

FIRST-YEAR EXPERIENCE AND THE COMMON READER: AN EXAMINATION OF CHANGE IN STUDENT ETHNOCENTRISM RESULTING FROM READING A BOOK

Kristina Drumheller
West Texas A&M University

R. Nicholas Gerlich
West Texas A&M University

Jessica Mallard
West Texas A&M University

ABSTRACT

Many colleges and universities utilize a common reader as a unifying theme in students' first-year experience. An underlying motive in selecting such books is to effect change in student awareness of a topic of national or global relevance. This study examines the effect of a common reader selection that explores the global labor and economic markets on student consumer ethnocentric tendencies. Findings indicated that there were significant differences in consumer ethnocentrism among those who had read the book. Furthermore, a favorable attitude toward the common reader program was significantly and inversely related to lower consumer ethnocentrism. It was concluded that the common reader program had achieved its intended objective of raising student awareness toward issues of global importance.

INTRODUCTION

Common reader programs have been popularized at universities around the nation in an attempt to build community and learning experiences among incoming freshman student populations (Mallard, Lowery-Hart, Anderson, Cuevas, & Campbell, 2008; Laufgraben, 2006; Upcraft, Gardner, & Barefoot, 2005). The common reader chosen at a south-central university, *Where Am I Wearing (WAIW)*, explores the idea of a global economy, multinational outsourcing, worker conditions, and the economic alternatives of such corporate decisions. The purpose of this study is to measure attitudinal and consumer ethnocentrism differences resulting from reading *WAIW*, change in awareness of global manufacturing concerns, and planned as well as past purchase of Fair Trade products. Although universities assess their individual programs, little is found in published research about the effects of common reader programs.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The importance of engaging students early in their university career is generally acknowledged. The amount of studying and reading of nonassigned books positively relates to gains in critical thinking (Terenzini, Springer, Pascarella, & Nora, 1993). The National Endowment for the Arts (2007) reported that despite the fact that Americans are reading and comprehending less, “the number of books in a home is a significant predictor of academic achievement” (p. 11) and future financial success. Encouraging student reading and critical thinking might require a shift in learning models.

Researchers report a shift in learning paradigms from a traditional instructional teaching model to a learner interactive model where students are more engaged in the learning process (Barr & Tagg, 1995; Mallard et al., 2008). In a study of online education paradigms, two different learning groups were created: one that used objectivist teaching strategies where the teacher controls the learning content and one that used constructivist teaching strategies, where the student has more control (Zapatero, Chen, Panigrahi, & Harris-Peoples, 2010). Students in the constructivist group outperformed those in the objectivist group. Furthermore, increasing student talk through classroom discussion enhances comprehension (Murphy, Wilkinson, Soter, Hennessey, & Alexander, 2009, p. 761).

With a change to an engaged student model, more and more universities have implemented common reader programs to enhance the first year experience. Current voluntary lists reveal well over 100 universities and colleges participating in common reader programs with earlier research reporting over 130 established programs (Fister, 2011; Twiton, 2007). Programs have mixed results depending on the goal of the program, but most consider it critical to the success of first year experiences (Anderson, 2006). Common reader selection committees often seek books that will connect with the freshmen, but not all book selections hit the mark (Mallard et al., 2008; Segel, 2011). In some cases committees have concerned themselves more with whether the book initiates discussion about important topics and themes, rather than worrying whether students will like the book (Mallard et al., 2008). Determining the net effects of common reader programs is an important next step for research in this area:

RQ1: What is the role of the common reader book choice in potentially influencing student attitudes?

It is expected that engaging students in activities and discussions related to the common reader will effect growth and potential attitude shifts. With *WAIW*, students were exposed to varying views about the garment industry, which potentially directly affects their purchasing decisions and consumer ethnocentrism tendencies, which is “the beliefs held by consumers about the appropriateness, indeed morality, of purchasing foreign-made products” (1987, p 280; Sharma, Shimp, & Shin, 1995). The *CETSCALE*, created by Shimp and Sharma (1987), is a widely used instrument for measuring consumer ethnocentric tendencies (CET), or inclinations toward foreign-made products. Though the scale has been widely tested across global markets (e.g., Hamelin, Ellouizi, & Canterbury, 2011; John & Brady, 2011; Martin & Eroglu, 1993; Spillan, Kang, & Barat, 2011; Yoo & Donthu, 2005), it has not yet been used to compare common reader effects. However, it is expected that students who read *WAIW* would be positively affected, thus:

H1: Students who have read the common reader book, *WAIW*, will have lower CET scores than students who have not read *WAIW*.

