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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Importance of the Research

Although attitude measures have been analyzed for student participants in study abroad experiences, little previous research was found to have been conducted on the attitudes or impact of such experiences on educators. Interest in such data was indicated by the Office of Research in the United States Department of Education, the National Center for Teacher Learning, and the Center for the Study of Evaluation, and by members of the National Association of International Educators. As the state of Iowa has mandated global education infusion across the curriculum, impact on global education is of interest to educators in the state.

Now that the cold war has ceased and the former Soviet Union is becoming more open to Americans, Iowa has a sister state relationship with Stavropol Krai, Russia. This is a time of less tension with moves being initiated toward friendship. The study assesses current attitudes of Iowa educators to determine whether they are more positive after an intensive program in Russia, or whether they are consistent among Iowa Educator respondents regardless of participation in such a program.

Educators support international exchange experiences of varying duration as having positive influence on global perspectives. The study makes an assessment of impact of the
experience on professional development and global perspectives as reported by current participants and administrators three to four months after the experience. The study includes both current implications and those reported over time through responses from similar Fulbright groups of Iowa educators who went to China in 1988 and to Egypt in 1976. The study assesses and documents impact of intensive five-week experience in a host country on Iowa educators. Since there has not been adequate attention given to the assessment of Fulbright Group Study Projects previously, this research was undertaken.

Statement of Problem

This study is designed to examine the impact of an intensive five-week Fulbright exchange program for Iowa educators upon the attitudes and perceptions toward the host country, Russia. Further, the study examines the impact on global education of participation in such a Fulbright project. To accomplish the goals of the study, a combination of quantitative and qualitative research instruments were selected. The Bogardus Social Distance Scale (Bogardus, 1925b, 1933), Child and Doob (1943) modification of Katz and Braly's (1933) stereotypical traits, and semantic differential instruments were used with the participant group, applicant group, and a control group of nonapplicants. Interviews, participant observer notes, group discussion, and a follow-up
questioning on impact three months later were used with the Fulbright participant group of Iowa educators.

**Rationale for the Study**

Assessing the attitudes and perceptions of the Iowa educators will be useful for several reasons:

1. Iowa is recognized as a leader in global education, but assessment measures have not been applied and reported on educators' global perspectives in education or the impact of an intensive five-week program in a host country.

2. Educators' attitudes and perceptions toward Russia, assessed before and after the experience and compared or contrasted to those of other populations, are of timely interest because of changes in the former Soviet Union.

**Relevance of the Study**

As pointed out by Keen (1988) relationships between the United States and the Soviet Union seem to alternate between enmity and friendship. In times of tension, stereotypes emerge and in times of calm we edge closer to each other in friendliness. At an earlier time when the United States and Russia were allies, Child and Doob’s research of stereotypes in the late 1930’s and early 1940’s included attitudes toward Russia.

Bogardus (1925b, 1951), Photiadis and Biggar (1967), and Mayton and Vickers (1988) all found significant relationships between education and more positive social distance ratios.
Bogardus and others have compared the responses of teachers to businessmen and other occupational groups. Perry and Melson (1989) compared the attitudinal differentiation toward countries with media use and knowledge of voters. Gerald Marker (1970) studied teacher dogmatism and its impact on the political attitudes of students. Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) have discussed attitudes as interconnected with beliefs and intended actions or behaviors. They attest to the realization that attitude is one of the major determinants of a person's intention to behave in a specific way. Cecil Babich (1986) examined global education attitudes of home economics teachers.

The current research will be of value to those who may be determining the inclusion of out-of-country experience in education, specifically for educators, at all levels. This study may also be of interest to those examining the influence of educators on others in school and community.

Research Questions

Based on the review of literature and interest expressed within the educational community, the following research questions are identified in this study:

1. Does an intensive five-week study abroad project coupled with orientation sessions have an impact on a teacher's global education attitudes and perceptions?
2. Does an intensive five-week study abroad project make a significant difference in global education attitudes and perspective as compared with those who applied for the Fulbright project but were not selected?

3. Does the interaction of American educators and Russian educators enhance global education perceptions and attitudes?

4. Does foreign language study have any relationship to the findings of the current study? Does it make a difference whether an individual has studied more than one language, or has studied in depth?

5. Do factors such as the amount of cross-cultural or international experience of educators show any significant relationship to their attitudes and perspectives?

6. Do Iowa educators hold consistent perceptions without regard to interest in participation in a Fulbright study abroad project to Russia in the summer of 1992?

7. What evidence of impact of the Fulbright experiences may be shown within a few months following such an experience or over time as reported by participants of similar out-or-country Fulbright projects in 1976 and 1988?

Overview of Methodology

Research Design

Based on the purposes of this study and a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches to address the research questions and problems, the researcher selected a
quasi-experimental design. Multiple sources of evidence were used as pre-and post-experience interviews and participant observation were combined with pre- and posttest of quantitative measures of Bogardus Social Distance Scale, semantic differential, and stereotypical traits. Follow-up inquiry on impact of experience on teaching and professional development was included for participants and their administrators. Former Fulbright intensive exchange program participants to China in 1988 and Egypt in 1976 were included in focus group interview discussion and inquiry on impact of their experiences. A comparative group of applicant Iowa educators and a control group of nonapplicant Iowa educators were given the quantitative measures.

Selection of Participants

The participant group of Iowa educators included in the Fulbright educational exchange project to Russia in the summer of 1992 was preselected by the Fulbright project appointed committee. From a pool of 122 applicants, 14 were selected (four elementary or middle school teachers and one principal, three secondary teachers and one principal, and four teachers in higher education). The comparison group of applicant respondents were matched for level of education and area of specialization from the pool of applicants not participating in the Russia Fulbright project. The control group of nonapplicant Iowa educators was similarly stratified and
respondents were invited according to the stratification of the Fulbright participant group.

Assumptions

There are four assumptions in this study:

1. Fulbright program participation is likely to be supportive of and conducive to the development of international and global perspectives for educators.

2. Participant observer notes yield insightful data.

3. Instruments used are valid and reliable.

4. Participants and respondents give honest responses to questionnaire and interview items which survey attitudes and beliefs.

Definition of Terms

The following list of terms provides a reference to assist in clarification of the intended meaning of words or phrases as used in this study and in the interpretation of data.

Applicant respondent -- One who applied to be a Fulbright participant in the Russian experience but did not go to Russia in summer 1992 as part of the Iowa educators' group program.

Attitude -- Favorable or unfavorable evaluation about something or someone (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975); manner, disposition, feeling, position, etc., with regard to a person or thing; tendency or orientation, especially of the mind
Belief -- Information one has about an object and links to attitudes (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975).

Cross-cultural experiences -- experiences with persons whose cultural frame of reference is different from one’s own (within one’s own country).

Focus Group Interview -- informal discussion among selected individuals, under the guidance of a moderator, about specific topics relevant to the situation at hand (Beck, Trombetta, & Share 1986, p. 73).

Global perspectives -- a frame of reference that extends beyond one’s own locale and country.

Nonapplicant Iowa educator respondent -- respondent who did not apply to the Iowa Fulbright Group Project to Russia in 1992.

Participant respondent -- Iowa educator who participated in the Fulbright Group Project to Russia, 1992.

Participant observation -- Researcher is one of the Iowa Educators group in Russia taking part in the group activities and making notes based on interactions and responses to experiences of participants on the spot or soon afterward, with interpretation based on researcher perception.

Perceptions -- Beliefs about or understandings of someone or something.
Semantic differential — a combination of controlled association and scaling procedures with bi-polar adjectives on a seven-step scale (Osgood, 1971, p. 20).

Social distance -- The distance from a person in group B (object group) as reported by person A (respondent) (Bogardus, 1939, pp. 74-75); or the difference in favorable and unfavorable reactions of persons or groups to each other (Bogardus, 1948, pp. 48).

Social Distance Score -- The numerical Bogardus Social Distance Scale rating assigned to a particular object characteristic by a respondent (Bogardus, 1939, p. 74).

Stereotype -- Preconceived ideas (usually negative) about persons or groups.

Organization of Dissertation

The remainder of the dissertation consists of chapters 2 through 5. The review of literature and theoretical issues are considered in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 covers research methodology, population and sample selected, variables, instruments, and statistical methods employed. Chapter 4 focuses on findings of the study. The relevance of findings and implications for further study are discussed in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter consists of five parts. First, is a brief review of literature concerned with attitudes assessment research of Bogardus Social Distance Scale over time. Second, literature concerning stereotypical traits research and characteristics of Russia or the former Soviet Union is examined. Third, a general review of research focused on study abroad experience and change in attitudes is included. Fourth, material related to the impact on global perspectives is provided. Finally, the literature that is directly related to the research design of the study is presented.

Attitudes Assessment and Bogardus Scale

The Bogardus Scale, developed by Emory Bogardus in 1925 building upon the work of Dr. Robert Park, has been used in assessment of acceptance of racial and ethnic differences with diverse populations over time. The scale measures acceptance in a progressive order as listed: (1) to close kinship by marriage; (2) to my club as personal chums; (3) to my street as neighbors; (4) to employment in my occupation in my country; (5) to citizenship in my country; (6) to visitors only to my country; and (7) would exclude from my country (Bogardus, 1925b).

Bogardus research pointed out that sources of social distance were influenced more from generalized feelings
rather than specific experiences (Bogardus, 1925a, 1926). Pemberton obtained correlations for reliability on the scale; and the equal-distance of one to seven ranking for the items were determined (Bogardus, 1939). This modification allows for resulting data to be analyzed and compared as interval rather than ordinal data. While there are criticisms of the measure, it stands as a valid instrument to measure general attitudes affecting social distance. Donald T. Campbell (1952) supported the original Bogardus Social Distance scale as an illustration of the hierarchial unidimensional set of items that research has confirmed to be a good one when compared to other scales. Theodore Newcomb (1950) said "for measuring order among various ethnic groups, the validity as well as reliability seem satisfactory." Sherif and Sherif (1956) supported the original Bogardus Social Distance Scale and variations of it as satisfactory measures (Bogardus, 1967, p. 9).

In his 1951 study, Bogardus showed that participants in an intercultural workshop held for six weeks had a measurable decrease in their social distance reactions toward ethnic groups. He further noted that the participants were experienced teachers who were interested in improving interracial conditions (Bogardus, 1951, pp. 48-50). Bogardus has observed that as people become better informed about one another, social distances tend to
decrease gradually between them, unless unequal competition
develops which would arouse insecurity, fear or loss of
status for the majority (Bogardus, 1959a). He reported a
reduction in social distance mean from 2.14 in 1926 to 2.09
in 1956 toward all racial groups (Bogardus, 1958). John D.
Photiadis and Jeanne Biggar (1967) also noted in their
research that formal education was negatively related at
both the .05 and .01 levels to ethnic distance. Owen,
Eisner, and McFaul did a replication of the Bogardus study
in 1977 and summarized the differences for 30 ethnic groups,
noting drops in average difference for the various groups
between the time periods of 1926, 1946, 1956, and 1966 (Owen
et al., 1981).

The Bogardus scale is supported as a reliable and valid
measure by Delbert Miller in his book, Handbook of Research
Design and Social Measurement (1977). Miller reports on the
split-half reliability coefficient reported at .90 or higher
in repeated tests by Eugene L. Hartley and Ruth E. Hartley
(1952). Reports of Theodore Newcomb further support the
validity of the Bogardus scale (Miller, 1977). Standard
scores in 1956 included that of Russians at 2.56. Further,
Miller (1970) points out that

the scale may be used to estimate the amount
of potential and real conflict existing
between any cultural groups, anywhere in the
industrial, political, racial, religious, and
other phases of life. It also helps to
determine the extent of the trend toward
conflict or toward cooperation between groups. (pp. 260-261).

Changes over time in social distance have been reported by Bogardus (1938, 1959, 1967), Payne and Fagan (1974), and Owen, Eisner, and McFaul (1981). While there seems to be disagreement on whether men or women display more social distance toward object groups, Owen and others (1981) reported that respondents with a rural background (1.99) were slightly more accepting of object groups than respondents with urban background (2.02). They found in their 1977 study that respondents ranged from low mean social distance scores to high social distance scores in the United States in the following order: (1) Mid-West (1.84); (2) West (1.92); (3) East 2.01); and (4) South (2.17).

Whalen reported in his 1987 study of resident college students at Iowa State University a 2.61 mean for Russians with 2.10 for small community, and 2.37 for medium sized community. Rural populations tend to be more accepting of others than do metropolitan populations. Since results have shown more positive acceptance over time, and that both rural and educated person’s responses tended to be more positive, does this mean that Iowa educators will be accepting rather than rejecting of those from other cultures as measured on a Bogardus social distance scale whether or not they participated in the 1992 Fulbright group experience?
Stereotypical Traits

Daniel Katz and Kenneth Braly (1933) of Princeton University conducted their landmark study of attitudes held by American college students toward racial and national groups. They point out the difficulty in knowing how much of the discrimination is a result of private versus public attitude (Katz and Braly, 1933).

Irvin L. Child and Leonard W. Doob in 1938 and 1940 studied the responses to 25 traits of people in eight different nations: America, England, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Poland, and Russia. They pointed to a general Slavic stereotype as a possible account for similarities between Poland and Russia in respect to many traits. Their research indicated that

as the attitude toward a nation changes, the traits attributed to that nation also change, and that the approval or disapproval of the traits and indication of traits as characteristic of himself are related to this change in about the same equal degree. (Child and Doob, 1943, p. 210).

They noted that traits which are regarded as favorable tend also to be ascribed to self to the extent that a tetrachoric correlation of +0.78 was reported for the data in 1938 and +0.68 for the 1940 data (Child and Doob, 1943 p. 211).

