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CHAPTER ONE. INTRODUCTION

From 1945 to 2015, seventy decades have passed since the end of World War II. Decolonization and the establishments of nation states seem to signify national independence, but actually the world is increasingly interdependent economically, politically and culturally as a result of globalization and the legacy of colonization. In the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s, many people from the “third world”/decolonized nations migrated to metropolitan centers of colonial powers after colonial powers exploited raw materials and resources and suppressed their homeland’s self-development (Shome & Hegde, 2002). The wave of migration continues, and a new phenomenon has emerged, that is, the non-immigrant international labor flow. The U.S. Department of Homeland Security issues H-2B visas to allow certain U.S. employers or agents to bring foreign nationals to the United States to fill temporary nonagricultural jobs (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2014). The number of participant workers grew from 15,706 in 1997 to 129,547 in 2007 (Seminara, 2010). The U.S. Department of Homeland Security also issues “the Exchange Visitor (J) non-immigrant visa” (J-1 visa) that allows college and University students who are enrolled full time and pursuing studies at post-secondary accredited academic institutions located outside the United States to come to the United States to work and travel in the United States temporarily. This is also known as the Summer Work Travel Program (U.S. Department of State, n.d.a). The number of participant workers grew from about 20,000 in 1996 to 153,000 in 2008 and recessed to 132,342 in 2010 (Maitra, 2013).

I knew about the J-1 Summer Work Travel Program when I was looking for a summer job. I heard from some friends that a lot of international students worked in M Town. I asked one American student who had previously worked with the international students in M Town, but she knew little about them. I started to search information about this program and found a slim body
of literature. Among the articles I found about the program, an Associated Press report caught my
attention. The journalists interviewed about 70 students on Summer Work Travel Program in 10
states and found they suffered from bad housing, forced work, low wages, unpaid work hours,
high third-parties fees, and employment in strip clubs and the adult entertainment industry
(Mohr, Weiss, & Baker, 2010). Another report revealed that some companies overcharged
international students for housing, reducing their wages to levels below those required by
minimum wage and overtime laws, and failed to keep proper records about workplace injuries
(Greenhouse, 2012, November 15). These two reports raised my concerns about the operation of
the Summer Work Travel Program. Generally speaking, this program received little public and
academic attention.

The trend of employing international students in temporary jobs is continuing, especially
in the service sector jobs (Maitra, 2013; Seminara, 2010). The service sector hosted more than
half of the work force in the United States since World War II; it generated the most new jobs in
the 1970s and 1980s, and it employed more than three times the number of workers in goods-
production in the late 1980s (Paules, 1991). Participants in the Summer Work Travel Program
were mainly employed in the service sector. Practically, as an important part of the temporary
labor market, this Summer Work Travel Program is worth studying regarding its recruitment and
operation, its attractiveness to international students, as well as its disadvantages. After entering
the field, I found that the international workers came from all over the world, including Asia,
South America, Europe, and Africa.

Historically, the United States’ immigration policies were discriminatory toward ethnic
minorities, especially toward Asians, such as Chinese, Japanese, and Vietnamese groups (Dalmag
& Rothman, 2011; Wilson, Gutierrez, & Chao, 2013). The Chinese were the first non-White
group to willingly immigrate to the United States in significant numbers and marked the beginning of anti-Asian immigration restrictions (Perry, 2014). Asian Americans have been suffering from racial discrimination and prejudice (Sue et al., 2007), even though it is less recognized by the public at large with the myth of Asian Americans as a “model minority” (Yi, 2000). “Model minority” is a term used by non-Asian Americans to characterize Asian Americans concerning their successful achievements (Nakayama, 1988). Whether Asian students in the Summer Work Travel Program in the United States will experience racial discrimination and prejudice remains a question. In addition, as postcolonial studies mainly focuses on immigrants in the United States (Shome & Hegde, 2002), theoretically, it is worthwhile to examine the experiences of Asian students who worked temporarily in the United States to extend the scope of postcolonial scholarship to non-immigrants whose lived experiences may tremendously differ from those of immigrants. For this study, I decided to focus on one specific group, that is, Asian workers, leaving other racial groups for future research.

When I entered the field, many students from Thailand and the Philippines had finished their work and left the United States. The majority of the Asian students were Chinese from mainland China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Malaysia. This situation led the focus of this study to Chinese, even though I tried to reach out to other students from other Asian countries. Being Chinese, my linguistic and cultural background facilitated rapport building with research participants and contributed to my understanding of the Chinese group.

This manuscript consists of fourteen chapters. Chapter One introduces this project’s background, objective, and overview. Chapter Two provides a literature review on the scholarship of racism in the United States, conceptualization of race and prejudice, globalization, colonization, immigration, international labor in the United States, and postcolonial studies.
Chapters Three presents an overview of the Summer Work Travel Program. Chapter Four illustrates the research methods of in-depth interviews, participant observation, and autoethnography. Chapters Five to Ten present themes identified from interviews and fieldnotes. Chapter Eleven documents my own experience in the field. Chapter Twelve narrates a story around a girl who died in a car accident in 2013. Chapter Thirteen reflects on the research process. Chapter Fourteen concludes the whole study. Research questions in this study are embedded in the literature review as follows.
CHAPTER TWO. LITERATURE REVIEW

The topics explored in this study were drawn from research on racism in the United States, conceptualization of race and prejudice, globalization, colonization, immigration, international labor in the United States and postcolonial scholarship.

Anti-Chinese Racism in the United States

The history of the United States is intertwined with immigration and racism against ethnic minority groups (Dalmag & Rothman, 2011; Wilson, Gutierrez, & Chao, 2013). Among all ethnic minority groups, “the Chinese were the first non-White group to willingly immigrate to the United States and Canada in significant numbers” (Perry, 2014, p. 78). In 1848, the discovery of gold in California brought thousands of Chinese to work in the gold fields in California. In 1864, the United States Congress passed “An act to encourage immigration,” and thereafter agencies were established to facilitate the immigration process. California hosted the majority of the Chinese population in the US, which accumulated to 71% by 1880. The regional White community felt threatened after the influx of Chinese immigrants, which evoked anti-Chinese sentiment in California. The Chinese were accused of intensifying local job competition and were stereotyped as deficient and incapable of being American citizens. The California anti-Chinese campaign finally persuaded federal lawmakers into replacing open immigration policies with immigration restrictions against the Chinese (Perry, 2014). In 1882, Congress passed a public law titled “An act to execute certain treaty stipulations relating to Chinese” (22 Stat. 58 1864-1883), also known as the Chinese Exclusion Act, barring most Chinese from entering the United States. In the following years, the United States continued to pass laws against Chinese immigrants. For instance, the 1888 law titled “An act to prohibit the coming of Chinese laborers to the United States” (25 Stat. 476 1883-1889), and the 1892 law titled “An act to prohibit the
coming Chinese persons into the United States” (27 Stat. 25 1888-1893). As the number of Chinese immigrant laborers declined sharply, immigrants from Japan increased in response to the labor shortage in California, which demonstrated the hypocritical rhetoric of job competition fabricated by White people and showed the essence of racism against Chinese (Wilson, Gutierrez, & Chao, 2013). The influx of Japanese immigrants evoked anti-Japanese sentiment as well. From 1882 to the 1960s, the United States enacted more discriminatory immigration policies, not only against Chinese and Japanese, but also against almost all Asian immigrants. The Immigration Act of 1917 (39 Stat. 874 1910-1917) designated an “Asiatic Barred Zone,” a region that included much of Asia and the Pacific Islands from which people were excluded from admission to the US. The 1921 law titled “An act to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States” (42 Stat. 5 1912-1923) created the nationality quota system, also known as the Emergency Quota Act, the Immigration Restriction Act of 1921, the Per Centum Law, and the Johnson Quota Act. According to this act, nations in central and western Europe were preferable source countries (Perry, 2014). The above legislations demonstrated discrimination against Chinese and other Asians in the U.S. history.

The American Civil Rights Movement in the 1950s and 1960s advocated against racial discrimination and abolished many discriminatory acts toward disadvantaged minority groups. Asians were among the ethnic groups who benefited from the movement. In 1965, a law titled “An act to amend the immigration and nationality act” was passed to lift immigration restrictions (79 Stat. 911 1962). Many Americans tended to believe that the Civil Rights Movement eliminated racism and achieved equality between White people and people of color in the United States (Thompson & Neville, 1999).

However, racism is still pervasive in the United States, especially in covert and subtle
forms (Bonilla-Silva, 2002; Griffin & Calafell, 2011; Sue et al., 2007). Scholars (e.g. Griffin, Pifer, Humphrey, & Hazelwood, 2011; Nuez-Smith et al., 2008; Ortiz & Roscigno, 2009; Roscigno, Williams, & Byron, 2012; Turco, 2010; Wingfield, 2007, 2010) have conducted many ethnic studies regarding the lived experiences of African Americans. Fewer studies (e.g. Jun, 2012; Wong & Halgin, 2006) have looked into ethnic issues among Asian Americans and Asians. Sue et al. (2007) conducted interviews among people who were born and raised in the United States and self-identified with being Asian American. The study identified eight microaggressive themes directed toward this group: (a) alien in own land, (b) ascription of intelligence, (c) exoticization of Asian women, (d) invalidation of interethnic differences, (e) denial of racial reality, (f) pathologizing cultural values/communication styles, (g) second class citizenship, and (h) invisibility. Jun (2012) conducted an online survey among Asian Americans and identified seven racial discriminatory message types among 176 personal stories: (a) racial slurs, (b) playground teasing, (c) Asian Americans as eternal others, (d) Asians as sexual objects, professional discrimination, (e) Asians are all the same, and (f) alienation within Asian groups. The study also found that Asian Americans tend to utilize nonassertive coping approaches due to (1) peer pressure, (2) lacking experience, (3) feeling powerless, (4) keeping safe, and (5) deciding it’s not worth it.

