educational level." The least important factor affecting the attitude of CFM hosts in Category A toward the foreign guest would be "the same race." The most important factor affecting the attitude of CFM hosts in Category C toward the student from a foreign country would be "the same religion." The least important factor affecting the attitude of the host families in Category C toward the foreign student would be "the same race."

\textsuperscript{15}Question 95 reads: "When you entertain a foreign visitor, do you think the visit is more enjoyable to you if you and he share the following?" Items were (a) same race, (b) the same educational level, (c) the same social class, (d) the same religion, (e) knowledge about the United States, (f) knowledge about his country.
TABLE XXIV

ATTITUDE OF CFM HOSTS IN THE STUDY WITH REGARD TO CHARACTERISTICS SHARED BY BOTH HOST AND GUEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Over-All ranking ** Scores</th>
<th>Category A (Both spouses comp. 4 yrs of college or more ** Scores)</th>
<th>Category B (Either spouse comp. 4 yrs of college or more ** Scores)</th>
<th>Category C (Neither spouse comp. 4 yrs of college ** Scores)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Same social class</td>
<td>40 Same social class</td>
<td>17 Same social class</td>
<td>13 Same religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Knowledge of his country</td>
<td>25 Same religion</td>
<td>8 Knowledge of his country</td>
<td>12 Same social class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Same religion</td>
<td>23 Same ed. level</td>
<td>6 Knowledge of U.S.</td>
<td>8 Knowledge of his country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Knowledge of U.S</td>
<td>19 Knowledge of his Country</td>
<td>3 Same ed. level</td>
<td>4 Knowledge of U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Same ed. level</td>
<td>14 Knowledge of U.S.</td>
<td>3 Same religion</td>
<td>3 Same ed. level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Same race</td>
<td>7 Same race</td>
<td>3 Same race</td>
<td>1 Same race</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number 1 represents the "most important," number 6 the "least important."

*Scores were computed on the basis of one point per item mentioned in the study.

N.B. "Ability to speak English" was inadvertently omitted from the questionnaire (Appendix IV).
Results have tended to indicate in this research that the greater the degree of formal education on the part of the host couple, the less the likelihood that the host family will hold an unwarranted stereotype about foreign student visitors; the greater the communication from the International Student Committee of the CFM to the host family, the less the likelihood that the host family will hold an unwarranted stereotype about foreign visitors.

The host families entertained visitors from foreign lands primarily out of a sense of improving United States relations with other countries. Language problems of the foreign guests seem to be the greatest obstacle in the visiting situation. "Same educational level" and "same religion" are ranked as most essential ingredients influencing the attitude of the host couples toward the foreign guest and the visiting situation. Host couples who completed four years of college or more would consider "the same educational level" to be most important, while host couples who did not receive four years of college would regard "the same religion" to be most important. Different race did not seem to have an adverse effect either on the hosts' attitude toward the foreign guest or on the visiting situation.
CHAPTER V
HOSTS' EVALUATION OF THE CFM PROGRAM OF HOSPITALITY AND SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

In this portion of the study, an attempt was made to examine some selected aspects of the host couples' evaluation of the CFM program of hospitality to foreign students. An additional purpose was to elicit the hosts' specific recommendations for improving this program.

Before the hosts' evaluation and specific recommendations are presented, a brief observation will be made about the extent of communication between host and guest after the visit of the foreign student. Thus, in this subsection of the study, questions 76, 77, 79, and 80 of the questionnaire will be considered.

During the visit of the foreign student, 36 (48.0 per cent) of the hosts (Table XXVII) "always" verbally invited the student to return. However, the students do not "always" return for second visits without specific invitations, and only 17 (22.0 per cent) do return when invited (Table XXVII). A contributing factor affecting the foreign student's "second return" to the host couples might be that the student was interested in "acquiring what he considered to be a cross-sectional acquaintance with all levels of society."2 Richard D. Lambert

1Appendix IV

2Richard D. Lambert and Marvin Bressler, Indian Students on an American Campus (Minneapolis, 1956), p 52.
and Marvin Bressler have noted that the student from India seemed particularly interested in meeting with various groups of Americans. One of the items in their questionnaire on American contacts reads, "What groups of Americans do you feel you have not come into contact with?" The answers were: "the working class," "skilled and unskilled workers," "farmers," "slum people," "Negroes," and the "average American."  

The responses in the present study (Table XXVII) indicated that 6 (8.0 per cent) of the foreign guests had "never" sent the host families a "thank you note." It is the opinion of the writer that the failure on the part of the foreign visitor to send a written "thank you" to the host couples might have been due partially to the transference of a cultural trait from the student's home country to the United States. On the other hand, the foreign student's failure in this regard, might be attributed to his "false sense of superiority" an attempt to identify himself, and to reaffirm his personal worth. John W. Gardner in his study of "Foreign Students in America," asserted:

The foreign student always experiences a diminished sense of personal worth...he leaves behind his whole personal and social environment—his family, country, and nation, the way of life, and the sense of membership—the terms in which he is accustomed to identify himself and appraise his worth. He is introduced into a strange context in which his own status is ambiguous and difficult

---

3 Ibid. p. 53
4 Ibid. 
### TABLE XXV

**EXTENT OF COMMUNICATION BETWEEN CFM HOST AND FOREIGN STUDENT GUEST AFTER THE VISIT HAS BEEN COMPLETED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Total No. of CFM hosts per category</th>
<th>Per cent per category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Do you invite the foreign student back?</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Do you send holiday greeting cards to the foreign students who have visited you?</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>After the visit do you hear from the foreign student?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) A &quot;thank you&quot; note</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Telephone call</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Holiday greeting cards</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Do your foreign student visitors return for second visits without invitations?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Do your foreign student visitors return for second visits when invited?</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A combination of categories "most do," and "some do."**
To establish. The position which he had at home means nothing here. In a sociological sense, he comes naked to our eyes. 5

HOSTS' EVALUATION OF THE CFM PROGRAM OF HOSPITALITY

Fifty-four (72.0 per cent) of CFM respondent hosts in this study asserted that they had joined the Chicago Christian Family Movement primarily for the purpose of improving their spiritual and social welfare. Of these 54, (28.0 per cent) belonged to Category A; 17 (22.7 per cent) to Category B; and 14 (21.3 per cent) to Category C. 6

Interestingly, thirty-seven (49.3 per cent) of the respondents stated that they did not consider the receiving of foreign students into American Catholic homes as visitors to be one of the most important functions of the Christian Family Movement (question No. 18.). Some representative selected reasons submitted by the respondents (who did not consider an important function the receiving of foreign students into American Catholic homes) are given according to Categories A, B, and C.

