

DOES THE ALGERIAN POLITICAL SCIENCES COMMUNITY HAVE ANTI-AMERICAN ATTITUDES?

Khemis Mohammed

Université Kasdi Merbah Ouargla
ORCID 0000-0002-0384

Benouareth Charafeddine

Université Kasdi Merbah Ouargla

Bara Samir

Université Kasdi Merbah Ouargla

DOI: 10.36169/2227-6068.2024.02.00010

Abstract. *Given that anti-Americanism in Algeria has intensified significantly in recent years according to surveys of Pew, Global Attitude Project (GAP), and Arab Barometer (AB), does that mean that Algerian academics in mainstream political science could be implicitly a part of that pervasive phenomenon? We have initially surveyed to examine the extent of bias and neutrality of the overall attitudes toward the U.S. within the Algerian political sciences community. The study has shown remarkable disparities among the respondents' attitudes, which appeared biased in some situations and neutral when the questionnaire required clear answers. The sample displayed proportionally a tendency toward anti-Americanism, either when they banished any moralism toward the U.S. actions and policies or when they failed to recognize some of the well-established facts about the US, such as its long-standing democratic traditions.*

Keywords: *Anti-Americanism; Algerian political sciences community; Neutral elite; The U.S. image; attitudinal responses*

Submitted: 13 July 2024; **accepted:** 3 November 2024

1. INTRODUCTION

Back when one of the authors was in his class with the students of the second master's degree in strategy and security studies, during a course on “American foreign and security policies”, they were brainstorming different ideas and questioning the U.S. power, foreign policy, hegemony, and its overall interactions in the international system. The purpose of the course's sequence was to examine the accuracy of the students' information about the US, and then eventually, the debate took another stream. However, a ‘cherry picking’ has occurred in many students' views. Students quietly ignored proven facts about the U.S. supremacy power in international relations while they solely focused on the downsides of the U.S. power. This unexpected conclusion led the author seriously to ask further questions such as: what exactly makes political sciences students who supposedly know very well about the topic involved massively in a cherry-picking fallacy?

Initially, our focus will be on the lecturers, graduates, and students of political sciences in Algeria, who partially constitute the elite opinion leadership and are the most knowledgeable about the United States under their scientific affiliation. They compose a specific group in the region where societal and political anti-Americanism is quite widespread and overpassed 50 percent in Algeria, according to Pew, Global Attitude Project (GAP), and the Arab Barometer (AB), after using a survey of 58.000 Arab citizens in the Middle East and North Africa (Glas & Spierings 2020).

The survey of Blaydes and Linzer has provided a descriptive scheme of the elite's orientations toward the United States in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA region), where the competition between the secularists and the Islamists has a marginal bearing on the anti-Americanism case. We know that secularists were generally associated with leaning political movements and positioned themselves in opposition to the U.S. as a part of the political environment of the Cold War. Islamists have also sought to leverage anti-Americanism sentiment for political ends. Accordingly, Blaydes and Linzer asserted that anti-Americanism in Muslim countries is an elite-led phenomenon that intensifies during the greater political competition between Islamists and secular nationalists (Blaydes & Linzer 2012).

Like many other MENA countries, Algeria has witnessed a surge of Islamic political movements right after the Iranian Revolution 1979. The proponents of Islamism in Algeria had subsequently formed their political parties throughout the 1980s and 1990s, even after having lost their luster during the Algerian Civil War. The Islamic rhetoric has become more pervasive among Algerian people across the country, and Islamic anti-Americanism could have been one of the main reasons behind the prevalence of the phenomenon among them as well.

The number of universities in Algeria has increased exponentially recently. It has outnumbered 100 academic institutions, with 1.7 million students. All this has contributed to a significant increase in the numbers of professors and students of political sciences as well. Thus, the spread of Islamic or any other kind of anti-Americanism among Algerian political science adherents would be striking due to their unbiased, well-professed knowledge of the United States, for most of them.

2. BACKGROUND, THEORY, AND HYPOTHESES

Historically, anti-American thought has been a pure European product, and more specifically, it was created by some of the greatest European minds of the past two centuries, who contributed to its making before it spread to the rest of the world. Although European anti-Americanism evolved in the scientific thought of the mid-eighteenth century, which is known as the “degeneracy thesis” (Ceaser 2003). According to naturalists Buffon and Cornelius de Pouw, proponents of the degeneration thesis, “Nobody could live in the new world whose discovery was the biggest tragedy that happened to mankind” (Piel 2014) or “It is a great and terrible spectacle to see one half of the globe so disfavored by nature that everything found there is degenerate or monstrous.” (Ceaser 2003). Therefore, the degeneration thesis occurred as an initial layer of what has transformed lately to anti-Americanism; such a thesis relies mainly on the different environment (e.g., inferior atmospheric conditions) in the New World. However, the romantic thinkers have placed degeneracy as an intellectual attitude towards the United States exclusively, and not Canada, Mexico, or any other nation from the New World.

Since then, anti-Americanism has reaffirmed its narrative as a global phenomenon. ‘Unreasoning animosity’ and ‘jealousy,’ far from being understood by the Americans, made them repeatedly ask, “Why do they hate us?” as the *New York Times* revealed in 1913. “They” were Canadians at that time, but now, the phenomenon has taken the world by storm, and the same question would have been asked again, maybe in other phrases like “Why does the world love to hate us?” (Friedman 2012).

The answers provided for these fundamental questions have shown the predominance of a psychopathology approach to anti-Americanism. These answers have, since then, mainly remained similar to those that appeared at the beginning of the twentieth century. Sayings often mentioned, like “unreasoning animosity”, “jealousy” toward “the best country in the world”, and “envy” of our “political and social and industrial success”, never disappeared from the daily discussions, even though anti-Americanism has undergone significant transitions.

For many scholars, criticism of the United States is a persistent psychological device that societies have resorted to and have been resorting to ever since America appeared in the world (Rubin & Rubin, 2004). Therefore, the consensus has come to approve what Americans have heard for a hundred years: “Foreigners are irrational and ill-informed about the best country in the world” (Friedman 2012). Nevertheless, scholars are constantly expressing their concerns and investigating whether anti-Americanism has become the dominant frame of the U.S. worldwide. This is what led Chiozza (2011) to reformulate the fundamental questions that underlie anti-Americanism in recent debates: instead of “Why do they hate us?” the questions should be asked accordingly: “Do they?” and “Who exactly are they?”.