Conceptualization of Race and Prejudice

Having discussed racism in the United States above, I will now introduce the theoretical development of the understandings of race and prejudice in academia. The conceptualization of race has evolved from an essentialist and categorical variable (Sankar, 2003) to a social construct (Omi & Winant, 1994). By an essentialist and categorical variable, I mean regarding race as a given biological attribute with definite boundaries between different races. Sankar (2003) listed
the categories of race in scientific research, and I will present it in the next paragraph. By a social construct, I mean regarding race as “an unstable and ‘decentered’ complex of social meanings constantly being transformed by political struggle” (Omi & Winant, 1994, p. 55). Race and ethnicity are often discussed together. The five federal surveillance categories of race are American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, Black or African-American, and White; and the two ethnic categories are Hispanic/Latina(o) and non-Hispanic/Latina(o). This standard was mandated by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget’s Directive Number 15 and employed in all NIH-funded research (Eisenhower, Suyemoto, Lucchese, & Canenguez, 2014). Eisenhower, Suyemoto, Lucchese, and Canenguez’s (2014) survey showed the standard was problematic as NIH measure of race and ethnicity resulted in higher rates of missingness and misclassification than open-ended measures. Eisenhower et al. (2014) suggested using a closed-ended and multiple-choice measure in large-scale public health research with the following three changes: (1) adding a Hispanic/Latina(o) race category; (2) differentiating Black racialization from African-American ethnicity by rewording the response to only “Black”; and (3) designing an ethnicity variable that captures greater variability in responses.

The categories of race and ethnicity outlined by US federal departments differ from those in scientific research. Sankar (2003) conducted a search in MEDLINE database about the definitions of race and ethnicity with a focus on genetic research. The Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) refers to race as “race stocks,” a term defined as “major living subspecies of man differentiated by genetic and physical characteristics.” MeSH lists four races: Caucasoid, Mongoloid, Negroid, and Australoid. Sankar argued that the nineteenth century colonialist terms, such as Hottentots, a subgroup of Negroid, should be abandoned. MeSH defines ethnic group as
“a group of people with a common cultural heritage that sets them apart from others in a variety of social relationships.” MeSH uses characteristics of geographic location, racial classification, ancestry, history, religion, social organization, and language group to define different ethnic groups, drawing primarily from the U.S. population (Sankar, 2003).

Generally, people have different understandings of race and ethnicity (Eisenhower, Suyemoto, Lucchese, & Canenguez, 2014) and sometimes use them interchangeably (Shibata, 2005). Racism is an encompassing term, including discrimination against both racial groups and ethnic groups. This project does not seek to draw a definite line between race and ethnicity, but rather report whatever highlighted identities from the perspective of the participants. For example, even though the Chinese is an ethnic subgroup under the Asian racial category, I will still refer to discrimination against Chinese as racism.

In contrast to the essential view of race, this project regards race as a social construct whose meaning varies across time and space and is embedded in a system of power and hierarchy. Omi and Winant (1994) wrote that race is “an unstable and ‘decentered’ complex of social meanings constantly being transformed by political struggle” (p. 55). Kibria (1998) noted that dominant groups imposed meanings to racial categories and controlled the production of racial images and stereotypes. In the US, Whiteness has been defined as the standard against which the racial identities of others are defined and measured. Scholars have not reached an agreement upon the exact meaning of Whiteness. Drawing upon a number of scholars, especially Dyson, Castagno (2008) regarded Whiteness as an identity, an ideology and an institution.

As an identity, Whiteness refers to the “self-understanding, social practices, and group beliefs that articulate Whiteness in relationship to American race”; as an ideology, Whiteness references the “systematic reproduction of conceptions of whiteness as
domination”; and as an institution, Dyson explains that “from the home to the school, from the government to the church—[various institutions] compose the intellectual and ideological tablet upon which have been inscribed the meanings of American destiny” (Chennault 1998:300-302). (Castagno, 2008)

“Whiteness” is not a biological given but a social construct that emerged in certain historical contexts, and its boundaries have varied across time. In the nineteenth-century United States, wageworkers were described as “White slavery,” “slavery of wages,” and “wage slavery,” as workers no longer controlled their product or had economic independence. In response to the anxiety brought by wagework,

White wageworkers emphasized their whiteness to differentiate their status from that of black slaves. By emphasizing whiteness, wageworkers unable to achieve economic independence could still achieve political independence or social acceptability. Whiteness became a way for the wageworker to communicate solidarity with economic and political elites, a way to distance the white working class from inferior races. (Perry, 2014, p. 85)

The antithetical aspect of privileging White people is stereotyping other racial groups. In California, American Indians were vilified by the White population as “uncivilized savages;” Mexicans were seen as “half civilized” (Kibria, 1998); and Chinese were viewed as ignorant, poor, and barbaric (Perry, 2014). Prior to the arrival of the Chinese in California, the stereotypes of the Chinese were already in Western minds. The first European travelers to China in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries described China as “an exotic yet backward and barbaric place,” emphasizing Chinese as having “deceit, cunning, idolatry, despotism, xenophobia, cruelty, infanticide, and intellectual and sexual perversity” as summarized by Stuart Creighton Miller. These accounts emphasized the perceived Chinese inferiority (Perry, 2014).
After the influx of Chinese immigrant laborers, the White people stereotyped all Chinese as indentured labor, linking the Chinese to slavery and reminding White wageworkers of their superior racial position (Perry, 2014). The historical development of Whiteness in the United Kingdom has similarities to and differences from that in the United States. In the nineteenth-century United Kingdom, Whiteness was a bourgeois identity excluding ethnic Others as well as British working class. The colonized Others were constructed as “uncivilized,” and Irish and Scottish people themselves were constructed as “barbarously rude.” The White privilege extended the working-class only recently (Russell, 2014).

Even though the dominant group controls the production of meanings of racial categories (Kibria, 1998), non-dominant groups have agency to contend and transform the imposed meanings on themselves. For example, in the 1960s, US-born Asian Americans coined the term “Asian American” in response to “Oriental” created by dominant US society. “Asian,” “Asiatics” and “Oriental” were all created by Western society (Said, 1977/2003). In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Asian immigrants were grouped together “Asiatics” or “Orientals,” even though they came from diverse backgrounds, maintained distinct identities, and even sometimes distanced themselves from each other (Kibria, 1998). To give another example, early Italian settlers came to the United States before the establishment of the Kingdom of Italy, and had an affiliation based on their local origins; between the two World Wars, the immigrants and their offspring identified themselves as members of the Italian ethnic group, as they were faced with anti-Italian prejudice, intolerance and discrimination in the US; after World War II, the Italian Americans shifted their identity, regarded themselves as White, and shared the anti-Black feeling, because African Americans moved to northern cities from southern states and competed with Italian Americans for jobs in the war industries (Luconi, 2012).
Discrimination and prejudice occur during the assignment of racial meanings. The theoretical conceptualization of prejudice evolved from the 1920s to 2000. Dovidio (2001) divided the research on prejudice into three waves: (1) the first wave from the 1920s to the 1950s, when prejudice was regarded as psychopathology, a disruption in rational processes and a dangerous aberration from normal thinking; (2) the second wave from the 1950s to the mid-1990s, when prejudice was viewed as normal cognitive processes both at the macro level and the micro level; (3) the third wave from the mid-1990s to 2000, when prejudice was researched from multidimensional aspects with the assistance of new technologies. Jones (2000) conceptualized racism, which is a type of prejudice, on three levels: institutional racism, personally mediated racism, and internalized racism. This project endorses a multidimensional perspective and situates individual and institutional racism in broader historical and social contexts. Van Laer and Janssens (2011) argued that studying discrimination and prejudice only from individual psychological processes lost structural roots of discrimination in society.

Globalization, Colonization, and Immigration

The emergence of racial categories dated back to the Great Discoveries of Geography, colonization, and early immigration. Globalization and current immigration are complicating the racial landscape in the United States and other parts of the world. Globalization is firmly rooted in the history of colonialism (Ellwood, 2001). Ellwood cited one of Britain’s most famous imperial spokesman, Cecil Rhodes’s speech in the 1890s.

“We must find new lands,” he said, “from which we can easily obtain raw materials and at the same time exploit the cheap slave labor that is available from the natives of the colonies. The colonies [will] also provide a dumping ground for the surplus goods produced in our factories.” (Ellwood, 2001, p. 13).
Colonization drove colonists to colonized land, created slavery trade across oceans, and facilitated transnational migration and immigration. I will briefly introduce theories on immigration and an overview of Chinese immigration.

Yang (2010) reviewed the classic push-pull theory, economic theories, sociological theories, and integrated theories on immigration. Ernest Ravenstein analyzed internal migration in English from 1871 to 1881 and came up with the push-pull theory, which was later refined by American demographer Everett Lee. The push-pull theory utilizes push factors (for example, natural disasters, population pressures, economic hardships, political turmoil or disturbances, environmental disadvantages) in the place of origin, and pull factors (for example, economic opportunities, political preferences, environmental advantages) in the place of destination to account for migration.

Four influential economic theories on migration are equilibrium theory, human capital theory, the new home economics of migration, and segmented labor market theory. Equilibrium theory regards migration as a process of labor and wage adjustment from disequilibrium to equilibrium. Human capital theory views “migration as an investment increasing the productivity of human resources, an investment which has costs and which also renders returns.” The new home economics of migration theory shifts the focus of migration from the individuals to the household. Michael Piore came up with segmented labor market theory, which emphasizes the influence of pull factors (unmet labor demand in low-end job market) more than push factors.

Two sociologist theories, the macro world system theory and the micro migrant social network theory, contribute new sights to explanations of migration. World system theory puts migration in the history of capitalist development and imperialism, which led people in the periphery countries that had a supply of migrant labor to immigrate to the advanced core
countries that were in demand for immigrant labor. The migrant social network theory regards migration as a process of networking building, which accounts for the initiation and especially the continuation of migration after the initial driving forces stop.

The above theories explain migration either from a macro or a micro level. The structural determination theory and the cumulative causation theory intend to integrate both levels. The former argues that societal structural changes in the place of origin inspired individual to migrate to better their lives; deliberate labor recruitment facilitates the immigration process; and developed social networks between origin and destination sustain migration. The latter argues that migration is cumulative “through the expansion of networks, the distribution of income, the distribution of land, the organization of agriculture, the culture of migration, the regional distribution of human capital, the social meaning of work, and the structure of production” (Yang, 2010). Yang proposed a multilevel causation theory to explain Asian immigration to the United States, which includes factors of multilevel connections, migration policies, and the cumulative and interactive process.