Their findings showed quite conclusively that:

for subjects, traits, and nations involved in this study, the attribution of traits to the citizens of the various countries is related to the attitudes toward the countries and the attitudes toward the traits. To the citizens of preferred
countries the subjects tend to ascribe approved traits, regardless of whether they believe the traits to characterize themselves. To the citizens of non-preferred countries they tend to ascribe disapproved traits which are disapproved yet believed to characterize themselves. Traits which are disapproved yet believed to characterize the subjects themselves are attributed to the various countries without much relation to preference, although a slight tendency appears to attribute such traits more frequently to the preferred countries. The significance of these results is increased by their consistency, in the same subjects, over a two-year period, and by the fact that all but one of the relationships hold true for changes during the periods well for the separate findings at each of the two testings. It is of interest to note that correlations were higher in 1940 than in 1938, possibly measuring the extent to which the emotional determination of stereotypes is heightened by an international crisis and for operation of the psychological principle under condition of emotional stress. (Child and Doob, 1943, p. 213)

It is important to note that Gilbert (1951) found evidence of both persistence of stereotypes and of resistance to stereotyping tendency in his study comparing 1930’s and 1950’s research with Princeton University students. It should be noted that the Child and Doob studies were conducted at a time of alliance between Russia and the United States similar to the current time of friendship and cooperation. Sam Keen (1988) points out that when the United States and the former Soviet Union draw closer as allies, the attitudes expressed are friendlier than in other pendulum swings of lesser political affinity.
Stereotypical attitudes have shown relative stability cross-nationally and through time as compared to open-ended responses, according to Howard Erlich and James Rinehart (1965). Further they point out that the traits assigned by check list are greater and more variable than those assigned in an open-ended question. Their findings show a 19 percent each overlap of traits between the check lists and open-ended responses for Japanese and Americans, and 12 percent overlap for Russians. The overlapping traits give an indication of general usage and/or salience; the uniquely assigned or withheld traits help sharpen our understanding of their contextual meaning. In their study, Russians were uniquely assigned characteristics of cruel, humorless, evasive, radical, rude, treacherous. Among other groups they were assigned poor and oppressed. They were uniquely not assigned traits of faithful, honest, kind, loyal to family ties, superstitious or very religious (Erlich and Rinehart, 1965, p. 573).

The study of stereotypes is essential to the development of a general theory of intergroup behavior. Stereotypes, as the language of prejudice, are thought to provide a vocabulary of motives both for individual and concerted action of prejudiced persons. They signal the socially approved and accessible targets for the release of hostility and aggression and they provide the rationalizations for prejudiced attitudes and discriminatory behavior. In providing a common language of discourse for prejudiced persons, stereotypes function as any special language to reinforce the beliefs of its users, and to furnish the basis for the development and maintenance of

Erlich and Rinehart support the properly constructed checklist as a most efficient instrument in the study of stereotypes.

Buchanan (1951) suggests that stereotyped views of certain peoples are common property of the Western culture rather than the effect of differing bilateral national outlooks as evidenced in a UNESCO study of 1950. The consistency of the Russian and American stereotypes might be counted an effect of the so-called "bi-polar" world. Americans described Russians as cruel, hardworking and domineering, backward, conceited and brave (Buchanan, 1951, 522). Comparison 1942 to 1948 results showed great increases in conceited and cruel descriptors for Russians by Americans. This seemed to change with deterioration of Russian-American relations (Buchanan, p. 526). He suggests that repetition of word-list studies over a period of time long enough to relate national stereotypes to events of international significance may shed further light on their swiftness of change and susceptibility to events (Buchanan, p. 527).

Lambert's 1967 study of Canadians and Western Europeans pointed to the sources of information about other people influencing national stereotypes: people and media were
major sources; school, books, and trips were minor sources. However, with increased age of respondents, media and school increased while books remained the same. Russians were generally considered as aggressive, different, bad, communist. Older respondents’ responses toward Russians less frequently included different. They more often assigned bad, communist, and dominated, while an assignment of aggressive traits remained the same. Perry and Melson’s 1984 study in Alabama also investigated the effect of news media and news magazines, concluding that such media may increase differentiation of a person’s attitudes toward Great Britain, Japan, Mexico, Venezuela, India, and the former Soviet Union.

Prothro (1954) and Diab (1962) studied stereotypes of Middle Eastern students and businessmen in Beirut and compared them to findings of other groups. They found consistency over time in those traits assigned to Americans as rich, industrial, superficial, materialistic, and democratic while Russians were assigned doctrinaire, strong, revolutionary, materialistic. Later respondents identified Russians as industrial and scientific (Diab, p. 343).

Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) suggest strong interconnections between attitudes and beliefs, or the change in attitudes and beliefs, and behaviors or intended behaviors. Harris and Moran (1979) in their book Managing
Cultural Differences, discuss the communication process and the impact of self image, expectations, goals, standards, cultural mores, and perceptions as they affect how input is received and interpreted.

Study Abroad and Change

The impact of exchange experiences abroad upon students' attitudes and beliefs has been examined by Hansel (1984) and Koester (1987). Calhoon and Long (1982) investigated the exchange of psychology department members from the University of North Carolina with those in Great Britain. Their results indicated change in perspectives on teaching of psychology toward a greater commitment to rigorous academic standards and more student writing. Henk Dekker and Marga Oostindie (1988) report for the Close Up Foundation of Arlington, Virginia, an evaluative study abroad exchange program in the United States by Netherlands social studies student teachers.

The Fulbright exchange programs have been of interest particularly to McDonald, Kennedy, and Bishop (1989). Although the study did include exchange teachers, they did not refer specifically to educators who participated in exchange programs in relation to the impact on their attitudes and teaching separate from other participants. General impact was noted in terms of job offers, using new ideas sometimes years later, the prestige of the Fulbright,
feelings of warmth of host countries, personal gains in knowledge and understanding. Participants reported that their expectations of the program had been met.

Global Perspectives

The impact of experience abroad has been assessed by Calhoon and Long (1982), Koester (1987), and McDonald and others (1989); but the impact of such experience on the attitudes and perceptions as they relate to global education had not been adequately addressed. Lamy (1987) discussed analysis of global education. Turney-Purda (1982, 1986) reported a general lack of global perspectives among 2,000 undergraduates.

The influence of an educated population such as teachers upon students and their community has been of interest to Morrow and Williams (1989), Daines and Plihal (1990) and others. Daines and Plihal report in the Home Economics Teachers Yearbook 10/1990 positive impact from experiences in a host country on the global attitudes of home economics teachers in Minnesota and Wisconsin as examined in focus group interview discussions.

An assessment of attitudes and perceptions of Iowa educators is of importance as Iowa schools are mandated to infuse global education across the curriculum from kindergarten through twelfth grade. Teachers are an
influential group in society and have an important influence on children.

Morrow and Williams (1989) report that attitudes of teachers toward global education were significantly correlated with practices. The attitudes of the teacher are noted as critical to helping students develop attitudes harmonious with cultural diversity. They suggest that the openness to implement new ideas or programs such as global education may be hindered or enhanced depending upon the developmental stage of the teacher (Morrow & Williams, 29). Results of their study indicated a significant correlation beyond the .01 level that those teachers with positive attitudes toward global education were implementing it in the curricula (Morrow & Williams, pp. 32-33). Further, their study confirmed findings of Borich and others in 1974 that more experienced teachers were more apt to be ready for implementation of global education. Their study showed through analysis of variance a significance of more positive attitudes toward global education with greater years of teaching experience. It was also noted that they found no significance of international or cross-cultural experiences relating to the level of global education perspectives (Morrow & Williams, 1989).

Barrows, Ager, Bennett, Braun, Clark, Harris, and Klein (1981) in the final report of the Global Understanding
Project reported that, contrary to their expectations, foreign language study did not seem to have an effect on global perspectives. It was pointed out that most language classes focused on grammar and mechanics rather than on cultural aspects of the language or on the people who are native speakers of such languages.

Sleeter (1989) indicated the difference of curriculum for students dependent upon the attitudes and perceptions of teachers. In this time of closer friendship between the United States and the former Soviet Union following the close of the Cold War and the breakup of the communist regime, it is of interest to assess whether Iowa educators hold consistent perceptions without regard to participation in a Fulbright study abroad project in Russia in the summer of 1992.

Literature Related to Design of Study

Emory Bogardus in his 1948 six-week intercultural workshop study compared the attitudes of experienced educators of the workshop with those of nonparticipant graduate students.

Kelman and Ezekiel (1970) studied a specific exchange program, a multinational seminar for communications specialists, sponsored by the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the United States Department of State and conducted at Brandeis University in the summer of 1962.
They examined the exchange experiences of broadcasters and changes in attitudes toward the host country of the United States. Their model used pre-and post-experience questionnaires, interviews, observation notes, follow up questions, and a comparison group analysis of persons who had applied for the exchange but were not part of the exchange group. The model was influential in the design for the current study.

Daines and Plihal (1990) reported on the insights gained from focus group interview discussion by home economics teachers in Minnesota and Wisconsin about their out-of-country experiences and the impact on their teaching and professional development. The discussions were taped and notes were taken for later analysis of the recurrent themes and points. The teachers participating in the focus groups indicated they had been affected professionally by enriching and redefining their roles, overcoming barriers, working in new ways, and going in new directions (Daines and Plihal, pp. 67-78). The focus group method was chosen for discussion on the impact of the experience in three mixed groups of Egyptian Fulbright exchange participants from 1976, Chinese Fulbright exchange participants from 1988, and Russian Fulbright exchange participants of 1992.

Child and Doob’s 1938 study is a modification of the Katz and Braly model of stereotypical traits. Their study
including Russia in the late 1930's and early 1940's produced results with highly significant consistency. Their model used 21 traits and asked respondents to indicate on a scale of -2 to +2 assignment of those traits. The traits were then identified as either being favorable or unfavorable. Next, respondents either assigned the traits as typical of themselves or not. Finally, the eight countries were ranked in order of preference by the participants. This model was chosen for the current study because at this time the United States and Russia are friendlier in relationships and the other six countries of the study are currently in the news or increasing relationships with the United States.

Semantic differential methodology was described by George Kelly in 1955 as a bi-polar dichotomous measure of evaluation, potency, and activity. The semantic differential as used by Osgood (1957) has been supported by Dawes (1972), Miller (1977), Henderson, Moore, and Fitz-Gibbon (1988), Sproull (1988), and others as a good measure of affect. The method of semantic differential has been shown to yield quality data and will be used in this study to measure descriptors for Russians.

Steiner and Dodge (1952) called for clarification of techniques in interpersonal perceptions. Ake Bjerstedt (1960) strongly suggested the importance of multiple
instruments of data collection and specifically the addition of personal open-ended comments to take away from the rigidity and incorrectness of closed questions. Dawes (1972) recommends using multiple instruments. Moore, Underwood, and Rosenhan (1981) cautioned attributing results to the operation of an affect and argue for the inclusion of multiple checks that access multiple affective states and collaborate results. Bogardus (1925a, 1936), Zeligs and Hendrickson (1933), Kelman and Ezekiel (1970), Fishbein and Ajzen (1975), Burn (1985) Henderson et al. (1988) and others also recommend interview measures and/or observation in assessing attitudes and perceptions. Sproull (1988) recommended using the semantic differential with other scales. B. Robert Tabachnick (1989) called for naturalistic research in order to better understand teaching, learning, and schooling. He argued for the inclusion of unplanned and unanticipated effects in description and analysis. Interview and observation techniques are recommended. Naturalistic research affirms the validity of examining an evaluation of a specific group experience as in the case of the Fulbright group educational exchange. Kane and Schuman (1991) successfully used open-ended follow up questions to gain information about impact.

In summary, a review of the literature supports the Bogardus Social Distance scale, the stereotypical traits
research of Child and Doob, the semantic differential
technique of Osgood especially when combined with open-ended
response through open-ended questions or interview.

The model of the Kelman and Ezekiel study of
broadcasters comparing the responses of the applicants who
were matched to participants fits for the Fulbright program
participants and applicants. The control group of non-
applicants expands the model. Research has been conducted
on global perspectives of teachers and students; and changes
in attitudes through impact of study abroad have been
assessed for students. The assessment of educators' experiences abroad has been limited.

The value of focus-group interview discussion as a
technique has been shown by Daines (1990), Beck, Thombetta,
and Share (1986), and Krueger (1988). The current research
blends these techniques in order to determine attitudes and
attitude change of educators involved in the Fulbright
exchange project in Russia and gains insight into impact
over time through the inclusion of Fulbright participants in
1967 and 1988 to Egypt and China.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Research Questions

The research questions addressed in this study are (1) assessment of global attitudes and perspectives of educators selected for a Fulbright program with educators in Russia (Are their attitudes and perceptions different from those of individuals who applied for the Fulbright program but who were not selected? Are their attitudes and perceptions different from a control group of educators who did not apply?) and (2) Assessment of global attitudes and outlooks at the beginning and end of the five-week project for the Fulbright participants and an evaluation of what impact was made on their teaching at least three months later.

Statement of Purpose

The study examined differences in attitudes and perceptions of Iowa educators while controlling for educational experiences such as foreign language study, global and international educational experiences, out-of-country experiences, level of education achieved, and educational teaching experience. The research looked at changes evident at the end of the project in order to assess how this international exchange experience affected teaching from a global perspective.
Population and Sample

The population consists of Iowa educators in kindergarten through higher education who were eligible for the 1992 Fulbright Exchange Program to Russia. Those selected for the program are the sample group (Participant). An appointed committee of five members selected the 14 individuals for the Fulbright Russian Exchange Group Program from the pool of 119 applicants. Four participants were from higher education. Four teachers and one principal were from the secondary level of education. Four teachers and one principal were from elementary and middle school education. Similarly stratified samples of those who applied but were not accepted and those who did not apply are identified as the comparison and control groups. Of the 14 invited respondents for each group, 13 applicants and 12 nonapplicant educators responded. The three groups of respondents to the questionnaire totaled 39 individuals.

The Fulbright participants to Russia, China, Egypt, and the administrators of the Russian participants were included in the follow-up questioning of impact of the five-week experience. Open-ended response was given by eight of the Russian Fulbright participants and seven each of the China and Egyptian groups. Seven administrators responded to the question of impact in the schools by their teachers or
staff. A total of 22 respondents were included, representing about 50 percent of each group.

All Fulbright group participants were invited to share in focus group interview discussions. The focus group interview discussions included 27 participants with six from the Egyptian group, 11 from the China group, and 10 from the Russian group. Each of the three discussion groups included members of Egyptian, China, and Russian Fulbright experiences. Table 1 which follows summarizes the participation of the 72 Iowa educators included in the study.