Category A (Both spouses completed college):
We consider it important, but no more important, than others such as participation in the liturgy.

Not one of the most important functions. We consider the most important function the Christianisation of our own environment.

It is a secondary function—but it holds tremendous importance at this time because of world affairs.

Main objective of CFM is to develop "the family religiously."

5 Gardner, p. 642
6 Division of Categories A, B & C is given in Chapter II, Table XIII.
Category B (Either spouse completed college):
While it is important, it is secondary to:
(1) increase of spirituality of our own family;
(2) Christianization of our parish and community.

It is an important action but not necessarily a function of CFM. Purpose of CFM is not to receive foreign visitors in the home.

We cannot resolve this particular function as being one of the most important since we have not resolved what functions are important. We should consider any function performed which helps us to lead a good Christian life equally important.

Category C (Neither spouse completed college):
One of the functions, but not one of the most important—other functions in neighborhood, parish are more important.

There are many functions equally as important.

The advantages are mutual and should be practiced by all Catholic families—not limited to CFM.

Some representative selected reasons submitted by respondents (who did consider the receiving of foreign students into American Catholic homes as visitors to be one of the most important functions of the Christian Family Movement) are also given below according to Categories A, B, and C.

Category A (Both spouses completed college):
People to people contact is far more effective in solving international problems than high level diplomatic conferences because only when we become involved with others do we really care about them.

I believe this gives them (foreign students) an opportunity to see family life under natural conditions and helps them to understand our way of life.

It is a specific concrete way to carry out the basic concepts learned in CFM about charity and responsibility for all people—foreign students are certainly in need of attention and love.
Category B (Either spouse completed college):
It is grass roots international relations; it
gives the foreign student an opportunity to see
American Catholic families in action.

True apostolic work--gives better view to foreign
students of the United States--follows precepts of
Christian hospitality.

If democracy is to defeat world communism, we feel
every American must do his utmost to have foreigners
(particularly educated, articulate ones) in his
home to learn first hand how democracy works.

Category C (Neither spouse completed college):
Creates better understanding among peoples of
various nations.

It offers a chance to meet future world leaders
and show them Christian love.

To give them an insight of the Catholic American
home and family life.

In answer to the question (#82), "What do you particularly like about having
foreign students at your home?" 49 (65.3 per cent) of the respondents indicated
that the visit of the student from a foreign land presented the opportunity for
the exchange of ideas, customs; an educational experience for the children; and
the fact that perhaps the student might be an "ambassador" for the United
States. Some representative selected remarks are submitted below according to
Categories A, B, and C.

Category A (Both spouses completed college):
Broadens appreciation of various customs in world--
gives greater appreciation of similarities of all
peoples--helps children avoid prejudice.

We prepare as a family to entertain them. We learn
much from them, and enjoy their company. They are
always most appreciative. Visit helps the children
educationally.
We find out how the students live at home. We find out what they think or say about the U. S. or the U. S. S. R.

They are always wonderful guests and one gains so much from contact with them--but also one feels that one can give these students the real "feel" of American life.

It is interesting to learn the customs and ways of people in other countries. It broadens one's knowledge of the world--points out the essential "sameness" of human beings.

Finding out more about their country. Giving them a better understanding of American family life.

We both enjoy other people anyway, and this is a chance to promote good foreign relations in our own small way. It also promotes tolerance and is a form of education for the children.

Category B (Either spouse completed college): To learn first hand the culture and problems of the foreign student.

To obtain different viewpoint of what others think of America and Americans.

We learned more of customs, geography, interests, in one week of their countries than we had in years of reading. We taught them much of our country and people.

The opportunity to demonstrate the Catholic American family life. A broadening experience for their children.

We like meeting them and learning from them.

You learn about their country, habits, religion and this gives you a better understanding of their race.

Category C (Neither spouse completed college): Very stimulating, enjoyable, and educational.

We feel this program is a contribution to world peace.

Broadens our knowledge and helps us to understand better world problems.

It is interesting to hear of their ways of life in another country. There is self satisfaction.

They are very interesting and make us and our children more aware that all human beings are related.

Hosts' Recommendations for Improving CFM Program of Hospitality

It is interesting to note that CFM families (43 or 58.7 per cent) in this study invited foreign students into their homes by utilizing two or more methods, e.g., "by writing" and "by calling" (Table XXVIII).

Seventy-two (96.0 per cent) of the hosts indicated that they had invited foreign students for a meal (No. 27). In answer to question (No. 36) "Do you regard the food you will serve as (a) the most important problem (b) a moderately important problem (c) the least important problem?" 37 (49.3 per cent) of the hosts indicated "(a)"; 33 (44.0 per cent) "(b)"; and 5 (6.7 per cent) "(c)”. Despite widely different dietary habits around the world, only 15 (20 per cent) of the hosts would turn to other CFM families would recommend inviting foreign students for a meal as a means of extending hospitality, even though the meal itself is viewed the least important problem, if any, in the visiting experience. Reflecting American culture, 65 (86.7 per cent) CFM families asserted that it would not be impolite for the foreign visitor to take food or drink without a specific invitation to do so (No. 71).
### TABLE XXVI

**FORM OF INVITATION EXTENDED TO FOREIGN STUDENTS BY CFM FAMILIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Invitation</th>
<th>Number of CFM families</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By writing to them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By calling</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through an intermediary source (Example: Foreign Student Office)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both by writing and by calling</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By calling and through an intermediary source</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By writing and through an intermediary source</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By writing, calling, and by means of an intermediary source</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two questions (No. 86 and No. 87) of the questionnaire were posed with the purpose of obtaining specific recommendations from CFM hosts in regard to hospitality to foreign students. Some representative selected recommendations are:

7 Question 86 reads, "What suggestions would you make to facilitate better relations between foreign students and CFM hosts in the homes?" Question 87 reads, "What recommendations would you make to the International Students Committee to improve the official activity of inviting foreign students into CFM homes?"
(No. 86) are listed again according to Categories A, B, and C.