H2: Students who indicated a higher level of interest in *WAIW* (as measured on the summated *COMMREAD* scale), will have lower *CETSCALE* scores.

Previous *CETSCALE* research is mixed on the role of gender and consumer ethnocentrism (Bawa, 2004; Sharma et al., 1995; Hamelin et al., 2011; Yoo & Donthu, 2005); however, given

that masculinity was positively related to CETSCALE scores in Japanese consumers (Yoo & Donthu, 2005) and the participant population is located in a conservative religious area given to a masculine societal dimension, it is expected that:

H3a: Males will have a higher summated CETSCALE than will females.

Additionally, geographical differences as well as religious and political leanings have been found to affect consumer ethnocentrism (de Ruyter, van Birgelen, & Wetzels, 1998; Spillan, Kang, & Barat, 2011). Despite the focus on geography, race has largely been ignored in the CETSCALE literature. Given that the south-central university region serves a large rural population that is predominantly white, identifying as politically and religiously conservative, it is expected that:

H3b: Students from rural regions will have a higher summated CETSCALE than will those from non-rural regions (i.e., city + suburban).

H3c: Right-leaning respondents will have a higher summated CETSCALE than left-leaning respondents.

H3d: White respondents will have a higher summated CETSCALE score than will non-white respondents.

Because a large portion of the students surveyed had completed the book, and the book is expected to increase awareness about the garment industry and labor conditions, it is expected:

H3e: Students who have read *Where Am I Wearing* will have a lower mean summated CETSCALE score than will those who have not read it.

Although there is not much research available on common reader programs, Mallard et al. (2008) did find that females responded more strongly and more positively toward the common reader text in their study. Thus, it is expected:

H4: Females will have a higher summated COMMREAD than will males.

While it is possible to support the inclusion of H4 based on prior studies, there is no extant literature that would allow for the development of hypotheses regarding how student residence, race and political preference might be related to COMMREAD scores. Thus, this research seeks to explore the role these variables might play.

RQ2: What are the roles of student residence of origin, race, and political preference with regard to their attitudes toward the common reader program?

METHOD AND RESULTS

A paper survey was distributed to each section of a required first-year experience course populated by the incoming freshman class. The university is a Division II regional institution in the south-central US. Students were required to read the book *Where Am I Wearing* (2006), by Kelsey Timmerman. A total of 939 surveys were completed and returned (out of 1180 distributed). Students were asked to provide demographic information, indicate whether they had read the book, answer the 17-item CETSCALE, several questions relating to awareness of global worker conditions and Fair Trade products, a 3-item series of questions provided by the author of *WAIW*, and an 8-item scale assessing their evaluation of the common reader program (Mallard et al., 2008).

A composite CETSCALE score was created that summed student scores on the 17 individual items. Each question was scored on a 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree) scale. The summated CETSCALE thus had a possible range from 17 to 119 (overall mean=54.25; std. dev.=18.274). Cronbach's alpha=.947, which is very consistent with the majority of prior applications of the scale (both domestically and internationally). Furthermore, the mean CETSCALE score for this sample is very similar to what Shimp and Sharma calculated for US

students overall (51.92). A hypothetical midpoint (i.e., if a person assigned an answer of 4 for each of the 17 items) would be 68. A score of 17 would be extreme non-consumer ethnocentrism, while a score of 119 would be extreme consumer ethnocentrism. By definition, consumer ethnocentrism is a tendency to prefer purchasing items made in one’s own country, regardless of any perceived product quality or image differences, as well as price. The mean for this sample indicates that student consumer ethnocentrism leans toward the lower end of the range, but is slightly more consumer ethnocentric than the national average.