**Variables**

The independent variable of the study identified the sample groups of Fulbright participant, comparison applicant group, control non-applicant group, or earlier Fulbright participant group.

Dependent variables are the attitudinal and perceptual factors measured in the study.

Intervening variables are identified as the cross-cultural and international experiences within the United States as well as out-of-country experiences. Study participants included eight with no cross-cultural or international and global experiences. Limited experience of one to two years was reported by eight. More than two years of such experiences were reported by 23 individuals. Ten
Table 1: Participants in the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fulbright Group Project Participants</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group Participants</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSSIA</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINA</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGYPT</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents to Open-Ended Question of Impact</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants for the Russian Experience</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonapplicant Iowa Educators Responding to Questionnaire</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Questionnaire Data Used in Analysis</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants Responding to Questionnaire</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators of the Russian Group Participants</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EDUCATORS PARTICIPATING</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
had no out-of-country experience. Nine had traveled to one country for a limited visit of one to four weeks. Travel or educational experiences in more than one country and of more than four weeks duration comprised the third classification and was reported by 20 respondents.

Moderator variables include educational level achieved. Ten reported earning bachelor's degrees, 23 had master's degrees, and six had earned doctorates. Teaching experience of five years or less was indicated by six persons. Three reported five to ten years of experience. More than ten years of experience was reported by 28 persons. Employment at one level of education was indicated by nine, while 20 reported employment at more than one level of education. Foreign language study was a moderating variable. Five reported no foreign language study. One language studied for two years or less was indicated by 22 persons. Six respondents each reported one language studied in depth or more than one language studied. Finally, gender difference was noted as a moderating variable. The three groups in the empirical study included 21 men and 18 women.

Control variables for the study were educational level of current employment and employment of respondents as teachers or administrators, or both. Ten respondents reported current employment in elementary education, 21 in secondary level education, and 10 in higher education. Five were
administrators, 29 teachers; and five were serving as both administrators and teachers.

Hypotheses Statement

1.a. Fulbright Program participants, when compared to those who did not apply, will have different global perceptions and attitudes.

1.b. The null hypothesis states that participants and nonapplicants will have the same global perceptions and attitudes.

2.a. Fulbright Program participants will have similar global perceptions and attitudes to those who applied but were not selected for the 1992 program.

2.b. Alternatively, applicants and nonapplicants will have similar global perceptions and attitudes.

3.a. Fulbright Program participants will change in their perceptions and attitudes following the educational exchange experience.

3.b. The null states that there will be no difference in the perceptions and attitudes expressed by the Fulbright participants in pretest and posttest results.

Research Design

The research design is quasi-experimental. Empirical data are obtained from the social distance scale, the semantic
differential, and the stereotypical traits through the pre-and post-tests of the participant group and comparison and control group respondents' questionnaires. The qualitative data come from the pre-and post-experience interviews, focus group interview discussions, follow-up open-ended questions, and participant observer notes. Figure 1 which identifies sources of data follows the outline of variables in the study. Table 2 summarizes variables of interest exhibited in the questionnaire data.

Independent Variables: Fulbright Program Participation X
a. The Iowa educators selected as participants in the 1992 Fulbright program to Russia.
b. The Iowa educators who applied for the program but were not selected as a similarly stratified sample.
c. A control group of Iowa educators who did not apply for the program also similarly stratified to include elementary, secondary, and higher education teachers and administrators.
d. The Iowa educators who participated in 1976 and 1988 Fulbright projects in Egypt and China

Dependent Variables: Attitudinal and perceptual factors

Intervening Variables: I/01.Cross-cultural or International/Global Experiences I
I1. No cross-cultural, international, or global experiences
I2. Some limited experience (1 - 2 years)
I3. More than 2 years experience
I2. Out-of-Country Experiences=0
O1. None
O2. 1 - 4 weeks travel to one country
O3. Travel or education of more than 4 weeks and more than one country

Moderator Variables: M1. Educational level achieved E
E1. B.A. Degree
E2. M.S. or M.A. Degree
E3. Ph.D. Degree
M2. Teaching Experience=T
T1. 5 years or less
T2. 5 - 10 years
T3. more than 10 years experience
T4. Teaching experience at one
level of education
T5. Teaching experience at more
than one level of education

M3. Language Study=F
F1. No foreign language study
F2. One foreign language studied
two years or less
F3. One foreign language studied
in depth
F4. More than one foreign language
studied

M4. Gender=Y
Y1. Male
Y2. Female

Control Variables: C1. Educational Level (Employment) L
L1. Elementary Education
L2. Secondary Education
L3. Higher Education

C2. Administration or teaching=A
A1. Administration only
A2. Teaching only
A3. Both Administration and Teaching

Procedures

Copies of the questionnaire (Appendix A), interview
( Appendix B), and letters were provided to the Iowa State
University Human Subjects Committee for approval (Appendix C).
Participants in the Iowa Fulbright group project to Russia
were asked to participate in one-on-one, taped interviews and
Figure 1: Research Data Sources
Table 2: Summary of independent, intervening, moderator and control variables of experimental, comparison, and control groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEP</th>
<th>INTERVENING</th>
<th>MODERATOR</th>
<th>CONTROL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group X</td>
<td>Intl./Global Experience</td>
<td>Out-of-Country Experience</td>
<td>Education Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>a=none</td>
<td>a=none</td>
<td>a=BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>b=1-2 yr</td>
<td>b=&lt;4wk</td>
<td>b=Ma/MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>c=&gt;2 yr</td>
<td>c=&gt;4wk</td>
<td>c=Phd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | and > country | | d=1 level | e=>1 level | | f=5 | |
| participant | | | | | | | |
| a=4 | a=5 | a=3 | a=3 | m=8 | a=3 | a=2 |
| b=1 | b=2 | b=7 | b=7 | f=6 | b=7 | b=9 |
| c=9 | c=7 | c=4 | c=1 | N=14 | c=4 | c=3 |

| | | | | | | |
| applicant | | | | | | | |
| a=4 | a=2 | a=4 | a=0 | a=1 | m=6 | a=3 | a=3 |
| b=4 | b=1 | b=8 | b=2 | b=9 | f=7 | b=8 | b=10 |
| c=8 | c=10 | c=1 | c=10 | c=2 | N=13 | c=3 | c=2 |

| | | | | | | |
| nonapplicant | | | | | | | |
| a=3 | a=3 | a=3 | a=3 | a=1 | m=7 | a=4 | a=2 |
| b=3 | b=8 | b=1 | b=6 | f=5 | b=6 | b=10 |
| c=6 | c=3 | c=1 | c=7 | c=3 | N=12 | c=3 | c=0 |

| | | | | | | |
| Totals | | | | | | | |
| a=8 | a=10 | a=10 | a=6 | a=5 | m=21 | a=10 | a=5 |
| b=8 | b=9 | b=23 | b=3 | b=2 | f=18 | b=21 | b=29 |
| c=23 | c=20 | c=6 | c=28 | c=6 | N=39 | c=10 | c=5 |

| | | | | | | |
| of all respondents | | | | | | | |
| a=8 | a=10 | a=10 | a=6 | a=5 | m=21 | a=10 | a=5 |
| b=9 | b=23 | b=3 | b=2 | f=18 | b=21 | b=29 |
| c=23 | c=20 | c=6 | c=28 | c=6 | N=39 | c=10 | c=5 |

| to the questionnaire | | | | | | | |
| e=20 | | | | | | | |
to answer a questionnaire at the close of the orientation sessions on June 13, 1992 and again at the close of the experience in Russia, July 16, 1992. A focus group interview discussion in three mixed groupings with Iowa Fulbright participants who went to Egypt in 1976 or to China in 1988 was conducted on September 23, 1992. A follow-up question regarding the impact of their Fulbright experience on their teaching and professional activities was sent to the participants and to their administrators on November 1, 1992, with 57 percent response rate from participants and their administrators.

One-on-one interview questions included four questions asked both before and after the experience: (1) How would you describe Russians? What are they like? (2) When you think of Russia, what three positive and what three negative perceptions come to mind? (3) What concerns, issues, hopes, or fears do you have about Russia’s future development? (4) How will this experience impact your teaching? The pre-experience interview included five other questions concerning factors influencing the decision to apply for the Fulbright group experience, expectations, previous perceptions, and discussion of global issues and the former Soviet Union in classes. The post-experience interview included six other questions concerning expectations, information received and orientation, changes they would recommend in the experience,
and influences or change due to Russian colleagues or schools visited. Both shorthand notes and taped interviews were transcribed during the month of August, after returning from Russia for repeated examination by the researcher.

The researcher made notes as a participant observer in the Fulbright group and kept a daily journal throughout the five weeks in Russia. The journaled record and anecdotal notations of positive and negative attitudes expressed were the basis for participant observer interpretation.

Based on the review of literature, research questions and hypotheses, the questionnaire sought to assess the information for the intervening, moderator, and control variables. The dependent variable information was obtained through the Bogardus Social Distance Scale (1929, 1933), a semantic differential, and the stereotypical traits used by Child and Doob (1943). It was intentionally determined by the investigator to use instruments previously designed rather than to develop new instruments to be tested.

The social distance scale included the ethnic groups of Haitians, Iraqis, South Africans, Croats, French, Russians, and Ukrainians. These first four groups were included because they have been in the news in warring conflicts and/or with relative negative indications of their interactions with the United States or in the case of Haitians direct efforts to block their immigration to the United States. The French were
included as a neutral, control group. The Russians and Ukrainians were included as two ethnic groups of the former Soviet Union with whom exchange and interconnections in Iowa have recently been increasing with particular interest to the Iowa Fulbright exchange project.

The semantic differential methodology used in this study is based on ideas and approaches found in Delbert C. Miller's, *Handbook of Research Design* (1977), Henderson's et al., *How to Measure Attitudes* (1987), and Natalie Sproull's *Handbook of Research Methods* (1988). The researcher followed their suggested procedures. First, sixty adjective bi-polar pairs were selected. Ten educators were given the lists, half with the instruction to indicate the most positive adjectives on the list and half to indicate the most negative ones. By checking the overlapping of responses, the final list of 22 pairs was selected for the instrument. They were randomly assigned with positive on left or right of the sheet, and respondents placed an X on one of seven spaces between the bi-polar extremes as they were asked to best describe Russians. For analysis the adjectives are reassembled and coded with a score of one given to those most negative and a score of seven assigned to those most positive.

Following the procedure used in Child and Doob's research, the 21 stereotypical traits were first given a rating on a five-point scale of -2 to +2 for the nationality
groups: England, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Poland, Russia, and United States. These were the same eight nationalities used in their 1938 and 1940 studies. Next, respondents assigned the 21 traits as either "approved" or "disapproved" traits. Third, the respondents were asked to indicate whether or not the traits were characteristic of themselves. Finally, they were asked to rank these eight countries in terms of preferred lifestyle.

This same questionnaire was used for the pre-experience and post-experience tests of the Russian Fulbright participants, the comparison group of applicants and the control group of non-applicants. From the remaining pool of applicants, the comparison group was drawn in a purposeful stratification to match the participant group as closely as possible. With two follow up inquiries, questionnaires from thirteen respondents were included. The control group of non-applicant respondents was solicited from across Iowa according to a similarly stratified grouping. For example a request was made for a response from a secondary social studies teacher to match with the participant and applicant respondents. With one follow-up inquiry, twelve respondents were included in the study.

Iowa Fulbright Group project participants to Egypt in 1976 and to China in 1988 were sent a letter of inquiry regarding the impact of their participation in the Fulbright
group project. Seven members of each former Fulbright Project
group responded to the inquiry. Some of the earlier
participants were not located with current mailing addresses.
The resulting responses represented a 50 percent return rate.
They were also invited to participate in the focus group
discussions at a reunion gathering in Ames, Iowa on September
23, 1992. A total of 27 persons, six from the Egyptian group,
11 from the China group, and 10 from the Russia group
participated in the focus group interview discussions. There
were two questions for the three mixed groups to discuss.
First, there was a question of impact of their Fulbright
experiences, personally and professionally. Second, they were
asked to make suggestions for planners of future similar group
projects. The discussion groups were randomly formed
including nine persons each from the varied Fulbright groups.
Two experienced members and the researcher served as
moderators of each of the three group discussions. Notes and
an audiotape were made of each. These notes and transcribed
tapes were examined for positives and negatives and common
recurring themes in all groups. The researcher listened to
each tape twice and reviewed the transcriptions and notes
three times.

In order to answer the research questions and hypotheses
of the study, comparisons before and after the experience in
Russia and between the participant group and comparison
(applicant) and control (nonapplicant) group responses were made according to the moderating and intervening variables. Data analysis includes frequency distributions and correlation comparisons for individuals and groups with the social distance scale and stereotypical traits. Participants' pretest and posttest results were analyzed using matched pairs t tests. Their posttest results were compared with the results of applicants and nonapplicants using ANOVA analysis.

Natalie Sproull (1988) recommends profile analysis plotting for the semantic differential. Comparisons were made according to the independent, intervening, moderator, or control variables.

Child and Doob (1943) used rho rank-order coefficient of correlation analysis of the stereotypical traits. Prediction of preference for a nationality and positive attribution of traits, disfavor toward a nationality and negative traits, and correlation to attribution of positive traits to self were made. Similarly, rho rank-order comparisons and the Friedman two-way analysis of variance by ranks test were used of current data.

The responses to the interview questions were examined to determine if they supported questionnaire findings. Individual changes on the four common questions of the pre-and post-experience interviews were compared using correlation analysis.
Participant observer notes, focus-group interview notes, and responses to the open-ended follow-up question regarding impact were examined for frequency and variety of responses. Common threads or trends were determined. The results either give support to the findings of the questionnaire data or not.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

The main purpose of analysis for the study is to examine differences between Russian Fulbright participants’ pre- and posttest results and between the participants’ results and those of applicant and nonapplicant groups. The impact over time of such an intensive five-week experience is also of importance. It is of secondary interest to examine influences of previous foreign language study, cross cultural and global experiences, or out-of-country experiences.

Results from four data gathering methods are reported. First, the empirical data from the questionnaire answered by participants before and after the Russian Fulbright visit and given to selected applicants and nonapplicants were examined. There were 34 individuals whose questionnaires yield comparable data. Five respondents offered comments without answering comparable questionnaire items. Comments included on questionnaires are reported following the empirical data analysis.