Indeed, empirical analysis, which frequently has cited the issues of anti-Americanism, such as the Global Attitudes Project of Pew, has shown that anti-Americanism was not a predominant orientation among the foreign public (Chiozza 2011) after having administered a survey to 38,000 people in 42 countries in the summer of

2002. The vast majority of respondents in the survey tended to manifest a favorable reaction to the United States whenever they were asked to offer a general evaluation. However, the dislike of the United States was widespread and intense only among Islamic respondents in the Middle East and Pakistan, and it was predominant in such disparate places in the world like Angola, Argentina, and Bangladesh.

Since then, it is evident that certain degrees of negative attitudes toward the United States have become quite common worldwide, but the intensity and the widespread of these sentiments in the MENA region are remarkable. Accordingly, religious background was probably the primary explanatory factor for this phenomenon in the MENA region (Blaydes & Linzer 2012; Chiozza 2004; Ciftci et al. 2017).

Moreover, Ciftci et al. (2017) have noticed an upsurge in anti-Americanism, led by radical religious groups like al-Qaeda. In the MENA region, many have shown sympathy and favorable attitudes toward these radical groups, along with more profound degrees of resentment toward American culture. Anti-Americanism in the MENA region has become more virulent (Darwish 2003) and more intense than in any other area in the world, which implies the need for another theoretical model that transcends the conventional “*what America does*” versus “*who America is*”.

A further study may dismiss any presumption of cultural correlation of anti-Americanism in the MENA region when it is recognized as a wave of hate inflamed mainly by the U.S. due to its unconditional support for Israel, which has enabled it to defeat and humiliate the Arabs (Abdallah 2003: 62). There is no room to end this hatred only through a profound revision of the U.S. foreign policy. Scholars who have assessed anti-Americanism as a negative evaluation of American interventionism have supported these findings, and they have considered U.S. policies as self-interested imperialism harming MENA citizens (Makdisi 2002; Parker 1988; Pitchford 2011; Tessler 2003).

The debate has progressively broadened to provide further explanations over the correlation between the Islamic outlook and anti-Americanism, whether the Muslims who dislike the United States do so based on cultural-religious values or otherwise (Paz 2003). We could find arguments that cultural anti-Americanism proposes that Arab citizens' religion (Islam) instead is used to construct and reinforce antagonistic boundaries between “the secular Christian” United States and the “Islamic Arab region” (Huntington 1993). For many Muslims, the anti-American sentiment would be an expression of overall opposition to democracy, market, and modern ideologies. Anti-Americanism is reflected accordingly as a state of psychological refuge for societies that fail to overcome their shortcomings, and they have nothing left but hatred, envy, and resentment. This kind of feeling is allegedly rife in Islamic countries “more than anything else” (McNeill 1993).

Ciftci et al (2017) have attributed the reason behind the widespread anti-Americanism in the MENA region to Islamic fundamentalism, and more specifically to the “Literalist outlook” of the Islamic scriptures, where it is evident that the majority of Muslims hold a favorable view towards that literalist interpretation. Al-Qaeda, as a proponent of that interpretation of Islam, has, therefore, succeeded in creating rhetoric of anti-Americanism, starting by depicting America as a “far enemy” in their ideology. However, there have been other scholars who argued that the reaffirmation of Islam,

whatever its specific sectarian form, means the repudiation of European and American influence upon local society, politics, and morals. Thus, Huntington pointed out that the "underlying problems for the West is not Islamic fundamentalism, it is Islam [*itself*], a different civilization whose people are convinced of the superiority of their culture and are obsessed by the inferiority of their power" (Huntington 2000).

In Table 1, we suggest the classification of the definitions and dimensions of different perspectives of anti-Americanism, which different political scientists propose.

Table 1. Anti-Americanism literature

Anti-Americanism perspectives	Definition	Dimensions	Literature
Historical perspectives	<p>1-Anti-Americanism phenomenon we can understand only by being familiar with its history (Ellwood 1999).</p> <p>2-Anti-Americanism Is a sentiment that has existed since the creation of America itself (Tomja 2013)</p>	<p>1. Elitist anti-Americanism: countries in which the elite has a long history to underestimate the American culture (Katzenstein & Keohane 2007)</p> <p>2. Legacy anti-Americanism: the cumulative historical actions of the U.S. toward a receiver society. Therefore, anti-Americanism is rooted in the history and memories of the U.S. policies (Katzenstein & 2007)</p>	<p>(Armus 2007; Baker & Cupery 2013; Blaydes & Linzer 2012; Ceaser 2003; Criss 2002; Friedman 2012; Granatstein & Stuart 1997; Güney 2008; Hakjooon 2010; Kim 2017; Makdisi 2002; Markovits 2005; O'connor 2004; Parmar 2004; Qiu-bin 2008; Roger 2005; Rubin & Rubin 2004; Stuart 1997; Rivera & Bryan 2019)</p>
Psychological perspective	<p>Anti-Americanism is an attitude embedded in cognitive schemas, emotions, and norms.</p>	<p>1. Cognitive schema: is a process through which the United States and its actions are perceived.</p> <p>2. Emotional dimension: the extent to which the United States is feared, the sentiments of hate and weakness.</p> <p>3. Normative standpoint: anti-Americanism can serve as identity markers or as ways to regulate behavior.</p> <p>4. Norms: People rationally shape their behavior to fit their expectations of what others will do.</p>	<p>(Ameli, 2007; Bowen, 2007; Brooks, 2008; Chiozza, 2007, 2009; Coen, 2009; Gienow-Hecht, 2006; Gilmore, Meeks, & Domke, 2013; Kizilbash, 1988; Knappertsbusch, 2013; McPherson, 2004; Nimer, 2007; Paz, 2003; Ross, 2010; Sinno, 2008; Stivachtis, 2007; Tkacheva, 2019)</p>