Similarly, a composite COMMREAD was created that summed student scores on the 8-item scale developed by Mallard et al. One item was reverse-coded to ensure commonality of direction. The 8 items were scored on a 1 to 5 scale, producing a range of scores from 8 to 40 (mean=28.88; std. dev.=5.405). Cronbach’s alpha=.833, which is favorable and consistent with three prior applications of Mallard et al.’s scale (alpha=.59, alpha=.94, and alpha=.83). Table 1 displays summary statistics for the 8-item scale.

Table 1: COMMREAD Descriptive Statistics

Item	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation
My motive for reading the book was because the text seemed interesting.	743	1	5	2.99	1.073
This book was dull.	739	1	5	3.43	1.077
My instructor was enthusiastic toward the text.	739	1	5	3.94	.778
I enjoyed discussing this book in class.	741	1	5	3.55	.862
I would recommend the common reader program for future incoming students.	742	1	5	3.66	1.041
I had conversations about the book outside of class.	742	1	5	3.37	1.149
The book exposed me to new ideas and perspectives.	742	1	5	3.92	.926
The author’s experiences were worth his expenses.	740	1	5	3.99	1.023

A third composite measure was created for the three *WAIW* author-provided items (KELSUM). These three items were measured on a 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree) scale; the resulting summated score could range in value between 3 and 21 (mean=10.53; std. dev.=4.154). Cronbach’s alpha=.673, which is just shy of the more desirable .7 or above. Table 2a displays summary statistics for the 3-item scale for the entire sample, while Table 2b displays summary statistics for only students who had completed the book.

Table 2a: KELSUM Descriptive Statistics (full sample)

Item	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation
I think about the people who made my clothes when I put them on.	925	1	7	3.26	1.631
I look at the tag of my clothes to see where they were made.	923	1	7	3.68	1.846
I know what life is like for the people who made my clothes.	919	1	7	3.59	1.857

Table 2b: Descriptive Statistics (read all or some of book)

Item	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation
I think about the people who made my clothes when I put them on.	741	1	7	3.35	1.671
I look at the tag of my clothes to see where they were made.	740	1	7	3.75	1.861
I know what life is like for the people who made my clothes.	737	1	7	3.78	1.853

Of the total sample, 679 students indicated that they had read the book in its entirety, with 166 having not yet read it or completed it. Given that it was the second week of the semester, the book completion rate is very encouraging. A t-test for independent means (equal variances assumed) was run comparing the mean CETSCALE scores of those who had and had not read the book. The “Yes” group had a mean CETSCALE of 53.58, while the “No” group averaged 56.94. The analysis produced $t=2.128$ ($p=.034$). Thus, H1 is retained.

A correlation was calculated between CETSCALE and COMMREAD ($r=-.199$; $p=.000$; $n=661$). The COMMREAD score is a proxy for overall interest in the book; the fact that the correlation was calculated with only 661 values is due to incomplete surveys filed by students. Those who had a higher interest in the book tended to have lower CETSCALE scores. H2 is retained.

A more robust measure, though, of gauging interest in the subject matter of the book is found in the composite KELSUM score, which captures readers’ level of agreement with thematic aspects of the book. A t-test for independent means (equal variances assumed) was run comparing the mean KELSUM scores of those who had read the book versus those who had not read the book. The “Yes” group ($n=736$) had a mean KELSUM score of 10.87, while the “No” group ($n=174$) averaged 9.17. This produced $t=4.927$ ($p=.000$).

Next, a correlation was calculated between CETSCALE, COMMREAD, and KELSUM (see Table 3). KELSUM is positively correlated with COMMREAD (as would be hoped), and negatively correlated with CETSCALE (consistent with COMMREAD being negatively correlated with CETSCALE). This secondary analysis helps bolster the conclusion to retain H2.

Table 3: Correlations

		CETSCALE	COMMREAD	KELSUM
CETSCALE	Pearson Correlation	1	-.199**	-.066
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.00	.05
	N	853	661	839
COMMREAD	Pearson Correlation	-.199**	1	.356**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.00		.00
	N	661	725	716
KELSUM	Pearson Correlation	-.066	.356**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.05	.00	
	N	839	716	918

The difference in counts among the “yes” and “no” groups between testing here and against CETSCALE is accounted for by the fact that not all students completed the 17-item scale items. CETSCALE could only be calculated if all 17 items were completed.

