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**Background:** As the world becomes increasingly interdependent, mutual understanding becomes increasingly important. Therefore, it is essential that people strive for reductions in social distance on an international level. Study abroad is one of the ways to approach internationalization and promote understanding among different peoples and cultures.

Prior research has been done on the degrees of social distance between people from different cultures; however, little research has been done regarding changes that cultural immersion produces among those who reside in different cultures. Studies about study abroad programs have focused on cultural sensitivity and adaptability, yet few have combined the study abroad experience with the perceptions of self and other cultural groups.

**Purpose:** This study presents a framework for understanding people through intercultural activities. It studied social distance and attitude changes brought about in social distance as an artifact of cultural immersion.

**Setting:** The study took place both in China and in the United States. It focused on the social distance among American undergraduate students who participated in a China Study Abroad program sponsored by the University of North Texas.

**Program:** The study measured before and after social distance of a group of American students who studied abroad in China. The study abroad program itself was the intervention and lasted for three weeks.

**Research Design:** A mixed methods research design was used in the study.

**Data collection and analysis:** Social distance data were collected before and after students
studied abroad in China. Both inferential statistics and descriptive statistics were used. Qualitative data were also collected and analyzed in the study.

Findings: Most of the sample population were close to the Chinese people to begin with. Some participants positively changed their social distance and attitudes towards the Chinese people after the study abroad program, even though the changes were not statistically significant.

Conclusions and recommendations: This study merits replication among randomly selected samples. Study abroad programs should be promoted and supported. More research needs to be done that explores the quality of cultural immersion study abroad programs. Studies also need to be done to examine attitude changes among peoples in host countries.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Overview

Study abroad is one of the ways to approach internationalization and promote understanding among different people and cultures. Higher education shoulders much of the responsibility for producing high quality students with a positive international mindset. According to Allan E. Goodman (Nov. 14, 2005), president of the Institute of International Education, "Many U.S. campuses are recognizing that increasing global competence among the next generation is a national priority and an academic responsibility." International education has become one of the core educational missions in many American colleges and universities. Goodman urges business leaders to reward and encourage studying abroad through hiring and advancement practices, so that more and more American students will strengthen their language and intercultural skills, as well as their ability to collaborate across borders by studying abroad.

Study abroad programs are increasing on the campuses of colleges and universities throughout the United States. According to the Institute of International Education, because of a growing recognition of the importance of international experience, American students are traveling and studying abroad in record numbers. The number of American students studying abroad for academic credit increased by 9.6% in 2003/04 (Open Doors, 2005), building on the previous year's 8.5% increase. This surge in participation brings the total number of American students studying abroad to a record number of 191,321, according to Open Doors 2005, the annual report on international education published by the Institute of International Education. Today, tens of thousands of Chinese students are studying in the United States. China, the second-largest sending country in the world has 62,523 students studying in America (Open Doors, 2005). At the same time, an increasing number of
American students are studying in China. By 1986, over 100 American Universities had entered into more than 200 exchange agreements with the Peoples’ Republic of China. (Lord, 1986). In 2003/2004, studying abroad in China had increased by a dramatic 90% (4,737, up from 2,493 in 2002/03) (Open Doors, 2005). This made China the 9th leading host destination for American students (Open Doors, 2005).

Why has China become a popular place for American students to study abroad? First, China is one of the four earliest civilizations in the world. According to myths and legends, the dawn of Chinese civilization began in 6000 BC. As Cameron has written, “Chinese civilization is set apart from any other. It was the ancient Chinese who invented a means of writing in order to communicate. Even in its early forms, it can still be read and understood, and has developed” (1997, p 18). Secondly, China also has a long history of learning and is a good place for people to learn. The great philosopher Confucius (551-479 BC) was born in China. He had three-thousand students. “Confucius instructed them in six arts: rites, music, archery, chariot –driving, writing and mathematics. He taught modesty and persistence in learning ” (Hookham, 1970, p 23). Today, the Chinese focus on modesty and a learning environment that produces scholars who are modest and eager to learn. Persistence and hard work are also necessary in producing successful ideas and products. “He [Confucius] himself was prepared to teach, and to learn from, anyone” (Hookham, 1970, p 23). This is a great principle for educators. Ill-prepared teachers cannot effectively teach their students. Confucius told his disciples (Waley, 1938): “To learn, and at due times to repeat what one has learned, is not that after all a pleasure?” And also: “He who learns but does not think, is lost. He who thinks but doest not learn is in great danger” (Waley, 1938). Confucius’ sayings contain much truth and are still appreciated today. At a very early time, the Chinese people knew the importance of learning, teaching, and thinking. In 124 BC, a university was established in China for the study of Confucian classics (Hookham, 1970, p. 48). In the
United States of America, the first university was not built until 1636 (Rudolph, 1990). Westerners can benefit from learning about Chinese history and studying the educational system of China.

Third, China and the United States have had a relationship for a long period of time. *Empress of China*, the first American merchant ship arrived in Guangzhou to purchase tea and other Chinese products in 1784 (Lazzerini, 1999). “The American presence in China increased with the influx of American missionaries, both Catholic and Protestant. The close link between promulgating the Christian religion among the Chinese people and promoting a completely new and different way of life cannot be overestimated” (Lazzerini, 1999, p. 72). Groups of dedicated, well-intentioned Americans helped China in many ways.

However, the Chinese political and economic immune systems were greatly compromised because of the close-mindedness of the Chinese government and corruption among government officials (Hoyt, 1986). The opium the Chinese people brought from the West poisoned both the bodies and minds of many Chinese people. During 1860, China was in an opium war with western countries. China lost the war and was forced to open her ports to western countries. Opium began to flood into China. During World War 2, China became vulnerable to Japan. The Nationalist party (the government of China at that time) was led by Jiang, Jieshi. He tried to oppose the community party within China instead of resisting the invasion from Japan, which caused great dissatisfaction and unrest among the majority of the Chinese people. The Communist party started to gain more and more support from the Chinese people. Hoyt (1989) describes that Americans and Russians helped China during World War 2 in fighting against the invasion from Japan. When the war ended, the government in China did not improve at all. It taxed common people highly and kept on adding new taxes while its top officials remained untaxed. The government officials were corrupt and arrogant, which isolated themselves from their people. Hoyt (1986) notes that
when World War 2 was ended, especially when the invasion from Japan to China failed and the war between China and Japan ended, the Chinese people were eager for peace and unity in the country. However, Jiang’s government ignored the Chinese people’s urgent demand and treated it as a communist plot from the Communist Party. They started to strike down all the peace-driven activities. The failure to listen to the majority of the people turned the nationalist government into the enemy of the Chinese people. Jiang planned to destroy the Communists by the summer of 1946. However, he had already lost the support of the Chinese people. The United States continued to support China by aiding the Nationalist government without clearly understanding situations in China. Hoyt (1989, p. 218) writes:

The Nationalists refused to believe that the people wanted peace badly enough to change sides if that was necessary. Jiang was no longer the revered hero of the anti-Japanese war, nor a liberator, but an oppressor; and the Americans were seen as his willing helpers. Anti-American sentiment came to a head on Christmas Eve, 1946, when a female student at Beijing University was raped by American soldiers. Half a million students quit classes and demonstrated against Jiang and American imperialism.

The Nationalist government lost China. Jiang, Jieshi fled to Taiwan, and the Communist Party remained in mainland China where they founded the Peoples Republic of China. Sino-American relationships worsened. The United States and the new Communist Chinese government became bitter enemies, influenced by the cold war between the Soviet Union and the United States. From 1949 to 1971, Chinese and American relationships were on the rocks.

Herein lay the opening that would lead to an easing of relations between the two countries. A lifting of the ‘Bamboo Curtain’ was dramatized by a tour of China by an American table-tennis team in 1971 (dubbed ‘pingpong diplomacy’ by the media). An even more significant trip was made to Beijing in 1972 by American President Richard M. Nixon, and full diplomatic relations commenced in 1979. During the following two decades, “China and the United States found themselves able to communicate with one another around the paramount need of China to modernize and the equally formidable need of the United States for China’s market and for balancing China against the Soviet Union (p. 77).

The Chinese and Americans became friends again.

Today, thousands of Chinese students are studying in the United States. At the same time, increasing numbers of American students are going to China. By 1986, “More than 100 American universities have shaped over 200 exchange agreements with Chinese counterparts” (Lord, 1986). Today the China Study Abroad program at the University of North Texas is providing opportunities for American students to visit China to learn about the country and its people.

Knowles (2001) has written: “No place has changed quite like China. My China is not merely a country of change. It is a country of great beauty. The China I love is a conundrum. It is breathtaking not merely for its antiquity, or for its beauty but despite its years of calamity, for its self-confidence.” Today’s China has become one of the emerging economic powers in the world. The 2008 Olympic Games are to be held in China.

This study focused on the China Study Abroad program at the University of North Texas. Because an increasing number of students are enrolling in the program, assessment and evaluation have become very important. It is important to conduct continuous formative and summative research on the study abroad experiences of American students in the
Peoples’ Republic of China.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of the proposed study was to examine the before and after social distance of American students who study abroad in China. The goal was to ascertain if and how study abroad experiences promote understanding among people and bring them closer through a compressed, short-term, and intentional process of cultural immersion.

Purposes of Study

The purposes of this study were to:

1. Develop a demographic profile of the traits and characteristics of American students at the University of North Texas who participate in a China Study Abroad program;
2. Determine the degree of social distance between the American students and the Chinese people prior to their participation in a China Study Abroad program;
3. Determine the degree of social distance between the American students and the Chinese people subsequent to their participation in a China Study Abroad program;
4. Determine if there were attitudinal changes towards the Chinese;
5. Examine the program through students’ eyes;
6. Evaluate the China Study Abroad program.

Research Questions

1. What are the demographic traits and characteristics of American students who participate in the University of North Texas China Study Abroad program?
2. What is the social distance between American students and the Chinese people prior to the participation of the American students in the University of North Texas China Study Abroad program?
3. What is the social distance between American students and the Chinese people subsequent to the participation of the American students in the University of North Texas China Study Abroad program?

4. How did the changes in social distance toward the Chinese people occur and what were the participants’ impressions of the China Study Abroad experience?

5. What did the study abroad participants consider to be the best and worst experiences of the program?

6. How did the study abroad participants evaluate the overall China Study Abroad experience?

Significance of the Study

Higher education has a profound impact on society and the development of its citizens. As societies become more diverse, the world in which we live becomes increasingly smaller. As the world becomes more and more interdependent, mutual understanding becomes increasingly vital. Therefore, it is essential that people strive for reductions in social distance on an international level. To reduce social distance requires a deeper understanding of people from diverse cultures, an open mind, and effective communication skills. The less social distance there is between people, the better people will presumably understand each other and, hopefully, the more peaceful the world will be.