The second method of data gathering reported is the interview data gathered on June 13, 1992 and July 16, 1992. The notes and transcriptions of tapes from the interviews with all 14 participants have been examined repeatedly and reported in this section.

Data collected in the three focus group interview discussions by 27 Fulbright group participants are reported in
the third section. The analysis includes recurring themes and examples given of impact resulting from the Fulbright group experiences. The suggestions made for planners of future Fulbright group experiences are included. For comparison, program material from the recent Fulbright group is included in Appendix D.

The responses to open-ended questions concerning impact of the Fulbright experience on teaching, personal and professional development were received from 21 participants and seven administrators. Those findings are reported in the fourth results section. Findings are then summarized and discussed at the close of the chapter.

Questionnaire Results

Social distance scores for the seven nationalities of Haitians, Iraqis, South Africans, Croats, French, Russians, and Ukrainians are reported. Each of these groups have been in the news recently in positive or negative reports and/or are part of the former Soviet Union. Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement on a scale of one to seven for the statements in descending order of social distance: 1. I would admit to close kinship by marriage. 2. I would admit to my club as a personal chum. 3. I would admit to my street as neighbors. 4. I would admit to employment in my occupation. 5. I would admit to citizenship in my country. 6. I would admit as visitors only to my country. 7. I would
exclude from my country. The response with the highest rating was then used as the determinant of social distance. Four Fulbright participants reported greater social distance scores after the experience. Seven reported less social distance. Three participants' scores did not change. The paired t test for the pre- and posttest results showed significant differences in three scores as noted in Table 3. The null hypothesis stating that the mean scores are the same for pre- and posttest results is rejected for the three nationalities of Haiti, Iraqi, and South African. Although not statistically significant, there is a positive change in a reduction of social distance expressed toward all groups including the Russians and Ukrainians.

One-factor ANOVA comparisons failed to show significant differences for social distance ratings of participants' posttest results and those of the comparison and control groups. Participants general social distance scores were obtained by averaging all ratings given.

A summary of resulting mean social distance ratings for each country and the general social distance score for each group is given in Table 4. The participants' social distance scores for Russians averaged 2.0 in the pretest and 1.71 in the posttest. Their mean social distances for all groups for the pretest participant scores is 2.06. Their posttest results have a mean of 1.84, while the comparison group of
Table 3: Participants’ pre- and posttest social distance scores and t-test results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Distance Scores of Participants Pre and Post Results</th>
<th>Haiti</th>
<th>Iraqi</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Croats</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Ukrainian</th>
<th>African</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-tail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t-val</th>
<th>-2.20</th>
<th>-2.39</th>
<th>-2.18</th>
<th>-1.55</th>
<th>1.68</th>
<th>-1.33</th>
<th>-3.90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p-val</td>
<td>.0367*</td>
<td>.0241*</td>
<td>.0381*</td>
<td>.1342</td>
<td>.5031</td>
<td>.1946</td>
<td>.7026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1-tail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t-val</th>
<th>-2.2</th>
<th>-2.39</th>
<th>-2.18</th>
<th>-1.55</th>
<th>-.68</th>
<th>-1.33</th>
<th>-.39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p-val</td>
<td>.0184*</td>
<td>.0120*</td>
<td>.0120*</td>
<td>.0671</td>
<td>.2515</td>
<td>.0973</td>
<td>.3513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .05
Table 4: Summary of social distances reported for all groups and general social distance means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Group</th>
<th>Haitian</th>
<th>Iriqis</th>
<th>South African</th>
<th>Croats</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Ukrainian</th>
<th>General Social Distance Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonapplicant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: General social distance is derived by summing the social distance scores for all seven nationalities and then dividing by seven.
applicants' scores result in a mean distance of 2.57, and the control group of nonapplicant's mean score is 2.18. Therefore the general social distance of the participants is lower in both testings than that of either the comparison or control groups. The 21 stereotypical traits were divided into 14 which are identified as positive traits and seven identified as negative traits. The percentage of positive trait assignment and negative trait assignment for each nationality group as well as the percentages of positive and negative traits assigned to self are reported in Table 5. Data for participants pretest and posttest and for applicant and nonapplicants are included. A similar table from the Child and Doob (1943) report is included in Appendix E for comparison. As with the social distance data, paired t-test comparisons were made for the pre- and posttest data of participants. The paired t-test comparisons failed to show significant differences in percentages of either positive or negative trait assignment to any of the eight nationalities or to self. The ANOVA test was used to compare data for participants' posttest, comparison group of applicants, and control group of nonapplicants. The ANOVA failed to show significant differences. Table 6 shows the summary of percentages of positive and negative traits assigned to each nationality and to self in the pre-and posttest comparison.
Table 5: Summary of trait assignment for participants’ pre-and post-test results and applicant and nonapplicant groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait Assignment to Countries and Self by Group</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carefree+</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriotic+</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious+</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy+</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic+</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Pos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immoral-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerful+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Poland</th>
<th>Russia</th>
<th>Pos Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loyal+</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress+</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruel-</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radical-</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selfish-</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educated+</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Poland</th>
<th>Russia</th>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Materialistic-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) 77 85 69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62 92</td>
<td>38 38 23</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) 77 54 69</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54 69</td>
<td>23 15 31</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) 70 60 80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70 80</td>
<td>50 40 42</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) 100 91 91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91 100</td>
<td>55 55</td>
<td>64 55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempered-</td>
<td>(a) 38 23 46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31 0 23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) 0 0 23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23 0</td>
<td>8 15 8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) 40 10 30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50 10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) 45 27 45</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36 9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9 36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent+</td>
<td>(a) 92 92 92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>85 92</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) 85 85 85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>77 85</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) 70 80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) 91 100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloomy-</td>
<td>(a) 23 31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) 31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) 30 40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) 27 27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0 36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident+</td>
<td>(a) 85 85 92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) 85 92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) 60 70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) 82 91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: Pre- and posttest results summary of percent of positive or negative traits assigned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Testing</th>
<th>Participants +/-</th>
<th>Assignment of Traits to Countries and Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assigned Traits</td>
<td>%+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Traits</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>Traits</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One might note that there were increases in positive trait assignments, coupled with decreases in negative trait assignments, for the United States, Russia, Italy, and self when comparing the pretest and posttest results.

A summary of respondents’ ranking of the eight countries in regard to preference for lifestyle is summarized in Table 7. The posttest increase in preference to 5.2 for Russian lifestyle, when compared to the 6.8 of the pretest of the participants and 6.9 for the applicant and nonapplicant groups should be noted. The posttest ranking of preference for Russian lifestyle is higher than the cumulative ranking for either Italy or Japan. When compared to Child and Doob’s 1939 and 1940 rankings of Russia of 5.5 and 6.9 respectively (Appendix E), the posttest ranking of participants is higher. The 6.8 ranking of the participants’ pretest and the applicants and nonapplicants each at 6.9 match more closely the earlier ranking for Russia.

The Friedman two-way analysis of variance by ranks test yielded a chi square of 110.719 and corrected score of 110.773 for the pre- and posttest results. Chi squares of 142.381 and the corrected chi square of 142.433 are reported for the participant’s posttest results compared with those of comparative and control groups. Each correlation has a p value of less than .0001, indicating significant differences in rankings made by participants, applicants,
Table 7: Group summary of ranking of lifestyle preference and assignment of traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Summary of Average Group Traits Assigned</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>%+</th>
<th>%-</th>
<th>%Self</th>
<th>%Self</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Compare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Compare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Compare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Compare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Compare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Compare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Compare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Compare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and nonapplicants. The current data differ from the findings of Child and Doob (1943) in that Germany is ranked higher than France. This finding is not surprising when one considers the relationship of the United States and Germany at that time. Currently, there was a lower rank for Poland than Russia, which also differed from the earlier data.

Spearman rho coefficient of correlation between participants' pretest and posttest data are reported in Table 8. Only a moderate correlation is shown for the preference of United States lifestyle in the correlation data from the participants pretest ranking and posttest ranking of the preference for lifestyles in the eight countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USA</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Poland</th>
<th>Russia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The semantic differential data findings are reported in Table 9. Mean and mode ratings for the 22 pairs of adjectives by which respondents rated Russians are reported for participants' pre- and posttest results and for the applicant and nonapplicant groups. The analysis of frequency of responses shows that each group tended to give more positive attributes than negative. The mode for groups responses gave a most positive rating of seven eight times for six adjectives: industrious, valuable, kind, peaceful, fair, and
Table 9: Semantic differential characteristics describing Russians with mean ratings for participants' pretest (*), posttest(#), applicants (A), nonapplicants (N)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>*A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>*#A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*#A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Industrious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*#</td>
<td>AN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*N</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferocious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*N</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peaceful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*#AN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delicate</td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
<td>*AN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rugged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunk</td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
<td>*AN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sober</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*#NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*#AN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gentle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsociable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*#N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sociable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissonant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*N</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harmonious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regressive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*#AN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*#AN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lenient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yielding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*#N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenacious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generous</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thrifty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*N</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boring</td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
<td>*AN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changeable</td>
<td>#N</td>
<td>*A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heretical</td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>*N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disreputable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*#AN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reputable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
interesting. There were group mode responses at the sixth level 24 times. In addition to the previous adjectives, these included active, good, rugged, sober, gentle, sociable, harmonious, and friendly. Group mode responses were never found in the most negative columns one or two, indicating a more positive than negative response on all adjectives. Those adjectives receiving the lowest modal score (value of third level) were drunk, dissonant, severe. Generous and thrifty adjective comparison is somewhat evenly split with 18 more generous, 14 middle, and 14 more thrifty responses. The feeling a respondent has about which is more positive would reflect this difference.

In order to assess the influence of the moderator and control variables which are of secondary interest in the study, correlations and ANOVA analysis were made from the data of participants' posttest, applicants, and nonapplicants. Very low correlations result when moderator and intervening variables were analyzed. A moderate correlation of \(-.5\) resulted for gender in the relationship to negative trait assignment to the United States. The t test, two-tail, comparison of gender differences shows significant probabilities for negative trait assignment to United States (.0036), England (.0221), Germany (.0461), and Poland (.0182). In each case the mean for males was higher than the mean for
females. This would indicate that males tended to assign more negative traits than did females to these nationalities.

Foreign language study was reported by all but five respondents. Twenty-two reported studying one language less than or equal to two years. Six reported studying one language longer or more in-depth. Six persons had studied more than one language and for more than two years. The ANOVA analysis of data from the participant's posttest, the applicant and nonapplicant respondents showed foreign language study to be of significance between the second and third group of language students in their ranking of Japan (F-value 4.47, p=.0106**, Scheffe 3.11*). The percent of positive traits attributed to self also showed an interaction (F-value 3.14, p=.0389*). The Scheffe results for the interaction of foreign language study and participants positive trait assignment to self were not significant.

The educational level achieved by respondents accounted for no significant differences in results. The teaching experience of respondents showed significant differences in United States ranking (F-test probability .0261*) between those with five years or less experience and those who reported from five to ten years of experience (Scheffe 3.73*). and for those with more than ten years when compared to those with five to ten years of experience (Scheffe 3.86*). For this comparison the null hypothesis stating that the rankings
were the same without regard to years of teaching experience was rejected. Six respondents had five years or less teaching experience. Three had five to ten years of experience. Twenty-eight reported ten years or more of experience.

Intervening variables of cross-cultural, international, or global experience and out-of-country experiences failed to show significant differences in the ANOVA tests. There were 23 respondents who had reported cross-cultural and international experiences. There were 20 who had previous out-of-country experience.

The five individuals who chose to comment rather than answer the questionnaire items specifically expressed difficulty and feeling upset or offended in being asked to make decisions based only on the nationality. A total of eight persons in the applicant group and two in the nonapplicant group included comments. One said, "I believe that there are people from every country with these characteristics, and I do not want to stereotype" (Questionnaire B2). One wrote, "Many comparisons were difficult due to limited experiences with all these nationalities" (Questionnaire B4). Another commented,

However, I have not had the great fortune to visit or learn about these countries first hand. I would really welcome the opportunity. I know I need to learn more and I am very open to different cultural experiences (Questionnaire B6).
Another commented, "All people are different. I would have to know them individually" (Questionnaire B12). Another asked, "Who is going to admit, on paper, that he/she would exclude certain ethnic groups from our country?" (Questionnaire C3). "One person sent a longer note, but requested not to be included in the study. Such comments as these would not be surprising. Bogardus (1951) and others have noted that educators tend to be trying to reduce social distance. As educated Americans become concerned about stereotypical traits assigned to persons and their social distance ratings decrease, they are more likely to look to individual differences. In contrast, one wrote a lengthy response indicating great interest in the study. His comment on the ranking was,

I selected each according to what I thought was the person’s freedom to choose how they wished to live in each of these countries. In other words, America does not necessarily have the best lifestyle, but we have the most political, spiritual, and economic freedom to choose a lifestyle over the other countries listed (Questionnaire B9).

At the close of another lengthy response, one respondent said,

I am very disturbed by the low quality of the information presented to persons going to Russia. Even material from US State Dept., CIA etc. are wholly inadequate. This information is based mainly on experience in the largest cities and usually only in the center of the city. None of the material is adequate for dealing with smaller cities, rural villages, or city outskirts. Any person going to Russia must be: flexible, adaptable, creative in order to live there with anything approaching ease (Questionnaire B14).
Interview Results

Interviews of the 14 Russian Fulbright group were transcribed and reviewed several times for evidence of changes in response to the questions which were included in both interviews. All interview questions and responses were examined by the researcher for similarities and for answers that either supported or refuted the findings of the empirical data analysis. Responses were examined to answer other research questions. Questions asked only in the first interview setting and the responses are reported here.