Category A (Both spouses completed college)
A pamphlet explaining American customs to foreign students—such as use of telephone, thank you's, general information to help the student have enough self-confidence to feel more relaxed in the beginning.

Invitation should be extended to students for a gathering of friends, not necessary for dinner.

Attempt to learn more about the student's country and customs before hand and something more about the student personality, if possible.

Make arrangements just as you would for ordinary guests.

R. S. V. P. is mandatory—then only last minute illness should cause cancellation. Hostess must be notified. A thank you to people having foreign guests for the first few times would be helpful.

The family should assimilate them rather than have them as an object of curiosity. Try to be as well informed as possible about their background.

Show a very definite interest in the country and people represented. Have fun with the visitor. Play games, sing songs, children are most effective at this. Visit the parish church. Introduce them to the pastor and mums. This gives them an idea that they are important in our eyes, which they are.

Have CFM potential host and hostesses meet the foreigners at a gathering first and then let friendship develop from there.

Category B (Either spouse completed college): I think the student should be better prepared— informed of the purposes of these programs.
Match families and students according to mutual interests and backgrounds where possible. Get background information on students in organised form where possible.

More research in advance.

Be yourself. Do not try to act heroic. Do not stress your material advantages.

Invite other foreign students for short periods, while your own guests are visiting.

Invite them in pairs.

CFM hosts should have more students visit their homes.

Encourage students to speak of himself and family living at his home. Have children show guests around—toys, rooms, to "break the ice."

Category C (Neither spouse completed college): To give some information on customs of country, from which student comes. Also information about individual student would be helpful.

Send foreign students to homes where their language is spoken if possible.

We should treat foreign students as we would wish to be treated in a foreign country.

Include the children—have a relaxed attitude—not a "company" attitude.

Some representative selected recommendations in regard to improving the official activity of inviting foreign students into CFM homes (No. 87) are submitted according to Categories A, B, and C.

Category A (Both spouses completed college): Get them better acquainted with each other. Perhaps through a "get-together" the foreign students and CFMers would meet and they could carry on from that on a person-to-person basis.
Expand the program, have a full time committee to run such a program.

More stories in newspapers and addresses to contact if interested in entertaining foreign students.

Disseminate more information about availability of foreign students.

More action on individual or family basis instead of large, mass production affairs in which people do not really get acquainted. If American families' first experience is pleasant, they will go on inviting more students. The family should invite the student, first for a meal.

Some means should be devised whereby the family can get to know the foreign student before extending an invitation.

Ask more CFM people to help out. They don't seem to volunteer but are glad to cooperate when asked.

To get CFM to recognize the need for this activity and assume the responsibility of informing and inspiring its action groups in this activity. To inform the student that acceptance of an invitation includes an obligation to appear.

More publicity to reach other interested host couples. Also a better follow-up in getting foreign students assigned to new homes.

Category B. (Either spouse completed college): Get more CFM couples interested. Get more priests interested in interesting CFM couples.

Make more demands on CFM because we think they would rise to the occasion.

Specialized groups in the parish should assist in this activity. Encourage priests to back this project, especially from the pulpit.
Better organization. Foreign student chairman (of the I.S.C.) should accept the job, and not be put into it.

Contacting of Church societies for group meetings of students and couples of that Church for easier introduction of students to couples or vice-versa.

Simply continue to impress all CFMers with the desirability of entertaining foreign students through Act, the Newsletter, and by word of mouth through federation, section, and down to group meetings.

Category C (Neither spouse completed college):
Arrange group meetings between families and students.

Suggest the foreign students observe good manners—when they are unable to keep a date—phone the hostess. Some have been remiss here.

Have one central clearing house for CFM families to contact.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary and Conclusions

In this thesis the writer has attempted to examine some aspects of contact between foreign students and Christian Family Movement hosts in the Chicago area. An investigation has been made to find how CFM families respond to the experience of having students from foreign lands in their homes and some attitudes of CFM hosts toward foreign student guests. An additional effort has been made to have the host couples evaluate the CFM program of hospitality to foreign students, and to make specific recommendations for improving this program.

The writer gathered the research data mainly through the use of the questionnaire technique. A group of 1140 CFM couples of the Chicago area affiliated with the International Students Committee of the CFM constituted the universe of study. The 1140 CFM members were all considered "active" by the International Student Committee of the Chicago Christian Family Movement. The participants were supplied questionnaires by mail and requested to answer all questions, returning them to the author. A stamped, self-addressed return envelope and a covering letter\(^1\) accompanied each questionnaire mailed. The

\(^1\)Appendix IV
author received the addresses from the president of the International Students Committee of the Chicago Christian Family Movement.

In consultation with CFM couples (who did not, of course, receive the questionnaire), the questionnaire (Appendix IV) was in part formulated. Secondary sources consisted mainly of library material, books, periodicals, articles, and files of the Christian Family Movement. The questionnaire was pretested by mailing it to CFM couples in Detroit, Michigan.

Findings in this study indicate:

1. CFM hosts who obtained information pertaining to the foreign student's country tend to have a more natural and easy experience with the foreign student.

2. Length of time the foreign student spent in the United States, and the religion of the foreign student, did not seem to "increase" the degree of ease of the visiting experience.

3. Questions posed by the host during the visit pertaining to the foreign student's country, field of study, customs, family appear to make the visiting experience of the host more natural and easy.

4. Hosts in this study were reluctant to make critical remarks of the United States, the foreign student's country, or the Catholic Church, but were willing to support critical remarks by the foreign student guest in the above areas during the visit.

5. Critical remarks, if made by the host during the visit, tend to be associated with host's visiting experience.
6. The greater degree of formal education on the part of the host couples, the less the likelihood that the host family will hold an unwarranted stereotype about foreign student guests.

7. The greater the communication from the International Students Committee of the CFM to the host family, the less the likelihood that the host family will hold an unwarranted stereotype about foreign student visitors.

8. The host families entertained visitors from foreign lands, primarily out of a sense of improving United States relations with other countries.

9. Language problems seem to be the greatest obstacle in the visits of foreign students.

10. "Same educational level" and "same religion" are judged to be the most important factors influencing the attitude of the host couples toward the foreign guest and the visiting situation. Host couples who received four years of college or more would consider "same educational level" to be most important, while host couples who did not receive four years of college would regard "same religion" to be most essential. The "same race" was identified or least important among seven factors on the host's attitude toward the foreign guest or on the visiting situation.