T-tests for independent means (equal variances assumed) were also run comparing average CETSCALE scores for four demographic variables and whether the student had read the book (see Table 4). First of these was Gender comparing the mean scores of Males (n=404; mean=57.01) and Females (n=446; mean=51.62), resulting in t=4.338 (p=.000). H3a is thus retained.

Table 4: T-Tests for CETSCALE means (full sample)

Hypothesis	Variable	Category	N	CETSCALE	t	prob
H3a	Gender	Male	404	57.01	4.338	.000
		Female	446	51.62		
H3b	Residence	Rural	318	57.47	4.022	.000
		Metro	531	52.31		
H3c	Political	Right-leaning	676	55.02	2.783	.006
		Left-leaning	148	50.39		
H3d	Race	White	522	55.39	2.514	.012
		Non-White	303	52.11		
H3e	Read the Book	Yes	679	53.58	2.128	.034
		No	166	56.94		

Second, mean scores of those residing in a Rural area (n=318; mean=57.47) and Metro (n=531; mean=52.31) were compared. This yielded t=4.022 (p=.000). H3b is thus retained. Third, mean scores based on self-designated political preferences were compared, with Right-leaning (n=676; mean=55.02) and Left-leaning (n=148; mean=50.39). This produced t=2.783 (p=.006). Thus, H3c is retained.

Next, mean scores based on White (n=522; mean=55.39) and Non-white (n=303; mean=52.11), with t=2.514 (p=.012) were compared. H3d is retained. Finally, mean scores based on having read the book were compared, with Yes (n=679; mean=53.58) and No (n=166; mean=56.94) producing t=2.128 (p=.034). H3e is thus retained.

A second set of t-tests were then calculated for the same four demographic variables against means on the COMMREAD summated variable, utilizing only those students who had read the book. The only variable to produce significant differences in mean COMMREAD scores was Gender, with Females (n=446; mean=29.64) and Males (n=404; mean=27.91) producing t=-4.318 (p=.000). H4 is thus retained with regard to gender-based differences. Analysis for the remaining demographic variables did not show significant relationships, but should be addressed in future research.

Two sets of cross tabulations and chi-squares were then calculated based on whether students had or had not read the book, and answers to a pair of yes/no questions regarding prior and future purchases of Fair Trade products. Both of these calculations showed there to be no significant differences between yes and No readers vs. prior and future purchases of Fair Trade products (see Tables 5a and 5b).

Table 5a: Crosstabulation

Count		Have you read the book, Where Am I Wearing? by Kelsey Timmerman?		Total
		0	No	
Would you purchase a product billed as being "fair trade?"	No	158	44	202
	Yes	569	126	695
Total		727	170	897

Chi-square=1.359; p=.244

Table 5b: Crosstabulation

Count		Have you read the book, Where Am I Wearing? by Kelsey Timmerman?		Total
		0	No	
Have you ever purchased a product billed as being "fair trade?"	No	355	95	450
	Yes	362	77	439
Total		717	172	889

Chi-square=1.816; p=.178

Next, two stepwise regressions were run using CETSCALE (see Tables 6a and 6b) and COMMREAD (see Tables 7a and 7b) as dependent variables. Independent variables were GENDER, HOME, RACE, POLI and NOT READ BOOK. Each of these was binary in nature. Stepwise regressions are useful in that they show the marginal effect of adding a variable to the equation. The improvement to overall R-square is shown at each iteration, until the inclusion of another variable causes R-square to drop. The discussion above demonstrated the theoretical support for examining these variables in the first place; stepwise regression made it possible to see each variable's effect vis-à-vis the others as they entered the equation.