As aforementioned, the Chinese immigrated to the United States in significant numbers after the 1840s due to push factors of the Taiping Rebellion, famine, and poverty and the pull factor of California Gold Rush; some of the Chinese immigrant laborers were under a contract labor system in which they were not free to choose their own employment or leave for China until they paid back the price of passage to business agents; the Chinese suffered from stereotypes and anti-Chinese sentiment (Perry, 2014). Chinese immigrated not only to the United States, but also to other parts of the world in the nineteenth century, where they also engaged in identity negotiation and dealt with racial discrimination. One example is the Chinese migration to Jamaica.
Jamaica, located in the Caribbean Sea, became a Spanish colony soon after it was discovered by Columbus in 1494. England (later the United Kingdom) took over Jamaica in 1655 and possessed it till August 6, 1962 when Jamaica gained full independence. From 1517, Spain started to import slaves from Africa to supplement the labor pool in Jamaica. The slave trade continued after England took over Jamaica. Jamaica became heavily dependent on slaves to support its sugar plantations and export trade. After the abolition of the slave trade in 1807, the British brought indentured workers from India and China to supplement Jamaica’s labor pool (Meditz & Hanratty, 1987).

There were three waves of Chinese migration to Jamaica. The first wave occurred between 1854 and 1886 (Bryan, 2004). After the Emancipation of slavery in 1838 in Jamaica, Chinese came to Jamaica as indentured laborers in sugar plantations in response to Jamaica’s labor shortage, initially via British Guiana or Trinidad (Shibata, 2005). The second wave was between 1900 and the 1940s, when a large number of Chinese businessmen immigrated to Jamaican and entered retail industries, encouraged by land hunger, high taxes, civil war, warlordism, international war and intervention in China. The 1980s marked the beginning of the third wave of Chinese immigration to Jamaica (Bryan, 2004). The Chinese laborers usually went into retail industries instead of returning to China after the expiration of contracts (Shibata, 2005) or even abandoned plantations for commercial pursuits in urban areas before contracts expired (Johnson, 1982). The success of Chinese immigrants in grocery retail trade evoked envy among Jamaicans who blamed Chinese for the loss of jobs. Johnson (1982) argued that the anti-Chinese riots in 1918, which aimed to close Chinese grocery stores, had been the most important expression of anti-Chinese sentiment, other than the anti-Chinese riots of 1938 and 1965. Even though Chinese Jamaicans adopted many strategies to adapt to host society, such as carrying
English first names and last names, quitting Chinese language education, engaging in interracial marriages, and allowing children baptized as Anglicans or Catholics, Chinese still remained a distinct ethnic minority in Jamaica (Shibata, 2005). Missionaries, among whom the Roman Catholics were most successful, played an important role in bringing Chinese into Christianity (Bryan, 2004). Bryan stated that the Chinese community was more prone to accept Christian teaching away from the Chinese homeland. The clergy offered practical assistance on legal matters to new immigrants who lacked proficiency in English. Missionary work was initially directed at children, and many parents entered the Catholic Church through the influence of their children (Bryan, 2004).

**International Labor in the United States**

Globalization not only facilitates capital flow across borders to use cheapest raw materials worked by the cheapest labor (Bales, 2012), but it also facilitates labor flows across borders. With a long history of employing immigrant laborers in the mining and construction industries in the United States (Perry, 2014), American employers in the service sector have adopted a cost-saving strategy of employing temporary international cheap labor. Recently, the United Airlines have decided to outsource more than 630 jobs to cut costs after a loss in the first quarter (Mutzabaugh, 2014). The U.S. Department of Homeland Security issues H-2B visas, which allow “U.S. employers or U.S. agents who meet specific regulatory requirements to bring foreign nationals to the United States to fill temporary nonagricultural jobs” (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2014). Employers in seasonal resort areas, such as Nantucket, started to replace American student workers with foreign workers to wash dishes and do other jobs and led to H-2B shortfalls in 2004 and 2005 (Lee, 2005 June 10). The number of participant workers
grew from 15,706 in 1997 to 129,547 in 2007 and the participant employers had become mainly non-seasonal (Seminara, 2010).

International students can also be employed in the United States through the Summer Work Travel Program on a J-1 visa. According to Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, “the Exchange Visitor (J) non-immigrant visa category is for individuals approved to participate in work-and study-based exchange visitor programs” (U.S. Department of State, n.d.a). It has fourteen programs, including camp counselor, government visitor, intern, physician, short-term scholar, teacher, trainee, summer work travel, and so on (U.S. Department of State, n.d.b). The J-1 visa homepage gives an introduction to the Summer Work Travel Program as follows:

College and University students enrolled full time and pursuing studies at post-secondary accredited academic institutions located outside the United States come to the United States to share their culture and ideas with people of the United States through temporary work and travel opportunities. (U.S. Department of State, n.d.a)

The number of participant workers grew from about 20,000 in 1996 to 153,000 in 2008 and recessed to 132,342 in 2010 (Maitra, 2013).

The globalized exploitation of workers accompanies the globalized labor market. The Associated Press once interviewed about 70 students on Summer Work Travel Program in 10 states and found they suffered from bad housing, forced work, low wages, unpaid work hours, high third-parties fees, and employment in strip clubs and the adult entertainment industry (Mohr, Weiss, & Baker, 2010). In 2010, some foreign students who were summer employees working in Hershey’s distribution plant in Palmyra, PA protested against the exploitative conditions for six months and drew national attention to the Summer Work Travel Program (Maitra, 2013). In 2012, the Labor Department accused three companies of overcharging the
students for housing, reducing their wages to levels below those required by minimum wage and overtime laws, reached a settlement that recovered $213,000 in back wages for the students, terminated the Council for Education Travel-USA (USACETUSA) as a program sponsor for forcing the students to do arduous factory work, and penalized Exel company $143,000 for excessive workplace noise and for failing to keep proper records about workplace injuries (Greenhouse, 2012, November 15). Even though the student workers were frustrated and angry about abusive working conditions, their voices were often unheard because of relative isolation and retaliatory threats from sponsors and employers (Maitra, 2013).

In a lengthy report, Maitra (2013) reviewed the legislative history of the J-1 visa and the statutory and regulatory basis for the Summer Work Travel Program. The cultural exchange programs have a long history, dating back to 1939 when Congress first established an exchange program. The report also pointed out the shortcomings regarding administration of the Summer Work Travel Program: (1) inadequate State Department oversight, which was caused by outsourcing oversight to sponsors, lack of effective mechanisms to address complaints, and lack of effective sanctions; (2) violations of the original purpose of the J-1 Exchange Visitor Program; and (3) overall lack of transparency and deficiency in the State Department’s recent review. The report ultimately suggested engaging the Labor Department as a partial solution.

Postcolonial Scholarship

This study employs the macro framework of postcolonial studies to situate the international labor flow in historical contexts. Shome and Hegde (2002) provided an overview of the historical development of postcolonial studies and explored the intersections of postcolonial studies and communication studies. Postcolonial studies is situated in the broader critical project of cultural studies and seeks to question knowledge production with a historical and international
perspective. It examines issues of race, class, gender, sexuality, and nationality and is interventionist and highly political.

The decolonization movements in the wake of World War II, the establishments of new nation-states, and the migration from the “third world”/decolonized nations to the metropolitan centers of colonial powers in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s all laid the historical foundation for the emergence of postcolonial studies. The immigrants left their homeland which lacked the infrastructure needed for development after colonial powers exploited raw materials and resources and suppressed their homeland’s self-development. The existence of immigrants living in neocolonial powers served as a reminder of the dark past of Anglo European society. Among the immigrants were a number of intelligentsia who entered universities and colleges in the United States and the United Kingdom and taught comparative literature, international relations, development studies, anthropology and others. Since then, postcolonial scholarship has roughly been established in the academy.

This chapter has reviewed literature on the history and theories of immigration to the United States, and racism against Asian immigrants, especially Chinese immigrants. A few articles about the Summer Work Travel Program revealed exploitative working conditions and illegal acts, which raised my concerns about whether international students received fair treatment in the United States. I will describe the history of the Summer Work Travel Program in greater detail in the next chapter. This chapter leads to the goals of this thesis project: First of all, I intend to know who those international student workers are and how they got to know about the Summer Work Travel Program; second, I will explore what motivated the international students to come to the United States; third, I will investigate the general work and living conditions of
the international students, whether race is salient in their intercultural encounters, and how race is relevant to their experiences.
CHAPTER THREE. OVERVIEW OF THE SUMMER WORK TRAVEL PROGRAM

This chapter will briefly introduce the historical development of the Summer Work Travel Program, some statistical figures, a few investigative reports, and current regulations. The Summer Work Travel Program is the largest of the fourteen J-1 non-immigrant visa exchange programs (Costa, 2011). The official introduction of this program is as follows: “College and University students enrolled full time and pursuing studies at post-secondary accredited academic institutions located outside the United States come to the United States to share their culture and ideas with people of the United States through temporary work and travel opportunities” (U.S. Department of State, n.d.a).

Historical Development

Maitra (2013) provided an overview of the history of the Exchange Visitor Program and the Summer Work Travel. The United States has a long history of executing cultural and educational exchange programs. Congress first established an exchange program in 1939, during the era of President Franklin D. Roosevelt’s “Good Neighbor Policy,” allowing for international student exchanges and greater scientific cooperation between the United States and Latin American countries. In 1948, Congress expanded the exchange programs beyond the Western Hemisphere, in hopes of combating what was viewed as “hostile propaganda campaigns directed against democracy, human welfare, freedom, truth, and the United States, spearheaded by the Government of the Soviet Union and the Communist Parties throughout the world.” The U.S. government believed that a robust cultural exchange program would have the potential “to correct misunderstanding and misinformation about the United States” by providing participants with “knowledge of the political principles which our history and traditions have evolved and of
daily life in the United States.” The U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act (commonly known as the Smith-Mundt Act) of 1948, more broadly aimed “[t]o promote the better understanding of the United States among the peoples of the world and to strengthen cooperative international relations.” After the passage of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) in 1952, the Smith-Mundt Act was amended to allow exchange visitors to enter the United States as unspecified nonimmigrants, most likely under existing “business visitor” or “student” categories.

The Exchange Visitor Program and the J-1 visa originated in 1961 with the enactment of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (Pub. L. 87–256, 75 Stat. 527) (also known as the Fulbright-Hays Act), with the purpose “to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries by means of educational and cultural exchange; to strengthen the ties which unite us with other nations by demonstrating the educational and cultural interests, developments, and achievements of the people of the United States and other nations, and the contributions being made toward a peaceful and more fruitful life for people throughout the world.” J-2 visas were also issued to spouses and children of J-1s.