Some Suggested Recommendations

As a kind of epilogue to this study the writer wishes to present some
recommendations which might improve the visits of foreign students for the host couples, "increase" the rapport between host and guest, and perhaps augment the frequency of visits on the part of students from foreign lands. These recommendations have been recently prepared by Richard T. Morris, in his work *The Two-Way Mirror: National Status in Foreign Student's Adjustment.*

Morris asserted:

If the student is particularly resentful of American ways or is in the habit of making biting comments about the personality characteristics of most Americans, it may be that:

a. He feels most Americans do not think well of his country. Perhaps they have never heard of it. They may have, in his opinion, unpleasant stereotypes of it. Americans may feel that the United States is superior to his country, and let him know it.

b. He may feel that his own country is superior to the United States. On various characteristics he rates his own country higher than other countries, particularly the United States. He may be comparing what he thinks of his country with how he thinks most Americans would rate it.

c. He is not aware of the actual facts about his country compared with others, especially the United States.

d. The student is highly involved with his country. How closely is his career tied into the national fortune? How much is he personally identified with the public successes or failure of his countrymen? How closely does he keep in touch with what is going on at home?

e. He has travelled in other countries before his arrival here and is now comparing America with these other countries.

---

f. He has difficulty in passing as an American. Problems may arise from his identification as a foreigner.

g. He feels that America is very different from his country in importance.

If the student is not particularly unfavorable toward Americans or America, but seems deeply dissatisfied with his stay here, it may be that:

a. His chief source of dissatisfaction is lack of contact with Americans— inability to make friends with Americans or to see a variety of American life.

b. He is also involved with his country that he cuts down the amount of contact he has with Americans, e.g. over-concentration on studies and exclusive contacts with fellow nationals in trying to keep up communication with the home country.

c. His race or foreign appearance have limited his contacts with Americans or special areas of American life.

d. His purpose in coming to America is so narrowly academic or vocational that he is dissatisfied with his social life and leisure-time activities.

e. His lack of foreign travel before his arrival here has limited his ability to make adjustments to new situations.

f. Language difficulty has been a barrier in meeting and talking with Americans.

g. He has had academic difficulty which has limited his opportunities for American contacts. Language difficulty may be responsible for his academic difficulty. His academic dissatisfaction is contributing to his general dissatisfaction.

h. His foreign appearance or accent have resulted in experiences which have frustrated him.
1. The differences he sees between his country and America are so great that he is unable to enjoy life here.

If the student is dissatisfied with his academic requirements or facilities, but otherwise seem happy enough, it may be that:

a. He has lost academic status. His colleagues think he is less intelligent than did his classmates or teachers at home. He lost credits or standing in his transfer here.

b. The academic routine is so different from that at home that he cannot accept the American way of doing things.

With regard to the host's responsibility in extending invitations to foreign students, Monsignor William McManus, Chicago Archdiocesan superintendent of schools, has commented:

Our attitude should be sincere in offering genuine hospitality. The foreign student is our guest and his coming here is providential. Hospitality must not be just another project. It must be something we want to do because we love people and want to learn about them and their countries. That is why we extend our hospitality to people regardless of their race, color or religion.3

With regard to the importance of the apostolate on behalf of international students, especially those from Africa and Asia, the late Pope Pius XII asserted:

Deprived of the natural social environment of their native countries, they often remain for various reasons without sufficient contact with centers of Catholic life in the nations that have given them hospitality. For this reason their Christian life can find itself endangered, because

---

the true values of the new civilization which they discover still remain hidden to them while material influences deeply trouble them and atheistic associations strive to win their confidence. The present and the future seriousness of this state of affairs could not escape you.  

This study is a practical and exploratory inquiry of important but infrequent and ephemeral contacts between representatives of two different groups students on the one hand as guests and hosts couples made up of CFM.  

Though limited, it represents a somewhat crucial encounter because the student is becoming involved with the most typical aspect of American society, namely, family life. However brief the visit may be, this particular inquiry was directed at those who make possible the cultural contact—the host couples.  

In part because of the recency of the program of the CFM and the nature of the visiting experience (usually for a meal) and because the focus is on the specific responses of hosts to this situation, the sociological literature that bears upon cultural contact, cultural conflict, role formation, is tangential to this study.  

What emerges is the reactions that the hosts derive based upon their sharing some cultural contact, similarities, however limited with their guests, and to a degree the hypotheses established bear upon these circumstances. Additionally, from an operational point of view, the CFM hosts' program should be able to derive some needs to be met for both hosts and guests from this study.  

---
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Before starting, see if there are other CFM groups in your diocese. They may help you start. The office of the Christian Family Movement Coordinating Committee has a list of the groups known to exist. Write CFM

Room 2100, 100 West Monroe St.
Chicago 3, Illinois
Telephone: RAnolph 6-2632


September 10, 1953.
4th Reprinting March, 1958
THE CHRISTIAN FAMILY MOVEMENT

WHAT IT IS...

What is CFM?
Married couples working together to promote happier family life. Each group is made up of five or six couples from the parish. These couples meet every two weeks in each other's homes. The groups are small so that everyone has a chance to speak. They talk about things they have in common that affect their family life and others.

Is it practical?
At the meetings the couples consider such topics affecting family life as: neighborhood, family recreation, finances, participation in the life of the parish and the community, and chores.

How extensive is CFM?
In the few years since it began CFM has grown until it includes more than 30,000 couples in 150 dioceses in Argentina, Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Dominican Republic, England, India, Japan, Malawi, Mexico, New Zealand, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Puerto Rico, Scotland, Spain, Tanzania, Trinidad, Uganda, United States, Uruguay and Venezuela.

Why it succeeds...
There are many advantages in acting together. Couples learn from, encourage, inspire, and help one another.

IT WORKS...

It is a sensible approach.
As a famous writer remarked—All happy families resemble one another, every unhappy family is unhappy in its own way. If a couple can meet regularly with other couples, they may find the common denominator in attitudes and daily conduct which makes for family happiness.

What do you talk about at the meetings?
A few lines from the Gospel are considered to give a true-to-earth understanding of what the Lord's teaching means in our every-day living. The next fifteen minutes are spent discussing the Mass, the Sacraments, and other aspects of being a Christian.