Table 6a: Model 1 Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.873	.762	.761	27.888
2	.894	.800	.800	25.560
3	.903	.815	.814	24.624
4	.906	.821	.820	24.235
5	.907	.823	.822	24.117

Table 6b: Model 1 Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	POLI	54.910	1.096	.873	50.122	.000
2	POLI	45.476	1.264	.723	35.967	.000
	GENDER	20.515	1.671	.247	12.277	.000
3	POLI	35.739	1.737	.568	20.571	.000
	GENDER	19.762	1.613	.238	12.254	.000
	RACE	14.329	1.823	.201	7.861	.000
4	POLI	33.724	1.754	.536	19.224	.000
	GENDER	18.609	1.603	.224	11.608	.000
	RACE	12.719	1.821	.178	6.984	.000
	HOME	9.239	1.799	.099	5.137	.000
5	POLI	33.227	1.754	.528	18.944	.000
	GENDER	17.763	1.621	.214	10.958	.000
	RACE	12.453	1.815	.175	6.862	.000
	HOME	8.772	1.797	.094	4.881	.000
	NOT READ BOOK	6.419	2.185	.050	2.937	.003

a. Dependent Variable: CETSCALE

b. Linear Regression through the Origin

In the first model, CETSCALE is predicted by (in order of entering) POLI, GENDER, RACE, HOME, and NOT READ BOOK , with the final R-square=.823. At the full-sample level, this means that the most important predictor (and contributor to R-square) is Political preference, with Right-leaning being the predominant value. Next, in order, being Male, White, Rural and non-book-reader rounded out the equation. A high CETSCALE profile thus emerges of conservative white males from rural areas who either do not like to read, or at minimum, had not yet read the book.

Table 7a: Model 2 Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.195	.038	.037	17.436
2	.248	.062	.059	17.235
3	.263	.069	.065	17.181
4	.276	.076	.070	17.127

Table 7b: Model 2 Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	71.681	3.813		18.800	.000
	COMMREAD	-.643	.130	-.195	-4.952	.000
2	(Constant)	69.699	3.802		18.330	.000
	COMMREAD	-.644	.128	-.196	-5.017	.000
	HOME	5.707	1.450	.154	3.937	.000
3	(Constant)	67.486	3.920		17.214	.000
	COMMREAD	-.633	.128	-.192	-4.945	.000
	HOME	5.320	1.456	.143	3.655	.000
	RACE	3.198	1.447	.087	2.211	.027
4	(Constant)	64.686	4.110		15.739	.000
	COMMREAD	-.588	.129	-.179	-4.551	.000
	HOME	5.103	1.454	.137	3.509	.000
	RACE	3.564	1.452	.097	2.455	.014
	GENDER	3.120	1.416	.087	2.203	.028

a. Dependent Variable: CETSCALE

In the second model, CETSCALE is predicted by the same four demographic variables, but the COMMREAD score is added in place of NOT READ BOOK. This was done because COMMREAD accounts for those who have not read the book. Results from this model were strikingly different from the one reported above, with COMMREAD being the first variable to enter the equation (and with an inverse relationship). Thus, the more favorable the student's attitude was toward the Common Reader Program, the lower their consumer ethnocentrism score. The other variables to enter the equation, in order, are HOME, RACE and GENDER. POLI was omitted from the model because it reduced total R-square. In this model, the three significant demographic variables had much less influence on CETSCALE scores than they did in the first model.

Given that the only difference between Model 1 and Model 2 is whether NOT READ BOOK and COMMREAD were included, it was interesting to note the different order of variable loading into the equation. Furthermore, the first variable to enter Model 1 (POLI) was the one variable excluded from Model 2. Thus, COMMREAD trumps political preference, overcoming any influence that this highly personal predilection may have on consumer attitudes.

DISCUSSION

The university at which this study was conducted is in its seventh year of implementing a common reader program. Prior research at the institution had focused primarily on attitudes toward the program, but not programmatic effect. This study sought to explore some of those outcomes beyond just liking having a common reader.

Common reader programs potentially influence student attitudes. Common reader programs tend to target one or more of the following purposes: model critical thinking and discussion, establish high expectations for success, create and foster campus involvement, and support meaningful learning (Laufgraben, 2006). Furthermore, many colleges and universities view the first-year experience as being pivotal in cultivating and developing students. In light of these institutional goals, this study contributes to the literature by linking the common reader program to specific measures of not only program efficacy, but more importantly, student attitudes toward subject matter addressed explicitly or implicitly in the book. The application of the CETSCALE was relevant to the subject presented in the book selected for this academic year. The timing of the study was critical in that an incoming freshman class was surveyed before they could settle into their new academic environment. In fact, since the book had been mailed to them during the summer prior, the reading of this book is perhaps the only activity associated with college life that they had experienced at the time of data collection.