Some studies (Parrillo & Donoghue, 2005; Kleg & Yamamoto 1995; Bogardus 1967) have been done on the degrees of social distance between people from different cultures; however, little research has been done regarding the changes that cultural immersion affects among those who reside in different cultures for a specified time. Studies of study abroad programs have focused on cultural sensitivity and adaptability, yet few have combined the study abroad experience with the perceptions of self and another cultural group. This study presents a framework for understanding people through intercultural activities. Social
distance and changes brought about in social distance are examined.

Definition of Terms

Social distance is defined as: “the grades and degrees of understanding and intimacy which characterize pre-social and social relations generally” (Park, 1924).

Attitude is defined in the following manner: “As individuals develop, their cognitions, feelings, and action tendencies pertaining to various objects in their world become organized into enduring systems called attitudes” (Krech, Crutchfield & Ballachey, 1962).

Attitude change: “Attitude change is brought about through exposure to additional information, changes in the group affiliations of the individual, enforced modification of behavior toward the object, and through procedures which change personality” (Krech, Crutchfield & Ballachey, 1962, p.225).

Delimitations

The study was delimited to American undergraduate students at the University of North Texas who participated in the university’s China Study Abroad program.

Limitations

1. The study was limited to those study abroad participants who completed both the pre- and post-test measures of social distance.

2. Because of the small number of students who annually participate in the China Study Abroad program investigated in this study, the generalizability of the findings is limited.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The History of Studying Abroad

Studying abroad involves the process of students pursuing educational opportunities in foreign countries. According to Vande Berg (2003), the 18th and 19th centuries witnessed the evolution and establishment of the European tours as a desired experience for the newly upper class Americans. They were sent by their families to travel to the continent to get culture and emulate the behavior of the British upper classes. At the same time they traveled to some sites of interests such as Paris, Rome and the Alps in Europe. The European grand tours help in shaping the attitudes and expectations about later studying abroad in the 20th century in the United States.

According to Nelson (1995), from the 19th century up to World War 2, American students were regularly traveling to Europe to study, particularly to England for undergraduate studies and to Germany for graduate programs. The well-structured study abroad programs can be traced back to 1923.

As Kochanek (1998) describes, in 1921, at University of Delaware, Professor Raymond W. Kirkbride of Modern Language Department, suggested a great plan to the President Walter S. Hullihen. This plan involved sending students to studying abroad for a year when they were juniors. Why did Professor Kierkbride come up with such an idea? He was a veteran in World War 1, and had seen with his own eyes that the disagreement between countries could raise terrible wars, which hurt so many people in different countries. He also knew the importance of understanding between people and nations. He strongly believed that international education is a powerful force in support of peace. In an attempt to explore the potential of studying abroad in promoting cross-cultural understanding and foreign language learning, Professor Kierkbride was tried to convince the president to send students to study
for their junior year in France. At the time, the concept of students studying in a different
country was incredibly unconventional. According to Kochanek (1998):

At the time, study abroad was unheard of, and America's isolationist tendencies were
still strong. But, Hullihen recognized that the Delaware Foreign Study Plan, which
came to be known as the Junior Year Abroad, had far-reaching influence. It would, he
felt, produce better-rounded students, train future foreign language teachers and
provide experience for students who wanted to go into careers with international
aspects.

Several influential people of the era were similar in their perspectives. President
Hullihen and Professor Kirkbride started to work on the plan for Junior Year Abroad for the
students at University of Delaware. Their plan was supported greatly by Secretary of
Commerce Herbert Hoover, Pierre S. Du Pont, and other prominent businessmen. On July
7th, 1923, the first group of students participated in this study abroad program in France. The
eight junior students in Professor Kirkbride’s France trip included Austin P. Cooley, Francis
J. Cummings, David Dougherty, Herbert L. Lank, William K. Mendenhall, J. Cedric Snyder,
T. Russell Turner and J. Winston Walker. “After six weeks of intensive language immersion
at Nancy, they moved to Paris, where Lank met his future wife; Turner became a basketball
hero; and Turner and Cummings won the Sorbonne's highly coveted diploma of French
civilization” (Kochanek, 1998).

This study abroad program was a great success and the University of Delaware
continued study abroad programs. The first group of students went to France; later the
program was expanded to Switzerland and Germany. Between the first study abroad program
started in 1923 to 1948, a total number of 902 students participated in the Junior Year Abroad
with the University of Delaware; various students from different universities such as
Columbia university, Penn University, Brown University, Harvard University and Princeton
University also joined the University of Delaware to study abroad (Kochanek, 1998).

After World War 2, the focus of studying abroad shifted from learning about the culture of the countries to foreign language learning. In the summer of 1946, President Truman appointed a Presidential Commission on Higher Education. He urged the United States colleges and universities to reexamine their system of higher education in terms of its objectives, methods, facilities, and in the light of the social role it was to play. George F. Zook, President of the American Council on Education, along with 28 educators, went promptly to work and produced a report the following year, which was entitled *Higher education for democracy: A report of the President's Commission on Higher Education*. The following goals were listed in the report:

- Education for a fuller realization of democracy in every phase of living.
- Education directly and explicitly for international understanding and cooperation.
- Education for the application of creative imagination and trained intelligence to the solution of social problems and to the administration of public affairs.

Even studying abroad was not explicitly explained in this commission; however, education for international understanding and cooperation is one of the goals of sending students abroad. Under the new internal and external conditions after World War 2, the American government spent millions of dollars in education. Sending college and university students abroad to master a foreign language and training more people understand foreign languages became an important way to strengthen the nation’s defense ability.

In the 1980s, the focus on foreign language learning as one of the major goals for study abroad programs became even more obvious. The National Commission on Excellence in Education was created by former Secretary of Education T. H. Bell on August 26, 1981. He asked the commission to examine the quality of education in the United States. The
A Nation at Risk (1983) was made under such a circumstance. It calls on the attention of foreign languages learning. As describes by the report, “We believe it is desirable that students achieve such proficiency because study of a foreign language introduces students to non-English-speaking cultures, heightens awareness and comprehension of one's native tongue, and serves the Nation's needs in commerce, diplomacy, defense, and education.” This urges the great need of studying foreign languages. The number of students went abroad to learn foreign languages was increasing from the efforts from the Commission on Excellence in Education.

As time has passed, study abroad programs have developed quickly. Study abroad programs are no longer restricted to upper class students, but to wider student populations as well. Learning about other cultures and foreign languages continues; however, other disciplines such as business, marketing, engineering are also offering study abroad programs to provide students learning opportunities in international settings.

Models and Types of Study Abroad Programs

The various models of study abroad programs in the United States have basically five options from which students can choose. They are

1. Programs sponsored by an American college or university.
2. Special programs for international students at a foreign university.
3. Direct enrollment in a foreign university as a degree candidate, occasional or special student.
4. Programs sponsored by an organization other than a college or university

The first type of study abroad program is under the sponsorship of an American college or university. For example, the University of Delaware has its own university department, Center for International Studies. This university remains a leader in study abroad
programs and offers studying abroad programs in fall, winter, spring, and summer semesters through the year. Currently it has 70 programs that are offered in about 30 different countries. In 2005, the University of Delaware ranked No. 1 in study abroad participation among the nation’s public institutions of higher education, according to the Institute of International Education (IIE).

The second type of programs is designed for international students at a foreign university. The Beijing Language and Culture University in China, is designed mainly for international students. It was founded in 1962. It was first called the Preparatory School for Foreign Students. It is the only university whose main function is to teach Chinese language and culture to foreign students. For the past 30 years, more than 20,000 foreign students have graduated from Beijing Language and Culture University. Every year, about 3,000 students from many countries are studying in this university. It offers language study programs ranging from monthly to annually.

The third type of study abroad program involves direct enrollment of degree candidates at a foreign university. According to *Open Doors* 2006 data, a limited number of American students went abroad to enroll as degree candidates. Most of the students are doing short term studies, earning some credits for their course work. Only 6% of the total number of American study abroad participants stayed in foreign countries for an academic year; very few of them earned a complete degree at a foreign university, which takes at least 2 or 3 years. Oxford University, the oldest university in the English-speaking world, enrolled its first 'overseas' student in 1190. Oxford University has been welcoming international students for over 8 centuries. It has a number of degree seeking students.

The fourth type of study abroad program is under the umbrella of an organization instead of universities and colleges. Many organizations realize the urgent need to expand Americans’ knowledge of other cultures and foreign languages. They focus particular
attention on encouraging more students to study abroad. For example, The Council for Christian Colleges & Universities (CCCU) is an international higher education organization that offers study abroad programs. This organization was founded in 1976. Currently it has 105 members in North America and 77 affiliate institutions in 24 countries. It offers seven study abroad programs that involve studying destinations in Latin American, Asia, Australia and Africa.

Verde Berg (2003a) also has described the various study abroad programs. They provide courses taught in English as well as in the language of the host country. The students are enrolled in courses specially organized for them at the host universities. They also arrange for the courses to be taught by faculty from host universities or from home campuses. Students earn credits through traditional classroom methods and through experiential activities. In short, students are offered a veritable cornucopia of options (p.24).

Reports on Study Abroad

The Institute of International Education mentions in its mission statement: “Peace and prosperity around the world depend on increasing the capacity of people to think and work on a global and intercultural basis. As technology opens borders, educational and professional exchange opens minds” (IIE, 2006). IIE reports on international education regularly through their annual publication entitled Open Doors.

According to Open Doors (2006), American students are “recognizing international study as an essential part of preparing for a successful career in a globally interdependent world”. American students studying abroad reached the number of 205,983, which is an increase of 8% over the report of 2005. “This latest surge builds on steady increases over the past few decades, and is buoyed in part by growing interest in destinations in Asia and South America” (Open Doors, 2006).

Open Doors (2006) has the 20 most popular hosting countries for study abroad listed,
they are: United Kingdom, Italy, Spain, France, Australia, Mexico, Germany, China, Ireland, Costa Rica, Japan, Austria, New Zealand, Czech Republic, Greece, Chile, South Africa, Argentina, Brazil, and India. “Of these, only five are primarily English-speaking, and most are located outside Western Europe” (Open Doors, 2006). The most popular countries for American students studying abroad remains the Western European area, which has hosted about 45% of all U.S. students abroad. (No.1 United Kingdom, No.2 Italy, No.3 Spain, and No.4 France), “There were major increases in the number of students going to other host countries” (Open Doors, 2006). China now is the 8th-leading host destination for American students, and it is the only Asian country in the top 10 list.