Then for about forty-five minutes actual local situations affecting the family are discussed. Groups decide whether there is need for change in family life will or own. With mutual encouragement, the couples figure out what is to be done. The group agrees to convert talk into action. Practical actions are characteristic of CFM.

The value of the individual is recognised...
There are no specialists—no lecturers. CFM believes that a person is too important to be used merely as a passive listener to someone else's ideas and plans. At a CFM meeting each member is treated as if he were the expert— he is listened to. For that reason the group discussion method is used and the group gets the benefit of the experience and thinking of all members.

WHAT IT DOES...

Gives a couple an interest they share together.

Acknowledges the father's importance and responsibility as head of the family.

Creates new and close friendships for you and your children.

Gives you an opportunity to become better acquainted with the priests of the parish and to take part in the life of the parish.

Helps you to create a friendly neighborhood where children and adults alike feel they have a right to share in things.

Awakens a realization of the relationship between your religion and everyday life.

Makes a couple aware that the privileges of growing older in the work of Christ are theirs—what Christ wants them to carry on.

Rt. Rev. Hubert A. Freyer recently suggested that the best results in adult education are obtained through exercises in reflection and expression carried out by small groups dealing with concrete topics.
APPENDIX II

THE INTERNATIONAL STUDENT COMMITTEE OF CHRISTIAN FAMILY MOVEMENT

The International Student Committee of the Christian Family Movement was formed to provide home hospitality for the foreign students in the Chicago area (there are over 2,000 such students in this area), and is devoted to the job of giving the students a better, first-hand look at the American way of life, and particularly the Catholic way of life. It provides an opportunity for Catholic families to make a positive contribution to the future peace of the world. By showing students from foreign lands how Christian life expresses itself in the American home, we can do much to

2. Give visitors to America a more real understanding of our way of life.
3. Possibly gain new converts to the Faith.
4. Help to preserve the Faith in those already members of the Church.

To gain a representative idea of American life, students must get to know people in America from all walks of life and from all so-called "economic levels".

To meet foreign students and show them Christian family life at work is an action which has been taken on by many CFM groups around the nation. These groups are attempting to cement world unity directly through their contacts with foreign students.

The Chicago CFM Federation is one of the many groups around the country which has taken action to help solve the problem of the thousands of foreign students in the United States—both Catholic and non-Catholic—who in their entire time in this country have never been invited to a Catholic home and who will go back to their native lands completely unaware of Catholic family life. Another problem is the great number of Catholic foreign students whose faith may be endangered far away from their home and country. Few Catholic families have opened their homes to them. Inviting foreign students into their home is a real work of charity. It is a practical way to show your concern for the Mystical Body all over the world.

Here in Chicago, a committee of couples act as a contact for those couples who wish to invite foreign students to their homes. We hope to make the foreign student program national in scope so that San Francisco students, for example, can be told where they can stop when in Portland, Chicago, Detroit, New York, Los Angeles, Denver, Buffalo, Boston or other cities where CFM exists.

The usual routine is to invite the students to spend a day or so with a family and to participate in the normal activities of an American Family.
No elaborate entertainment is ever expected, but students are given the opportunity to become for the time, a member of an average American family. They participate in the usual meals, conversations, prayers and recreation. The CPM members feel that in this way these foreign students learn a great deal more of the American life and customs than they would be the common dormitory life or visiting the industrial and cultural activities of an American city.

Because loneliness, if it does appear, usually takes over during the holidays, the invitations are more frequently made at these times, such as during Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays, also during Easter vacation. It is also during these seasons that students have more leisure to get away from their studies. However, there are ample occasions to see and visit with these families at other times if the student has the opportunity to break away from his study routines.

Students, find after the first shyness has worn away that they will have much in common with these American families, and the family group differs little in feelings and attitudes from their own homes so many miles away. The differences, moreover, in habits and customs make interesting conversation which all can enjoy.

Many students and the families they visit become attached to each other and he finds his new home an ever welcome refuge when he can get away from his studies. Even when his student days are over, he continues his contact with his new family in America.

The American families consider it a great privilege to entertain these students and are eager to learn the customs of the students' families and home-lands. They often realise that in the final tabulation their debt to their foreign friend is by far greater than the little they have offered.

These students are here to be educated and trained in our colleges, universities and hospitals. But the education they take home with them will consist not only of what they have absorbed from texts, lectures and laboratory experiments. Far more important are the impressions they receive of the American way of life, the Catholic way of life in the United States. Unfortun-ately, this extra-curricular experience, for the most part, has not given them a wholesome impression of our country, and particularly of our Catholic faith. It is an unfortunate fact that many Catholic students lose their faith during their stay here.

The good we can do for these people and for ourselves is great. They are the cream of their nations' crop--young, vigorous, alert, and intelligent. One day they will assume positions of great responsibility and influence in foreign lands. The type of leadership they offer and the principles they espouse will be determined to a large extent by their experiences in America. Here, then is an opportunity for all Catholic families to do their share in contributing to the future peace of the world.
We have an opportunity to gain something from these students. We have found their cultures to be a source of inspiration to the development of our family life, since family life is much closer in their countries. But because they are in a strange country, speaking a strange language, because they are shy and busy with school work and outside jobs necessary to supplement income, because they lack private transportation and are not familiar with public transportation systems, it is not an easy job to set up an International Student Program.

The start has been simple. We and many other couples have invited a foreign student over for Sunday dinner, or over a weekend and let him or her share in the every-day family life we enjoy. We all had our fears and misgivings. How do we go about entertaining them? From our short experience, let us reassure you that any such misgivings are groundless.

These students are no different essentially than our own American boys and girls. They love children (and the children take to them instantly). They love the atmosphere of home life and they do not expect to be treated as visiting royalty. They are eager to help with household chores. They freely talk about their families, their homeland and their customs. And when it comes to bunking them, they do not expect anything elaborate in the way of accommodations. Honestly, you will find that you and your children will be enjoying them so much, that you'll wonder whether it isn't they who are doing more for you than you for them. In our case our children just can't wait for the students to pay us visits. Although this has been only a start, much remains to be done, and we can certainly use the help of any interested in the program.

Following are the steps the Chicago Federation has taken to set up an International Student Committee for the Christian Family Movement.

1. Appoint a chairman couple for the entire city.

2. Appoint 8 or 10 couples to serve on the Committee as contacts between the CFM couples and the students. Choose the couples geographically so as to cover the entire city area.