<p>Political perspective</p>	<p>Political anti-Americanism takes shape as reactions from U.S. practices, (foreign policies, and values).</p>	<p>1. Social Anti-Americanism: stem from a set of liberal values in a broader set of social and political arrangements that the U.S. translates into actions.</p> <p>2. Sovereign-Nationalist Anti-Americanism: Sovereign-nationalists concentrate on protecting their state values against all kinds of U.S. interventions, which could pose stability threats and form uncertain situations that contradict with their principal values.</p> <p>3. Radical Anti-Americanism: The U.S. economic and political power and institutional practices make a mirror of the radicalizing world especially states that disclaim from any principal values carried by the U.S. constantly form Anti-Americanism threats.</p>	<p>(Katzenstein & Keohane 2007).</p>
<p>Sociological perspective</p>	<p>Anti-Americanism involves an "us/them" cleavage such as those of race, ethnicity, class, and religion</p>	<p>The movements develop in times of change that suggest an uncomfortable situation that poses an uncertain case or a threat to the previous situation, therefore, the new change will bring a more organized movement against the new one.</p>	<p>(McAdam 2011)</p>

Working hypotheses

Algeria, along with MENA countries, has earned the reputation of being the most anti-American region in the world. Still, we assume that higher education in political sciences within Algerian universities tended to shape the attitudes of the Algerians toward domestic and foreign political issues, and it could also have a formative effect on attitudes toward the United States. Because of receiving several courses on U.S. policies, we argue that the outputs of teaching political sciences in Algerian universities might be sufficient to generate favorable opinions about the US.

This hypothesis relies on Gentzkow and Shapiro's approach that considered that "individuals who are more educated will always be better informed on the politically neutral measure" (Gentzkow & Shapiro 2004). Blaydes and Linzer have suggested that anti-Americanism theories neglect the importance of intermediary roles played by political elites to form people's opinions (as a process from up to bottom) (Blaydes & Linzer 2012). Therefore, the connection between anti-Americanism and the elites differ substantially according to elite type, whether ideologically biased or academically neutral.

The neutral elite, as we have to assume in this study, are framed as highly educated, objective, and unbiased; such elite often shows more awareness when making prejudices and stereotypes it is somehow more able than any other elite type to answer correctly the fundamental questions about the US, such as, "What the United States is?" or

"What does the United States do?". On the contrary, Katzenstein and Keohane assumed otherwise, "perhaps the worst misconceptions are found in universities, where academics who have not studied the subject are eager to enunciate their favored single-factor explanation for anti-Americanism" (Katzenstein & Keohane 2007) may be the most ironic thing is the single-factor explanation for anti-Americanism comes from someone who studies or teaches political sciences.

Moreover, a positive image toward the U.S. made by some of the elite members who have received an education in political sciences, inclined towards that attitude, due to their Realism and pragmatism, gets them into a sort of conviction by the American leadership as a superpower in the current international system. On the other hand, there is another array of those who like American realism and pragmatism but are not entirely sure if they can show a similar appreciation for American moralism, values, and beliefs.

We have tested the hypothesis that implies the role of political sciences education in framing specific images in the United States.

Hypothesis 1 (H1): being a student or lecturer of political sciences in Algeria can provide you with unbiased attitudes toward the U.S.

Lars Willnat et al. argue that the mass media is an important source of political information (Willnat et al. 2006). These mass media outlets are usually criticized for not giving in-depth coverage of any political phenomenon. But to form and carry out anti-Americanism or pro-Americanism sentiments, there must be at least a media source to feed this sentiment.

We also assume that the respondents with direct access to the U.S. official documents and available reports, combined with their sound knowledge of the English language, will likely have a positive attitude toward the U.S. and vice versa (Gentzkow & Shapiro 2004). Furthermore, individuals who master the English language are the ones who appreciate the positive image of the U.S..

Given that the respondents in our sample are political sciences students, they have more significant interaction with the English language, and they are individuals who possess abundant knowledge of politics and international relations. Thus, we expect to find a significant association between respondents' attitudes toward the U.S. and their sources of information.

Hypothesis 2 (H2): the variation of data sources about the U.S. may engender significant differences in perceptions and frames among Algerian students/lecturers of political sciences.

Hypothesis 3 (H3) Regardless, the debate over U.S. foreign policies often gives rise to heated controversies between supporting and opposing views; the attitudes toward the U.S. may differ, in fact, for various reasons, including the level of the American educational system and the high standards of life in America. Those factors might create good impressions about the U.S. worldwide. Katzenstein and Keohane corroborated this when they argue that an individual can like or dislike different aspects of American

society simultaneously, "America has been both the dream and the nightmare," to use the words of Hanna Arendt (Arendt 1994)

The respondents would have multidimensional attitudes that may exist simultaneously toward certain American aspects.

Methodology

This research studies data collected through a three-part questionnaire consisting primarily of two attitudinal scales. The first part of the scale was devoted to measuring the respondents' attitudes toward the US, relying on their profession and educational background (Alpha 0.54). This part also contains 26 five-point Likert-scale questions range, including five assessments, from 1 to 5, where 1 strongly disagrees and 5 strongly agrees.

The second part of the questionnaire was thus devoted to the respondents' data sources in all aspects relating to the U.S. (alpha 0.61), including 15 five-point Likert-scale questions, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) up to 5 (strongly agree). The third part of the questionnaire measured whether the respondents have multidimensional attitudes regarding the U.S. (alpha 0.86). This part also has five five-point Likert-scale questions, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) up to 5 (strongly agree). We would also point out that the survey was distributed in Arabic and English.

We have used the "SPSS 26" version for data analysis. Respondents' attitudinal scales have been recorded to calculate the overall mean scores for each attitude. The measurement of the multidimensional attitude is shown in Table 2, through using the coefficient of Pearson to demonstrate the hypothetical association between the statement "*You are entirely sure that the U.S. power is in decline*" (inevitable decline) and the statements referring to the expected time scales of that decline, which were as follows (20 years, 50 years and 100 years). The same statement has also been tested to determine the correlation with other statements that address issues relating to U.S. foreign policies (what America does). However, the study has subsequently examined the correlation between the variation in respondents' data sources and their frames and perceptions of the US. It is important to note that the one-way ANOVA test applied to the survey's groups did not indicate any statistical significance between males versus females or lecturers versus students.