As described in Open Doors (2006), the largest growth comes from short-term study. There are about 56 percent of U.S. students who chose summer, January term, and other programs of less than one semester to study abroad. These short-term programs have played an important role in increasing the popularity of study abroad, offering flexible international study opportunities to students who might otherwise be unable to participate in traditional programs.

Thirty –eight percent of the students studied abroad for a semester and only 6% students stayed abroad for a whole academic year.

The field of studying abroad varies. The top 2 majors come from social science and business. Table 1 lists the students’ fields of study for the academic years 2003 to 2005 according to Open Doors.
Table 1

Field of Study of American Study Abroad Students

Open Doors

Report on International Educational Exchange

Fields of study of American study abroad students, 2003/04 - 2004/05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of study</th>
<th>2003/04 Total</th>
<th>2003/04 Percent</th>
<th>2004/05 Total</th>
<th>2004/05 Percent</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>43,258</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>46,552</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Mgm't</td>
<td>33,473</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>36,047</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>25,401</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>27,396</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15,010</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>16,067</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine or Applied Arts</td>
<td>14,493</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>15,655</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Languages</td>
<td>14,340</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>15,449</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>13,509</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>14,625</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>7,918</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>8,445</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>6,467</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>7,003</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td>6,457</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>7,003</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>5,462</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5,974</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math or Comp. Sci.</td>
<td>3,263</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3,502</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>2,269</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2,472</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>191,321</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>205,983</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to *Open Doors* data, undergraduate students are the number one to study abroad. Juniors still remain the top academic category to study abroad. Female students went abroad twice as much as the number of male students. The Caucasians made up the majority of students who went abroad.

### Table 2

*Study Abroad Participants’ Characteristics from 1993 to 2000*

*Open Doors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 2 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino(a)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visa students**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76302</td>
<td>84403</td>
<td>89242</td>
<td>99448</td>
<td>113959</td>
<td>129770</td>
<td>143590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

Study Abroad Participants’ Characteristics from 2000 to 2005

Open Doors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic level</th>
<th>2000/01</th>
<th>2001/02</th>
<th>2002/03</th>
<th>2003/04</th>
<th>2004/05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>38.04891</td>
<td>34.69213</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.18755</td>
<td>19.34858</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>11.76117</td>
<td>12.03513</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 3 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic level</th>
<th>2000/01</th>
<th>2001/02</th>
<th>2002/03</th>
<th>2003/04</th>
<th>2004/05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.767077</td>
<td>4.141279</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.865239</td>
<td>3.042994</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.374599</td>
<td>2.42425</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.135267</td>
<td>1.628553</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.621475</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.932366</td>
<td>0.494877</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>83.22387</td>
<td>83.74456</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-Pacific Islander</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.021527</td>
<td>6.132847</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino(a)</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.12303</td>
<td>4.96351</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.386468</td>
<td>3.376257</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.789013</td>
<td>1.327857</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American/Alaskan</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.45609</td>
<td>0.454971</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>154168</td>
<td>160920</td>
<td>174629</td>
<td>191231</td>
<td>205983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Good News and Bad News of American Students Study Abroad

Despite the good news and increasing number of American students study abroad, there are also some concerns. According to NAFSA, Association of International Educators (2007), “only about one percent of U.S. college undergraduates have studied abroad, despite opinion polls that indicate that more than three-quarters of Americans believe it is important to do so and a rising chorus of business, education, and government leaders concerned about Americans’ lack of preparedness in engaging and communicating with the world.”

Current Research on Study Abroad

As international education garners more attention, studies about it are also increasing. Current research on studying abroad varies. Portillo (2004) did an intensive study of recent literature about study abroad and summarized his findings in a table about the positive outcomes of study abroad experiences. Areas in which positive outcomes of the study abroad experience may be observed include:

1. Positive Cognitive Outcomes:
   - Promotion of graduate studies
   - Foreign language appreciation
   - Acquisition of knowledge of specific content areas
   - Acquisition of knowledge of specific area of the world
   - Development of international perspective
   - Arts appreciation
   - Examination of vocational direction in life
   - Increased cognitive and problem solving skills

2. Positive Culture-related Outcomes:
   - World mindedness
   - International awareness
Personal philosophy

Adaptability

Acquisition of knowledge of specific areas of the world

Development of international perspective

Self image modification/crystallization of identity

Effective management of problematic situations in cultural transitions

Gains in understanding and appreciation of the host country

Openness to the ideas of others

Examination of criteria for one’s own values

Tolerance toward out-groups and acceptance of the values of out-groups

New outlooks on the countries visited and on the United States

3. Positive Psychological Outcomes:

Maturity

Increased awareness of oneself

Responsibility for self

Adaptability

Body image

Evaluation of “personal demons”

Self-image modification/crystallization of identity

Examination of vocational direction in life

Increased cognitive and problem solving skills

Effective management of problematic situations in cultural transitions

Life-long commitment to international civic engagement

Increasingly differentiated and realistic assessment of people as individuals

Openness to the ideas of others
Network expansion
Examination of criteria for friendships and for own values
Tolerance toward out-groups and acceptance of the values of out-groups
New outlook on their homes and families (Portillo, 2004)

Among the positive studies, the Institute of International Education of Students (IES) 50-year Alumni Survey was one that was up to date and had a large sample. According to Peters (2004), this survey was the largest ever quantitative survey of study abroad alumni. This survey was done in 2002 and involved about 3,400 study abroad alumni between the years 1950 and 2000. The results have been presented by McMillan and Opem (2004) and Dwyer and Peters (2004). It is noteworthy that more than 80 percent of the respondents agreed that studying abroad has enhanced their interests in academic study. As Hendley (IES Vienna 1963) so eloquently remarked, "The 18th century English gentleman culminated his education with the 'grand tour', a year-long ramble through Europe. My own year in Vienna, however, served not as the climax of my education, but the beginning".

Eighty-two percent of the alumni surveyed said they have developed more sophisticated ways of looking at the world as a result of studying abroad. “The experience of living and studying in another country was so eye-opening … [it] tested preconceptions and habits I wasn’t even aware were so ingrained in me” said Perras (IES Paris, 1981).

“Almost all of the respondents (94 percent) reported that the experience continues to influence interactions with people from different cultures” (Dwyer and Peter, 2004). More than 96 % of students surveyed indicated that they believe study abroad increased their self-confidence (McMillan and Opem, 2004).

According to Dwyer and Peter (2004), “Few other experiences in life have proven to net such a positive and sustainable impact. With study abroad offering so many life-changing and enduring academic, career, intercultural, personal, and social benefits, students should
carefully consider studying abroad when searching for a college and during their collegiate career”.

Among the positive benefits, other research has discussed limitations of studying abroad. According to Carsello and Creaser (1976), studying abroad may decrease the quality of one’s study habits and one’s ability to concentrate. However, they conclude that these negative impacts may be transitory conditions due to the newness of the experience.

Hokanson (2000) has listed the following conditions which may affect students’ study abroad experiences: 1. anomie (alienation experienced by those immersed in the target culture without access to their home culture); 2. unfriendliness; 3. insufficient linguistic resources; 4. purposelessness; 5. scarcity of support; 6. lack of access to varied activities; and 7. major social blunders with their host families. According to Portillo (2004), if students do not overcome the conditions and allow these conditions to permeate the overall experience, the outcomes of their study abroad experiences are likely to be negative.

Attitude Formation and Attitude Change

In the study abroad literature, little has been reported regarding attitudes and attitude change. According to Krech, Crutchfield and Ballachey (1962), as individuals develop, their cognitions, feelings, and action tendencies pertaining to various objects in their world become organized into enduring systems called attitudes. Krech, Crutchfield & Ballachey (1962) have examined in detail the formation of attitudes. “Attitudes develop in the process of want satisfaction” (p.181). If objects and people satisfy one’s needs, the individual will develop favorable attitude toward those same people and objects. On the other hand, if those objects and people block one’s goal or achievement, the individual will develop unfavorable attitudes toward them. Rosenberg’s study (1956) supports their hypothesis. His research involved 120 college students. They were tested on their attitudes toward freedom of speech for communists; subsequently, they were presented two tasks about personal satisfaction and
goal attainment. The outcomes suggested that their attitudes toward freedom of speech for communists were highly correlated with their beliefs about the instrumental value of achieving important goals. Attitude objects that facilitated goal attainment were favored, and vice versa.

Individuals’ attitudes are influenced by the information to which they are exposed (Krech, Crutchfield & Ballachey, 1962). Living in a complex world, human beings depend on authorities as sources of information such as parents, teachers, newspapers, books, and radio and television broadcasts. However, sometimes authorities are unreliable. They may be totally ignorant of the facts, or falsify the facts purposely (p.191). Furthermore, individuals do not necessarily accept all the information offered by authorities. Their personal wants may govern what to accept and who to believe. Individuals have been known to use information which is consistent with their preexisting attitudes. When certain facts are not relevant or conflicting, one tends to create, invent or distort “facts” that are congruent with existing attitudes.

Krech, Crutchfield & Ballachey (1962) believe that human beings’ attitudes direct their social actions. Social actions reflect their attitudes which are “enduring systems of positive or negative evaluations, emotional feelings, and pro or con action tendencies with respect to social objects” (p.139). In the case of studying abroad, the participants will already have some kind of positive attitude toward the destination to which they are going to study. If one is not interested in a certain culture or country, one is unlikely to choose the destination. So it is not far-fetched to assume positive attitudes toward China and the Chinese people among those who study abroad in China.

At the same time, the attitudes of the participants who study abroad are similar, yet different. As Krech, Crutchfield & Ballachey (1962) describe:

Man’s attitudes develop as he develops. But no man’s life develops apart from the
lives of his fellows. And just as each man’s life intersects the lives of others—but only at certain points—and just as each man’s life story is similar to—but not identical with—the life stories of his neighbors, so are the attitudes which each man develops similar to—yet different from—the attitude of his family, friends, neighbors, and compatriots (p.180).

Krech, Crutchfield & Ballachey (1962) believe there are two major kinds of attitude change. “Attitude change has most generally come to mean a change in the sign [direction] of the existing attitude (from positive to negative or negative to positive) or a decrease in the initial amount [valence] of positivity or negativity” (p.215). They refer to attitude modifications as incongruent change and congruent change. Incongruent change is “because the direction of change is toward the sign opposite that of the original attitude; congruent change is change in a direction congruent with the sign [direction] of the existing attitude” (p.251-252).