3. Assign each committee couple to 2 (or more if necessary) CFM Regions to contact personally by their presence at a Regional meeting to give a little 3 to 5 minute "Sales Pitch."

4. Assign each committee couple to a neighboring college or university and have them contact the foreign student advisor for a current list of the foreign students enrolled at the school.

5. Suggest that each committee couple entertain a foreign student as soon as possible so they can speak of a "first-hand" experience when they are selling other couples on the idea of entertaining the students.
6. Selling the idea of entertaining foreign students can be accomplished best in person.

7. Contact the International Institute of Education, Foreign Consulates and Advisors, Hospitality Centers, local Y. M. C. A. or any groups that deal with foreign students to get additional names of students.

8. Put a questionnaire in the CFM Newsletter to get additional names of interested couples.

It is a fact that the Communists attempt to instill their beliefs in these students of the higher intellectual groups from foreign lands. As a result of the above listed efforts it is our opinion that we can do much to counteract these adverse influences by showing people from other lands the Christian way of life.

This study is a practical and exploratory inquiry of important but infrequent and ephemeral contacts between representatives of two different groups, students on the one hand as guests and host couples made up of CFM.

Though limited, it represents a somewhat crucial encounter because the student is becoming involved with the most typical aspect of American society, namely, family life. However brief the visit may be, this particular inquiry was directed at those who make possible the cultural contact—the host couples.

In part because of the recency of the program of the CFM and the nature of the visiting experience (usually for a meal) and because the focus is on the specific responses of hosts to this situation, the sociological literature that bears upon cultural contact, cultural conflict, role formation, is tangential to this study.

What emerges is the reactions that the hosts derive based upon their sharing some cultural contact, similarities, however limited with their guests, and to a degree the hypotheses established bear upon these circumstances. Additionally, from an operational point of view, the CFM hosts' program should be able to derive some needs to be met for both hosts and guests from this study.

***************
CHRISTIAN FAMILY MOVEMENT
International Student Committee

FEAST OF ST. AGATHA

Dear Members of CFM:

It is with high hopes that we send you this letter today—with high hopes that our disappointment of last year will be turned into joy. Yes, last year we were very disappointed at the lack of interest shown by CFMers in the foreign student program. Out of 700 couples, we had only eight interested in offering hospitality to foreign students. Since this seems to indicate that we did not present our case very well, we are sending this personal letter to you.

Catholic families today are being desperately urged to extend hospitality to foreign college students. These students want friends, want to see American family life, want to know what Americans think. Most of them are lonely. The Catholic foreign student often needs spiritual help. It is frightening to note that some 70% of African Catholic foreign students lose their faith while in this country. This fact alone seems to indicate that our offer of hospitality then is not a mere act of Christian charity but rather a duty. Admittedly, entertaining requires extra work but foreign students are enjoyable and educational and your children will love them.

Give these students a chance to see Catholicism as it is lived in the United States. Add your name to the CFM International Student Committee. You will not be obligated to entertain under trying circumstances. All entertaining will be at your convenience. But we must have a reasonable large list of prospective host couples from which to work in order to successfully arrange visiting programs.

If interested, please fill out the enclosed card and mail to: Mr. and Mrs. Patrick Bruder, 19410 Goldwin, Detroit 41, Michigan.

We have available booklets containing “do’s and don’ts” for hosts of foreign students. If you want one, let us know.

May Christ shower His blessing on you and your family.

In the Holy Family,

Pat and Corinne Bruder
CFM International Student Committee
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LOYOLA UNIVERSITY
Lewis Towers - 820 N. Michigan Ave.
Chicago 11, Ill.

Department of Sociology

October, 1960

Dear Mr. and Mrs.__________

Kindly allow me to introduce myself to you. I am a graduate assistant in the Department of Sociology of Loyola University.

Presently, I am working on my master's degree in sociology. I have received permission from my academic advisor, Dr. Paul Mundy, associate professor of Loyola University, to write my master's thesis on, SOME ASPECTS OF CULTURE CONTACT BETWEEN FOREIGN STUDENTS AND CHICAGO CFM HOSTS.

I have also received approval to pursue this research from Fr. Lawrence Kelly, Chaplain of the Chicago Federation of the CFM, and also from Mr. and Mrs. Paul Babcock, chairman of the International Students Committee of the CFM.

In my research I am attempting to find out how CFM families respond to students who come to their homes.

Enclosed is a questionnaire covering this topic. I am kindly requesting you to complete and return it at your earliest convenience. A stamped, self-addressed envelope is also enclosed.

I wish to assure you that your completed questionnaire will be treated in a strictly confidential manner. Please do not place your name on the questionnaire or on the return envelope. In this way, your identity is not known to me. Please be completely frank in your answers.

Thanking you most kindly for your cooperation, I remain

Sincerely yours,

Marcel Fredericks
Person(s) answering the questionnaire

Husband ☐  Wife ☐  Husband and Wife ☐

Please do not sign your name.

Date Answered ______

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. When did you join the C.F.M.? ____________________________

2. What were your principal reasons for joining C.F.M.? ____________________________

(If you need more space please write on the reverse side.)

3. Please give the number of children in each of the following categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) At home</td>
<td>(e) High school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Nursery school</td>
<td>(f) College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Kindergarten</td>
<td>(g) Graduate or Professional school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Grammar school</td>
<td>(h) Other type of school (Please specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. In your household what is the husband's nationality-descent (example: Mother, German; Father, Irish-Scotch)? ____________________________

5. In your household what is the wife's nationality descent? ____________________________

6. What is the husband's occupation? (Please be specific --do not give salesman, office worker, office manager, clerk). ____________________________

7. Does the wife work? Yes (full time) ☐  Yes (part-time) ☐  No ☐

8. If "yes", what is the wife's occupation? (Please be specific--do not give office worker, clerk). ____________________________

*N.B. Specific occupations would be: life insurance salesman, loan company office manager, department store sales clerk, resturant cashier, etc.
(9) Formal education completed by husband:

Please circle last year completed in each category.

Elementary: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
High school: 1 2 3 4
College: 1 2 3 4
Graduate or Professional: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
Other type of education
(please specify) 1 2 3 4

(10) In High School, what kind of course did you follow? Please check:

Academic (college preparation) course
Technical (trade or vocational) course
Business (typing, bookkeeping, etc.) course

(11) If you attended college, what was your major subject(s)?