The program was initially absorbed by the U.S. Information Agency (USIA), in the Office of the General Counsel. In 1999, when the USIA was dissolved and superseded by the State Department’s Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (ECA), the State Department assumed its role as the primary agency responsible for the administration of the Exchange Visitor Program. The Exchange Visitor Program is more specifically housed within the ECA’s Office of Private Sector Exchange, directed by the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Private Sector Exchange.

Before the USIA was dissolved, it administered a summer guestworker program for foreign students, without any requirement for cultural or educational activity or authorization
from Congress. In 1998, Congress authorized “[t]he Director of the United States Information Agency… to administer summer travel and work programs without regard to preplacement requirements,” although this provision did not specifically refer to any cultural exchange component apart from the word “travel.” The State Department has since promulgated regulations for the present-day Summer Work Travel Program under 22 C.F.R. § 62.32.

Although the State Department is the primary agency responsible for implementing regulations pertaining to the Summer Work Travel Program, the actual, daily administration of the program is carried out by organizations, designated by the State Department as sponsors. While U.S. local, state, and federal government agencies are eligible to be sponsors for exchange visitor programs, a majority of sponsors are private organizations and businesses (Maitra, 2013).

Statistics

The State Department publishes statistics detailing the total number of J-1 and J-2 nonimmigrant visas granted every year. In fiscal year 1962, 27,910 visas were granted to exchange visitors and their spouses and dependents. By FY 2008, the number of J visas issued had increased by 1,300%, to 392,089. In FY 2009, 345,541 visas were issued, and in FY 2010, 353,602 visas were issued. The top ten source countries for Exchange Visitor Program participants in 2010 were, in descending order: China (mainland and Taiwan born), Russia, Germany, U.K. France, Brazil, Ukraine, Turkey, South Korea, and Thailand (Costa, 2011).

With regard to the Summer Work Travel category in particular, the number of participant workers grew from about 20,000 in 1996 to 153,000 in 2008 and recessed to 132,342 in 2010 (Kammer, 2011). In 2012, the State Department commanded that the Summer Work Travel Program should not to exceed 109,000 participants annually, “until [the Department] is confident
that the program regulations are sufficient to remedy identified concerns” (Exchange Visitor Program—Summer Work Travel, 77 Fed. Reg. 27,593, 27,596 – 97 (May 11, 2012)).

The nationalities of the program’s participants have also shifted recently. While the largest number of students historically came from Western Europe, the majority of participants today were nationals of Eastern European countries (United States Government Accountability Office, 2005). In 2004, the top ten sending countries were Poland, Russia, Bulgaria, Slovakia, Brazil, Ireland, Czech Republic, Peru, Romania, and Belarus (United States Government Accountability Office, 2005). In 2010, the top ten sending countries for the Summer Work Travel Program were, in descending order: Russia, with 21,823 students; Ukraine, with 9,116; Turkey, 7,087; Brazil, 6,024; Thailand, 6,008; Ireland, 5,213; China, 5,056; Bulgaria, 4,860; Moldova, 4,072; and Peru, 3,388. (Kammer, 2011). Notably, more students from Asian countries, such as Turkey, China and Thailand, participated in the Summer Travel Work program. The Exchange Visitor Program was expanding. In 2008, the State Department announced innovative J-1 Visa Exchange Programs with Ireland and Korea (Lewis, 2008). The U.S. and Ireland would implement a 12-month Work and Travel Pilot Program (The designated length for the Summer Travel Work Program is up to four months 22 C.F.R. § 62.32(c)). The pilot program would provide J-1 exchange visitor visas to thousands of post-secondary students and others up to 26 years of age from Ireland, to participate in internship and travel opportunities in the U.S. U.S. students would have reciprocal opportunities to work and travel in Ireland. The U.S. and the Republic of Korea agreed to establish an 18-month WEST (Work, English Study, Travel) program for up to 5,000 Korean university students and recent university graduates to participate in internships, study English and travel in the U.S. on J-1 exchange visitor visas. The
Republic of Korea would establish an 18-month Working Holiday Program (WHP) to allow American students to work, study and travel in Korea.

On June 1, 2011, the State Department published a new “J-1 Visa Exchange Visitor Program” website at http://j1visa.state.gov (Costa, 2011). This website includes an interactive map and downloadable data on exchange visitors in each of the 50 states, by category. Accessed on February 27, 2015, the website showed that there were 91,763 participants and 41 sponsors in 2012 in total, calculated by adding the numbers in each state up. Table 3 shows the total number of participants in the Summer Work Travel Program in each state. Table 4 shows the total number of sponsors in each state. In 2012, there were 2318 participants in the Summer Work Travel Program.
Table 1

*Number of Participants in Each State in 2012*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>7938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>2664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>5914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>2318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>5855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>2287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>5556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>2054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>5489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>5331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>5279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>1604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>5124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WY</td>
<td>1565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>3705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>1317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>3149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>1286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>2853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>1123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>2845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. State Department website, accessed on February 27, 2015.
Table 2

*Number of Sponsors in Each State in 2012*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Sponsors</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Sponsors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. State Department website, accessed on February 27, 2015.

**Investigations**

In October 2005, the United States Government Accountability Office (GAO) published a report titled “Stronger Action Needed to Improve Oversight and Assess Risks of the Summer Work Travel and Trainee Categories of the Exchange Visitor Program.” The investigative group reviewed previous GAO and Office of Inspector General (OIG) reports, reviewed program files maintained by the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Office of Exchange Coordination and Designation, interviewed State officials, met with nine sponsors of the Summer Work Travel Program that accounted for 75 percent of the participants in 2004, met with 28 exchange participants to discuss their views of the programs in Boston, Massachusetts; Bolton Valley and
Smugglers’ Notch, Vermont; and Washington, D.C, and made other efforts in collecting archival and field data to assess the Summer Work Travel and Trainee Categories of the Exchange Visitor Program. The report concluded that the State Department had not exerted sufficient management oversight of the Summer Work Travel and the Trainee programs to ensure that only authorized activities were undertaken by sponsors, employers, and third-parties. In the last 4 years, State officials made just eight visits to its 206 designated Summer Work Travel and/or Trainee sponsors. The potential risk associated with the Summer Work Travel and the Trainee exchange programs included: (1) foreign nationals using the program as a means of entering the United States and remaining illegally after their visas expire; (2) the Trainee Program being misused as a work program; and (3) exchange participants being exploited, resulting in negative experiences, which could undermine the purpose of the programs. The report recommended that the Secretary of State (1) fully implement a compliance unit to better monitor exchange program activities and address deficiencies; (2) update and amend the regulations where necessary; and (3) develop strategies to obtain data, such as information on overstays and program abuses, to assess the risks associated with the program, and use the results of its assessment to focus its management and monitoring efforts.

In 2010, the Associated Press published an investigative report on the Summer Work Travel Program. The journalists interviewed about 70 students 10 states and found they suffered from bad housing, forced work, low wages, unpaid work hours, high third-parties fees, and employment in strip clubs and adult entertainment industry (Mohr, Weiss, & Baker, 2010).

In 2010, some foreign students who were summer employees working in Hershey’s distribution plant in Palmyra, PA protested against the exploitative conditions for six months and drew national attention to the Summer Work Travel Program (Maitra, 2013). In 2012, the Labor
Department accused three companies of overcharging the students for housing, reducing their wages to levels below those required by minimum wage and overtime laws, reached a settlement that recovered $213,000 in back wages for the students and terminated the Council for Education Travel-USA (USACETUSA) as a program sponsor for forcing the students to do arduous factory work (Greenhouse, 2012, November 15), and issued 2012 Interim final rule with request for comment in May 2012.

In July 14, 2011, the Economic Policy Institute issued a report titled “Guestworker Diplomacy: J Visas Receive Minimal Oversight Despite Significant Implications for the U.S. Labor Market” (Costa, 2011). This report introduced the basic elements of the Exchange Visitor Program with a focus on its impact on the U.S. labor market. It concluded four major flaws in the program: (1) the lack of protection for U.S. workers; (2) the State Department’s overbroad authority to create new guestworker programs; (3) the significant and inappropriate financial incentives for J visa sponsors and their partners; and (4) the program’s flawed system of management, data collection, oversight, compliance, and enforcement.

In December 2011, Center for Immigration Studies published a report titled “Cheap Labor as Cultural Exchange: The $100 Million Summer Work Travel Industry” (Kammer, 2011). The report indicated that the sponsoring agencies, which relentlessly advertised the program and annually collected more than $100 million in fees from the participants, had developed a lobby that persistently and successfully pushed for permissive regulation.

Lucht (2012) published a Master’s thesis title “Beyond Bologna and Bolashak: Work & Travel U.S.A. as a Context for Student Agency in Kazakhstan’s Internationalization of Higher Education.” The author examined media reports, interviewed student participants, teachers, staff members and one administer, and observed classroom interactions. Four key themes related to
students’ international exchange experiences were: friendship networks, financial considerations, program flexibility, and personal transformation. Adopting the framework of Douglas’s group and grid cultural theory, Lucht explained Kazakhstan’s students’ preference of flexible exchange programs that accommodate their strong group solidarity and their collaborative decision-making preference.

In March 2013, fifteen Summer Work Travel Program students demonstrated outside of a McDonald’s restaurant in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, and filed complaints with the State Department and the Labor Department against their employer for exploitative working conditions (Maitra, 2013).

The reports and protests listed above indicated the failure of the State Department’s oversight of the Summer Work Travel Program and called for more investigations. The program also lacks transparency. Costa (2011) found that much was missing that would allow the public to know more about who exchange visitors were and what they were doing while in the United States, beyond the basic data on the State Department’s new J-1 visa website and in the SEVIS quarterly reports.

Preview reports were mainly based on archival data and interviews. This participatory ethnographic study aims to fill this methodological gap and provide first-hand on-the-ground data about who the participants are and what they are doing while in the United States.