Changes in attitudes are rational. According to Krech, Crutchfield & Ballachey (1962), “attitude change is brought about through exposure to additional information, changes in the group affiliations of the individual, enforced modification of behavior toward the object, and through procedures which change personality” (p.225). Participants in study abroad programs are exposed to different cultures and abundant new information. The group they are associated with, and the people with whom they interact abroad, will stimulate attitude change, either congruent or incongruent.

Krech, Crutchfield & Ballachey (1962) have also observed that “the direction and degree of attitude change induced by additional information is a function of situational factors and of the source, medium, form, and content of the information.”(p.226). Attitude change among study abroad participants may be due to exposure to different information both at home and abroad.
Lehmann (1958) concluded from several studies that “the degree and extent to which attitudes are modifiable depends on the nature of the experience, the type of contact, personality makeup of the individual, the group’s approval of new attitudes, and the subject’s perception of the outcomes” (p.469). Lehmann suggested that attitude changes during college years may be due to the maturity, or immaturity, of the individual, the particular time, the college experience, or a combination of one or more other factors. However, “there is no one factor which can be singled out in the college experience to explain changes in attitudes” (p.470). Therefore, studying abroad during the formative college years can be a significant factor that contributes to attitude changes among students.

Smith (1955) conducted an intensive study of a group of students who studied abroad in Europe for a year. Their counterparts were the control group who remained in the home country. The results showed that the experimental group developed a more favorable attitude towards people in foreign countries.

Hofman and Zak (1969) conducted a study of attitude change among 112 Jewish high school students who studied abroad in Israel. They divided the students into 2 groups: those who had a high level of contacts with host nationals versus those who had a low level of contacts with host nationals. Variables tested regarding attitude changes included: attitudes toward Jewishness (interests, closeness, interdependence, solidarity, and centrality), and attitudes toward Israel (help, interdependence, immigration and Hebrew). The results indicated that those who had a higher level of contacts developed favorable attitudes toward both Jewishness and Israel; the low contact group remained unchanged on most of the test variables.

Hensley and Sell (1979) conducted a study to assess attitude change among a sample of study abroad students. Their experimental group included 52 students who participated in the Kent State University Study Abroad program in Geneva, Switzerland for a semester. The
control group consisted of 17 students who stayed home. There were four dependent variables in the study: 1. Worldmindedness; 2. support for the United Nations; 3. self-esteem; and 4. tolerance for ambiguity. They used four instruments to measure the dependent variables. The Worldmindedness Scale developed by Sampson and Smith (1957) was used to measure worldmindedness. Rosenberg’s self-esteem inventory was used to measure self-esteem. An instrument developed by Budner (1967) was used to measure tolerance of ambiguity. To measure support for the United Nations, the researchers developed their own instrument by using items from Lutzker’s 1960 internationalism scale, a 1963 Roper poll, and a 1970 Gallup poll. Multiple regression analysis was used to measure attitude changes. The researchers discovered that the self-esteem of the study abroad participants was higher than the control group. The worldmindedness, support for the United Nations and tolerance of ambiguity of the experimental group, was not statistically different from the control group. The authors concluded that “the extent of contact with non-Americans is a more important factor in attitude change, although the impact is on psychological and non political attitudes” (p.407).

Social Distance Studies

Social distance refers to “the grades and degrees of understanding and intimacy which characterize pre-social and social relations generally” (Park, 1924). Bogardus (1967) conducted a series of studies on social distance. He conducted his experiments to ascertain how and why degrees of understanding and intimacy vary among different racial groups. Bogardus found that social distance is influenced by traditions and accepted opinions, then personal experiences in the early years of life. Adulthood also has a great impact on social distance. Bogardus developed a racial distance scale and conducted decades of research using the instrument. His book summarized those studies. He conducted his research on racial distance in 1926, 1946, 1956 and 1966. The participants in these four research studies
numbered 1,725, 1,950, 2,053 and 2,605. The number of participants ranged from students in 24 colleges and universities in 1926 to 36 colleges and universities in 25 states throughout the United States in 1966. Most of his samples consisted of young people from 19 to 26 years of age “whose minds were awake to urgent problems of the day, but who had not crystallized their thinking.” These people were similar to Americans who study abroad today.

In a 1926 study, Bogardus found that the greatest social distance in the racial groups involved Asians, African Americans and Mexicans. The means of the 1,725 respondents ranged from 2.69 to 3.91. He concluded that a large number of the participants were not personally acquainted with immigrants from Asia, such as the Chinese. “The Chinese whose China towns, coolie laborers and the Chinese tongs in some of the larger cities of the United States were viewed with various degrees of misunderstanding, suspicion, and hence of distance” (p.13).

In another study, Bogardus (1946) used the same scale and conducted similar research. The results showed that “The Chinese strongly favored the United States in the War (World War 2) against Japan, and hence received a noteworthy increase in the nearness reactions. For many years numerous Americans had had warm feelings toward the Chinese people-- a factor that seems to have found expression in the decrease in distance” (p.18). The grand mean of the 58,500 racial distance reactions obtained in 1946 remained about the same as the grand mean in 1926(Bogardus, 1967, p.19). However, the racial distance spread between groups in 1946 had decreased to 2.57 compared to 2.85 in 1926.

Bogardus(1997) stated that

The take-over of China by the Communists in 1948 and 1949 explains to a degree the marked increase in the social distance index given the Chinese in 1956. However, if many participants in the racial reactions study had not found themselves friendly toward the Chinese as a people, the index would have increased even more. This
friendly attitude included a belief stated by some of the respondents that one day the Chinese people would overthrow Communism, and once more proceed under Confucian, Taoist, and other historic Chinese philosophies, and possibly Christianity (p.23 and p.24).

Bogardus also noticed the feelings between races changed. “Good feeling between races began to develop in the period 1946 to 1956 as suggested by the unusual decrease in racial spread between the race receiving the least distance index and the one receiving the greatest index. The decrease in spread of .82 points from 2.57 to 1.75 is very marked” (Bogardus, 1956, p.25). Bogardus stated the change in social distance between races took place slowly. “The over-all trend implies, however, that substantial decreases in racial distance take place slowly. Racial relations are an aspect of underlying cultural conditions and of deep-seated human attitudes. Changes in cultural relations and in basic human attitudes occur unevenly from decade to decade, and as a rule it is exceedingly difficult to hurry them. In fact, ill-advised effectors may even defeat cultural changes and hence racial improvements in good will may likewise be stalled” (Bogardus, 1967, p.25 and p.26).

In a 1966’s study, the Indices showed that “the Chinese also gained in nearness points, possibly as a result of rising conflict between China and Russian, and the developing civil strife in China-factors which make Chinese Communism seem less dangerous to the United States, and hence revive at least slightly an old-time friendly feeling of Americans for the Chinese as a people” (Bogardus, 1967, p.29).

Bogardus (1967) concluded that racial distance reactions in forty years of study seem to be stable. This indicates that racial feelings run deep in human nature and are difficult to fathom(p.28). He suggested that any proposal to change reactions needs to be a long-term educational program. He also concluded that there is an overall trend towards nearness in race relations in the United States, which may mean “an increasing degree of racial
understanding and of mutual fair play between ethnic groups” (p.29). The decrease in the racial distance spread is “a social movement toward a recognition of the unity of the human race” (p.29).

Owen, Eisner and McFaul (1977) replicated the Bogardus study in 1977. They had 1,488 respondents, similar to those in Bogardus’ surveys, who were from 12 colleges and universities in 11 states. The mean social distance score was 1.93 with a spread of 1.37. The study supported the half century trend toward decreased social distance (p.95). Also in this study, African American respondents showed greater social distance with a greater spread than any other group. As an ethnic group, African Americans for this first time moved to the second sector (p.90). Female respondents expressed greater social distance than males (p.89). The Chinese ranked 23 with a social distance score of 2.29 (p.89). Compared to Bogardus’ 1966 study, the Chinese shifted positions only slightly (p.93).

In 1993, Kleg and Yamamoto conducted a study using the Bogardus scale (1995). However, their sample consisted of 135 middle school teachers in Colorado. In this study, they computed a Pearson $r$ correlation between two sets of social distance scores and a rank order-correlation. Two important findings emerged. The first was that “the level of permissible intimacy had improved considerably for all the groups involved” (p.65). The second was that “the preferential order among the differing ethnic/racial groups remained remarkably stable…it appears that certain perceived social attitudes, and such nonwhite people as Turks, Koreans, Japanese, Chinese, and African Americans remain among the more clearly distanced” (p.66). The Chinese ranked as 20 and with a social distance score of 1.7 in this study.

The latest study of social distance was published in 2005. Parrillo and Donoghue “attempted to preserve the Bogardus legacy of social distance measurement yet meet the challenge presented by a far more diverse society”. They randomly selected 22 colleges and
universities stratified by the four major regions of the United States. Their sample consisted of 2,916 college student respondents. The findings received a social distance mean score of 1.45 with a spread of 0.87, “revealing greater social distance acceptance than the 1977 replication”. The Whites continued to be the most accepted, and the African Americans dramatically moved to the top. Gender, place of birth, ethnicity and race played important roles in social distance. The results showed that females were more tolerant than males while Native-borns were more tolerant than foreign-borns. The Chinese moved to the second sector with a distance score of 1.47. The findings indicated that “the spread in social distance—despite 1. increased diversity in society, 2. a revised list reflecting that demographic reality, and 3. increased diversity among respondents—continued to shrink”. “These results may suggest a growing level of acceptance by a more diverse society of different others.” It was suggested that “the growing acceptance might also be due to the legacy of political correctness and multicultural education initiatives designed to promote tolerance of others”.

Table 4 and 5 summarize the social distance score and spread by the year, and social distance score towards the Chinese people from research studies by Bogardus (1967); Owen, Eisner & McFaul (1977); Kleg & Yamamoto (1995) and Parrillo & Donoghue (2005).

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Spread</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 4 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Spread</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

*Social Distance Score and Rank toward the Chinese*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Owen, Eisner and Mcfaul stated (1977, p.82), “Bogardus measure of social distance has been the launching point for myriad studies of social class, occupation, religion, sex, age and race in many different cultures here and abroad.” Parrilo and Donoghue (2005) also described, “In varying applications, the Bogardus social distance scale remains influential and extensively applied, vivid testimony from the academic community as to its merits”.
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CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Overview
This study investigated the effects of studying abroad on the attitudes of American undergraduate students toward the Chinese people. This chapter outlines the research design, participants, instrumentation, procedures, and methods followed in the study.