(12) Do you hold any college or university degrees?

Degree Major field of study

(12) Please indicate extent of Catholic education:

Elementary: None Number of complete years
High School: None " " "
College: None " " "
Graduate or Professional None " " "
Other type of education (please specify) None " " " 
(13) Formal education completed by wife:

Please circle the last year completed in each category:

- Elementary: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
- High school: 1 2 3 4
- College: 1 2 3 4
- Graduate or Professional: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Other type of education (please specify):

- 1 2 3 4

(14) In High School, what kind of course did you follow? Please check:

- Academic (college preparation) course
- Technical (trade or vocational) course
- Business (typing, bookkeeping, etc.) course

(15) If you attended college, what was your major subject(s)?

(16) Do you hold any college or university degrees?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Major field of study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(17) Please indicate extent of Catholic education:

- Elementary: None □ Number of complete years
- High School: None □ Number of complete years
- College: None □ " " " "
- Graduate or Professional: None □ " " " "
- Other type of education (please specify): None □ " " " "
18. Do you consider receiving foreign students into American Catholic homes as visitors one of the most important functions of the C.F.M.? 
  yes ☐ no ☐

Why?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

19. Have you ever invited foreign students to your home?
  yes ☐ no ☐

20. If "no" please return the questionnaire completed to this point.

21. If you have invited foreign students to your home, approximately how many have you had come to your home Males? _______ Females? _______.

22. How many do you ordinarily invite at a time? _______

23. How do the foreign students usually reach your home?
   1. By public transportation ☐
   2. By your car ☐
   3. Other (please specify)

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

24. How many times in the last twelve months have you extended invitations to foreign students? _______

25. How many invitations were accepted? _______

26. How did you invite foreign students?
   (a) By writing to them Yes ☐ No ☐
   (b) By calling Yes ☐ No ☐
   (c) Through an intermediary (Example: Foreign Student Office) Yes ☐ No ☐

27. Have you had foreign students come for
   A meal ☐
   Overnight ☐
   Week-end ☐
   Longer than a week-end ☐
28. If some did not accept, what reasons were given by them?

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

29. What reasons do you think promoted acceptance of your invitations on the part of those who did come to your home?

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

30. When your invitation is accepted, do you make a special effort to learn something about the foreign student's homeland?

Always □ Sometimes □ Never □

31. If "Always" or "Sometimes", please explain what you do.

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

32. When your invitation is accepted do you try to learn the amount of time the foreign student has spent in the United States before his arrival at your home?

Always □ Sometimes □ Never □

33. When your invitation is accepted do you try to learn the type of recreation in which the foreign student indulges (before his arrival to your home)?

Always □ Sometimes □ Never □

34. When your invitation is accepted do you try to ascertain the religion of the foreign student (before his arrival to your home)?

Always □ Sometimes □ Never □

35. In which of the following might you turn to other C.F.M. families for advice?

(a) Menu □ (b) Conduct of your children □

(c) Anything else. Please specify ________

__________________________________________________________________________________

36. Do you regard the food you will serve as

(a) The most important problem □ (b) A moderately important problem □

(c) The least important problem □
37. When you are having foreign students do you prepare the kind of meal you would ordinarily serve your family?

Always ☐ Sometimes ☐ Never ☐

38. Do you intentionally prepare an extra vegetable or fruit dish, just in case the visitor does not eat meat?

Always ☐ Sometimes ☐ Never ☐

39. Do you prepare your children in any special way for the visit by the foreign student?

Always ☐ Sometimes ☐ Never ☐

40. If "always" or "sometimes," what kind of special preparation?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

41. Does the visit of a foreign student to your home cause you any particular concern?

Always ☐ Sometimes ☐ Never ☐

42. If "always" or "sometimes," what are the"particular concerns?"

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

43. Do you encounter difficulty in using the names of your foreign students?

Always ☐ Sometimes ☐ Never ☐

44. If "always" or "sometimes," what kind of difficulty?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

45. How do you address the foreign student on first meeting?

(a) First name ☐ (b) Mr. or Miss and last name ☐

(c) other (please specify) ☐

46. If you did not answer the previous question with the first item, do you ever use your guest's first name on his first visit?

yes ☐ no ☐
47. How does the foreign student address you on first meeting?
   (a) First name □  (b) Mr. or Mrs. and last name □  (c) other (please specify) □

48. If you did not answer the previous question with the first item, does the foreign ever use your first name on his first visit?
   yes □  no □

49. When you are in doubt do you ask your guests to repeat or to spell their names when you are introduced?
   always □  sometimes □  never □

50. Do you ever consider that the use of the first name might be offensive to your guest?
   yes □  no □

51. Do you show your foreign students guests around the house when they visit the first time?
   always □  sometimes □  never □

52. Does this "tour" ordinarily includes your kitchen?
   always □  sometimes □  never □

53. Do you introduce your children to the foreign guests?
   always □  sometimes □  never □

54. Do your children help "break the ice" when a foreign student visits your home?
   always □  sometimes □  never □

55. Based upon your experience how would you rate children as "ice-breakers?"
   poor □  fair □  good □  excellent □

56. Do you have difficulty in selecting topics for conversation?
   always □  sometimes □  never □

57. In addressing your foreign guests do you find that you speak more slowly and carefully than usual?
   always □  sometimes □  never □

58. Do you try to avoid the use of "slang?"
   always □  sometimes □  never □

59. In choosing topics for discussion do you:
   (a) Introduce topics of primary interest to you □
   (b) Try to introduce topics of primary interest to the visitor □
   (c) Try to balance (a) and (b) □
60. In the course of the visit do you ask questions about the visitor's country?
   always ☐ sometimes ☐ never ☐

61. Do you ask questions about the foreign visitor's customs?
   always ☐ sometimes ☐ never ☐

62. Do you ask questions about the foreign visitor's field of study?
   always ☐ sometimes ☐ never ☐

63. Do you ask questions about the foreign visitor's family?
   always ☐ sometimes ☐ never ☐

64. Do you think that the foreign student prefers to be treated as an American guest would be treated when visiting your family?
   always ☐ sometimes ☐ never ☐

65. If your visitor should make remarks critical but true of the United States do you agree with him?
   always ☐ sometimes ☐ never ☐