**Regulations**

I will list some provisions pertaining to Summer Work Travel under 77 Fed. Reg. 27,593, 27,595 (May 11, 2012), codified at 22 C.F.R. § 62.32 (2013), which can be compared and contrasted with the participants’ experiences in the following chapters.
22 C.F.R. § 62.32 (b) Purpose. The purpose of this program is to provide foreign college and university students with opportunities to interact with U.S. citizens, experience U.S. culture while sharing their own cultures with Americans they meet, travel in the United States, and work in jobs that require minimal training and are seasonal or temporary in order to earn funds to help defray a portion of their expenses. Employment is of a seasonal nature when the required service is tied to a certain time of the year by an event or pattern and requires labor levels above and beyond existing worker levels. Employment is of a temporary nature when an employer’s need for the duties to be performed is a one-time occurrence, a peak load need, or an intermittent need. It is the nature of employers’ needs, not the nature of the duties that is controlling.

22 C.F.R. § 62.32 (f) Cultural exchange. (1) Sponsors must ensure that all participants have opportunities to work alongside U.S. citizens and interact regularly with U.S. citizens to experience U.S. culture during the workday portion of their Summer Work Travel Programs; and (2) Sponsors must ensure that all participants have opportunities to engage in cultural activities or events outside of work by planning, initializing, and carrying out events or other activities that provide participants’ exposure to U.S. culture.

22 C.F.R. § 62.32 (g) Participant placement. (3) Sponsors must not pose obstacles to job changes, but must offer reasonable assistance to participants wishing to change jobs regardless of whether their jobs were secured by the sponsors (direct-placed) or by the participants (self-placed).

22 C.F.R. § 62.32 (h) Program exclusions. Sponsors must not place participants: (8) in positions requiring work hours that fall predominantly between 10:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m.;

22 C.F.R. § 62.32 (i) Participant compensation. (1) Sponsors must inform program participants of Federal, State, and Local Minimum Wage requirements, and ensure that at a
minimum, participants are compensated at the higher of: (i) The applicable Federal, State, or Local Minimum Wage (including overtime); or (ii) Pay and benefits commensurate with those offered to their similarly situated U.S. counterparts.

22 C.F.R. § 62.32 (o) Host employer cooperation. Sponsors may place participants only with host employers that agree to: (1) Make good faith efforts to provide participants the number of hours of paid employment per week as identified on their job offers and agreed to when the sponsors vetted the jobs; (2) Pay eligible participants for overtime worked in accordance with applicable State or Federal law; (5) In those instances when the employer provides housing or transportation, agree to provide suitable and acceptable accommodations and/or reliable, affordable, and convenient transportation.
CHAPTER FOUR. METHOD

This chapter will elaborate on the methods employed in this study, give an overview of the research participants, and briefly introduce the analysis process and the actual operation of the Summer Work Travel Program. This study aligns itself to critical qualitative inquiries, acknowledging the subjectivity and positionality of the researcher and the political stance of this research. I adopted in-depth interviews, participant observation, and autoethnography to collect data, with a grounded theory approach.

A Critical Perspective

This study endorses a social constructivist approach to the understanding of everyday practices. Rather than regarding the world as a given and seeking one-dimension absolute truth, this study views the world and individual identities as socially constructed and constantly transformed. As Said (1977/2003) illustrated, “History is made by men and women, just as it can also be unmade and re-written, always with various silences and elisions, always with shapes imposed and disfigurements tolerated” (p. xlv). Enormous incidents have happened in the past but only those documented become history and are memorized. Dominant forces control the means of knowledge production, and disqualify the knowledge of the oppressed and the historically marginalized groups as inadequate (Foucault, 1980). The mission of critical scholars is to question knowledge production, pose and solve problems, tell untold and muted stories, and liberate the oppressed rather than seeking the ultimate truth or objective generalizations. This study seeks to depict the Summer Work Travel Program from the perspectives of international students.

A qualitative approach that focuses on lived experiences fits well the purpose of this study. Auerbach and Silverstein (2003) addressed the characteristics of the qualitative paradigm
that contribute to power sharing in research: (1) It “focuses on the voices of the participants” who are experts in the research topics; (2) it “acknowledges that there are variations in experience, rather than a universal norm” and that “the researcher may not know enough about the phenomenon under study to generate a valid hypothesis;” (3) it “includes a reflexive stance that provides the opportunity for the researcher to examine her or his biases,” increasing “the probability that the research process will not be exploitative or oppressive for the participants;” and (4) the outcome of the research is more likely to “be relevant to improving the lives of the participants, not simply furthering the career of the researcher” (p. 126). Therefore, this study employs humanistic and qualitative research methods of participant observation, in-depth interviews, and autoethnography.

A Grounded Theory Approach

This study was informed by the classic grounded theory approach originally put forward by Glaser and Strauss (1967) and extended by Glaser (1978, 1992), and was less related to the work of Strauss and Corbin (1994). Heath and Cowley (2004) compared Glaser andStrauss, arguing the former highlighted the importance of induction or emergence and that the latter emphasized validation. As little is known about the topic and exploratory nature of this study, I stick to the classic grounded theory approach with a focus on emergence.

A grounded theory approach begins with a general research question or perspective, involves wide reading and theories, and allows concepts to emerge from the data. In contrast to monopolistic implications of logico-deductive theories, a discovered, grounded theory, “will tend to combine mostly concepts and hypotheses that have emerged from the data with some existing ones that are clearly useful (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 46). The grounded theory approach also “suggests that many ethnographic studies [sic] and multiple theories [sic] are needed so that
various substantive and formal areas of inquiries can continue to build up to more inclusive formal theories” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 35). Otherwise if the researcher commits himself exclusively to one specific preconceived theory, “potential theoretical sensitivity is lost….for then he becomes doctrinaire and can no longer ‘see around’ his pet theory or any other” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 46). Therefore, I did not commit myself to any specific theoretical framework when I entered the research field. Instead, I read widely about identity theories, labor, race, and culture to sensitize myself to a wide range of possibilities. After spending some time in the field, preliminary themes that emerged from the data informed my further reading on racism, immigration, and colonization.

The grounded theory approach also guided the sampling processes in this study. Theoretically sampling diverse groups and maximizing differences are potentially beneficial to the validity of the grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Therefore, I employed the purposive sampling method (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011) to recruit interviewees from different backgrounds, based on gender, age, ethnicity, nationality and job positions.

Developing a grounded theory consists of two steps: first thematic analysis and then relationship building/hypothesis generation between themes (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). These two steps are not linear but iterative. Theory construction has higher standards and requires more work. Research with a grounded theory approach does not necessarily generate a grounded theory. It could remain at the level of thematic analysis. Well-developed themes and concepts can also contribute to the research topics of interest.

**Participant Observation**

The advantage of participant observation is to “create increasingly precise, vivid, detailed, and theoretically relevant accounts of this experience” (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011, p. 136).
In in-depth interviews, interviewees might be unable to recall some practices because of blurred memory. I could make up for this disadvantage of interviews by observing in the field. Also, observing scenes can build up contexts for social interaction. Whyte (1981) also discussed the rationales for observation in studying individual behaviors:

A man’s attitudes cannot be observed but instead must be inferred from his behavior.

Since actions are directly subject to observation and may be recorded like other scientific data, it seems wise to try to understand man through studying his actions. This approach not only provides information upon the nature of informal group relations but it also offers a framework for the understanding of the individual’s adjustment to society.

(Whyte, 1981, p. 268)

Based on the degree of participation, the role of the researcher can vary among complete participants, participants-as-observer, observer-as-participant, and complete observers (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011). My role in the field was not static but varied across scenes. I was a complete observer when I was just watching the communication between service workers and customers, an observer-as-participant when I joined their communication, a participant-as-observer when I acted as a customer to interact with service workers, and a complete participant when I performed as a service worker.

During the observation, I focused on six questions: Who are the actors? How is the scene set up? How do initial actions occur? How do actors claim attention? Where and when do actors interact? Which events are significant? (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011). In addition to verbal language, I paid attention to various nonverbal cues, including kinesics, haptics, proxemics, physical appearance, vocalics, chronemics, and artifacts (Afifi, 2007). I took pictures, wrote down brief
notes, and made headnotes in the field. After I left the field, I expanded my fieldnotes as soon as possible.

**In-depth Interview**

The key method in this study was semi-structured in-depth interviews, through which I could better elicit interviewees’ accounts of their experiences and perceptions. There are several rationales for utilizing this qualitative method.

In-depth interviews best suit the research purpose for the following reasons: First, “quantitative method assume that researchers already know both the key problems and the answer categories” (Rubin & Rubin, 2012, p.9), but this study explores a phenomenon which is not yet fully understood. Second, each individual has distinct experiences, and qualitative interviews can be easily adapted to fit every interviewee. Third, in-depth interviews can elicit vivid and detailed accounts from participants, which is consistent with the goal of this study to present contextual experiences and evocative narratives.

In what follows, I will introduce the procedures and details of how I enacted the research methods, including IRB review, recruitment, interview guides, interview times and places, and pseudonyms.

**IRB review.** This study involved human subjects and applied for institutional review board approval from the BGSU Human Subject Review Board (HSRB). I revised the documents as the research design evolved and as suggested by the BGSU HSRB. I prepared English informed consent forms for service workers, supervisors, and other parties respectively. To reach and inform some Chinese whose English was limited, I also prepared the Chinese versions of the recruitment notice for service workers, the recruitment notice for supervisors and the informed consent form for service workers.
Recruitment. The primary participants of this study are Asian international student workers. By the time I entered the field, most students who were from Thailand and the Philippines had finished their work and returned to their home countries. Asian students who remained in the field were mainly Chinese students. Therefore, Chinese students became my research focus. I recruited participants mainly based on my personal relationships. I stopped recruitment of Chinese students when my data was saturated, that is, when I did not hear new information from interviews.

To gain a more comprehensive understanding of the Chinese students’ experiences, I also recruited local service workers, supervisors, and local residents. Supervisors could provide some background information for the study and they also played an important role in service work. The local workers could provide their insights of service work, which could be compared to those of the international students. In the field, I found local Christians played an important role in helping the international students with living and traveling in M Town. Therefore, I also interviewed two Christians who organized Bible studies and assisted the international students.