Research Design
The study employs a mixed research method. In this research, both quantitative and qualitative techniques are employed. According to Johnson (2006), mixed method research is “the third major research paradigm, adding an attractive alternative (when it is appropriate) to quantitative and qualitative research”. He states that:

Proponents of mixed research typically adhere to the compatibility thesis as well as to the philosophy of pragmatism.

1. The compatibility thesis is the idea that quantitative and qualitative methods are compatible, that is, they can both be used in a single research study.

2. The philosophy of pragmatism says that researchers should use the approach or mixture of approaches that works the best in a real world situation. In short, what works is what is useful and should be used, regardless of any philosophical assumptions, paradigmatic assumptions, or any other type of assumptions.

Creswell et al (2003) define mixed method research as “a collection or analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data in a single study in which the data are collected concurrently or sequentially, are given a priority, and involve integration of data at one or more stages in the process of research” (p.212).
Using Mixed Methods Research

The utility of mixed method research is discussed by Tashakkori and Teddlie (2003). There are three areas that can clearly show mixed methods are better than any single approach, for example, quantitative or qualitative methods. Mixed methods research answers some research questions that are not answerable by other methods. It has a stronger inference, and it presents a large diversity of different views (p.14).

Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998) provide a good picture of using both qualitative and quantitative methods:

Data collection methods often provide new and uncharted information about the person or the setting of study. Each of these approaches to data collection alone might provide insufficient and/or partially incorrect data. Combining the two approaches…provides richer data than either approach. The alternative approach either validates the data collected through the other approach or complements add to such data (p.55).

When using mixed research design, researchers need to keep the fundamental principles of the method in mind; that is, “methods should be mixed in a way that has complementary strengths and nonoverlapping weakness” (Johnson & Turner, 2003, p.299; Brewer&Hunter, 1989; Tashakkori& Teddlie, 1998). The author tried to use a mixture or combination of methods that has complementary strengths. First, a pre-post measure was used to compare students’ attitudes toward the Chinese people at two points in time. Before departure, respondents completed a demographic survey and a pre test. Before the respondents returned back to the United States, they completed a post test together with an open-ended questions and essay questions. Secondly, after they were back to their home institution, intensive interviews were conducted to capture the China Study Abroad program
Interviewing, in Glesne’s word (1998) is “a process of getting words to fly” (p.67). Interviewing is an interaction between at least two or more persons. To conduct an interview, a researcher first needs to develop a clearly defined topic, then designs interview questions based on the topic. Secondly, a researcher asks the interview questions with adroit knowledge and consummate skills. Finally, a researcher will need enough time to “pitch” the question “at his respondents with the intent to making words fly” (Glesne, 1998, p. 67).

In the process of developing research questions and interview questions, Maxwell (1996) makes it very clearly that “your research questions formulate what you want to understand; your interview questions are what you ask people in order to gain that understanding” (p.74). During the interview process, Glesne(1998) pictures such a process very vividly: “Unlike a human baseball pitcher whose joy derives from throwing balls that batters never touch, you toss questions that you want your respondent to ‘hit’ and hit well in every corner of your data park, if not clear out of it- -a swatted home run of words”(P.67).

By conducting comprehensive interviews among the studying abroad participants, the author could capture the unseen, find out how the respondents feel or think about their studying abroad experience and their attitude change towards the Chinese, and explain how the attitude change took place. Just as Glesne (1998) says “such a broad scale approach is directed to understanding phenomena in their fullest possible complexity” (p93).

Pre and Post Testing

According to Campbell and Stanley (1963), this study involved a quasi-experimental design with the pre- and post testing of an experimental group exposed to a particular intervention. A control group was not involved.

A pre-post measure was used to compare student attitudes toward the Chinese people
at two points in time. Before departing to China, respondents completed a demographic survey and a scale for measuring the social distance between them and the Chinese people. Before returning to the United States, the American students again completed the social distance scale.

Description of the China Study Abroad Program

The study was conducted both at the University of North Texas in Denton, Texas and in China. “UNT is a student-centered public research university with 11 colleges and schools offering 93 Bachelor’s, 111 master’s and 50 doctoral degree programs in the Dallas-Fort Worth region. UNT is the flagship of the UNT system.” It is one of the largest universities in Texas, enrolling more than 33,500 students.

The China Study Abroad program is jointly administered by the College of Business and the School of Merchandising and Hospitality Management at the University of North Texas. Studying in Hong Kong and vicinity, a major sourcing and marketing hub for apparel and other industries, allowed the students from the University to participate in a variety of opportunities for interaction with local business leaders and firms competing in the global marketplace. The program extended to Shanghai, the metroplex in the Yangtze River delta, and provided students with hands-on opportunities to examine the ways in which cultural norms and standards impact contemporary marketing tactics and strategies. Scheduled tours included Hong Kong and China manufacturing plants. Cultural tours and experiential learning activities were scheduled as part of the Study Abroad learning and living experience. Featured speakers included the Director of the Hong Kong-America Center, an organization involving the promotion of understanding between Chinese and American cultures through educational and cultural exchanges. Study abroad participants earned 6 hours of course credit through the University of North Texas.
Participants

The sample for this study consisted of undergraduate American students at the University of North Texas who actively engaged in a summer cultural immersion experience in the People’s Republic of China.

Instrument

This study utilized Bogardus social distance scale (Bogardus, 1925). It is a scale created by Emory S. Bogardus to empirically measure people's willingness to participate in social contacts of varying degrees of closeness with members of diverse social groups. As Krech, Crutchfield & Ballachey (1962) describe:

The classification progress in an orderly way from one implies a willingness to accept a close degree of relationship with the nationality to one implying a willingness to accept only an extreme remote relationship or none at all. The valence of the individual’s attitude toward the nationality is then taken to be the highest degree of intimacy he would accept (p.154).

The scale asks people the extent to which they would be accepting of each group (a score of 1.00 for a group is taken to indicate no social distance):

1. As close kinship by marriage (score 1.00)
2. As my close personal friends (2.00)
3. As neighbors on the same street (3.00)
4. As co-workers in the same occupation (4.00)
5. As citizens in my country (5.00)
6. As only visitors in my country (6.00)
7. Would exclude from my country (7.00)

According to Krech, Crutchfield & Ballachey (1962), “The Bogardus social-distance scale has shown itself to be a highly reliable measure of general social distance, as
distinguished from distance expressed for specific groups. Split-half reliability coefficients of .90 and higher have been secured by different investigators” (p.157).

In this study, only three groups (Chinese, Mexicans and Nigerians) were used in the Bogardus social distance scale instead of multiple group (Appendix A and B). The major purpose was to determine the China Study Abroad program participants’ attitude toward the Chinese people.

A demographic survey developed by the author was used along with the Bogardus social distance scale to obtain basic information about the participants before they departed for China. The demographic survey collected data such as gender, age, student classification, ethnicity, family income (Appendix C).

An open-ended questionnaire at the post study abroad captured some qualitative data about the China Study Abroad program and participants’ experience (Appendix D). An interview questionnaire was also developed by the author to follow up the pre-post test of attitude toward the Chinese people (Appendix E).

Data Collection Procedure

Initial contacts were made with the leading faculty member of the China Study Abroad program at the University of North, Dr. Lou Pelton. Dr. Pelton is an Associate Professor in the College of Business, Department of Marketing and Logistics. These contacts were followed up with the University of North Texas Institutional Review Board which approved the study.

During the orientation meeting, students who would be studying abroad in China were asked to complete a demographic survey and the Bogardus social distance scale test. Thirty students agreed to participate in the study and returned the survey.

After a two-week stay in China, including travel to Hong Kong and mainland China, the American study abroad students were asked to complete again the Bogardus social
When students returned to the United States from China, an email was sent to all the participants of the China Study Abroad program in the summer of 2006, encouraging them to participate in an interview. An intensive interview was conducted at the University of North Texas to obtain detailed information about students’ attitude toward the Chinese people and their study abroad experience.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics: The descriptive analyses were used in this study. Expert Scan was used to scan the data and summarize the results. The demographic and background characteristics presumably provided insight into the types of undergraduate students from the University of North Texas who studied abroad in China in 2006.

In this research, the social distance of study abroad participants was measured on the social distance scale prior to and after their China Study Abroad experience to determine possible attitudinal changes toward the Chinese people. The dependent variable was social distance. All statistical tests of significance were performed at the 0.05 alpha level. Pair Samples \( t \) Tests was the original design, and the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test was later conducted to find out the statistical significance of attitude changes.

Qualitative data: The open-ended questionnaires at the survey, field notes, students’ journals, web postings and discussions, and interviews provide data in words to describe participants’ attitudes toward the Chinese people before and after studying abroad. It also provides a deeper insight about their studying abroad experience. A qualitative method was used to analyze the data which includes content analysis and data transcribed from interviews. The initial step of the qualitative data analysis is to read the documents, interview transcripts, notes, and web posting of China Study Abroad program participants to provide “layer of analysis” (Creswell, 1998, p.36) to help the data interpretation. Yen& Inman (2007)
noted that “qualitative research analysis is a circular, fluid and ongoing process that requires examination and reexamination on multiple levels at different points in time” (p.384). Heppner et al. (1999) described qualitative data analysis as involving reading and rereading data to find core ideas and deeper insights. The process requires an open-mindedness and flexibility (Polkinghorne, 2005). Another issue that is very important in qualitative data analysis is the validity across the analyzing process. One of the major threats is the subjectivity of researchers. To limit this threat, the author used self reflexivity (Rennine, 2004) to deal with the personal biases as an insider of Chinese culture. On the other hand, employing data triangulation to control the research biases is another method used in the qualitative data analysis process.

In brief, by employing mixed methods research, the author sought to explore the benefits of multiple approaches to best understand and represent the attitudes toward the Chinese people among the participants of China Study Abroad program.
CHAPTER 4
PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

Overview

The findings from this study are presented in this chapter. The findings are organized according to the research questions which guided the study. Chapter 4 also includes an identification of the demographic characteristics of the research participants, the pre-treatment levels of social distance between the research participants and the Chinese people, and the post-treatment levels of social distance between the research participants and the Chinese people. The causes of attitude changes and study abroad experiences are also presented.

Research Question 1

Research Question 1: What are the demographic characteristics of American students who participate in the University of North Texas China Study Abroad program?