When participants were asked why they decided to apply for this Fulbright group experience to Russia in 1992, the most frequent responses were to have the opportunity to see first hand the transitions and change going on in Russia today as educators, not as tourists. Three respondents indicated a general interest in international experiences and perspectives, and four indicated a particular interest in Russia that had been longstanding or as a follow-up to previous experiences with Russians. Two respondents mentioned the importance of global education in Iowa. Three persons indicated hopes to gain resources, enhance curriculum, or begin exchanges between schools through projects such as pen pals. Previous out-of-country experiences were mentioned by two participants.
Participants were asked to indicate expectations held for professional development, cultural awareness, current conditions and changes they would see. Respondents indicated specific and general areas of professional development expectations. For example, five specific programs such as phonics and reading, early childhood education, special education classes, art, or agriculture were identified by participants with an intention to return with information to share and use in their classes. They were interested in what curriculum is being taught and what methods are being used as well as teacher education in those areas. Six persons indicated expectations to meet and share with fellow educators in their fields of particular interest. Five participants indicated expectations for learning about changes and attitudes toward change first hand. Four persons indicated expectations in bringing general knowledge to share in the classroom. Two persons mentioned being in a minority position or communicating with teachers in another language. There were eight references to cultural awareness. Three shared expectations for increased tolerance and a reduction of stereotypes built upon propaganda and a lack of experience with Russia. Four persons indicated uncertainty in expectations or no particular expectations for the trip. As one said, "I'm open to discoveries" (Interview Number 8, June 13, 1992).
When asked about their perceptions of the former Soviet Union during the period of the 1950's to the 1980's, respondents overwhelmingly cited negative images. Forty-two such statements were made. References to the evil empire, red scare, antiAmerican or antiWest enemy, or communist threat were mentioned twelve times. Military power and force were stated four times. Describing the Russian or Soviet people as suppressed, restricted, controlled, or doing without were mentioned seven times. Descriptors such as cold, closed, aloof, rigid, stagnant and stale were included. The educational system was mentioned twice in regard to being highly dictated and emphasizing science and math. There were references to perceptions that they were trying to destroy the arts, religion, and other cultural infrastructure. The lack of individual spirit or incentive was mentioned three times. By contrast, the only positive statements were that they were not totally bad people or that there might be fewer social classes than in the United States. The fact that people were taken care of by the government, no matter what, was spoken of both in positive and negative tones. Five individuals indicated some gradual change toward an image of Soviets wanting peace and education for their children, or having pride and trust, a mixture of good and bad qualities, and a more sophisticated international image than before.
When asked how often global issues are discussed in their classes, the respondents generally reported some frequency of inclusion in every class or course taught. Five individuals indicated a frequency of once a week or more. Others spoke in terms of units and topics. Two individuals felt that global issues were included very little. One administrator felt that his school was being negligent. Perhaps only in social studies were they included.

Finally, participants were asked if they had discussed issues related to the former Soviet Union in class. Eight reported that they had discussed issues relating to the former Soviet Union, while five reported not doing so.

Six questions were asked only in the exit interviews. The first of these questions inquired whether or not expectations had been met; and if not met, why they had not been met. Ten individuals reported meeting or exceeding expectations in cultural awareness and learning about the people and culture. Ten persons responded that some of their expectations had not been met. Eight referred to greater expectations for one-on-one exchanges with Russian colleagues or specific educational exchange and study. Frustration with the social aspects of the exchange and being treated as celebrities rather than as Russian educators are treated was noted by teachers who were expecting very direct academic sessions. Five participants expressed disappointment or
frustration and confusion regarding leadership on both sides in the organization of the Fulbright experience. As one person said, "Most of the best experiences were developed in spite of our schedule" (Personal Interview Number 13, July 16, 1992). One expressed appreciation for the forthrightness with which the Russians had shared; but that he wished we had been given more opportunities to meet with our counterparts directly. He expressed an understanding that this was not a fault of the program, but a part of the culture. Two persons indicated that they felt more coordination and communication between different Iowa groups going to Russia would have helped. Three participants expressed uncertainty about expectations or assumptions of the group. In contrast, another participant said,

Words are not sufficient to explain how I feel about the experience on this last day . . . . I had no thought of ever wanting or thinking of coming back to Russia when I came over here, and after five weeks, I truly say I will return. (Personal Interview Number 12, July 16, 1992).

Participants were asked to comment on additional information they would have liked to have in the orientation before coming to Russia. Three items were repeatedly included in participants' suggestions. First, there were nine who expressed lack of clarity or agreement on the specific expectations of the group and the group project. More goal-setting activity and agreement on the curriculum plan were suggested. Second, six participants identified a need for
group dynamics, team building, and decision-making processes. One participant identified the group as "a dysfunctional group in leadership, organization, information and direction" (Personal Interview Number 8, July 16, 1992). The third area of concern was uncertainty about what to bring and what not to bring. This was identified by four participants. Specifically, the concerns were about personal needs and conveniences and about gifts for the officials. There were suggestions for more coordination among the group in order to avoid duplication and to make sure all needs were met. A concern for more language training was expressed by two participants. Two participants expressed appreciation for the efforts made and a realization that things were changing so fast that it made it difficult to stay current. One person suggested the need to emphasize the expectation for bureaucratic "snags" and changes in our schedule, which was planned by the Russian Department of Education. They were responsible for both the social and academic portions of the experience.

Participants were asked what was missing from their experiences. Seven participants expressed disappointment in the number of contacts and amount of time given to one-on-one contact with professional counterparts. One suggested that an arrangement similar to the Phase III program be arranged to pay Russian teachers to come and meet in a conference for two
days and discuss issues instead of paying for banquets. It seemed to several that the contacts with counterparts were "tacked on" to social events instead of being the primary focus of events. Other participants expressed a desire for contact with more students and wished that schools were in session. One person expressed a desire to "walk without hearing English voices" or to get out of the "group" setting (Personal Interview Number 8, July 16, 1992). Another expressed a wish to have lived with families in their homes. One described the focus as too broad, desiring one or two items to be the focus. One wished for more time in Moscow. Two persons said that nothing was missing at all. One person expressed his feeling by saying,

A day with nothing scheduled is not the same as being given help in making contacts. A day in the hotel is not meeting professional contacts (Personal Interview Number 13, July 16, 1992).

Another participant expressed a desire for more personal contacts, but he quickly added, "It is freer this time than ever before" (Interview Number 14, July 16, 1992).

Participants were asked if they thought they had changed because of their Fulbright experience. They were asked to identify three important changes. Only one participant said he did not feel he had changed. Six persons expressed a greater appreciation for America and the opportunities and freedom as well as material things. Six changes were noted that indicated a greater flexibility or appreciation for
strengths and weaknesses within themselves or in the group. The importance of group dynamics training for professionals was affirmed. Changes in cold-war mentality or a realization that there are two sides to every perspective were mentioned by seven. A general increase in awareness and openness to others was expressed by five. One respondent said, "The world seems bigger and smaller at the same time because I know a few people here" (Personal Interview Number 1, July 16, 1992). Two others expressed a realization of how materialistic they felt and of learning to tolerate cold water or other inconveniences. One participant said,

Much more aware of my personal handicap in not knowing a second language than I ever realized when I was in the middle of America. That may be one of the most obvious changes. I am determined to take advantage of some classes and beginning to learn a second language . . . . It's hard to say, just the awareness of the way other people live and a reminder of how rich we are in America in material goods and how much we whine about insignificant things. Not to take for granted what we have in America. A lot of people worked very hard to make our lives more comfortable (Personal Interview Number 13, July 16, 1992).

Another affirmed "a personal philosophy of the primary and essential importance of education" (Personal Interview Number 6, July 16, 1992). Another expressed a cautious regard for people and a reinforcement in "the belief in universal human traits of altruism on the one hand, and self seeking on the other" (Interview Number 14, July 16, 1992). Finally, another participant identified
... the importance that we are in a global society and we must teach our students about other people, other nations, and other governments. In a number of hours we can be home, or in a number of hours, they can be our guests. We have opportunity for exchange of ideas, information, materials ... True exchange can be very important for the countries and the world. We must take leadership for ecology and saving the world for the future generations (Personal Interview Number 12, July 16, 1992).

Participants were then asked if Russian colleagues changed any ideas or perceptions they had, and if so how they did so. Communication was mentioned frequently. As more information is gained, one's understanding is broadened and reassured or changed. One respondent said,

I have always viewed this country as stoic, unchanging, unmoving, and committed to one idea. I have felt so welcome and solicited for ideas. That was a big surprise. (I) felt more alike than different (Personal Interview Number 2, July 16, 1992).

Another expressed surprise at how much Russians studied English but how little they know about Americans. Or that they have the same misconceptions about Americans as we do about them. Still another said,

I think that it was the Russian colleagues that changed our whole perception. If they hadn't taken us into their homes and taken time to talk to us and show us the inner soul, my perspectives would never have changed. The longer we are here, we would change more (Personal Interview Number 3, July 16, 1992).

Another expressed it in the friendliness, warmth, kindness, and helpfulness of the Russians. He said,
They really welcomed us and I did not feel that was going to be true. Even if I didn’t understand the language, people would come up to me and talk to me and communicate and show me how to get places and where to go (Personal Interview Number 5, July 16, 1992).

Another expressed a positive attitude of being impressed with Russian warmth, openness, and candidness. An appreciation for basic needs versus luxuries was expressed by two. A change in perception of young people from fancy free and rebellious to submissively expecting to be told what to do by parents was another observation expressed. The emphasis on their own history in whatever they are teaching was evident. Their isolation from the outside world, and information isolation were noted. Still another commented on the ability of Russians to address contemporary problems in undogmatic ways.

The final interview question asked if visits to Russian schools influenced or impacted their teaching perspective; and if so, how it did so. In regard to methods, emphasis on games was mentioned. Students’ choices in some schools were greater than expected. Another educator referred to the emphasis on knowledge-based content rather than critical thinking. The enthusiasm, creativity, and expectation for high standards were mentioned. The lack of materials and resources was mentioned six times. Praise was given for elementary education in holistic approach. Another pointed to the

... personal bonding between teachers and their students. It was very enlightening. They have one advantage that we don’t. They work with a group of
children three to four years before they enter the next level. In America where we see them one year only in most cases, we maybe do not allow enough time for this personal bonding. I would imagine it is most helpful for those students who might be having difficulty and a tough time adjusting in school. If there is a stable pupil/teacher relationship for a number of years, their adjustment to a school environment must be very helpful (Personal Interview Number 13, July 16, 1992).

The two administrators in the group shared the following observations. One administrator commented,

It certainly has given me a perspective I didn’t have before, and that information I am sure will be utilized in some way just in sharing in global perspectives . . . certainly better informed . . . . I’m not an expert on Russia; I will be very cautious about that. I will use this in my communications with business: 1. the role of business in schools; 2. importance of early childhood; 3. administrative structure and business and legislative concern (Personal Interview Number 6, July 16, 1992).

The other administrator observed,

I came in looking at things saying, what is the structure of the school like? The structure of the school is different wherever we went. Then I sat back and thought about it the other day. It is the same with us, we are not all the same. I want to make sure that they understand that they’re not all alike . . . this age to this age, this group to this group, different structures, and so forth. We are different too. We were given an article clearly stating how the structure was, but every school was different. Teachers, their class structure, pay scale, how evaluated, was different. The same is true in Iowa schools. It was real frustrating at first, but then I realized it is the same way. If someone comes to D, it is an entirely different structure than B (Personal Interview Number 5, July 16, 1992).

There were four interview questions that were included in both interviews. Participants’ responses were examined to see
if there was evidence of change in attitudes and perceptions toward Russia, or in their expectation of how the experience would impact their teaching. When asked to describe Russians, the second responses of participants were more positive. In the first interview, participants gave 31 positive attributes to Russians; in the later interview, they gave 52 positive attributes. In the first interview, 13 negative traits were assigned; in the second interview, 15 were given. The most frequently attributed characteristics were those of hospitable and giving, friendly, warm, caring, loving. Other positive statements included the wish for peace, hunger to know us, openness, willingness to change, being likeable, very hard working, sensitive, caring deeply, loyal, religious, honest, inquisitive, family centered, thinking highly of children, proud, open, or like Americans and people everywhere. The negative traits mentioned in the exit interviews were those of doubt, caution, victimized, deprived, unambitious, slow, 'drunkers', sad, afraid to risk, afraid of responsibility, rude, disrespectful, adrift, falling apart.

Participants were asked in both interviews to list three positive and three negative perceptions of Russia. A comparison of those items listed by participants in the two inquiries reveals that the most frequently mentioned positive characteristics given in the first interviews were 1. people who are friendly, warm, and loving; 2. land and resources; 3.
cultural heritage; 4. science and space; and 5. change and peace. The most frequently mentioned negative views centered on 1. the economic condition, 2. lack of technology and material goods, and 3. a sense of confusion. In the exit interviews the people and positive attributes of the people were mentioned 15 times. The education system for early childhood education and kindergartens was mentioned four times. The high literacy rate and foreign language training were also noted. The land and natural resources, culture and art, were each mentioned four times. The negative perceptions focused on the unstable economy, need for upkeep, lack of incentives, poor communication systems, and confusion. Another focus for negative perceptions was the lack of independent thinking and challenge to seek information or to be self-governing.

In regard to the question of concerns, issues, hopes or fears one has about Russia’s future development, the economy is most often mentioned in both interviews. It received ten comments in the first interview and 15 in the second. The change in government structure and leadership was mentioned six times in the earlier interviews as an issue or concern. It was mentioned as a hope five times. In the second interviews, it was mentioned as an issue or concern six times, and as a fear five times. It was noted as a hope only once in the second interview. The most frequent fear was that people
would lose patience, mentioned by six participants. Planning and independent thinking were mentioned as concerns and hopes in the first interview, as hopes or fears in the second interview. Social issues were mentioned as hopes and concerns in each interview with equal frequency. Education was only mentioned three times, each of which was in the first interview. In the exit interview, help from America and a view of the world-wide community were expressed as hopes three times. Concern or fear regarding the nuclear and environmental issues was mentioned four times in the first interviews, but only once in the later ones.