Facets of first-year success include: developing intellectual competence, creating and sustaining interpersonal relationships, helping students find their personal identity, promoting multicultural awareness, and developing civic responsibility (Upcraft et al., 2005). Students report positive affect toward common reader programs (Mallard et al., 2008), finding the sense of community these programs are intended to create. Similar to the findings of Mallard et al. (2008), females in this study responded more positively to common reader programs than males, however, the student population overall experienced attitude differences potentially attributable to reading *WAIW*. Other demographic variables did not appear to significantly influence attitudes toward the common reader program.

The data showed that this sample of the freshman class had slightly higher consumer ethnocentric tendencies than reported nationally by the scale's authors, yet still below the mid-point of the scale. This is not surprising given the area from which the university draws the majority of its students. Furthermore, the profile of consumer ethnocentrism derived from Model 1 above is practically an archetype for the region: male, white, conservative, and rural.

A stronger indicator of differences that may be attributed to reading the book is found in the KELSUM scores. This three-item scale, while in its first application, produced significantly different attitudes toward specific topics addressed in *WAIW*. Whereas the CETSCALE is an extension of the book's contents, the author's scale focuses on themes that run throughout the text. While it is possible that those who had read the book may have arrived on campus with a predisposition favoring fair labor practices, given that the sample is all of the same age and is primarily from the same conservative region, it is unlikely that many students would have come to college with cemented views on the subject. Significant correlations between CETSCALE, COMMREAD, and KELSUM further support this conclusion.

Perhaps the most important findings are to be found in the two models. Model 1 demonstrates the overall profile of consumer ethnocentrism (white, rural, male, conservative). But when the model is changed to include COMMREAD in Model 2, and thereby limited to those who have read the book, the dynamics change considerably. Attitude toward the common reader program was the most significant predictor of CETSCALE, and it completely removed the importance of political preference, which was the most important predictor of CETSCALE in Model 1. This is a clear indicator of the role the common reader program played in student attitudes toward consumer ethnocentrism.

That this sample has favorable attitudes toward the common reader program is encouraging, but even more so is the result that student scores on the COMMREAD scale were inversely and

significantly correlated with their CETSCALE scores. While this does not necessarily indicate cause and effect, it does demonstrate the kind of relationship that colleges and universities implicitly wish to see resulting from common reader programs and first-year experiences. Although no pre- and post- measures were collected regarding CETSCALE, given that data were collected at the very beginning of these students' college career, and that the book was likely the sole artifact of their college experience, suggests that the book played a significant role in shaping their consumer ethnocentrism score. Further evidence of this is that a significant difference exists in CETSCALE scores between those who have and have not read the book.

While there was a significant difference in mean CETSCALE scores between those who had and had not read the book, it may not be possible to conclude that this difference was solely produced by reading the book. It is possible that other variables could have influenced this outcome, as well as the possibility that those who were motivated to read the book in the first place may have approached it with greater interest, and/or had a higher CETSCALE score prior to reading had that been measured.

Another limitation of the study is that students were not asked to consider any specific product purchases (whether domestic or imported), as studies such as Shimp and Sharma (1987) have done. Had such scenarios been included, it would have been possible to study consumer ethnocentrism in light of a product category, for example, or specific products. Future research could benefit from such an extension. At the age of 18, freshmen have not likely been major purchasers of products, including their clothing, and are just now embarking in product distinction as primary purchasers of the products they consume.

Other limitations focus around the use of the COMMREAD scale, which thus far has only been used at this university. While reliability scores are encouraging, the scale itself has not been subjected to rigorous testing such as factor analysis. Furthermore, the three-item scale provided by the book's author has not been utilized prior to this study and is a nascent indicator of reader views toward a narrow subject.

Fixed-point data collection is another limitation of this study. Future research could explore whether common reader program books have a lasting effect in any resulting heightened awareness; or whether readers revert to views they may have held prior to entering college. This issue could be explored by tracking selected participants through a longitudinal study to assess these possible changes.