Twenty-nine undergraduate students participated in the study prior to studying abroad in China. In table 6 are data pertaining to their gender characteristics. Twenty-four students were female; 5 were males; 83.3 % were females; 16.7 % were males.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the 19 participants who took both the pre and post China Study Abroad survey, 4 were males; 15 were females.
Table 7

*Gender of Pre and Post Study Abroad Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding ethnicity, among the 29 participants who took the pre survey, there were one African American, one was Asian, 19 were Caucasians, 6 were Hispanics, and 2 “other.”

Table 8

*Ethnicity of Pre Study Abroad Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of those who completed both the pre and post study abroad survey, 4 were Hispanic, one was Asian, one was African American, one was “other”, and the remainders were Caucasians.
Table 9

*Ethnicity of both Pre and Post Study Abroad Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the data in Table 10, the majority of participants were seniors (n=17); the fewest were sophomores (n=3); 10 were juniors, and 17 were seniors. No freshmen were in the research.

Table 10

*Academic Classification of the Pre Study Abroad Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Of those who completed both surveys, 2 were sophomores, 6 were juniors, and 12 were seniors. Their ages ranged from 20 to 27.

Table 11

*Academic Classification of the Pre and Post Study Abroad Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One survey question requested estimates of family income. Twenty-nine respondents estimated their family income. In Table 12 and 13 appear the ranges of their family incomes.

Table 12

*Estimated Family Income of the Pre Study Abroad Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Family Income</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20,000 to 24,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000 to 74,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75,000 to 99,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 to 149,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150,000 to 199,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Regarding the number of countries the participants had been to prior to the China Study Abroad program, 6 had never been abroad. However, among those who had been abroad before the China trip, all had been to countries located in North America, South America and Europe. None of them had been to any Asian countries prior to China Study Abroad program. China Study Abroad became the participants’ first Asian experience.
Table 14

*Number of Countries Pre Survey Takers had Been to Prior to the Study Abroad Program*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15

*Number of Countries both Pre-Post Survey Takers had Been to Prior to the Study Abroad Program*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 15 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16

*Countries Visited Prior to the Study Abroad Experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bahamas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 16 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porto Rico</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the participants’ family members had been abroad. Only 2 families had not been abroad. For those who had been abroad, the length of stay had been short. The longest stay had been for more than 6 months.

Table 17

*Length of Time Spent Abroad by the Pre-survey Takers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Time</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than a week</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 6 months</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18

*Length of Time Spent Abroad by both Pre and Post Survey Takers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Time</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than a week</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 6 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four questions in the survey were about the Chinese language. One student had family members, friends, and, including himself, who spoke Chinese (This participant was Asian). One participant had close friends who spoke Chinese. The rest of the participants marked “no” on all four questions. The four survey questions were designed to find out whether they had Chinese friends before the China studies program, which may have affected their attitudes toward the Chinese people. Secondly, in a foreign county without knowing the language, communication is a problem.

Prior to departing for China, the Study Abroad participants were asked why they had chosen the China Study Abroad program. Most answered to learn about a new culture and to experience something different. Some answered that their course was a merchandising course for which they would earn credit. One mentioned that family encouragement prompted this trip; another mentioned that a former China Study Abroad program participant’s positive experiences influenced his decision.

Research Question 2

Research Question 2: What was the social distance between American students and
the Chinese people prior to the participation of the American students in the University of
North Texas China Study Abroad program?

The average social distance score between American students and the Chinese people
prior to the participation of the American students in the University of North Texas China
Study Abroad program was 1.53. The lowest level of social distance score was 1, which
indicated the highest acceptance of the Chinese people in Bogardus social distance scale. 12
of pre-test takers’ social distance score was 1. Six pre-test takers’ social distance score was 2
and one had a social distance score of 5.

Research Question 3

Research question 3: What was the social distance between American students and the
Chinese people subsequent to the participation of the American students in the University of
North Texas China Study Abroad program?

The social distance mean score between American students and the Chinese people
subsequent to the participation of the American students in the University of North Texas
China study abroad program was 1.21. Fifteen participants’ social distance score was 1, and 4
participants’ social distance score was 2.

Nineteen participants completed the Bogardus Social Distance Scale before and after
studying abroad. There was a .32 score change and a decrease on the post test. The following
tables describe detailed information regarding the pre and post social distance scores.

Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>1.5263</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post test</td>
<td>1.2105</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20

*Pre-test Social Distance Scores toward the Chinese*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21

*Post-test Social Distance Scores toward the Chinese*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22

*Outlook of Social Distance Scores toward the Chinese*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pretest social distance scores towards the Chinese

- Pretest
- 1.00
- 2.00
- 5.00
The graphs above give the pre and post social distance scores in pie charts.

An original design of Paired Samples $t$ Test was conducted to measure the social distance scores. The following tables display the result of the test.
Table 23

*Paired Samples t Test*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Paired Difference</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>95% CI of the difference</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td></td>
<td>.31579</td>
<td>1.0029</td>
<td>.23009</td>
<td>-.16760</td>
<td>.79918</td>
<td>1.372</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24

*Paired Samples Correlations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>r squared</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Post</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.616</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data were not normally distributed in this study. A nonparametric test was conducted to determine whether there was a statistical significant difference in the pre and post social distance scores. The Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test was used. It is a non-parametric test used to test the median differences in paired data and is equivalent to a paired *t*-test. It does not have to meet normal distribution assumption.

To carry out the test, firstly, the difference between pretest and posttest of social distance scores of each pair was calculated. Secondly, the differences were ranked according to their absolute values by giving 1 for the smallest difference, 2 for the next smallest and so on. Thirdly, the positive rank of differences and negative rank of differences were summed.
The null hypothesis for the Wilcoxon Signed-Ranks Test is that the difference \((d = \text{posttest} - \text{pretest})\) between the members of each pair has a median value of zero. To be complete, pretest and posttest social distance scores have identical distributions (Bluman, 2007, p.679).

Table 25

**Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>posttest - pretest</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative Ranks</td>
<td>4(a)</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Ranks</td>
<td>1(b)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ties</td>
<td>14(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| a  | posttest < pretest |
| b  | posttest > pretest |
| c  | posttest = pretest |

Table 26

**Test Statistics(b)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>posttest - pretest</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1.414(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | .157 |

| a  | Based on positive ranks. |
| b  | Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test |

Additional Findings of Research Question 2 and 3

In research question 2 and 3, both Mexicans and Nigerians were used in the Bogardus social distance scale along with the Chinese group. When students were tested on their
attitudes towards these three groups, the social distance scores of these study abroad program participants towards the Mexicans and Nigerians were analyzed.

*Social Distance toward the Mexicans*

Table 27

*Descriptive Statistics toward the Mexicans*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>1.4211</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.07061</td>
<td>.24561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post test</td>
<td>1.1053</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.4588</td>
<td>.10526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28

*Pre-test Social Distance Scores toward the Mexicans*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29

*Post-test Social Distance Scores toward the Mexicans*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social Distance toward the Nigerians

Table 30

Descriptive Statistics of Social Distance Scores toward the Nigerians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>1.1579</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.50146</td>
<td>.11504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post test</td>
<td>1.1053</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.45833</td>
<td>.10526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31

Pre-test Social Distance Scores toward the Nigerians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32

Post-test Social Distance Scores toward the Nigerians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By looking at the social distance scores towards three different groups which measures study abroad participants’ attitude toward the Chinese, Mexicans and Nigerians before and after studying abroad in China, a clear picture of social distance scores towards the Chinese can be obtained.

Table 33

A Comparison Table Presents a Picture of 3 Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Mexicans</th>
<th>Nigerians</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Mexicans</th>
<th>Nigerians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.5263</td>
<td>1.4211</td>
<td>1.1579</td>
<td>.96427</td>
<td>1.07061</td>
<td>.50146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.2105</td>
<td>1.1053</td>
<td>1.1053</td>
<td>.41885</td>
<td>.45883</td>
<td>.45883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>.3158</td>
<td>.3158</td>
<td>.0526</td>
<td>.54542</td>
<td>.61178</td>
<td>.04263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 4

Research Question 4: How did the changes in social distance toward the Chinese people occur and what were their impressions of the China Study Abroad experience?

To answer this question, a qualitative analysis was employed. The subjective narrative descriptions of the students about what made the greatest impression on them depict their attitudes toward the Chinese people. Among the 19 post-study abroad comments about the China trip, 10 participants answered that the Chinese people impressed them most. The following unedited verbatim quotes illustrate their attitudes toward the Chinese upon returning to the United States.

Participant 1:

“I was most impressed by the hospitality of the Chinese people. They were all very nice and happy to have us.”
Participant 2:
“What impressed me the most about China was how nice the natives /locals were. They always stopped to help us, and if they couldn't they would find someone who could. I was also impressed with their lifestyles. Although it wasn't the life of luxury or glamour, they made it work and seemed to be enjoying themselves. I am so glad that I took the opportunity to go on this trip. I met so many wonderful people and made so many lifelong friends.”

Participant 3:
“The willingness of the local people to help in any way possible and at any time.”

Participant 4:
“How nice everyone was to us, and how far they went out of their way to make us feel comfortable.”

Participant 5:
“I think how generous, kind and helpful the people were. They were always willing to go out for lunch with me.”

Participant 6:
“How hard people there work, also how well they get along.”

These written descriptions by the participants illustrate their impressions about the Chinese people gained through their participation in the China Study Abroad program. Most of them had positive feelings towards the Chinese and mentioned in different ways the helpfulness and friendliness of the Chinese people. None of the respondents came away with negative feelings about the Chinese people.

Follow up intensive interviews were conducted after the participants returned to the United States. One of the questions asked about their attitudinal changes towards the Chinese people. What follows are some of their answers:
Participant 1:

“The Chinese people are nicer and much more open than I thought. At first I thought they would be hateful; actually, they are not.”

Participant 2:

“I did not have any opinion before I went over there. Not knowing a lot of Chinese people in America. I had not conversed with them. Going there and speaking to them gave me an opinion of them. Before I did not socialize with them. Now I have a very positive opinion of them. They are very warm, very welcoming, and very helpful.”

Participant 3:

“How warm the Chinese are! The shopping malls, the markets and the factories where I went, people were very warm and welcoming. They made me feel that I am not a stranger to them. They made me feel at home. That was very comforting.”

Participant 4:

“The Chinese value so many more things than we do. I know that coming from America, how different the two cultures are. Even though the Chinese do not have much, they love what they have. I was raised in America, being so used to the American culture. Now I saw the Chinese culture. (They are) so different. I like the way they live.”