Sample description and respondents' affiliation

We addressed our questionnaire via Facebook and emails during curfew caused by the health situation provoked by COVID-19 (23/06/2020) until (10/03/2021). We have received ninety-eight replies from about one hundred and fifteen sent questionnaires, including five responses from the English version of the survey. Here are universities and number of responses from those, who reacted to our questionnaire: University of Algiers (10), University of Annaba (6), University of Batna (1), University of Blida (1), University of Boumerdes (1), University of Constantine (1), University of Ghardaia (3), University of Laghouat (6), University of Oran (6), University of Ouargla (47), University of Saida (3), University of Setif (1), University of Skikda (1), University of Tamanrasset (4), University of Tebessa (3), University of Tizi Ouzou (4). The survey sample includes forty-

two lecturers, nineteen students with a bachelor's degree, and thirty-seven students with a master's degree from sixteen Algerian Universities.

3. RESULTS

More than half of the respondents who participated were females (64.3 percent) and 35.7 percent were males. Most participants were between 29 and 40 years old, with 53.1 percent being 19 to 62. Students represented 16 different universities, where the southern region of Algeria accounted for 52.9 percent of the sample, whereas 16.6 percent represented the northern region, 11.7 percent from the Eastern, and 8.8 percent from the Western region.

The overall Attitudes towards the U.S image

The respondents favor the “strongly agree” segment in the following items. (1) “*You believe that America is biased in favor of Israel’s interests*” (mean = 4,4); (2) “*America is constantly interfering in other countries’ internal affairs*” (mean = 4,2); (3) “*The U.S. is putting pressure on the IGOs to serve its interests*” (mean = 4,4); (4) “*The U.S. controls the international oil market*” (mean = 4,2); (5) “*The U.S. violates international laws*” (mean = 4,3). In addition, the respondents are in favor of the “strongly disagree” segment in the following items. (1) “*Morals and ethics determine U.S. foreign policies*” (mean = 1, 73); (2) “*America is a cooperative and honest partner with other countries*” (mean = 1, 76).

Table 2. Respondents’ attitudes towards the U.S image

Statements	Mean	Median	Standard	Variance
You are totally certain that the U.S. power is in decline	3,0918	3,0000	1,21066	1,466
The U.S. power will decline due to a severe economic crisis	3,0918	3,0000	1,14051	1,301
The U.S. power will decline due to a political crisis.	2,9286	2,5000	1,13292	1,284
The U.S. power will decline due to brutal ethno-demographical strife	2,5612	2,0000	1,14032	1,300
China’s actual rising is spelling the end of the American power	2,7857	2,0000	1,24561	1,552
The U.S. will remain a power for only another 20 years	2,4796	3,0000	0,97631	0,953
The U.S. will remain a power for only another 50 years	2,6020	3,0000	0,85843	0,737
The U.S. power will not collapse for at least another hundred years.	3,2143	3,0000	1,11457	1,242
The American decline would be a positive outcome for the Islamic world	3,1939	3,0000	1,32118	1,746
Morals and ethics determine U.S. foreign policies.	1,7347	2,0000	0,89155	0,795
US behavior is Realist by nature.	4,1224	4,0000	1,11471	1,243

Would you admit that America is the most significant power from the end of the cold war until the present?	3,8878	4,0000	1,15663	1,338
Would you agree that America is the most significant power history has ever known?	2,5306	2,0000	1,18586	1,406
You believe that America is biased in favor of Israel's interests	4,4592	5,0000	0,82697	0,684
America is constantly interfering in other countries' internal affairs	4,2755	4,0000	0,82212	0,676
America is a cooperative and honest partner with other countries.	1,7653	2,0000	0,84708	0,718
US policies support human rights.	2,3673	2,0000	1,18746	1,410
The U.S. is putting pressure on the IGOs to serve its interests.	4,4388	4,0000	0,61033	0,373
The U.S. controls international relations.	4,0306	4,0000	0,91329	0,834
The U.S. controls the international oil market.	4,2041	4,0000	0,73160	0,535
The U.S. violates international laws.	4,3163	4,5000	0,83230	0,693
The U.S. is using its military power against weaker countries like Iraq due to its aggressive nature.	4,3061	5,0000	0,87824	0,771
You see that the U.S. is a country of personal freedom.	3,3980	4,0000	1,20771	1,459
You are impressed by the U.S. aid and assistance to poor countries	2,3061	2,0000	1,06885	1,142
You see that the U.S. is a country of law and order.	3,3265	4,0000	1,19945	1,439
You see that the U.S. is a country of democracy.	3,3571	4,0000	1,19492	1,428

Respondent's information sources about U.S image

The respondents strongly agreed with the statement “*Your research on the web has contributed to your cumulative knowledge about the US*” (mean = 4.2) but, they replied agree with the following statements “*Reading non-US writers has helped you to obtain cumulative knowledge about the US*” (mean = 3,81), “*Your academic and research activities in university curricula relating to U.S. topics have increased your knowledge about U.S. issue*” (mean = 3,98), “*The University courses provide you with accurate knowledge about the US*” (mean = 3,63), “*Several TV programs have provided you with the necessary information about the US*” (mean = 3,63), “*You trust your own information about America*” (mean = 3,55), “*It is preferable to obtain data related to U.S. issues from U.S. official resources*” (mean = 3,51), “*Joining ‘the American corner’ at your university has contributed to increasing your U.S. culture knowledge*” (mean = 3,45), “*IGOs reports have an impact on your own views concerning U.S policies*” (mean = 3,51). Moreover, they have responded neutral to the following statements “*The*

English language remains the main obstacle preventing you from getting accurate knowledge about the US” (mean = 2,97), “Your information about America comes from reading U.S. novels” (mean = 3,06), “The public broadcasting influences your positions toward the U.S. policies” (mean = 3,19), “Watching American films has created in you a body of information about America” (mean = 3,30).