Interview guides. I used semi-structured interview guides and asked open-ended questions. The interview questions consisted of main questions, probes, and follow-up questions (Rubin & Rubin, 2012). The main questions in the interviews with international students were comprised of four parts. The first part concerned the background information about the participant’s current job(s). I also asked the participant to describe a typical day from getting up to going to bed to gain a general understanding of the participant’s everyday life. The second part was about work experiences. Sample questions were “How do you feel during work?” “What part of work do you like? What part of work do you dislike?” “What do you get from your work? Which is most important to you?” The third part was about cultural adaptation and
social identities concerning race, ethnicity, nationality, education, linguistics, age, health status, religious belief, sexual orientation, and so on. A sample question was “Do you think your nationality matters in your work? In your social life? Why?” In the actual interview process, the participants often had already touched upon identity issues before I moved to the third part. I asked additional questions that probed into the identity issues they raised in the conversations. In the third part, I asked about whatever identity markers they had not touched upon. In the fourth part, the participants provided suggestions to the employers, sponsors, and other relevant parties. I also offered the participants a chance to share whatever stories they would like to share with me that I had not asked about. With regard to supervisors, I asked about the characteristics they thought were important to a service worker in addition to the background information. In interviews with other parties related to the international students, I asked them to describe the routine activities they engaged in with the students and to share with me their memorable experiences with the students.

**Interview times and places.** I conducted interviews either face to face or via technology. Two interviews were via QQ—a popular instant message software and app among Chinese—audio chat; one interview was via QQ video chat; one interview was via phone call; and the remaining fourteen interviews were face-to-face. Most interviews were conducted outside of the participants’ work time. I intended to find places that were safe, private, quiet, and comfortable for the interviews, but a variety of contextual factors played a role in determining the interview spots. The locations of the actual interviews were not always optimal. Most interviews were set in my dorm, or the participant’s dorm/house/apartment, or other places of the interviewee’s choice. The four other places included an employee lounge, Subway, Dairy Queen, and Delicious Restaurant.
Before each interview, I presented the HSRB approved informed consent form to the interviewees, and prompted them to ask questions. In light of the small sample size and no more than minimal harm nature, I did not collect interviewees’ signatures of their names to maintain confidentiality. Checking the paired questions and signing a date on the consent form indicated consent to participate in the interview.

Before conducting the interviews, I collected demographic information from each participant, including age, gender, race/ethnicity, nationality, religion, and province/state. I also collected information about major, grade, employer, sponsor, job positions, hourly wage, weekly work hours, date of arrival in the United States, expected last day of work, and expected date of leaving the US from the international students. I documented dates, methods, languages, the starting times, the ending times, and the recording times of each interview. Each interview was audio-recorded after being approved by the participants. Each recording lasted about one hour, varying from about 30 minutes to 90 minutes. Five interviews were conducted in English. One interview was conducted partly in English and partly in Chinese. Twelve interviews were conducted in Chinese.

**Pseudonyms.** Before conducting interviews, I made a list of pseudonyms of given names, including Chinese female names, Chinese male names, English female names, and English male names. I put them in alphabetic order and assigned them to the participants or people referred to by the participants according to the time order of the interviews, so that there was no association between the pseudonym and the participant’s real name. The Chinese female names used are: Chunhua, Xiayin, Qiuyue, Dongxue, Lianghui, Chenxi, Meiting, Jiabi, Beibei, Juanjuan, Xixi, Dongdong, Yiyi, and Fangfang. The Chinese male names used are: Renrong,
Yihua, Lifu, Zhigui, Xinpeng, Wende, and Quanyi. The English female names used were Amy, Beth, Perry, Carolyn, and Diana. The English male names used are Andrew, Ben and Calvin.

After the interviews, I made a list of pseudonyms of places and companies referred to during the interviews. The pseudonyms are Amazing Park, Fun Waterpark, Best Food Chain, Delicious Restaurant, Palatable Food Chain, OOO Inn, BBB Inn, CCC Inn, DDD Inn, EEE Inn, Middle Church, XX Sponsor, YY Sponsor, ZZ Sponsor, and Tengfei Agency.

**Participants**

I conducted 18 interviews in total, including 12 Chinese students. The 12 Chinese students were in a range of 19-26 years old at the time of interviewing. They were undergraduates or recent graduates with a diploma, Bachelor’s degree or Master’s degree. Four of them were males and eight of them were females. Six of them were Chinese Malaysians; five of them were from mainland China; and one of them came from Taiwan. They worked as housekeepers, lifeguards, food host, admission associate, human resources associate, escort, housing supervisor, restroom assistant, or food preparation associates. Their weekly work hours varied from 35 to 60 hours except Zhigui who worked about 100 hours per week. Table-1 offers more information about each individual.

Six participants I interviewed were not international students. They included 1 White American local worker, 1 Black American local worker, 1 Chinese restaurant owner, 1 Chinese worker who was a US citizen, and 1 Chinese worker who held a green card, and 1 White American retiree. Four of them were females and two of them were males. Table 2 offers more information about them.
Table 3

Participant Characteristics—International students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Job position</th>
<th>Weekly hours</th>
<th>Interview method</th>
<th>Interview language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chunhua</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>OOO Inn</td>
<td>Housekeeper</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>QQ video</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renrong</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Fun Waterpark</td>
<td>Lifeguard</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>QQ audio</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiayan</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>Amazing Park</td>
<td>Food service</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>F2F</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qiuyue</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>Amazing Park</td>
<td>Food host</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>F2F</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dongxue</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>Amazing Park</td>
<td>Admission associate</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>F2F</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lianghui</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>Amazing Park</td>
<td>Human resources associate</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>F2F</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chenxi</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>Amazing Park</td>
<td>Escort</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>F2F</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yihua</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>Amazing Park</td>
<td>Housing supervisor</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>F2F</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifu</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Fun Waterpark/BBB Inn</td>
<td>Lifeguard/Housekeeper</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>QQ audio</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meiting</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>DDD Inn</td>
<td>Housekeeper</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>F2F</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhigui</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Palatable Food Chain, EEE Inn, Delicious Restaurant</td>
<td>Kitchen hand/Housekeeper</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>F2F</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juanjuan</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Chinese/Taiwanese</td>
<td>Amazing Park</td>
<td>Restroom assistant</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>F2F</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

*Participant Characteristics—Others*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Job position</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Interview language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>F2F</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiabi</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>An American company</td>
<td>Finance-related</td>
<td>F2F</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>African</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Best Food Chain &amp; A decorative store</td>
<td>Cashier/Food host</td>
<td>F2F</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xinping</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Delicious Restaurant</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>F2F</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beibei</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Delicious Restaurant</td>
<td>Waitress/cashier/manager</td>
<td>F2F</td>
<td>Chinese &amp; English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Best Food Chain</td>
<td>Cook/Assistant manager</td>
<td>Phone call</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Autoethnography

Autoethnography is “the use of personal experience to examine and/or critique cultural experience” (Jones, Adams, & Ellis, 2013, p. 22). It is different from other personal work for it examines cultural experience with purpose, contributes to existing research, embraces vulnerability, and creates a reciprocal relationship with audiences (Jones, Adams, & Ellis, 2013). Working as customer service worker at Amazing Park was not only a pass to enter the field and conduct participant observation, but also an opportunity to explore service work through personal experience.

This interpretative and critical research acknowledges researcher’s biases in the research process. In qualitative research, the researcher is not, and by no means can be, objective. The researcher is not only a research tool, but also can be the research subject. In particular, as my in-depth interviews are cross-sectional rather than longitudinal, documenting my personal experience from the beginning of entering the field can serve as an important data source for examining new service workers’ experience and keeping track of emotional and behavioral changes.

Service work involves emotional work and embodied experiences. Emotions and lived experiences are indispensable in our social life as well as research. However, they have long been marginalized in social scientific studies. They are difficult to approach from an objective, scientific stance, too, as implied by the question, “How could a person study speech anxiety without ever having embodied such anxiety (Pelias, 1997)?” (Jones, Adams, & Ellis, 2013, p. 29). Autoethnography is a method which makes such emotions and feelings visible. I kept a diary every day on my daily activities, conversations, emotional change, and reflexive thinking. All of these served as data for later analysis.
Last but not least, autoethnography is devoted to making research results more readable and accessible by adopting various creative presentation forms beyond academic writing. Instead of following the traditional academic writing style, I will present my findings in the form of stories. Patton provided reasons for storytelling given by cognitive scientists and linguistic scholars as follows:

Cognitive scientists have found that stories are more memorable and better support learning and understanding than nonstory narratives (Shaw et al. 1998:42). Language scholars Richard Mitchell (1979) has observed, “Our knowledge is made up of the stories we can tell, stories that must be told in the language that we know…Where we can tell no story, we have no knowledge.” (Patton, 2002, p. 34)

Bromiley (1998) noted, “A good story (and a good strategic plan) defines relationships, a sequence of events, cause and effect, and a priority among items—and those elements are likely to be remembered as a complex whole [sic]” (p. 42), as cited in Patton’s (2002, p. 197) qualitative research handbook. Therefore, presenting findings in the form of stories can illustrate the complexity of the phenomenon under study, promote understandings, and help readers memorize research results.

Analysis

The data analysis processes were iterative. I first open coded some interview transcripts and fieldnotes line by line, using the software Nvivo 10 for Windows. I adopted a thematic analysis approach (Braun & Clarke, 2006) to identify themes and subthemes, based on the criteria of repetition, recurrence, and forcefulness. I used the techniques summarized by Ryan and Bernard (2003) to identify themes. After identifying some preliminary themes, I employed a
focused coding strategy, and divided data into slices—meaningful trunks. I moved back and forth between data and theories in the coding and analyzing processes.

Five major themes identified from the data are racialization, racism, internalized racism, personal transformation, and religious assimilation. Racialization means the process in which racial identity and perceptions become salient in one’s experience. Racism can incorporate institutional racism, personally mediated racism, and internalized racism (Jones, 2000). Here I refer to the theme “racism” only as institutional racism and personally mediated racism, and list “internalized racism” as a separate theme. Institutional racism is defined as “differential access to the goods, services, and opportunities of society by race;” personally mediated racism is “prejudice and discrimination, where prejudice means differential assumptions about the abilities, motives, and intentions of others according to their race, and discrimination means differential actions toward others according to their race;” and internalized racism refers to “acceptance by members of the stigmatized races of negative messages about their own abilities and intrinsic worth” (Jones, 2000). Personal transformation means the changes that individuals make regarding their perceptions and behaviors. Religious assimilation is the process in which religious groups disseminate their religion and assimilate and convert international students. I will elaborate on these themes and their subthemes in chapters Five to Ten. In each chapter, I will write about one individual’s story with a focus on one major theme, and supplement that story with other examples. When I use direct quotes, I will not correct the grammatical errors made by the participants and present the original messages. When I am not sure whether the English translations convey the exact meanings of the original Chinese messages, I will put the Chinese words or sentences in brackets after the English translations.
Actual Operation

Before presenting the themes, I will describe the actual operation of the Summer Work Travel Program from the perspectives of the international students. They described the process from knowing about this program to finally settling down in the United States. Parties involved in this process included American employers, American sponsors, agencies, and universities/colleges. International students who participated in the Summer Work Travel Program must be sponsored by certain institutions. The agencies connected students with sponsors. In what follows, I will introduce the recruitment process told by three students from China—Chunhua, Meiting, and Zhigui—and one student from Malaysia—Qiuyue.