Participant 5:

“I remember asking the Chinese students in one of the local universities about what they want to do? Whether they want to go abroad to America or not. One of the students answered: ‘I just want to graduate early and help my family.’ The simple answer surprised me a lot. Before I went to China, I thought the Chinese and Americans are similar. However, we are quite different. We care more about ourselves and focus on what we want. The Chinese are family-oriented and seem to be more responsible. That really changed my opinion about them.”
These qualitative reports showed how and why the study abroad participants changed their attitudes and opinions about the Chinese people after interacting with them personally.

Research Question 5

Research Question 5: What did the study abroad participants consider to be the best and worst experiences of the China Study Abroad experience?

Best Experience

Intensive interviews were conducted to explore the participants’ experiences. What follows are some examples pertaining to their experiences:

Participant 1:

“Met some important executives and managers; got to see the factories they run; it was a very eye-opening experience.”

Participant 2:

“When I was there, we visited a local university. I got to talk to the students. They were thrilled to have us; they showed us their campus, their classrooms and dorms. One of the local media interviewed me. I was on the air of the local news. That was very exciting.”

Participant 3:

“Shopping. I am a shopaholic. There are so many more things I can buy in China. They are more edged. I am a fashion design major. Comparing the Chinese fashions and American fashions helped me learn. Viewing the Chinese things really opened my eyes. To us, we follow what the catalogues say and the fashions that magazines talk about; then we look at everyone else, imitate or mimic. However, the Chinese people put themselves into what they wear. They are more creative.”

Participant 4:

“My best experience was interacting with the local university students. They showed me their dorms. There were four girls living in one small room. The space and resources are
very limited. However, they study hard and seem to enjoy their daily life. We have more spacious rooms; we can work and earn a lot of money while we are students, and we take it for granted.”

Participant 5:

“Eating and trying the new authentic Chinese food. Here in America, before I went to China, I had never eaten Asian or Chinese food. The trip let me try new things. Actually, the Chinese food is much healthier and not greasy. It is steamed or grilled. Eating it actually tasted pretty good.”

Worst Experience

The study abroad participants reported different stories of their best experiences. Every one had certain wonderful and unforgettable experiences. While searching their worst experiences, here is what some said:

Participant 1:

“The language barrier. Communication sometimes is a problem. If the Chinese know more English, or we know some Chinese, things will be easier and not so frustrating.”

Participant 2:

“My worst experience had to do with my group members. They wanted to shop all the time. They did not want to do the group project. We were there to learn and that was our purpose. They were not very cooperative and we had disputes.”

Participant 3:

“We were on a very tight schedule. One time we got lost and were running late. The other group had been waiting for us and when we got there, there were a lot of complaints. That was not very good. Besides, we missed going to one of the university to see their fashion collections. That was one of the things we were supposed to do, but because of running late, we did not get to do it. I was very disappointed about this.”
Participant 4:

“Worst experience? I don’t think I have any bad experience during my stay in China.”

Participant 5:

“When I am in America, I know the street signs and everything. In China, getting
used to the flow was very hard. Getting my way around was quite difficult. I am not sure
whether this should be called worst experience or not. Maybe some difficulties that I
encountered were more appropriate.”

Research Question 6

Research Question 6: How do the students evaluate the overall China Study Abroad
experience?

The overall ratings for this China studies experience were positive. Seventeen (89%)
participants rated the program “excellent.” Two (11%) rated it “good.”

Table 34

*Overall Rating for the China Study Abroad program*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK/Fair</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

In summary, the demographic characteristics of China Studies Program participants
are displayed in tabular form. There were changes in social distance scores among some
participants after studying abroad. Participants’ attitudes toward the Chinese people changed through daily interaction with the Chinese or through special events while studying in China. Their best and worst experiences report stories during their stay in China. The overall China studies experiences were very good according to self report ratings by the participants.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, DISCUSSION,
CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overview

This chapter presents a summary of the findings of the research, discusses the findings, draws conclusions based on the findings, and includes recommendations for future research and practice.

Summary of Findings

Findings are the results of research conducted among a specific sample and are expressed in the past tense. What follows is a summary of the major findings of the research reported in this document:

1. The majority of the study abroad participants were female. The UNT study consisted of 83% females and 17% males. This percentage of male and female participants reflects the national data closely.

   For example, the annual report by the Institution of International Education stated 67% of the study abroad participants were female. Female participants have been 60% to 67% of the total number of participants for the past 13 years (Open Doors, 2006).

2. The majority of study abroad participants were Caucasian. In the UNT study 63% of the study abroad students were female. However, the Caucasian figure is lower than the national data, with the national data reporting 83% to 86% Caucasian (Open Doors, 2006).

3. The number of Hispanic participants in the UNT study was 20%. However, national data on the number of Hispanic study abroad participants reflects a much lower participation of Hispanic students, with 4.5 to 5.6% Hispanic student participation for the past 13 years (Open Doors, 2006).
4. As to educational background, academic seniors were the largest group in the UNT study, with 56.7% being seniors and 33% being juniors. National data shows juniors as the largest number, with the percentage for the past 13 years ranging from 34% to 43%. Senior participants ranged from 15% to 19% for the past 13 years (Open Doors, 2006).

5. A large percentage (62%) of participants in the UNT study were from middle to high level income families. The data collected by the Institute of International Education does not show family income information.

6. The majority of students in the University of North Texas study had previously traveled internationally, with only 20% of the students having no international experience. For those students who had been abroad, their destinations were South America, North America, Europe, and Mexico. No students in the University of North Texas program had been to China before the China Study Abroad program.

7. Very few students in the University of North Texas study knew the Chinese language. (Only one out of the 30 participants knew some Chinese). Additionally, UNT students prior to the study had little or no contact with Chinese people. However, as mentioned in their interviews and also shown in the data, some students made good Chinese friends during the program.

8. The pre-treatment mean for social distance score reported in the UNT study toward Chinese people was 1.53. The mode for the social distance score was 1, with the range being 4. The maximum social distance score was 5 for the UNT students, revealing that some UNT students had a low intimacy level towards the Chinese people prior to China Study Abroad program.

9. The post-treatment mean for social distance score toward the Chinese people was 1.21. The mode for social distance score was 1, and the range was 1. The maximum social
distance score was 2.

Additional findings

In this study, Nigerians and Mexicans were also included with the Chinese in the Bogardus social distance scale. It is interesting to find that some students reduced their distance toward Nigerians and Mexicans after studying in China. By comparing the social distance scores before and after studying abroad, by comparing three groups’ difference, it is not hard to see some American participants in this study, prior to the study abroad in China, their social distance towards the Chinese are higher than toward Nigerians and Mexicans, which means their intimacy level towards the Chinese is not as close as towards the other two groups. After studying abroad in China, the social distance towards the Chinese reduced more than the other two groups, which can be shown clearly through the difference of pre-scores and post-scores, and the standard deviations for post scores towards the Chinese were smaller than the standard deviations in the post scores for Mexicans and Nigerians.

Discussion of findings

Discussion of the sample

The China Study Abroad students in this study represent anything but a random sample of China Study Abroad students. First, the sample was taken from a single institution. Second, the sample of students was taken from a limited number of academic disciplines, viz., business, marketing, fashion design, hospitality and merchandizing. Third, the sample was not randomly selected. Finally, the availability sample used in this study was a very small one. Each student included in the research represented a delimitation beyond the control of the student-researcher.

Discussion of the gender differences

The percentage of female participants in the study abroad programs are larger compared with the male participants. It is the same case with the sample in this study. According to
Marklein (2005), the college gender gap is widening, 57 percent of the college and university students are woman. For example, for the first time in Minnesota in the year of 2004, “women earned more than half the degrees granted statewide in every category, be it associate, bachelor, master, doctoral or professionals.” However, compare this national percentage for women college students (57 percent) in 2005 with the national percentage of female participants in the studying abroad programs (60-67 percent) for past thirteen years, the gap is even wider, which means there are even fewer male participants in the study abroad programs.

The wide gap between genders in study abroad program participants should raise some attention and be given some concerns. First of all, there are some differences exists between males and females. As we learn from different researches (Alper, 1985; Beckwith, 1983; McGlone, 1980; Rebert, 1980) that on the whole, variation between men and women tends to be smaller than deviations within each sex, but very large differences between the groups do exist. Study abroad programs involve studying in a different cultural setting, getting in contact with different people. Women are better in interpersonal skills and communication. Whether the difference between genders or the nature and the setting of study abroad programs are more appealing to female students remains a question.

Secondly, whether the family income or the students’ personal income stay unknown and whether it is a factor that causes more female participants than male ones stay unclear. However, according to the Census Bureau, women on average earned 77 cents to each dollar paid to male counterparts in 2004. So there is a pay gap with males receiving more money than females in the same positions. Hopefully, money and income is not the issue that results in more females than males in the study abroad programs.

Since studying abroad matters for one’s educational experience and future business experiences as suggested by Johnson (2006), CEO of Association for International Educators,
which strongly believes that “international educational exchange advances learning and scholarship, builds respect among different peoples, and encourages constructive leadership in a global community.” How to tailor the study abroad programs to meet the male students’ needs and attract more male precipitants should not be neglected.

Discussion of the family income

Studying abroad involves traveling, transportation and lodging in a foreign country. Usually it will cost more than studying in the home country. At University of North Texas where the sample was obtained, there is approximately $3,595 for the China Study Program and this is on top of the course tuition in the year 2007. To many students, this is not a small amount of money. The result of this study shows that most studying abroad participants in this China Study Abroad program came from middle to upper income families.

No data on the family income of study abroad participants nationally were reported in the Open Doors data, which is an annual report by Institute of International Education on the American students studying abroad.

To explore the opportunities of studying abroad for more and more students, scholarship and grants for studying abroad should be doubled. One cannot be deprived of the opportunities of learning and prospering through studying abroad programs because of family income and conditions.

Discussion of the ethnicity

As we learned from the data, no matter the sample population in this research or from the national population, the majority of study abroad participants were Caucasians. To attract more minority groups into the studying abroad program is essential.