Table 3. Respondent's information sources about U.S image

Statements	Mean	Median	Standard deviation	Variance
You consider the American official reports, which are released by the Department of Defense or the White house, reliable sources to obtain information about America and its future.	3,0918	3,0000	1,25252	1,569
It is preferable to obtain data related to U.S. issues from U.S. official resources.	3,5612	4,0000	1,05583	1,115
You trust your own information about America	3,5510	4,0000	0,94293	0,889
The English language remains the main obstacle preventing you from getting accurate knowledge about the US.	2,9796	3,5000	1,32369	1,752
Watching American films has created in you a body of information about America	3,3061	4,0000	1,15239	1,328
Several TV programs have provided you the necessary information about the US.	3,6327	4,0000	0,99884	0,998
Your information about America comes from reading U.S. novels.	3,0612	3,0000	1,04355	1,089
Reading non-US writers has helped you to obtain cumulative knowledge about the US.	3,8163	4,0000	0,73705	0,543
Your reliance on social media has helped you to adopt individual attitudes toward U.S. policies.	3,3980	4,0000	1,12827	1,273
Your research on the web has contributed to your cumulative knowledge about the US.	4,2245	4,0000	0,56588	0,320
The University courses provide you with accurate knowledge about the US.	3,6327	4,0000	1,13417	1,286
The public broadcasting influences your positions toward the U.S. policies.	3,1939	3,0000	1,01187	1,024
Your academic and research activities in university curricula relating to U.S. topics have increased your knowledge about U.S. issues.	3,9898	4,0000	0,85548	0,732
Joining 'the American corner' at your university has contributed to increasing your U.S. culture knowledge.	3,4592	4,0000	0,97567	0,952

IGOs reports have an impact on your own views concerning U.S policies	3,5102	4,0000	1,03789	1,077
-----------------------------------------------------------------------	--------	--------	---------	-------

Respondents' attitudes towards life and immigration to the US

The respondents replied agreed with the statement “*You want to study in America*” (mean = 3.44), but they were disagree regarding the following statements: “*You have applied for a job in America*” (mean = 2.15); “*You have applied for an American scholarship*” (mean = 2.20); “*You are considering obtaining U.S. citizenship*” (mean = 2.48).

Table 4. Respondents' attitudes toward life and immigration to the US

Statements	Mean	Median	Standard deviation	Variance
You are considering obtaining U.S. citizenship.	2,4898	2,0000	1,27016	1,613
You want to study in America.	3,4490	4,0000	1,28531	1,652
You have applied for an American scholarship.	2,2041	2,0000	0,87295	0,762
You have applied for a job in America.	2,1531	2,0000	0,88925	0,791
You are thinking of immigrating to the U.S. through American immigration programs.	2,8673	2,0000	1,34423	1,807

Table 5. The correlation between a statement in which the U.S. will inevitably decline and the causes, and the expected time scales

	R	P value
You are fully certain that the U.S. power is in decline		
The U.S. power will decline due to a severe economic crisis	0,487**	0,000
The U.S. power will decline due to a political crisis.	0,409**	0,000
The U.S. power will decline due to brutal ethno-demographic strife	0,331**	0,001
China’s actual rising is spelling the end of the American power	0,351**	0,000
The U.S. will remain a power for only another 20 years	0,455**	0,000
The U.S. will remain a power for only another 50 years	0,133	0,193
The U.S. power will not collapse for at least another hundred years	-0,213 [†]	0,035
The American decline would be a positive outcome for the Islamic world	0,318**	0,001
Would you admit that America is the most significant power from the end of the cold war until the present?	-0,241 [†]	0,017

Would you agree that America is the most significant power history has ever known?	-0,355**	0,000
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------	-------

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

An association is found between “The U.S. power will decline due to brutal ethno-demographic strife” (P=0,001), “The U.S. power will decline due to a severe economic crisis” (P=0,000), “The U.S. power will decline due to a political crisis” (P=0.000), “China’s actual rising is spelling the end of the American power” (P=0,000), “The U.S. will remain a power for only another 20 years” (P=0.000).

Table 6. The correlation between a statement in which the U.S. will inevitably decline and what America does category (U.S foreign policies)

You are fully certain that the U.S. power is in decline	R	P value
Morals and ethics determine U.S. foreign policies.	-0,073	0,476
US behavior is Realist by nature.	-0,193	0,057
You believe that America is biased in favor of Israel’s interests	0,209*	0,039
America is constantly interfering in other countries' internal affairs	0,115	0,258
America is a cooperative and honest partner with other countries.	-0,327**	0,001
US policies support human rights.	-0,382**	0,000
The U.S. is putting pressure on the IGOs to serve its interests.	0,088	0,389
The U.S. controls international relations.	0,038	0,707
The U.S. controls the international oil market.	0,045	0,663
The U.S. violates international laws.	0,361**	0,000
The U.S. is using its military power against weaker countries like Iraq due to its aggressive nature.	0,075	0,464
You are impressed by the U.S. aid and assistance to poor countries	-0,398**	0,000

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

An association has been found between the following items: “Is America a cooperative and honest partner with other countries?” (P=0,001), and “Do U.S. policies support human rights?” (P=0,000), “does the U.S. violate international laws?” (P=0.000), how far the respondents were impressed by the U.S. aid and assistance to poor countries (P=0,000).

Table 7. The correlation between the variation in respondents’ data sources and their frames and perceptions on the U.S.

	R	P value
You trust your own information about America		
You consider the American official reports, which are released by the Department of Defense or the White house, reliable sources to obtain information about America and its future.	0,377**	0,000
It is preferable to obtain data related to U.S. issues from U.S. official resources.	0,326**	0,001
The English language remains the main obstacle preventing you from getting accurate knowledge about the US.	-0,023	0,821
Watching American films has created in you a body of information about America	0,007	0,943
Several TV programs have provided you with the necessary information about the US.	0,139	0,173
Your information about America comes from reading U.S. novels.	0,143	0,160
Reading non-U.S. writers has helped you to obtain cumulative knowledge about the U.S.	0,152	0,136
Your reliance on social media has helped you to adopt individual attitudes toward U.S. policies.	-0,178	0,079
Your research on the web has contributed to your cumulative knowledge about the US.	0,108	0,292
The University courses provide you with accurate knowledge about the U.S.	0,186	0,067
Public broadcasting influences your positions toward U.S. policies.	-0,113	0,269
Your academic and research activities in university curricula relating to U.S. topics have increased your knowledge about U.S. issues.	0,063	0,538
Joining ‘the American corner’ at your university has contributed to increasing your U.S. culture knowledge.	0,083	0,415
IGOs reports have an impact on your own views concerning U.S policies	0,052	0,612

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

An association has been found between if the respondents “consider the American official reports, which are released by the Department of Defense or the White House, reliable sources to obtain information about America and its future” (P=0,000), “It is preferable to obtain data related to U.S. issues from U.S. official resources” (P=0,001).