In both interviews participants were asked how they felt the experience of their Fulbright group experience would impact their teaching. In both sets of interviews, participants were positive about impacts on teaching from this experience. The importance of being able to speak from first hand experience was mentioned by every interviewee. One teacher said, "Multicultural learning will be more exciting with first hand experience" (Interviewee number 1, July 16, 1992). Several teachers referred to breaking old stereotypes and fears and helping students be more open to others' views. Seven individuals referred to a more global world view or the importance of global education. Both administrators affirmed the importance of global education and global thinking. Each spoke of impact on other educators through sharing with them.
All of the teachers related ideas for directly incorporating experiences and knowledge gained into their classes. One elementary teacher said, "I think that I will look at my own personal horizons differently and consider what I can teach and where. I would be interested in teaching here for a year" (Interviewee number 2, July 16, 1992). A secondary teacher said,

I think the more I become aware of multiplicities of cultures, more tolerant, more open minded, and more global, and I hope intellectually respectful I can be of every individual. And I hope that is the ultimate value in the classroom. You can't teach about another culture. You can share, you can give insights; but until we have walked in another's shoes, we do not understand, we only walk away with stereotypes, perceptions. A little bit of knowledge is a dangerous thing. And having seen this part of the world for only three weeks, I would hope I would never make a generalization or assume anything that I would pass on to my students as an absolute (Personal interview number 8, July 16, 1992).

One teacher in higher education responded,

I will be paying more attention to what the teacher does in the classroom and less on the materials and visual aids. When I see the dedication of some of the Russian teachers and the results which come about in the Russian classrooms despite the facilities that we would not allow our children to go to, it reminds me again how important is the role of a good teacher in the education. We cannot rely on technology, materials, and supplies to teach students. It requires a dedicated teacher. The American teacher's role may be reassessed. We need to remind ourselves of the importance of a good teacher as the most important link in education and not the materials that fill a classroom.

Another difference between American and Russian education is the great emphasis on history in Russia. The histories are very different and the length of their histories is very different. But
the great emphasis on history and the great sense of identity and national pride: This is who we are and this is who we came from. It would be nice to incorporate that sense . . . in American schools. Somehow we need to tap our common history a little more and what it means to be an American and what America is about. Definitely the great diversity from which we have developed would make it difficult (Personal Interview Number 13, July 16, 1992).

Participant Observer Notes

Notes made as a participant observer throughout the Russian Fulbright group experience were examined for examples of positive and negative responses and reactions of participants. General levels of interest and excitement, bewilderment or confusion, frustration, anger, or disgust were noted. Positive and negative examples were noted. Examples of quotes that exemplify the cultural shock experiences follow:

Upon arrival in Moscow, June 14, 1992:

"How dark and drab."

"I’ve been in state park out houses that were better."

"Why doesn’t he smile?"

"Man, I didn’t expect this."

"Why am I here?"

"I didn’t expect to see so much in English."

The first day in the country, June 15, 1992:

"I couldn’t prepare psychologically for what I saw yesterday. I knew that it would be different, but it seems as if history stopped about 1952. Maybe by the end of the trip, I’ll see that it hasn’t. I think I had culture shock!"
"That man was going to the bathroom right there by the fence. It smells like urine here. I’m not putting my shoes back in my suitcase."

"I’ve been robbed. It was those boys, no, the driver."

"We could bring a Snapper or a Lawn Boy and show them how to cut grass."

**Day two in Moscow, June 16, 1992:**

"I just want to give it all away and have only one small bag to take."

"I am deeply touched by their tradition, beauty, majesty, faith and devotion of the people."

"The circus did not smell like a zoo. It was clean and well produced."

"Everyone is begging from me, mauling me."

"That driver was aiming at me!"

"I don’t see any lines or shortages. I tried to buy her abacus! I didn’t know she was using it."

"The best service in McDonalds I’ve ever seen, and the rest room is nice!"

"See the gypsies in the park."

**Transferring to Stavropol, June 17, 1992:**

"Aeroflot needs repair. Those cups don’t look clean."

"It was efficient. . . a smooth ride and early versus late."

"Look, they brought our luggage in a truck!"

"Cows along the roadway. Stavropol, a lovely old-world atmosphere. Elevator is small. Room is lovely."

"There is a chandelier in my room with one working light bulb out of five, and a single candle-shaped socket above my bed that is empty."
June 18, 1992:

"People are acutely aware of language barriers tonight after our first banquet with Russian colleagues."

At a village, June 19, 1992:

"I was overwhelmed by their (village children) presentation. I’m anxious to write home now; I wasn’t before."

"Maybe they’re way ahead of us in letting grass grow naturally."

"The shady, restful parks are so nice. We’ve lost that."

"Those young men have been following us. Be careful of your things."

"I rode my first trolley bus, that was fun!"

"Language is really the barrier. Next time a Russian language course should be required first."

"Russian men are cute, nice looking. They treat a lady nicely with flowers and a kiss on the hand." (June 18, 1992, Stavropol).

One week in Russia, June 21, 1992:

"I really feel like my batteries are recharged. It doesn’t matter that you can’t understand the words, you can still worship."

"I want to buy... how much?... being typically an ugly American."

"It seems we are truly being American, individuals versus the group orientation of the Russians. We’re frustrating each other."

June 22, 1992:

"The pedagogical institute rooms remind me of a one-room school. How do I fix it up for a place of learning?"
"It’s badly in need of repair. The worst toilet!"

"The guest lecturer didn’t like it because we took too long of a break, so he’s determined to keep us here for an extra long time so that he can say all that he wants, whether there is time for the contemporary history lecture or not."

"The kindergartens are quite opposite. They’re beautiful!"

At a school, "How loved all the children are. We are in trouble."

"How beautiful the children are. How capable. When they look at me with those wide and curious eyes."

June 23 - 26, 1992:

When seven Americans shared an after party dance at the restaurant with Russian friends, all commented on the "warmth, passion, and fun-loving nature of the people."

"We’ve been in Stavropol just over a week and everyone welcomes us."

"Our presentation went well; but everyone wanted to ask about higher education, teacher assessment, orphanages, and how long our teachers teach to afford a house or car."

In the Caucasus at Dombai, June 28, 1992:

At the hotel in Dombai, "The maintenance is terrible. Nothing is finished right. There are a hundred things that wouldn’t pass inspection at home."

"Just a little farther. It’s a short hike up the mountain. It’s breathtakingly beautiful."

"I’m deeply struck by the contrasts in Russia--rich and poor, wealth of resources and technology and lack of human comforts, warmth and openess on the personal level and stoic dependence on the group level, and the political power plays."
Transfer to Pytagorsk, July 1, 1992:

"I have this feeling they are going to try to outdo Stavropol in Pytagorsk."

"Oh, this is beautiful, great. Let’s hit the casino."

"That Cossack is not a happy camper. He doesn’t want to be teased."

"We’re the ugly Americans. They don’t know that some of the stuff is culture kits... they just see us with all this baggage."

Kislovodsk, July 2, 1992:

"The Party is alive and well."

"I am very much aware that we are being shown what they want us to see, when, and where. I am very aware of the guards at the hotel and at the check points."

"What a little American ingenuity and technology could do here. It wouldn’t take long to turn things around."

July 4, 1992:

"These people just want to drink. They don’t want to talk about schools. But, of course we aren’t in school, but at a picnic, a celebration for us" (in the mountains above Kislovodsk).

"Americans and Russians singing fun songs, and the Star Spangled Banner, Moscow Nights, and We Shall Overcome in front of Lenin’s statue. We couldn’t have done that on the night of July 4, one year ago."

July 7, 1992:

"Sanitoriums, a rich man’s playground. What did he say? There’s a tremendous emphasis on buying and setting up deals for the future... a new Miami Beach indeed."
July 8, 1992:

"The orphans seem so well cared for. They don't have foster care like we do. We haven't had such orphanages in Iowa in years."

"If we had kids run around in their underpants, we'd get sued in America. This experimental school is something else. Do you believe this?"

At Pytagorsk State Pedagogical Institute, July 9, 1992:

"A pedagogical institute that can't get current books, periodicals, or newspapers!"

July 12, 1992:

"The determination, just to come to church. Isn't that something?"

"She is truly a wise woman. I wonder if her international experience has made her so."

"The two Russian women assigned to our group have differing political views."

"We're seeing some of the 'system' of how things really work. The politics, the top-down protocol."

"They really seem to be making sure we don't see a production factory."

"We're all frustrated with their own agendas."

"Russian telephones are a hunk of junk!"

"The Ruskies. . . ."

"Just think a baritone soloist in a Polish Catholic church turned into a concert hall."

"The Gypsy Baron. . . . you really didn't have to know the language to understand what was going on!"

July 14, 1992:

"Maybe the Russians really are a long-suffering, patient people."

"I see no hope for them to make it."
"You understand the meaning of being trampled. The crowd in the market moves only one way. People shove and push, or someone blocks the way in order to see anything."

"It's good they can get out into the parks, out of their crowded flats."

"The train was terrible... 110 degrees with no air, and shoulder to shoulder."

"I was surprised at the crowds in church of young and old, not many in the middle."

Kislovodsk Conference, July 15, 1992:

After a banquet, "Too much drinking and food, what's the matter with them?"

When schedule is changed again, "So, what else is new, why should we expect something to be different?"

"I thought American crowds were rude. They can't hold a candle to the Russians."

The last day in Stavropol Krai, July 17, 1992:

"This is our farewell party. We'll do it our way, not the Russian's way. No vodka, no cognac for lunch."

Return flight from Mineral Vode to Moscow, July 18, 1992:

"It's so terribly hard to say 'goodbye' today. Will we ever see them again?"

Focus-Group Interview Results

On September 23, 1992 three focus group interview discussions were held at Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa. The mixed groups included six participants of the Fulbright group project to Egypt in 1976, eleven participants of the group to China in 1988, and ten participants to Russia in 1992. Notes, tapes, and transcriptions of tapes were reviewed
three or more times by the researcher in order to scrutinize for examples of impact and repeated comments included in more than one group’s discussion. Becoming a global citizen, having a global and/or international world view, and increased sensitivity to and awareness of other cultures and perspectives was mentioned 28 times within the discussions. Person-to-person networking, communication and linkages through state and international organizations, professional conferences or committees were mentioned 33 times. This included interaction with international students and visitors and an increased interest in international travel. Giving support to fellow educators who might wish to pursue similar experiences was also included. There were 19 examples of changes in teaching perspectives, ways of talking about or approaching a subject, curricular changes, and enthusiasm for teaching. There were also increases in public speaking activities included. Six persons spoke of looking at news and information in new ways. More critical thinking and questioning information, and looking to primary sources for information were mentioned. They were also encouraging students to do the same. Four persons spoke of a greater appreciation for the United States and things we take for granted. Three individuals spoke of career changes they attributed directly (or indirectly) to their Fulbright group experience. One participant referred to his Fulbright group
experience as "a watershed event in his career." Another person spoke of a change, "instead of passing out material and helping people use it, I now help create it. My experience affects what I produce and how." Several persons said it was hard to separate personal growth from professional impact as "international" became a new way of life.

Each group was asked to make a list of suggestions for planners of future Fulbright group experiences. Their suggestions included interest in going to African and South American countries. They emphasized the importance of a knowledgeable scholar to prepare, accompany, and assist the participants after their return. The importance of language expertise within the group and the need for continuing language study, before and during the experience, were noted. A homestay within the country was listed as important. It was suggested that there be a lead person to go in advance to make arrangements. International students and previous participants were suggested as resource people to help in the planning. There were suggestions for media, curriculum, and music persons to be included. Including a photographer and a nurse were suggested. There was a suggestion to include more minority Iowans. It was suggested that an interview in the selection process is important.

The importance of group dynamics training and team building early in the process were noted. It was suggested
that focused within the guidelines of the Fulbright program, the curriculum planning should include texts, sample lesson plans, and actual teaching materials to take in the culture kits. Participants expressed interest in computer bulletin boards, video conversion equipment, and business cards in the language of the country. Previous participants also suggested more student, business, and city leaders be involved. They would suggest more involvement with Sister City and Sister State organizations, or the establishment of sister schools. Finally, they would suggest provisions to bring the teachers from the host country to Iowa for an exchange visit.

Impact of Fulbright Group Experiences

The final method of sampling was to request a consideration of the impact of the Fulbright group experience upon professional development or classroom teaching. This request was sent to each of the participants of the Egypt, China, or Russia groups and to the administrators of the Russian Fulbright participants. Responses were received from seven persons in each category.

The administrators who responded with information about the impact of the Fulbright group experience on their teachers were all positive. Seven references were made to the courses taught or influence on students. Influence in the broader community through workshops and presentations was mentioned five times. There were three references to sharing with or
inspiring colleagues. Finally, there were two references to personal changes of renewed enthusiasm for teaching and a changed world view.

The recent Russian Fulbright participants who responded all reported giving presentations as well as using in the classroom their experience and information gained. Two have written grants to extend projects in their schools. One participant mentioned reading more news about Russia, helping his son when his class studied Russia, and changing misconceptions he had about the country and its people. One person referred to the experience as "a journey" to share with students, educators, parents, and community. He referred to the importance of connectedness and global citizenry as he works to influence global education in his school, district, and the state. Another participant expressed a greater awareness of the importance of our nation's history as it identifies the people and culture. He said he teaches more broadly, with global awareness. He is concerned about wise use of resources. He expressed being closer to international students as they struggle with our system, and a greater patience with all students. He said he feels he has been given a gift of understanding that is just beginning to unfold and which he is sharing with his classes.

For those who were part of the Fulbright group to China in 1988, there were examples of curriculum development,
enthusiasm for infusion of global perspectives in their classes, and a continued interest and curiosity. Respondents shared a global, nonjudgmental attitude, and respect for other lifestyles. One credited a fellow participant with introducing him to conflict resolution. They have contacted Chinese students and delegations. They have encouraged others to pursue similar experiences. One reported securing a grant for another in-depth study, while another wrote professional papers, newsletters, and presentations on the state and national level. One spoke of having wetted an appetite for world travel with educational focus. Involvement with state and national organizations as a result of their networking was reported by three. All referred to long-term involvement with other Iowa educators. One expressed a deeper understanding of our educational system.

The respondents who had participated in the Egyptian experience of 1976 reflected on the impact of their trip over a 16-year time span. Awareness of stereotypes toward Arabs and Islam and efforts to change those were mentioned by six. A conscious awareness of Middle East politics and third world conditions gave new meaning to topics in daily discussions or course revisions. An appreciation for international students from developing countries was mentioned by two. One commented on the rapport with students when you have visited their country. One reported an unquenchable thirst for world
travel, citing travel to 24 countries and 48 states. One wrote of a long-term correspondence with an Egyptian couple she had met. Grant writing directly related to the Fulbright experience and his job since was mentioned by one. Experiences such as sponsoring a child in India or teaching an Elderhostel were credited to seeds planted by the Fulbright experience. Other responses were more of a personal philosophy as one said,

the importance of a smile, a handshake, and acceptance in solving the world’s problems. [He also credits the] emotion expressed by a lecturer, teacher, or anyone else as the most important thing (Egyptian Fulbright participant, personal correspondence, September, 1992).