Tengfei Agency promoted the Summer Work Travel Program at Chunhua’s university, claiming that a student could earn about 8,000 USD per month. After knowing about this program, Chunhua enrolled for it, signed a contract, and then paid a program fee and registration fee. The program fee was paid in two installments. The first time, Chunhua paid 2,500 CNY, a unit of Chinese currency (1 CNY = 0.16 USD), for the program fee and 2,500 CNY (= 400 USD) for the non-refundable registration fee. Then Chunhua had an informal phone interview and an easy written examination. The ZZ Sponsor representative interviewed her in person. During interviews organized by ZZ Sponsor, some students were eliminated, but they had a second chance to try. After passing the interview, Chunhua paid 15,000 CNY (= 2,400 USD) for the program fee and applied for a visa by herself. She paid all the fees to Tengfei Agency and did not have direct contact with ZZ Sponsor. Tengfei Agency assigned Chunhua a job. If the student failed to obtain the visa, the 17,500 CNY (= 2,800 USD) program fee would be refunded. Chunhua paid 1,080 CNY (= 172 USD) for the visa and spent more than 7,800 CNY (= 1,248 USD) on round-trip tickets. In total, Chunhua spent 28,800 CNY (= 4,608 USD) before coming
to the United States. She was suggested to bring 1,000 USD because she had to pay for her living costs by herself when she arrived. Before coming, Chunhua planned to use her wages to cover her living costs, traveling costs and gifts. After arriving in the United States, Chunhua found it impossible to earn as much as 8,000 USD per month in her job. She said she might need to use money out of pocket, and she was not happy about the situation. Chunhua’s rent was 80 USD per week and other living costs were about 60 USD per week. After deducting rent from wages, Chunhua could only earn a bit more than 2,000 USD per month. During my interview with Chunhua, she said that her employer would decrease the rent from 80 USD to 70 USD per week from the next week of the interview.

Meiting paid 2,000 CNY (= 320 USD) for registration, 3,500 CNY (=560 USD) for job placement, 2,500 CNY (= 400 USD) for insurance, and 10,000 CNY (= 1,600 USD) for other fees. She paid 18,000 CNY (=2,880 USD) in total excluding a visa fee and the cost of plane tickets. Her family did not support her choice of coming to the United States. She insisted on her plan and borrowed money from her friends to pay for the fees. She knew that she could not earn back the money in her job but this trip was meaningful to her.

Some teachers in Zhigui’s university often promoted the Summer Work Travel Program but few students in his department were interested in the program. Zhigui was good at English in his high school and interested in English. He lived in Guangzhou for two years and communicated a lot with foreigners while playing basketball. He was the president of the student union in his department and received a grant of 5,000 CNY (= 800 USD) from his university. He paid the remaining 15,000 CNY (= 2,400 USD) for registration and program fees and 9,296 CNY (= 1,487 USD) for round plane tickets. Zhigui was assigned to work at Palatable Food Chain in M Town because of his limited English. He failed the oral English examination for a
waiter position with a wage of 12 USD per hour in Maryland. The total score was 10 points; Zhigui scored 7.5 points; his friend scored 9.2 points. Zhigui was jealous that his friend got that job.

The process in Malaysia described by Qiuyue was a little bit different from the process in China described above. Qiuyue had both an informal job interview and a practice interview for a visa with an agency. Then it was the real visa interview in the US embassy and the completion of payment of the fees.
CHAPTER FIVE. RACIALIZATION

This chapter will present Lianghui’s experiences with a focus on the process of racialization. She participated in the Summer Work Travel Program to experience American culture and to seek job opportunities.

Lianghui: “It’s amazing! I don’t want to go back anymore.”

Lianghui, female, 22, an associate in the Human Resources department at Amazing Park.

- 7:00am: wake up
- 7:30am: start to work
- 11:30am-12:30pm: lunch break
- 5:00pm: get off work
- Night activities: Rides, games, sports, movies, and casual dinners.
- 2:00am: go to sleep
- Two days off every week.

This is Lianghui’s daily schedule. Chinese Malaysian Lianghui received private Chinese-English bilingual education and just graduated from a university in Malaysia. Extroversion and proficiency in English helped her get an office job in Human Resources with an hourly wage of 8.1 USD and made her an exception among her Asian friends, most of whom did not have a fixed work schedule and were paid a minimum hourly wage of 7.95 USD.

Lianghui had about 12 coworkers from Russia, Poland, Kosovo, Moldova, and of course, America. She enjoyed working and becoming friends with her teammates, “There is no problem for me with my coworkers. Everyone is doing their job really well. Everyone is very friendly, very helpful and uh, and very fun.” Lianghui said, “We don’t have language barriers at all. Because to work in Human Resources, your English proficiency has to be at a higher level.”
Every Monday night, Lianghui and her coworkers would have a departmental dinner. The interview happened to be conducted on Monday after she came back from the departmental dinner at a local restaurant. “We made the idea because we only have about a month and [a] half left so we decided that every Monday we had to gather together and just spend time with each other,” said Lianghui. “We try to go to different restaurants.” Having a small team and a common fixed schedule made their departmental dinner gatherings possible. Many departments had too many workers to get everyone together.

During and after work, Lianghui enjoyed talking with her coworkers. She pointed out the two key factors in promoting intercultural communication: be open-minded and be curious. She said, “If I am curious with you, I ask questions about what kind of food do you eat there like initiate conversations, try to be understanding if they act differently as you are, because you are from a different culture.” Even though Lianghui had very good relationships with her coworkers, she initially experienced coldness from them. When she came in May, she was unhappy because she felt her American coworkers did not treat her well. The coworkers talked to each other happily but became quiet when they saw her. Lianghui did not understand. She said to me, “Fine, if you don’t want to make friends with me, I will make friends with other people.” Later on, Lianghui found out the reason: “After that, I realized that, some of them, we don’t talk to each other is because we have no common topics at all. Like, there is nothing to talk about. Doesn’t mean that they don’t like me. Just that we don’t have anything in common.” The situation also changed. “As we get along. I mean people get along when live in the same environment. So normally we’ll start to have some topics together.” Lianghui said that her previous feeling was more like an assumption. “It’s OK now,” said she.
Lianghui not only got along well with her coworkers, but also had good relationships with her managers. She said, “The managers, well, they are just amazing. They treat us like their children and uh, the managers just randomly bring some breakfast over, bring some snacks everything, so we are never hungry in the office.” Lianghui was satisfied with her wage: “I think I am paid fairly good [well].” Lianghui also had another job as a resident assistant for two nights a week. She picked up the extra hours because she wanted to work at least 60 hours to earn money to travel. She paid for the registration fee and airplane tickets using her own study loan.

Lianghui’s dorm was fewer than 50 meters away from her workplace. She lived with two other Chinese Malaysians. She liked her easygoing roommates and they shared food. She was satisfied with the living conditions as well: “To me it’s good. It’s comfortable. It has fan, it has lights, it has heater, [and] I mean showering heater is good.” Lianghui also went to the recreation center about three times a week after work to have fun with her friends.

Lianghui made a lot of international friends. Many workers knew her because she worked in the Human Resources department where every employee was processed before work. Also, Lianghui had a good memory of people. She made friends with everyone: “Like the Europeans, they are crazy fun. The Taiwanese, it feels like a family, and the Americans, they’re just friendly.” I probed what she meant by crazy fun Europeans. She answered, “Well. They love to party and Asians basically do not do that. So when you get along with them, you can try different things.” I asked again, “Do you like party?” She replied, “So-so. If I have energy, then yeah.”

During the interview, Lianghui was super tired and sleepy because she went to a party on Sunday night, stayed up till 4 a.m., went to work at 7:30 a.m., and went to the departmental dinner after work. The bus was supposed to come at 3 a.m. but actually came at 3:30 a.m. Lianghui was awake from 6a.m. until she had the interview at 11 p.m. She went to bed very late
at about 2 a.m. “I feel that there is not enough time to sleep over here,” she said. “I want to fully utilize all the time. So it’s fine with me.” Lianghui chose to contribute more time to fun activities than sleep.

Using Skype, Lianghui spoke with her mother in Malaysia every two days, and talked about her happy life: “Every day is very interesting. That too many things are happening over here. So just keep saying today is super interesting.” Lianghui’s mother changed her attitude toward Lianghui’s trip to the U.S. before Lianghui came, “My mom was not very supportive because she was worrying that you are a graduate student, you will walk in and sweep the floor, serve food and everything. But after she knows that I’m going to work in office, she was really fine with it.” Lianghui’s father supported her choice: “My father say, just go and experience. Whatever you work, it’s going to be great.”

As her father expected, Lianghui had great experiences in her work and life. She felt “more freedom” in the United States: “People don’t really judge over here. Like back in Malaysia, if you are wearing some short, and you have a tummy, and they’ll be like, look at the girl, what is she trying to do, but over here, people just don’t care. You can wear whatever you want. It’s very open.” She added, “I don’t want to go back anymore.” Everything was what Lianghui had expected: “It’s super funnier. And the lifestyle, besides food, everything here is good. The environment, the air, the people. It’s amazing!” She would like to know people from different cultures and to understand how Americans work, and to look for future job opportunities overseas. Now, she wanted to find a job in the United States in her major financial marketing or human resources, but she still needed to go back to Malaysia to reunite with her family first.
The above text documented Lianghui’s positive experiences in work and life, which does not mean that she had not encountered any problems. She reported the tiredness of standing for a long time, boredom of filing, frustration of facing angry guests, and unhappiness when her friends were fired. She said, “I think the management will listen to staff’s problem. Because many things, like, after they ask, after they are gone, and the boss will be like, do you think we really care or they really care something like that.” Lianghui found the supervisors did not care about employees or actively handle the problems the employees encountered; she hoped for more attentive and friendly management.