4. DISCUSSIONS

The results have reaffirmed Mathew and Jesse's presumption about the existence of a positive correlation between the owners of higher education and their neutrality toward political issues. Nevertheless, we can take into account the influence of regional variations as suggested by Chiozza, which led him to conclude that the relationship between education and anti-Americanism varies in cross-regions and cross-attitudinal dimensions as further explanatory factors of the phenomenon (Chiozza 2009). However, Chiozza's findings were not significantly different from our results, precisely in his note that anti-Americanism is less common among Africans with higher degrees of educational attainment. The same applies to educated people in the Middle East, who are significantly less likely to have negative views of the U.S. (Chiozza 2009), and they almost share some socio-cultural traits with North Africans.

This survey is directed mainly toward the highly educated population, specifically those who belong to the mainstream political science in Algerian universities. We can describe the results that have emerged as a mixture of biased and neutral attitudes to the U.S. image. For instance, the responses were almost neutral regarding the possible external and internal triggers of the US's inevitable decline, such as the rise of China, severe political crisis outbreak in the US, ethnic-demographic strife in the US, and a crisis hitting the American economy. The replies kept their neutrality even for the projected time scales where the U.S. decline was supposed to happen (twenty years, fifty years, and one hundred years). For some, this may be regarded as evidence of the absence of anti-American elements. Still, concerning what falls under U.S. actions and policies, the respondents have shown some bias against the US, which others might interpret as anti-American.

According to Russell Berman, anti-Americanism has many sources and multiple forms, but there is only one source figure quite prominent, which is the high moral standard that the United States has set for itself and others (Berman 2004). The essence of moralism that has evolved in American politics as a resort to justify any decisions made in foreign policy has probably led to an opposite reaction among other people so that when specific actions were considered ethical domestically for Americans, the same acts were not perceived, by people from different cultural orientations.

Thus, the idea that U.S. actions are determined by morality and ethics has not received significant support from our respondents. Instead, we assume that our sample has fallen somehow under the narrative identifying America as a hostile and aggressive state. Some intellectuals worldwide have endorsed that narrative widely, and there is no room, consequently, to see America as an honest partner in their eyes. This evaluation could have been even worse when dealing with American favoritism towards Israel, which existed, according to our respondents.

John Bowen has hinted at the growing awareness among people about the signs of inconsistencies in U.S. policies and institutions (Bowen 2011). To refer to increasing skepticism directed against the U.S. civil rights issues, the 2020 Gallup Law and Order Index have also indicated that the U.S. was only slightly above the global average of 80% reported feeling safe. Then, the situation was compounded by the aggravated violence

and insecurity that erupted following the "Black Lives Matter" movement and the Capitol insurrection on 6th January 2021.

These factors have probably misled our respondents to overlook some substantive facts, that the U.S. still enjoys properties of rules of law and democracy, so the answers to the question of *'You see that the U.S. is a country of law and order'* were therefore neutral. However, they strongly agree about *'whether the U.S. violates international laws'*. This would suggest that our participants tend to produce neutral responses even when it comes to certain objective facts about the US's nature and substance. To understand this outcome, we must draw clear lines between anti-Americanism and what interferes with it.

This survey showed whether our respondents have negative attitudes toward the U.S. in areas such as *"American bias in favor of Israel"*, *"America is constantly interfering in other countries' internal affairs"*, and *"the U.S. violates international laws"*. However, they have taken a neutral stance when it comes particularly to Islamic anti-Americanism, through the question: *«The American decline would be a positive outcome for the Islamic world»*. Accordingly, Algerian political scholars in Algeria have probably tended to be free of Islamic Ideology in their conception of the US' image, contrary to the general impression associated between the Islamic world and the extreme levels of anti-Americanism. Then, the reasons for these negative attitudes among our respondents are entirely consistent with the explanations of the following scholars (Abdallah 2003; Makdisi 2002; Parker 1988; Pitchford 2011; Tessler 2003), as discussed above.

However, the survey revealed significant discrepancies between those who have held a neutral stance and those who have opted for negative attitudes towards the U.S. image. We assume that the variation of information sources about the U.S. among respondents might have been the reason for those attitudinal disparities (H2). It is based on Camber Warren's thesis in his piece *'Explosive Connections'*, when he argues that individuals who usually use social media tend to have more extreme attitudes (Warren 2015). Nevertheless, our respondents cannot be considered as such because the survey findings have shown that social media was not regarded as a primary information source for them in general matters relating to the US. They seem, therefore, less likely to have extreme anti-American sentiments.

Yet, unlike Warren's suggestion, Marc Neugröschel has presumed that anti-Americanism along with anti-Semitism were just products of conspiracy fantasies made by conventional media outlets, such as TV networks and newspapers, to frame Israel and America as collaborators in- or interchangeable representation of evil, controlling the humanity and wreaking havoc on the world. In contrast, The Internet and social media are portrayed as means of communication that can be used to oppose and sideline that narrative (Neugröschel 2021).

Thus, using the Internet as a primary source of information about the U.S. among our respondents, and more specifically when they prefer the official U.S. reports as the most reliable sources available online, would make them under the influence of the opposing narrative of anti-Americanism or anti-Semitism, which is accordingly viewed as a redemptive battle for the emancipation of humanity. However, it appears that our

respondents have demonstrated a sort of selectivity concerning the data sources by their affiliation with the Political science's disciplines.