Findings Summary

The findings of the study support the influence of the intensive five-week study abroad project coupled with orientation sessions on a teacher’s global attitudes and perception. The study has failed to reject the test hypotheses that participants responses are the same as those of nonapplicants, or that applicants and nonapplicants results are the same. The study fails to show significant differences between program participants and applicants in global education attitudes and perspectives. There are some empirical data results which reject the null hypotheses of the sameness of pre- and posttest results. From the interview data, there is evidence that interaction of American educators and Russian educators did enhance global education perceptions
and attitudes as participants reported more openness and awareness to different perspectives.

Examination was made to determine if there was evidence of any interaction between moderating variables. Foreign language study differences showed significance only in the ranking of Japan (F-value 4.47) and whether a language was studied two years or less or in depth (Scheffe 3.11*). A significant F value (3.14) was noted for the percentage of positive traits assigned to self and foreign language study; but no significance was revealed by the Scheffe test. There was some gender difference noted for negative trait assignment to the United States, England, Germany, and Poland. No other significant difference could be noted for the moderating or intervening variables. Because little significant difference could be shown, it appears that Iowa educators do hold consistent perceptions without regard to interest in participation in a Fulbright study abroad project to Russia in the summer of 1992.

The focus group interview discussions and responses of current and former Fulbright project participants provide evidence of impact of the experiences within two to four months following the trip as well as over four or sixteen years time lapse. The primary insights in impact of the experiences were 1. personal and professional development and the impact on education; 2. changes in one's world view and
enthusiasm for infusion of global education; and 3. increased critical thinking and in-depth approach to seeking truths.

The empirical data of the study fails to reject the null hypotheses that Fulbright program participants, when compared to those who did not apply, will have the same global perceptions and attitudes. The participants do seem to have similar global perceptions and attitudes to those who applied but were not selected for the 1992 program. However, there are significant differences in the ranking of preference of countries according to the Friedman test. There is evidence that program participants changed their perceptions and attitudes following the educational exchange experiences. There is evidence of experiences affecting the lives of the educators involved.
CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of an intensive five-week Fulbright group project upon the attitudes and perceptions of Iowa educators toward their host country, Russia. Further, the purpose was to examine the impact of such an experience on global education perspectives. The sample population of 14 Iowa Fulbright group participants was selected. Similarly stratified samples of a comparison group of applicants who did not go to Russia in the summer of 1992 and a control group of educators who did not apply for the program were selected. Thirteen applicants and 12 nonapplicants responded. There were 39 persons whose responses were included in the questionnaire data. Fourteen previous Iowa Fulbright group participants responded to a question regarding the impact of their experiences four or sixteen years ago on their teaching or professional development. Twenty-seven Iowa Fulbright group participants were included in the focus group interview discussions on September 23, 1992. There were four persons who either participated in the interview or answered the open-ended question, but did not do both. Seven administrators responded to a question concerning the impact of the Russia group experience on the teaching or professional development of their school's teacher or administrator who participated. The
entire sample population of Iowa educators involved in the study is 72 persons. The questionnaire to which 39 persons responded included the seven items from the Bogardus Social Distance Scale for attitudes toward persons from Haiti, Iraq, South Africa, Croatia, France, Russia, and Ukraine. Paired t-test analysis was made for the Fulbright participants' pre- and posttest data. Significant differences in the scores were shown only for the ratings given to Haitians, Iraqis, or South Africans. ANOVA tests comparing the participants' posttest scores with those of the comparison and control groups failed to show any significant differences. The 21 characteristics of which 14 were positive and seven were negative were assigned by respondents to persons from the United States, England, Germany, France, Italy, Japan, Poland, and Russia. They also assigned or did not assign the traits to themselves. Paired t-test analysis showed significant differences in the percentages of positive traits or negative traits assigned to each of the eight countries by participants. A t-test comparison for gender differences did reveal significant differences in the negative traits assigned to the United States, England, Germany, and Poland. The percent of positive traits assigned to self was shown to have some interaction with foreign language study. No other differences were shown to be significant in the ANOVA analysis. The ranks assigned to each of the eight countries by respondents were analyzed
using the Spearman rho coefficient of correlation and the Friedman test. Significant differences were noted in the chi square between groups. The semantic differential plot analysis was made for the means of the assignments of positive or negative adjective pairs assigned to Russians. The results show more positive adjectives chosen than negative.

The interview data from June 13 and July 16, 1992 and participant observer notes were examined to determine if there was evidence of change in participants' attitudes and perceptions. The results indicated differences and insights into global perspectives and attitudes.

The focus group interview data and the open-ended question responses give evidence of the impact of the five-week intensive group projects of 1992, 1988, and 1976 on the educators' global attitudes and changes in perceptions of their host countries. There is also evidence of impact on their professional development as well as their classroom teaching.

Conclusions

The study did not show significantly measurable decreases in social distance reactions in the post-experience testing in contrast to Bogardus (1951) findings when experienced teachers had been involved in intercultural workshops for six weeks. However, the group mean general social distance of 2.06 and 1.84 are both low scores. The posttest score of 1.84 matches
the Mid-West score reported by Owen and others (1981) in their comparison of responses of persons from rural versus urban backgrounds. Because this mean score was not significantly different from those of comparison and control groups, one might say that the Iowa educators participating in the study held similarly low social distance scores and tended to be accepting of internationals. The control group's score of 2.18 is almost the same as that of the South reported in Owen and other's data. The 2.57 mean distance score of the comparison group is higher than those means reported by Owen and others. When compared to Whalen's (1987) study of college students at Iowa State University, the mean social distance scores for Russians that were reported by participants in this study of 2.0 in pretest, 1.71 in posttest, 2.36 for applicants and 1.91 for the control group are all below Whalen's reported 2.61 mean for Russians. The highest social distance mean scores were given to Haitians and Iraqis with mean scores of 2.64 assigned by the comparison group of Iowa educators. Considering the recent Iraqi conflict, this could be a deciding factor.

When comparing the findings of the current study to those of Child and Doob (1943), the Iowa educators ranked Germany at 3.61 compared to 5.7 and 5.4 in the earlier study. Iowans ranked France lower at 4.45 compared to the earlier ranks of 3.5 and 3.0. Iowans gave Japan a 5.5 average rank compared to
6.8 and 6.5 in the earlier studies. These findings are not surprising due to the fact that the earlier studies were done near the beginning of World War Two when Germany and Japan were enemies to the United States. Iowans ranked the United States, England, and Italy about the same as in the earlier studies. Russia was ranked 5.5 in the 1938 study and 6.9 in the 1940 study conducted by Child and Doob. Russia received an average rank of 6.27 in the current study, but received a lower 5.2 ranking by the Fulbright participants in their posttest results. Poland was ranked 5.3 earlier, and less favorably at 6.91 currently.

In contrast to Buchanan (1951), Iowans did not regard Russians in 1992 as cruel. There was some evidence of hard working or backwardness expressed in the interview data. In comparison to Lambert’s 1967 findings, the Iowans did not consider Russians aggressive or bad. Some reference to being dominated is shown in the interview data. The exit interviews showed more positive attributes being assigned.

Findings of the current study on impact of the Fulbright experience over time would concur with findings of McDonald and others (1989) in that there is evidence of impact on attitudes and teaching. Over time, the Fulbright participants have reported using new ideas years later and feelings of warmth toward host countries. Personal gains in knowledge and understanding were noted by all. When asked about changes
they had experienced, six participants expressed appreciation for the United States of America. Six had gained new insights into strengths, weaknesses, and flexibility for themselves and in the group. Five participants expressed new openness and awareness. Seven people referred to changes in cold-war mentality and enemy images. These are examples of impacts that are important for global awareness.

Similar to the findings of Daines and Philal (1990), the current study shows evidence of impact from experiences in a host country on the global attitudes of educators as expressed in the focus group interview discussions. The group participants in this study also have indicated professional enrichment and redefinition of roles, or new directions in their professional lives due to the Fulbright group experience. Similar to earlier findings, this study did not show significant differences in results based upon foreign language study. There is evidence that Iowa educators who participated in Fulbright group experiences are including global perspectives in their teaching.

This study has utilized a variety of data gathering measures both empirical and naturalistic in nature in order to assess Iowa educators' attitudes and perceptions and the impact resulting from a Fulbright study abroad group project on global education. The study has had similarity in design
to that conducted by Kelman and Ezekiel (1970) with communication specialists.

Recommendations

1. Assessment of Fulbright Group Study Abroad projects would enhance the planning, implementation, and effectiveness of such programs. Evaluations and suggestions made by those who had experienced such a project, would be of value in anticipating potential difficulties or frustrations for future participants.

2. An accompanying scholar facilitates the interpretation of guest lecturers and can serve as a valuable resource person. Participants from each of the previous experiences expressed the reassurance this person brought to the group and the continued value of his expertise as the participants reflected following their experience.

3. Orientation and language sessions need to be critically planned, and the program should be clearly outlined and discussed. It is important for each participant to attend and actively be involved in the orientation and planning. The members gain a sense of ownership and direction when they take responsibility for some aspect of the preparation. Some of the confusion expressed by the Russian Fulbrighters was due to a lack of full participation in the planning phase. The continued language and culture learning are important to strengthen the levels of understanding.
4. Coordination between the Project Director and designated program planner at the host agency is vitally important. Each needs to have good communications. When there is a lack of clear communication or when plans cannot be effectively coordinated as planned, difficulties and frustrations arise. Anything that can strengthen the coordinated effort toward project goals would be of value.

5. Some allowances have to be made for flexibility and adaptability by participants because of changes in the host country beyond the control of the sponsor. Whenever one is going international, flexibility and adaptability are the key components of success. Participants may benefit from orientation activities that emphasize these qualities.

6. Involve to the extent possible other helpful agencies in strengthening the project. Networking with such groups will be helpful before the departure, during the time in the host country, and upon return. One can gain insight from another's experience and expertise. As one examines the experiences of participants and outcomes over time, such networking has been shown to be very important.

Limitations

The researcher alone reviewed tapes and notes from the interviews, focus group discussions, follow-up questions, and participant-observer notes. While there is consistency in the methodology followed by one person, there is also a
limitation. When more than one researcher conducts the interviews or reviews the data, there is an opportunity for corroboration and validation. Only one researcher making participant-observer notes is also limiting. It would be difficult to hear everyone's comments and reactions during the experiences. Thus, other important insights may not have been recorded.

**Implications**

As some of the quotes may exemplify, educators tend to be leaders who are used to being in charge and being very direct. Their frustrations with experiential learning in a cross-cultural setting are expressed in terms of fluctuation in planning and schedule and blamed leadership. One of the key elements to successful international experience is flexibility. Some were expecting a very structured academic format. They were thwarted. Those who were taking in everything as it came along were more gratified.

The greatest concerns about the economic and political instability are very real. They tend to overshadow everything. Russia seems to be near the brink of a hill, and she could go either way. It is the inner strength of the Russian people that offers the greatest hope. And we must not turn our backs, but continue to build linkages of friendship and cooperation. What kind of ambassadors for the Fulbright programs were we? Did we carry that message of friendship and
cooperation? Did we impact our Russian counterparts in their attitudes and perceptions about the United States and Iowa?

The current study has added to the body of knowledge regarding impact of out-of-country experience by Iowa educators on their attitudes and perceptions toward their host country. It has been a pioneering effort, included assessment of global perspectives. It has documented an impact on classroom teaching and professional development through grant writing, involvement in state, national, and international organizations, conferences and committees, or career path changes of those Iowa educators involved in the current project and in previous projects. There has also been evidence of appreciation for the home country, the United States, as well as appreciation for other cultures. Individuals have reported personal changes in life perspectives. Over time, there has been notation of more critical thinking and searching for truth and understanding, individually and with students.

It is not possible to generalize the findings of this study, but it offers a validation for these Iowa educators involved in the Fulbright study abroad group projects to Russia, China, and Egypt. It also shows the attitudes and perceptions of other Iowa educators included in the study at this point in time when there was little evidence in the literature of studies concerning attitudes toward other
nations. A follow-up study of the Fulbright participants' activities over time may be of further interest. Their teaching impact on students' attitudes and perceptions and their professional development would be of interest. Will they become more involved in international activities or engage in additional travel abroad?

It has been interesting to include a variety of methods in this study. Further study may be suggested in which naturalistic methods are followed in depth, such as an ethnography or several case studies in order to further document the values of study abroad projects, whether the participants are educators or students.

As other world events bring changes in political and economic interactions between the United States and other nations, similar assessment of attitudes toward persons of those nations could be examined. Will there be significant changes in social distance scores or stereotypical traits assigned to persons at a later point in time? A study of patriotism and the effects of cross-cultural or international experiences might be interesting and provide significant information.

Because the importance of group dynamics and team building were mentioned so frequently by participants in the personal interviews and focus group interviews, a study of the group dynamics processes within a group study abroad
experience might be of interest. What differences in a group's experiences and their satisfaction with the experience abroad might there be given different group dynamics? Would the inclusion of group process experiences be valuable? How might the group interaction and efforts toward their goals be scrutinized and documented?

In order to build a more peaceful and understanding world, we must continue to expand global perspectives and tolerance. The intensive five-week experiences in host countries have been exemplified as one way in which this has happened. As educators influence the people they teach, each one can and does make a difference.
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APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRE
Please indicate with an x in the blank next to the characteristic that best describes you:

1. Educational employment:
   ___a. elementary school
   ___b. secondary school
   ___c. institution of higher education

2. Are you in administration or teaching?
   ___a. administration only
   ___b. teaching only
   ___c. both administration and teaching

3. What is your gender?
   ___a. male
   ___b. female

4. What level of education have you achieved?
   ___a. B.A. Degree
   ___b. M.A. or M.S. Degree
   ___c. Ph.D. Degree

5. What out-of-country experiences have you had?
   ___a. none
   ___b. one to four weeks of travel in one other country
   ___c. travel or educational experiences of more than four weeks or in more than one other country

6. Have you studied foreign languages?
   ___a. no
   ___b. I have studied one foreign language two years or less.
   ___c. I have studied one foreign language in depth.
   ___d. I have studied more than one foreign language.