The primary contribution of this study is in tying a measure of attitude toward a common reader program to two specific outcomes, one explicit in the book, the other by extension and therefore implicit. The two RQs are addressed in detail, and a basis for future research is presented based on these exploratory findings. The common reader program is shown in this instance to be a significant predictor of student consumer ethnocentrism tendencies as well as attitudes toward worker conditions and global sourcing. Finally, the roles of race, residence and political preference were also explored with relation to attitudes toward common reader programs.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, C. F. (2006). Assessing common reader programs. *Common Reading Program: Going beyond the book*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.

- Bawa, A. (2004). Consumer ethnocentrism: CETSCALE validation and measurement of extent. *Vikalpa*, 29(3), 43-57.
- Barr, R. B., & Tagg, J. (1995, Nov/Dec). From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change*, 12-26.
- de Ruyter, K., van Birgelen, M., & Wetzels, M. (1998). Consumer ethnocentrism in international services marketing. *International Business Review*, 7, 185-202.
- Fister, B. (2011). One book, one college: Common reading programs. Retrieved from <http://homepages.gac.edu/~fister/onebook.html>
- Hamelin, N., Ellouizi, M., & Canterbury, A. (2011). Consumer ethnocentrism and country-of-origin effects in the Moroccan market. *Journal of Global Marketing*, 24, 228-224. doi: 10.1080/08911762.2011.592459
- John, A., & Brady, M. P. (2011). Exploration of dimensionality of the consumer ethnocentric tendencies scale in Mozambique. *Journal of African Business*, 12, doi: 10.1080/15228916.2011.555275
- Laufgraben, J. (2006). *Common reading program: Going beyond the book*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.
- Mallard, J., Lowery-Hart, R., Andersen, A., Cuevas, M., & Campbell, K. (2008). We'll give you the story; you make it your own: Developing the common reader program at West Texas A&M University. *Enrollment Management Journal*, 2(2), 86-103.
- Martin, I. M., & Eroglu, S. (1993). Measuring a multi-dimensional construct: Country image. *Journal of Business Research*, 28, 191-210.
- Murphy, P. K., Wilkinson, I. A. G., Soter, A. O., Hennessey, M. N., & Alexander, J. F. (2009). Examining the effects of classroom discussion on students' comprehension of a text: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101, 740-764. doi: 10.1037/a0015576
- National Endowment for the Arts. (2007). *To read or not to read: A question of national consequence* (NEA Research Report #47). Retrieved from <http://www.nea.gov/research/toread.pdf>
- Segel, C. F. (2011, Jul. 6). This I (somewhat) believe. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2011/07/06/segal_essay_on_purpose_of_freshman_common_reading_selection
- Sharma, S., Shimp, T. A., & Shin, J. (1995). Consumer ethnocentrism: A test of antecedents and moderators. *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, 23, 26-37.
- Shimp, T. A., & Sharma, S. (1987). Consumer ethnocentrism: Construction and validation of the CETSCALE. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 24, 280-289.

- Spillan, J. E., Kang, Z., & Barat, S. (2011). A multi-country study exploring relationships of lifestyles to ethnocentrism. *Journal of Transnational Management, 16*, 62-83. doi: 10.1080/15475778.2011.571609
- Terenzini, P. T., Springer, L., Pascarella, E. T., & Nora, A. (1993). Influences affecting the development of students' critical thinking skills. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for Institutional Research, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 372 666)
- Twiton, A. (2007). Common reading programs in higher Education. Retrieved from: <http://www.gustavus.edu/academics/library/Pubs/Lindell2007.html>
- Upcraft, M., Gardner, J. & Barefoot, B. (Eds.). (2005). *Challenging and supporting the first-year student: A handbook for improving the first year of college*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Yoo, B., & Donthu, N. (2005). The effect of personal cultural orientation on consumer ethnocentrism: Evaluations and behaviors of U. S. consumers toward Japanese products. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing, 18*, 7-44. doi: 10.1300/J046v18n01_02
- Zapatero, E. G., Chen, J., Panigrahi, B., & Harris-Peoples, M. (2010). An experimental evaluation of student performance using an eclectic vs. a constructive on-line environment. *Journal of Business & Education Leadership, 2*(1), 11-15.