Finally, from the questionnaire responses, our respondents seem likely to have multidimensional attitudes toward the US. Therefore, they seem more willing to get a scholarship to study in the US, but they do not express a similar interest in immigration opportunities to the US. These findings may reaffirm an established pattern indicated by other researchers, who argued that anti-Americanism is a heterogeneous phenomenon, mainly due to the diversity in America's characteristics itself (Katzenstein & Keohane 2007), not to mention that America is inherently multidimensional and multifaceted, as stated by Chiozza (Chiozza 2007).

5. CONCLUSIONS

The present study has attempted since the beginning to go into the dilemma facing the Algerian political science community to subdue their biases and anti-American sentiments in all matters concerning the U.S. as a subject of scientific inquiry, bearing in mind that this community particularly has been perceived to be most unbiased, neutral, and accurate, unlike the rest of the public mood. Meanwhile, some of the recent surveys that covered the MENA region indicated a prevalence of anti-Americanism that overpassed 50 percent in Algeria among ordinary people regardless of their affiliation to political sciences. As reflected in Pew, Global Attitude Project (GAP), and the Arab Barometer (AB), after using a survey of 58.000 Arab citizens in the Middle East and North Africa (Glas & Spierings 2021).

Therefore, we have surveyed how far anti-Americanism is a widespread phenomenon among the Algerian political sciences community. By submitting a questionnaire via Facebook and emails, among those who replied, there are forty-two lecturers, nineteen students with a bachelor's degree, and thirty-seven students with a master's degree from sixteen Algerian Universities. Their replies have provided U.S. with further explanations for the phenomenon in Algeria.

The survey reflected the complexity of the anti-Americanism phenomenon when the respondents articulated multidimensional attitudes towards the US. They suggested their love to America by appreciating the access to its educational system, in return, they were not that interested when it comes to immigration and the possibility of acquiring American citizenship, a finding which emphasized by other scholar's contributions.

The participants did not show anti-American attitudes when dealing with the most appropriate way to obtain their data about the US. Moreover, they demonstrate a great interest in American sources of information, which are first-hand and credible. Arguably, it makes sense, considering a large proportion of them are lecturers and researchers who know the scientific methods to distinguish reliable information adequately. It could also be argued that American sources of information, such as official reports, are publicly available.

However, the fundamental observation we have witnessed in this study was the presence of attitudinal disparities among the respondents, as a mixture of biased and neutral responses in cases requires clear answers. Hence, they displayed a tendency towards anti-Americanism proportionally, either when they banished any moralism in the U.S. actions and policies or when they failed to recognize the objective facts that are well-known about the US, such as democracy and the rule of law. It is noteworthy that this modest type of anti-Americanism within the Algerian political science community does not refer precisely to Islamic anti-Americanism.

Bibliography:

- Abdallah, Abdel Mahdi (2003). Causes of anti-Americanism in the Arab world: A socio-political perspective. *Middle East Review of International Affairs*, 7(4): 62–73.
- Ameli, Saied Reza (2007). Intercultural approach to Americanism and anti-Americanism: British Muslim impressions of America before and after 11 September. *Comparative American Studies An International Journal*, 5(1), 37–61.
- Arendt, Hanna. (1994). *Essays in understanding, 1930–1954*, ed. Jerome Kohn. New York, San Diego, London.
- Armus, Seth D. (2007). *French Anti-Americanism (1930–1948): Critical Moments in a Complex History*: Lexington Books.
- Baker, Andy, Cupery, David. (2013). Anti-Americanism in Latin America: Economic exchange, foreign policy legacies, and mass attitudes toward the colossus of the North. *Latin American Research Review*, 106–130.
- Berman, Russell A. (2004). *Anti-Americanism in Europe: A cultural problem*: Hoover Press.
- Blaydes, Lisa, Linzer, Drew A. (2012). Elite competition, religiosity, and anti-Americanism in the Islamic world. *American Political Science Review*, 106(2): 225–243.
- Bowen, John R. (2007). Anti-Americanism as schemas and diacritics in France and Indonesia. *Anti-Americanisms in world politics*, 227–250.
- Bowen, John R. (2011). 8. Anti-Americanism as Schemas and Diacritics in France and Indonesia *Anti-Americanisms in world politics* (pp. 227-250): Cornell University Press.
- Brooks, S. (2008). Anti-Americanisms in world politics. *Canadian Foreign Policy*, 14(1), 129.
- Ceaser, James W. (2003). A genealogy of anti-Americanism. *Public Interest*(152), 3.
- Chiozza, Giacomo (2004). Love and hate: Anti-Americanism in the Islamic world. *Paper dipresentasikan dalam the Department of Politics, New York University*.
- Chiozza, Giacomo (2007). Disaggregating anti-Americanism: An analysis of individual attitudes toward the United States. *Anti-Americanisms in world politics*, 93–126.
- Chiozza, Giacomo (2009). A crisis like no other? Anti-Americanism at the time of the Iraq war. *European Journal of International Relations*, 15(2), 257–289.
- Chiozza, Giacomo (2011). 4. Disaggregating Anti-Americanism: An Analysis of Individual Attitudes toward the United States *Anti-Americanisms in world politics* (pp. 93-126): Cornell University Press.
- Ciftci, Sabri, O'Donnell, Becky J., Tanner, Allison (2017). Who favors al-Qaeda? Anti-Americanism, religious outlooks, and favorable attitudes toward terrorist organizations. *Political Research Quarterly*, 70(3), 480–494.
- Coen, Alise E. (2009). *Rethinking anti-Americanism: Egyptian perceptions of the United States*: University of Delaware.