7. What is your teaching experience? (mark all that apply)
   ___a. five years or less
   ___b. from five - ten years
   ___c. more than ten years
   ___d. Teaching experience is at one level of education.
   ___e. Teaching experience is at more than one level of education.

8. What cross-cultural, international or global experiences have you had? (i.e. hosting visitors, participating in workshops led and participated in by cross-cultural or international individuals, day to day contact with international or cross-cultural individuals).
   ___a. no experience
   ___b. one to two years of experience
   ___c. more than two years of experience
BOGARDUS SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALE

Please consider the groups of people listed below. Place a number 1-7 (with 1 indicating low agreement and 7 indicating high agreement) according to what most nearly represents the degree of closeness to which you would be willing to admit members of each group. Give your answers to each group as a whole. Do not give your reactions to the best or worst members that you have known. Please complete item 1. for all groups then go to item 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I would admit</th>
<th>Haitians</th>
<th>Iraqis</th>
<th>South Africans</th>
<th>Croats</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Russians</th>
<th>Ukrainians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. to close kinship by marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. to my club as a personal chum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. to my street as neighbors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. to employment in my occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. to citizenship in my country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. as visitors only to my country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I would exclude from my country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If you are certain that the trait is characteristic of people from the country, put +2 in the blank; if you are uncertain, but still feel that the trait does characterize the people of the country, please place +1; use -1 or -2 for degrees of certainty that the trait does not characterize the people of the country. Please rate the peoples of the eight countries in respect to each given trait and then go on to the next trait.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRAITS</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Poland</th>
<th>Russia</th>
<th>USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>carefree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patriotic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ambitious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>artistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immoral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intellectual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>powerful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loyal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progressive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cruel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selfish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quick-tempered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intelligent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gloomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please mark your approval or disapproval of the traits listed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRAIT</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Disapproved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>carefree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patriotic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ambitious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>artistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immoral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intellectual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>powerful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loyal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progressive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cruel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selfish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materialistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quick-tempered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intelligent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gloomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please indicate whether or not each trait characterizes you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRAITS</th>
<th>Characteristic of Me:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>carefree</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patriotic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ambitious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>artistic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immoral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intellectual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>powerful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loyal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progressive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cruel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selfish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materialist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quick-tempered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intelligent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gloomy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please indicate how well the following adjectives describe Russians. Please put an x in the blank that best describes Russians for each pair of adjectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>active</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>lazy</th>
<th>valuable</th>
<th>kind</th>
<th>peaceful</th>
<th>fair</th>
<th>delicate</th>
<th>sober</th>
<th>strange</th>
<th>gentle</th>
<th>sociable</th>
<th>dissonant</th>
<th>regressive</th>
<th>lenient</th>
<th>tenacious</th>
<th>thrifty</th>
<th>friendly</th>
<th>boring</th>
<th>stable</th>
<th>orthodox</th>
<th>reputable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industrious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worthless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cruel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ferocious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rugged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drunk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>familiar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsociable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harmonious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progressive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>severe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yielding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfriendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interesting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>changeable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heretical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disreputable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please rank the eight countries in order of your preference for them at this moment, in terms of lifestyle.

America
England
France
Germany
Italy
Japan
Poland
Russia

Any comments you'd like to make are welcome:
APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
Wolf, Interview Questions for the Fulbright group

Pretest only:
1. Why did you decide to apply for this Fulbright group experience to Russia in 1992?

2. What expectations do you have for the trip in regard to professional development, cultural awareness, current conditions and change?

3. What were your perceptions of the former Soviet Union during the period of the 1950’s to 1980’s?

4. How often do you discuss global issues in your class if you do so?

5. Have you discussed issues related to the former Soviet Union in your class?

Both pretest and posttest:
1. How would you describe Russians? What are they like?

2. When you think of Russia, what three positive and what three negative perceptions comes to mind?

3. What concerns, issues, hopes or fears do you have about Russia’s future development?

4. How will this experience impact your teaching?

Posttest only:
1. To what extent have your expectations about this experience been met? If not met, why not?

2. What additional information would you have liked to have in the orientation before you came to Russia?

3. What was missing? What would you have liked to have seen/experienced that you did not?

4. How do you think you have changed because of this Fulbright experience? What are three important changes?

5. Did Russian colleagues change any ideas or perceptions you had? If so, how?

6. Did your visit to Russian schools influence or impact your teaching perspective? If so, how?
APPENDIX C: HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE APPROVAL FORM
1. Title of Project: Determination of educators' attitudes and perceptions and the impact resulting from a Fulbright study abroad project to Russia.

2. I agree to provide the proper surveillance of this project to insure that the rights and welfare of the human subjects are protected. I will report any adverse reactions to the committee. Additions to or changes in research procedures after the project has been approved will be submitted to the committee for review. I agree to request renewal of approval for any project continuing more than one year.

3. Linda Lou Wolf
   Date: 6/9/92
   Signature of Principal Investigator

4. Professional Studies
   1800 210th Street, Oskaloosa, IA 525739812

5. Signatures of other investigators
   Date: 6/10/92
   Relationship to Principal Investigator: Major Professor

6. Principal Investigator(s) (check all that apply)
   Faculty ☐ Staff ☐ Graduate Student ☐ Undergraduate Student ☐

7. Project (check all that apply)
   Research ☒ Thesis or dissertation ☐ Class project ☐ Independent Study (490, 590, Honors project)

8. Number of subjects (complete all that apply)
   84 Adults, non-students ☐ # ISU student ☐ # minors under 14 ☐ other (explain) ☐ # minors 14 - 17 ☐

9. Brief description of proposed research involving human subjects: (See instructions, Item 7. Use an additional page if needed.) To assess the impact of a five-week Fulbright Educational Project in Russia, pre/post responses to semantic differential items, Bogardus Social Distance Scales, Stereotypical Traits, and interview will be made. (See attached forms) One assessment of each (except interview) will be made of the comparison and control groups of Iowa educators, similarly stratified to the Fulbright group. Observation notes (anonymously made) during the group experience and follow-up question to each participant and his or her administrator regarding the impact on personal development and teaching. Group discussion regarding impact by current group and earlier Fulbright groups to China and Egypt.

10. Informed Consent: ☐ Signed informed consent will be obtained. (Attach a copy of your form.)
    ☐ Modified informed consent will be obtained. (See instructions, Item 8.)
    ☐ Not applicable to this project.
9. Confidentiality of Data: Describe below the methods to be used to ensure the confidentiality of data obtained. (See instructions, item 9.) Groups will be identified by color of instrument. Individuals will be numbered only until response is received in order to follow up as needed to obtain the response forms. Only the principal investigator will have access to this list. As soon as a response is received, the number will be removed.

10. What risks or discomfort will be part of the study? Will subjects in the research be placed at risk or incur discomfort? Describe any risks to the subjects and precautions that will be taken to minimize them. (The concept of risk goes beyond physical risk and includes risks to subjects' dignity and self-respect as well as psychological or emotional risk. See instructions, item 10.) Do not anticipate any discomfort to participants.

11. CHECK ALL of the following that apply to your research:
   □ A. Medical clearance necessary before subjects can participate
   □ B. Samples (Blood, tissue, etc.) from subjects
   □ C. Administration of substances (foods, drugs, etc.) to subjects
   □ D. Physical exercise or conditioning for subjects
   □ E. Deception of subjects
   □ F. Subjects under 14 years of age and/or □ Subjects 14 - 17 years of age
   □ G. Subjects in institutions (nursing homes, prisons, etc.)
   □ H. Research must be approved by another institution or agency (Attach letters of approval)

If you checked any of the items in 11, please complete the following in the space below (include any attachments):

Items A - D Describe the procedures and note the safety precautions being taken.

Item E Describe how subjects will be deceived; justify the deception; indicate the debriefing procedure, including the timing and information to be presented to subjects.

Item F For subjects under the age of 14, indicate how informed consent from parents or legally authorized representatives as well as from subjects will be obtained.

Items G & H Specify the agency or institution that must approve the project. If subjects in any outside agency or institution are involved, approval must be obtained prior to beginning the research, and the letter of approval should be filed.
Checklist for Attachments and Time Schedule

The following are attached (please check):

12. ☐ Letter or written statement to subjects indicating clearly:
   a) purpose of the research
   b) the use of any identifier codes (names, #’s), how they will be used, and when they will be
      removed (see Item 17)
   c) an estimate of time needed for participation in the research and the place
   d) if applicable, location of the research activity
   e) how you will ensure confidentiality
   f) in a longitudinal study, note when and how you will contact subjects later
   g) participation is voluntary; nonparticipation will not affect evaluations of the subject

13. ☐ Consent form (if applicable)

14. ☐ Letter of approval for research from cooperating organizations or institutions (if applicable)

15. ☐ Data-gathering instruments

16. Anticipated dates for contact with subjects:
   First Contact
   Last Contact
   
   6/13/92
   11/1/92
   Month / Day / Year
   Month / Day / Year

17. If applicable: anticipated date that identifiers will be removed from completed survey instruments and/or audio or visual
   tapes will be erased: Identifiers will be removed upon receipt; tapes would all
   be erased by:
   
   1/1/93
   Month / Day / Year

18. Signature of Departmental Executive Officer Date
   Department or Administrative Unit

19. Decision of the University Human Subjects Review Committee:
   ☑ Project Approved  ☐ Project Not Approved  ☐ No Action Required

   Patricia M. Keith  8/3/92
   Name of Committee Chairperson  Signature of Committee Chairperson

GC:1/90
APPENDIX D: FULBRIGHT PROGRAM MATERIALS
Responsibilities of Participants

1. Participants are required to provide a letter of administrative support for the participation in all phases of the intercultural curriculum project from his/her employer.
2. Securing:
   - Passport
   - Health certificate
   - Travel & Health insurance
   - Local travel in Iowa
3. Project fee of $350.00 to cover planning, orientation and follow-up activities. Part of incidental costs will be covered by this fee while in Stavropol.

Project Funds

Provides economy air travel - Des Moines - Stavropol - Des Moines.
Travel expenses in Soviet Union.
Lodging and meals for five weeks.
The Department of Education, Stavropol will host our study group and facilitate all local arrangements.

Program Co-Director

William D. Wolansky
Professor & Coordinator
International Education Programs
College of Education, ISU
Don C. Rawson
Associate Professor
History Department, ISU

Advisory Council:

Mrs. Carol Brown
Social Science Supervisor
Des Moines Public School System
Dr. Donna Cowan
Associate Dean
College of Family & Consumer Sciences, ISU
Mr. Dennis Peterson, Director
International Education Services, ISU
Dr. Les Stember
Associate Dean
College of Education, ISU
Dr. Bill Liu (Chr.)
Executive Director
USA-China Teacher Education Consortium

INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

TRAVEL, VISIT & STUDY SOVIET UNION CULTURES

June 13 - July 18, 1992

Sponsored by College of Education
Office of International Education
E115 Lagomarcino
Iowa State University
Tel. (515)294-7350
& Stavropol Sister State Association
Funded by the U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.
An Introduction to Intercultural Education Project

Program

The overall program will include two orientation sessions to enhance participants' linguistic, historic and cultural perspectives of the Soviet Union; planned five-week formal study in Stavropol, Soviet Union; and two post-project seminars to complete curriculum material and dissemination activities.

Objectives

The intercultural curriculum project has the following objectives:

1) To study the role of education in the Soviet Union's rapidly changing society;
2) To research the various aspects of Soviet economic and social life with respect to curriculum development for Iowa schools;
3) To collect and develop resource material on Stavropol and Soviet Union to strengthen curriculum development in Iowa's public schools and teacher education;
4) to disseminate these materials to education agencies and other interested groups;
5) To create effective educational linkages between key agencies in Iowa, Stavropol, and Soviet Union.

Participants

Fourteen participants will be chosen from the following:

- Elementary schools of Iowa
- Secondary schools of Iowa
- Teacher education of Iowa

The majority will be classroom teachers and selected from the following subject areas: agricultural education, foreign language, music, art, history, philosophy, anthropology, home economics, psychology, curriculum and instruction, industrial education, sciences, English, mathematics, and social studies. Consideration will also be given to gender minority and regional representation.

Procedures

Program procedures include:

1) Predeparture orientation and planning sessions.
2) In-country formal lectures, field trips, attend cultural events, visits to various points of interest, group discussion, and curriculum development.
3) Participants will form the following study clusters: culture & history, education, earning & living, leisure time, and family life.

Participant Selection Criteria

The participant is
1. a citizen of United States of America
2. a resident of Iowa
3. able to provide evidence of support from her/his institution's administrator
4. interested in and committed to promoting international education
5. able to make direct use of the experience in her/his teaching or administrative activities
6. willing to serve as a consultant and/or speaker at a local school in Iowa or community group meeting
7. academically qualified and interested in developing curriculum materials for comparative study

Applicants are expected to address the above criteria in submitting a one-page document to qualify for the review process.

Credit Option

Those desiring graduate credit in History or Higher Education for 3 credits should make arrangements with the Co-Directors prior to departure. Tuition fees will be the responsibility of the student.
## Anthropological Model for the Study of Russia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life and Leisure</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Arts</td>
<td>Family Life Section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying and Selling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earning a Living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Political Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Early Childhood
- Family Life Section
- Support of Kindergartens
- Early Childhood plan
- Economics section
- Computer
- Concern for saving our earth
- Current effects are evident
- Ethnic pride/history
- New ventures
- Exploration and new ventures
- Need for new advances
- Renewal and support
- Church supported schools are just beginning
APPENDIX E: TABLE FROM CHILD AND DOOB'S STUDY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Trait</th>
<th>America</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Poland</th>
<th>Russia</th>
<th>Percent attributing the trait to the citizens of the country</th>
<th>Percent approving the trait trait to self</th>
<th>Percent approving the trait to self</th>
<th>AD of</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carefree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriotic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immoral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 1 (Cont.)