66. (a) Do you yourself make critical remarks about the United States that you feel are justified?
   always ☐ sometimes ☐ never ☐
   (b) If "always" or "sometimes" do you balance your remarks by stressing good points about this country?
   always ☐ sometimes ☐ never ☐

67. (a) Do you make critical remarks about the foreign student's country that you feel are justified?
   always ☐ sometimes ☐ never ☐
   (b) If "always" or "sometimes" do you try to balance your remarks by stressing good points about the foreign student's country?
   always ☐ sometimes ☐ never ☐

68. If your foreign student visitor should make remarks critical but true of the Catholic Church (in its human aspects) do you agree with him?
   always ☐ sometimes ☐ never ☐

69. (a) Do you yourself make critical remarks about the Catholic Church (in its human aspects) that you feel are justified?
   always ☐ sometimes ☐ never ☐
   (b) If "always" or "sometimes" do you balance your remarks by stressing good points about the Catholic Church?
   always ☐ sometimes ☐ never ☐

70. Do you think that there is such a thing as national differences in "sense of humor."
   yes ☐ no ☐

In what way?
71. At the table would you consider it impolite for the foreign visitor to take food or drink without a specific invitation to do so?
   always ☐  sometimes ☐  never ☐

72. Do you take into consideration the possibility that foreign student visitors who are not Catholics may have different times and kinds of fast and abstinence?
   always ☐  sometimes ☐  never ☐

73. How would you answer these questions?
   (1) Are Moslems permitted to eat pork?
      always ☐  sometimes ☐  never ☐  do not know ☐
   (2) Are Hindus permitted to eat beef?
      always ☐  sometimes ☐  never ☐  do not know ☐
   (3) Are Cambodians permitted to eat sea food?
      always ☐  sometimes ☐  never ☐  do not know ☐

74. When a foreign visitor is in your home do you tend to ask him More questions than he asks you?
   Fewer questions than he asks you? ☐
   About the same number of questions he asks you? ☐

75. Do you go to more preparations than you customarily do for guests, when a foreign student visits you?
   always ☐  sometimes ☐  never ☐

76. Do you invite the foreign student visitor back?
   always ☐  sometimes ☐  never ☐

77. Do you send holiday greeting cards to the foreign students who have visited you?
   always ☐  sometimes ☐  never ☐

78. After the visit do you hear from the foreign student?
   (a) A "thank-you" note  always ☐  sometimes ☐  never ☐
   (b) Holiday greeting cards  always ☐  sometimes ☐  never ☐
   (c) A telephone call  always ☐  sometimes ☐  never ☐

79. Do your foreign student visitors return for second visits without invitations?
   always ☐  most do ☐  some do ☐  none do ☐

80. Do your foreign student visitors return for second visits when invited?
   always ☐  most do ☐  some do ☐  none do ☐

81. From what countries have the foreign students entertained in your home come?
   __________________________
   __________________________
82. What do you particularly like about having foreign students at your home?

________________________________________________ __


83. What do you particularly dislike about having foreign students at your home?

__________________________________________________


84. (a) Have you had foreign students visit you that you really liked as persons?

yes ☐ no ☐

Remarks: ____________________________________________________

(b) What traits in the foreign student visitors have caused you greatest difficulty?

(1) ___________________ (3) ___________________

(2) ___________________ (4) ___________________

Why? ____________________________________________________


85. Do all foreign students have basically the same answers for questions asked during their visits to your home?

yes ☐ no ☐

Please explain: ____________________________________________________


86. What suggestions would you make to facilitate better relations between foreign students and C.F.M. hosts in the home? _______________
87. What recommendations would you make to the International Students Committee to improve the official activity of inviting foreign students into C.F.M. homes?


88. Has the International Students Committee of the C.F.M. helped you in your role of inviting students to your home?

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{yes} & \text{no} \\
\checkmark & \checkmark
\end{array} \]

Remarks


89. Do you think that you have provided foreign student visitors with a new experience in coming to your home?

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{yes} & \text{no} \\
\checkmark & \checkmark
\end{array} \]

If "yes", in what way?


90. Do you consider entertaining foreign student visitors a mark of "friendship"?

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{always} & \text{sometimes} & \text{never} \\
\checkmark & \checkmark & \checkmark
\end{array} \]

91. Do you entertain foreign student visitors out of a sense of social obligation to other C.F.M. couples?

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{yes} & \text{no} \\
\checkmark & \checkmark
\end{array} \]

Remarks:


92. Do you entertain foreign student visitors out of a sense of obligation to improving United States relations with other countries?

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{yes} & \text{no} \\
\checkmark & \checkmark
\end{array} \]

Remarks:


93. Do you entertain foreign student visitors for any other motives?

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{yes} & \text{no} \\
\checkmark & \checkmark
\end{array} \]

Remarks:
94. In your opinion who benefits most from entertaining foreign student visitors:
   foreign student visitor □ you □ both □
   Please explain: ____________________________________________________________

95. When you entertain a foreign visitor, do you think the visit is more enjoyable to you if you and he share the following:

   Yes  No
   (a) Same race: □  □
   (b) The same educational level: □  □
   (c) The same social class: □  □
   (d) The same religion: □  □
   (e) Knowledge about the United States: □  □
   (f) Knowledge about his country: □  □

96. Do you ask the foreign student visitor such questions as the following:

   1. How are you treated in his country?
      always □  sometimes □  never □
   2. How are the Americans treated in your country?
      always □  sometimes □  never □
   3. Do you have the same customs as we have?
      always □  sometimes □  never □
   4. Do you celebrate the same holidays (or holy days) we do?
      always □  sometimes □  never □
   5. Wouldn't you rather stay here in the United States than go back home?
      always □  sometimes □  never □
97. In entertaining a foreign student visitor, how do you rank the following items in influencing your judgment that he is a person like you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) The same race</td>
<td>1 (most important)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) The same social class</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) The same educational level</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) The same religion</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Knowledge about United States</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Knowledge about his country</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) His ability to speak the English language</td>
<td>7 (least important)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
November 10, 1960

Dear Mr. and Mrs.__________:

On October 13, 1960 I sent a questionnaire requesting you to complete and return in a stamped, self-addressed envelope. As the returned questionnaires are anonymous, I do not know if you have returned the questionnaire as yet. If you have not done so, will you please do so, at your earliest convenience?

Your cooperation is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Marcel Fredericks
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