- Criss, Nur Bilge (2002). A Short History of Anti-Americanism and Terrorism: The Turkish Case. *The Journal of American History*, 89(2), 472–484.
- Darwish, Adel. (2003). Anti-Americanism in the Arabic language media. *Middle East Review of International Affairs*, 7(4): 44–52.
- Ellwood, David. (1999). *Anti-Americanism in Western Europe: a comparative perspective*: Johns Hopkins University.
- Friedman, Max Paul. (2012). *Rethinking Anti-Americanism: The history of an exceptional concept in American Foreign relations*: Cambridge University Press.
- Gentzkow, Matthew A., Shapiro, Jesse M. (2004). Media, education and anti-Americanism in the Muslim world. *Journal of Economic perspectives*, 18(3), 117–133.
- Gienow-Hecht, Jessica. (2006). Always blame the Americans: Anti-Americanism in Europe in the twentieth century. *The American Historical Review*, 111(4), 1067–1091.
- Gilmore, J., Meeks, L., & Domke, D. (2013). Why do (we think) they hate us: Anti-Americanism, patriotic messages, and attributions of blame. *International Journal of Communication*, 7, 21.
- Glas, Saskia, Spierings, Niels. (2021). Connecting contextual and individual drivers of Anti-Americanism in Arab countries. *Political Studies* 69(3): 686-708. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032321720923261> (accessed 23 May 2024).
- Granatstein, Jack L., & Stuart, Reginald C. (1997). Yankee go home? Canadians & anti-Americanism. *The American Review of Canadian Studies*, 27(2), 293.
- Güney, Aylin. (2008). Anti-Americanism in Turkey: past and present. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 44(3), 471–487.
- Hakjooon, Kim. (2010). A brief history of the US-ROK alliance and anti-Americanism in South Korea. *Shorenstein Asia-Pacific Research Center Paper Series*, 31, 7-45.
- Huntington, Samuel P. (1993). *The third wave: Democratization in the late twentieth century* (Vol. 4): University of Oklahoma press.
- Huntington, Samuel P. (2000). The clash of civilizations? *Culture and politics* (pp. 99-118): Springer.
- Katzenstein, Peter J., Keohane, Robert, O. (2007). Varieties of anti-Americanism: A framework for analysis. *Anti-Americanisms in world politics*, 9–38.
- Kim, Taewoo. (2017). Actualized stigma: The historical formation of anti-Americanism in North Korea. *Modern Asian Studies*, 51(3), 543–576.
- Kizilbash, Hamid H. (1988). Anti-Americanism in Pakistan. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 497(1), 58–67.
- Knappertsbusch, Felix. (2013). The meaning of anti-Americanism: A performative approach to anti-American prejudice. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence (IJCV)*, 7(1), 91–107.
- Makdisi, Ussama. (2002). “Anti-Americanism” in the Arab world: An interpretation of a brief history. *The Journal of American History*, 89(2), 538-557.
- Markovits, Andrei S. (2005). Anti-Americanism in Europe: From Elite Disdain to Political Force. *Old Europe, New Europe, Core Europe: Transatlantic Relations After the Iraq War*, 198–207.
- McAdam, Doug. (2011). 9. Legacies of Anti-Americanism: A Sociological Perspective *Anti-Americanisms in world politics* (pp. 251-270): Cornell University Press.
- McNeill, William Hardy. (1993). Fundamentalism and the World of the 1990s. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 7–32.
- McPherson, A. (2004). Myths of Anti-Americanism The Case of Latin America. *The Brown Journal of World Affairs*, 10(2), 141–152.

- Neugröschel, Marc. (2021). Redemption Online: Antisemitism and Anti-Americanism in Social Media *Volume 5 Confronting Antisemitism in Modern Media, the Legal and Political Worlds* (pp. 175-200): De Gruyter.
- Nimer, Mohamed. (2007). *Islamophobia and anti-Americanism: Causes and remedies*: Amana publications.
- O'Connor, Brendon. (2004). A brief history of anti-Americanism: From cultural criticism to terrorism. *Australasian Journal of American Studies*, 23(1), 77–92.
- Parker, R. B. (1988). Anti-American Attitudes in the Arab World. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 497(1), 46–57.
- Parmar, Inderjeet (2004). Selling Americanism, combatting anti-Americanism: The historical role of American foundations. *Language*, 25.
- Paz, Reuven. (2003). Islamists and anti-Americanism. *Middle East Review of International Affairs*, 7(4), 53–61.
- Piel, Helen (2014). Cornelius de Pauw and the Degenerate Americas. *MaRBL*, 6.
- Pitchford, Jenna (2011). The “Global War on Terror,” Identity, and Changing Perceptions: Iraqi Responses to America’s War in Iraq. *Journal of American Studies*, 45(4), 695–716.
- Qiu-bin, W. (2008). The Historical Evolution of Anti-Americanism [J]. *Collected Papers of History Studies*, 5.
- Roger, Philippe (2005). *The American Enemy: The History of French Anti-Americanism*: University of Chicago Press.
- Ross, Andrew A. (2010). Why they don’t hate us: emotion, agency and the politics of ‘anti-americanism’. *Millennium*, 39(1), 109–125.
- Rubin, Barry, Rubin, Judith C. (2004). Anti-Americanism re-examined. *The Brown Journal of World Affairs*, 11(1), 17–24.
- Rubin, Barry, Rubin, Judith C. (2004). *Hating America: a history*: Oxford University Press.
- Sinno, Zane Siraj. (2008). *The Impact on Language Learning of Lebanese Students’ Attitude towards English in the Context of Globalization and Anti-Americanism*.
- Stivachtis, Yannis. (2007). Understanding Anti-Americanism. *Research Institute for European and American Studies (RIEAS)*.
- Stuart, R. C. (1997). Review Essay: Anti-Americanism in Canadian History.
- Tessler, Mark (2003). Arab and Muslim political attitudes: Stereotypes and evidence from survey research. *International Studies Perspectives*, 4(2), 175–181.
- Tkacheva, Olesya. (2019). Digital media and perceptions of the United States among the Russian elite, 2004–2016. *Post-Soviet Affairs*, 35(5–6), 393–405.
- Tomja, Alida. (2013). Anti-Americanism in Europe: Causes and Consequences. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(3), 259.
- Warren, Camber (2015). Explosive connections? Mass media, social media, and the geography of collective violence in African states. *Journal of Peace Research*, 52(3), 297–311.
- Rivera, Werning S., Bryan, James D. (2019). Understanding the sources of anti-Americanism in the Russian elite. *Post-Soviet Affairs*, 35(5-6), 376–392.
- Willnat, Lars, et al. (2006). Media use, anti-Americanism and international support for the Iraq war. *International Communication Gazette*, 68(5–6), 533–550.