Discussion of the classification

The juniors and seniors as the major groups to participate in the studying abroad program may be justified. Firstly, freshman are fairly new to their universities and colleges,
they might need a certain time to adjust to the new environment of campus and get a sense of what they are doing and what major they are really interested in. Secondly, the juniors and seniors are more mature, as the research of Feldman and Newcomb (1969) concluded their analysis and stated that “freshman-to-senior changes in several characteristics have been occurring with considerable uniformity in most American colleges and universities,” namely "declining 'authoritarianism,' dogmatism, and prejudice, together with decreasingly conservative attitudes toward public issues and growing sensitivity to aesthetic experiences" (p. 326). So generalization from Feldman and Newcomb’s research points out that the juniors and seniors are more liberal and mature than the freshmen and sophomores. However, it would not be a bad idea to explore the possibility of studying abroad at different stages or classifications. Just as learning a foreign language should be started as early as one’s childhood, studying abroad should not be limited to juniors and seniors. According to the research conducted by Pascarella and Terenzini(1991), after examining more than 2,600 empirical studies completed over a period of fifty years, they found that "the early college years may be somewhat more influential than the later ones." To encourage and support students studying abroad during the early college years may have deeper impact on their attitudes, interpersonal relationship, and other areas.

Discussion of the social distance scores

The pre-treatment social distance mean towards the Chinese people in the sample was 1.53. However, most of the participants have a social distance score of 1, which means at the very beginning of the test, the social distance towards the Chinese people is close. Bogardus discussed in his book that the smallest social distance score of 1 and the largest social distance score of 7 usually were quite rare (1967). However, as time goes by, today’s study abroad participants seem to be more open and liberal to accept other ethnic groups that are different from one’s own. The post-treatment social distance between the American study
abroad students and the Chinese people was 1.21, which means that the China Study Abroad program participants did decrease the social distance towards the Chinese people. This arithmetic decrease in social distance was not statistically significant at alpha = 0.05. However, it needs to be kept in mind that 1. statistical significance and practical significance are not always synonymous. Something can be especially “significant” from a practical standpoint and yet be “not significant” from a statistical standpoint; 2. the observed reduction in social distance between the time prior to entering the study abroad immersion experience and the time after exiting the study abroad cultural experience was definitely in the direction one might expect; 3. the reduction in social distance can only be attributed to the study abroad experience; and 4. it is not unreasonable to hypothesize that a lengthier study abroad experience (two months long versus three weeks) could reduce the social distance score of American study abroad students to a theoretical one (the lowest score in Bogardus social distance scale, a lower score indicate a higher acceptance of a particular ethnic group).

In Pascarella and Terenzini’s tone (1991), “the college impact is found in non-authoritarian thinking and tolerance for other people and their views, in intellectual orientation to problem solving and their own world view in general, in the maturity of their interpersonal relations, in their personal adjustment skills and general sense of psychological well-being, and in their more globally measured levels of maturity and personal development” (p. 257). Studying abroad during college years can be an important attribute to the positive impacts of students’ college experience. Through studying abroad, the participants hopefully can reduce “authoritarianism, dogmatism, and (perhaps) ethnocentrism and in increasing their intellectual orientation, personal psychological adjustment, and sense of psychological well-being” (p.259).

Discussion of additional findings

The unexpected findings of changes in social distance scores toward Mexicans and Nigerians
after China Study Abroad program participants studying abroad were interesting. These are two assumptions based on the findings:

1. Based on the ethnicity make up of the China Study Abroad group, it was not hard to see the variety of races. By studying abroad at an international setting, the participants were staying together, having close contacts with each other on a daily basis. By interacting with classmates who have different skin colors from one’s own, one became more open minded and thus had a deeper understanding about the African Americans and Hispanics. So the participants’ attitude towards the Nigerians and Mexicans changed and the distance towards those two groups were also reduced.

2. After studying abroad, the participants of China Study Abroad program become more liberal and open minded. The openness of participants made them more willing to accept other people that are different from their own. Thus the social distance scores towards the Nigerians and Mexicans were changed and a certain closeness and intimacy were added.

By comparing the social distance scores towards the Chinese with the Mexicans and Nigerians, the China Study Abroad program participants lowered their distance level towards the Chinese more than the other two groups. This may have related to their study abroad experience in China and the close interaction with the local people there. However, the social distance toward the Chinese is still higher than Mexicans and Nigerians. This also validates again Bogardus study(1967) in social distance that Chinese, throughout the years, the rank order was still in the second category, the distance or intimacy level towards Asian people is still pretty remote.

Conclusions

Conclusions are inferential statements about a population from which a normal, random sample has been drawn and studied. Unlike findings, which are reported in the past
tense, conclusions are reported in the present tense.

Because the sample in this study was skewed beyond even approximate normality, the following conclusions must be viewed as tentative, at best:

1. Social distance between study abroad students and the indigenous members of their host countries can be ascertained using the Bogardus social distance scale;
2. It is undoubtedly crucial to quantitatively assess the amount of learning that takes place among participants in study abroad programs;
3. It is equally crucial to quantitatively and qualitatively assess the effects of cultural immersion programs on the attitudes of study abroad students;
4. Study abroad programs can be effective modalities for bringing about positive international attitude changes in students who participate in them. Just as George Bush said in 1989: "International exchanges are not a great tide to sweep away all differences, but they will slowly wear away at the obstacles to peace as surely as water wears away a hard stone."

Recommendations

1. This study merits replication among randomly selected samples drawn from randomly selected study abroad programs drawn from randomly selected colleges and universities;
2. Study abroad programs should be promoted as instruments for improving international relations and developing goodwill between and among nations; “The spirit of seeking understanding through personal contact with people of other nations and other cultures deserves the respect and support of all” as late President Gerald R. Ford stated in 1976.
3. Considering that familiarity can breed contempt, research needs to be done that explores the quality of cultural immersion study abroad programs. Not all intercultural
experiences can be expected to promote goodwill and improve international relations.

4. Studies need to be done that look at the effects of study abroad programs, not only in terms of attitude changes among program participants, but on attitude changes among the indigenous people in host countries. This recommendation is predicated on the assumption that attitude change is a two-way phenomenon which can affect more people than just American study abroad participants.
APPENDIX A

BOGARDUS SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALE FOR PRE STUDY ABROAD
Below are 7 questions regarding how you feel about Mexicans, Nigerians, and Chinese people. We want to know how you feel about each of these 3 groups of people. The 7 items below ask how close you feel comfortable being to Mexicans, Nigerians, and Chinese people.

*Circle “Yes” or “No” in each box below.* Just give your *first feelings* in every situation. *Do not* give reactions to the best or worst members you have known. Instead, think of the *stereotype* that you have of the *whole* group.

Would I want to have members of the following groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mexicans</th>
<th>Nigerians</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. As close kin by marriage</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In my club as personal friends</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. On my street as neighbors</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Working alongside me in my job</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. As citizens in my country</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. As visitors to my country</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Exclude them from my country</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

BOGARDUS SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALE FOR POST STUDY ABROAD
Below are 7 questions regarding how you feel about Mexicans, Nigerians, and Chinese people. We want to know how you feel about each of these 3 groups of people. The 7 items below ask how close you feel comfortable being to Mexicans, Nigerians, and Chinese people.

Circle “Yes” or “No” in each box below. Just give your first feelings in every situation. Do not give reactions to the best or worst members you have known. Instead, think of the stereotype that you have of the whole group.

We do not need your name on this survey. Simply put your date of birth and your 3 initials below on the form. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Would I want to have members of the following groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mexicans</th>
<th>Nigerians</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. As close kin by marriage</td>
<td>Yes   No</td>
<td>Yes   No</td>
<td>Yes   No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In my club as personal friends</td>
<td>Yes   No</td>
<td>Yes   No</td>
<td>Yes   No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. On my street as neighbors</td>
<td>Yes   No</td>
<td>Yes   No</td>
<td>Yes   No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Working alongside me in my job</td>
<td>Yes   No</td>
<td>Yes   No</td>
<td>Yes   No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. As citizens in my country</td>
<td>Yes   No</td>
<td>Yes   No</td>
<td>Yes   No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. As visitors to my country</td>
<td>Yes   No</td>
<td>Yes   No</td>
<td>Yes   No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Exclude them from my country</td>
<td>Yes   No</td>
<td>Yes   No</td>
<td>Yes   No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate your overall study abroad experience.

Poor _____ Fair _____ Good _____ Very good _____ Excellent _____
APPENDIX C

DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY
China Studies Program Survey

Response Definition: M=Male  F=Female

1. What is your gender?  .................................................................  ○  ○

Response Definition: A=African American  B=Asian/Pacific Islander  C=Caucasian  D=Hispanic  E=Other

2. What is your ethnicity? .................................................................  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○

Response Definition: 1=Freshman  2=Sophomore  3=Junior  4=Senior

3. What is your student classification? .............................................  ○  ○  ○  ○

4. What is your best estimation of family income?
   ○ less than $6,000  ○ $6,000 to $9,999  ○ $10,000 to $14,999  ○ $15,000 to $19,999
   ○ $20,000 to $24,999  ○ $25,000 to $29,999  ○ $30,000 to $39,999  ○ $40,000 to $49,999
   ○ $50,000 to $59,999  ○ $60,000 to $74,999  ○ $75,000 to $99,999  ○ $100,000 to $149,999
   ○ $150,000 to $199,999  ○ $200,000 or more

5. Have you been to any foreign countries?
   ○ None  ○ 1  ○ 2  ○ More than 2

6. If you have been abroad, please write down the countries you have been to

7. Have your family members been to any foreign countries?
   ○ None  ○ 1  ○ 2  ○ More than 2

8. What was the longest amount of time you spent in another country during a single visit?
   ○ Less than a week  ○ 2 weeks  ○ 3 weeks
   ○ 1 month  ○ 2 months  ○ 3 months
   ○ 4 months  ○ 5 months  ○ 6 months
   ○ over 6 months but less than a year  ○ over one year but less than two years
   ○ two years or more

9. Do you know how to speak Chinese?
   ○ Yes  ○ No
China Studies Program Survey

10. Do any of your family members know how to speak Chinese?
   ○ Yes   ○ No

11. Do any of your close friends know how to speak Chinese?
    ○ Yes   ○ No

12. Are any of your close friends from China?
    ○ Yes   ○ No

13. Please briefly write down the most important factors that influence your study abroad in China?
APPENDIX D

ESSAY QUESTION AT THE END OF THE STUDY ABROAD PROGRAM
WHAT IMPRESSED YOU MOST DURING YOUR STAY IN CHINA?
APPENDIX E

INTERVIEW QUESTIONAIR
1. What impressed you most about China?

2. What do you think about the Chinese people? And Why?

3. What do you like about the Chinese people? And Why?

4. What do you dislike about the Chinese people? And Why?

5. What about your study abroad experience changed your opinion of China and the Chinese people?

6. Describe your BEST experience during your Study Abroad program in China.

7. Describe the WORST experience during your Study Abroad program in China.
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