Others: Racial Encounters

Lianghui came up with racial categories and attributes in her account—crazy fun Europeans, family-like Taiwanese and friendly Americans. She also experienced American culture—freedom and openness in contrast with the conservative culture in Malaysia. Other participants also experienced racial differences and imposed meanings on racial categories, such as Indians, Turkish people, White people and Black people.

**Indians.** Zhigui said that he knew Indians were mean. His Indian boss was always critical of his work. Zhigui also acknowledged that the problems might be his own faults. In the mornings, he was very tired and did not pay attention to details. The boss only gave Zhigui about ten minutes to clean a room, even if it was with a king size bed. When his boss found a hair or a scrap of paper, he would reproach Zhigui for a whole day. Zhigui did not feel there was not enough time to completely clean a big room and felt a bit annoyed.

**Turkish people.** Lifu felt the local coworkers were nice but he did not like his Turkish coworkers. He thought Turkish people were rude and lazy. One or two times, the supervisor saw
the Turkish coworker make mistakes but did not say anything. Lifu did not understand why. Lifu only let one under-height kid take a ride on the slide and was fired. He was unhappy about that.

Lifu did not like his messy Turkish roommate, either, because of his poor personal hygiene. Lifu and another female tenant reported this to the landlord. The landlord said several times that she would ask the Turkish roommate to move to live with other Turkish students. Lifu thought his Turkish roommate was a nice guy; he just did not like his roommate’s odor.

The house Lifu lived in only had one kitchen and one stove, which was not enough for all tenants to cook. Therefore, they took turns cooking. Occasionally, some Turkish roommates cooked at 1 or 2 a.m. when Lifu was not sleeping but playing with his cellphone or reciting English vocabulary. The tasty smell of the food made Lifu very hungry. Lifu did not want to eat late at night because he was afraid of gaining weight.

Another lesson Lifu learned was to be independent and to not easily trust anyone. He felt that he was very naive before and now he saw through many things. He treated his coworkers and roommates nicely, but he felt that they turned out to be jerks after he got to know them more. For example, Lifu brought some food from the Chinese restaurant he worked in to a Turkish roommate but the Turkish roommate was ungrateful and did not pay attention to him at all. Lifu also noticed that some people spoke ill of others behind their backs. He found many people only cared about their own interests.

**White and Black people.** Lifu thought that White people discriminated against Black people and Black and White mixed-race people, who he called “Brown people.” Sometimes when he talked to White people, the White people addressed Black people as “nigger” or “animal” behind Black people’s backs. Lifu did not think that White people discriminated against Yellow people.
Lifu said that many supervisors were not nice and treated people differently. His two White supervisors were not nice at all and they liked to curse. His two Black supervisors were nice people.

Lifu thought that most Americans were kind and ready to help. The absolute majority of White people were nice. He felt some Black people were messy and uncivilized. As a housekeeper, Lifu did not like to clean the rooms in which Black people slept because their rooms were messy and disgusting. Once he saw strawberry jam on the bed. Some Black people were nice, such as Lifu’s friends. Lifu borrowed one Black friend’s cellphone to make a phone call to a company where he wanted to look for a job after he was fired from Fun Waterpark.

The above paragraphs showed the racial perceptions of Indians, Turkish people, White people, and Black people from the perspectives of the students. Zhigui confirmed in his mind that Indians were mean. Lifu found his Turkish roommate’s personal hygiene was poor. Lifu had mixed perceptions of White people and Black people. He felt most White were nice but his White supervisors were not. His Black supervisors and friends were nice but he found some Black people were uncivilized.

Analysis

The Chinese students came to the United States and experienced the complex racial landscape in the US. They had encounters with other races and ethnicities and imposed meanings on different groups. In the meantime, some students, such as Lifu, witnessed White people’s discrimination against Black people. This is a process in which racial identity and perceptions became salient in the students’ overseas experiences. Many scholars have conducted studies among African Americans versus Whites (Griffin, Pifer, Humphrey, & Hazelwood, 2011; Nuez-Smith et al., 2008; Ortiz & Roscigno, 2009; Roscigno, Williams, & Byron, 2012; Turco, 2010;
Wingfield, 2007, 2010). Bonilla-Silva’s (2002) study demonstrated the pervasiveness of racism against Black people in covert and subtle forms and argued against the claim of a “post-racial” America. In this study, the participants revealed the existing overt racism against Black people. Using derogatory terms such as “animals” and “nigger” is politically incorrect and White people usually consciously avoid it (Bonilla-Silva, 2002). I propose two possible explanations of White people’s self-disclosure to the Chinese students: (1) White people are less concerned with political correctness regarding discrimination against Black people when communicating with other racial groups, especially internationals; (2) the international students working temporarily in the US encountered more old-fashioned racists in the low-end service industry. These tentative explanations need verification from future studies.

Lifu suggested that White people do not discriminate against Yellow people. Americans tend to believe that Asians are a “model minority” (Yi, 2000) and fewer studies have looked into racism against Asian Americans and Asians (Sue et al., 2007). Lifu himself reported that his supervisors were prejudiced against him, which I will describe in detail in Chapter Seven. He attributed prejudice as an individual propensity rather than regarding it as a social phenomenon. Other Asian participants also reported being discriminated against, which contradicts Lifu’s belief that White people do not discriminate against Yellow people. I will elaborate on this issue in the following chapters.
CHAPTER SIX. SUPERIORITY VS. INFERIORITY

This chapter will focus on Lifu, who planned to improve his English in this Summer Work Travel Program, and supplement his story with Chunhua’s narratives.

Lifu: The Inferiority of the Chinese People

Lifu, male, 19, a lifeguard at Fun Waterpark and housekeeper at BBB Inn.

Lifu was from Shanghai, China, and attended college there. Before he came to the United States, Lifu liked the US and wanted to immigrate to the US. He thought that China’s population was too large and China’s education was poor. According to him, too many under-the-counter deals were going on in the education system. His father was a policeman and also engaged in under-the-counter deals. Lifu thought education in the US was strict and more pure than in China.

After spending some time in the US, Lifu changed his mind and wanted to immigrate to Canada instead. His impression was that Canada had fewer Black people and better environments. He thought people in Canada were more civilized. He felt that the weather in the US was changeable and he thought the climate in Canada suited him more. Lifu had not visited Canada, but heard stories about Canada from a friend who had visited Canada. Considering the exchange ratio between the currencies in the two countries, he thought it would be a good idea to earn money in Canada and spend it in China. Lifu said that he would go back to China when he was old.

Lifu also had a 5-year-old sister at the time of the interview. He said whether his sister would be able to study overseas all depended on him. His mother supported his immigration plan but his father did not. As a member of the China Communist Party, Lifu’s father did not want
Lifu wanted to immigrate but wanted him to be a soldier. However, Lifu had many tattoos so that he could not be a soldier. 

Lifu enrolled for a friendship family program organized by Fun Waterpark and Middle church, and was assigned to a local family. He felt that his friendship family was gentle, and he thought this was related to education. He felt that Chinese people were so poorly civilized. He pointed out the inferiority of China’s education and the Chinese people. This summer trip further affirmed his immigration plan.

Lifu had already applied for schools and paid application fees. Which school he would attend depended on his International English Language Testing System (IELTS) scores. He planned to transfer to another university as a junior and then immigrate after graduation. His plan was to improve his English on this trip to the US and then go back to China to take the English test. He felt it was urgent to improve his English and did not want to waste his time serving as a lifeguard. After finishing work, Lifu would travel to New York for half a month and then go back to China.

**English learning.** Lifu did not care about wages. He was not here for the money, but to learn English. He did not think about earning back the living costs or application fees. He knew about this summer program through YY Agent’s promotion at his university. He thought he could only learn authentic English in the US. He felt the English he learned in China was “Chinglish,” a term to describe inauthentic English spoken by Chinese.

Lifu had coworkers from China, Ukraine, Turkey, and the US. He interacted with four or five American coworkers. As for his Chinese coworkers, he would greet them and chat, but only talk a little bit. At first, Lifu did not expect there would be so many Chinese workers. He did not
want to talk much with Chinese people because he knew he would speak Chinese with them. He came to the US to practice English, not Chinese.

As a lifeguard, Lifu had to stare at the water and was not able to talk. He was very bored. Lifu tried to seek other chances to practice English. He went to a public basketball court and played basketball with a group of Black people he did not know. Because they spoke very fast, Lifu’s English listening improved quickly. Lifu talked to them and made three friends. Unfortunately, Lifu did not have much time to play basketball. Lifu also tried to talk to people at bus stops. Once, he had a very good conversation with a Mexican person. When meeting new people, Lifu would observe how others looked at him before he initiated a conversation. He could tell whether they were friendly at one sight.

Among his housekeeper coworkers, only one was Chinese. Lifu spoke English more often and improved his oral English very fast. He would chat with customers and coworkers in places such as the elevators or the laundry room. He described his supervisor as an old man, over 60 years old, fat and short; he chatted with Lifu every day. Lifu thought the supervisor was very nice, or at least were not prejudiced against him.

When talking to his Black coworkers, Lifu was satisfied with being able to understand them as they spoke very fast. He regarded it as listening practice and seldom expressed himself. When talking to White people, Lifu practiced his oral English.

**Boring and tiring job as a lifeguard.** Lifu participated in swimming competitions before but he did not know how to rescue people. Before starting his job, Lifu had a three-day training. The first day, he swam and the employer observed his moves. The second day, he learned how to rescue people. The third day was the examination day.
Lifu worked either day shifts or night shifts. For day shifts, Lifu worked seven or eight hours; for night shifts, Lifu worked six hours. In the morning, Lifu walked to the bus stop and waited for the bus to his workplace. During work, he was responsible for either watching people or carrying boats. After work, he went back to sleep and then went to work again the next day. This kind of work life was mechanical and boring to him.

During work, Lifu walked around and waited to rescue people, but the water was too shallow for people to drown. He did not have the opportunity to rescue people, and he could not practice English, either. Lifu changed positions with other employees in different locations, but his work was still basically walking around. Occasionally, two or three people asked him for directions.

Lifu did not expect the job to be so tiring. He thought he only needed to work four or five hours a day and would then have free time. According to his contract, Lifu should work 32 hours a week. If he worked for five days, it would be about six hours a day. However, he worked at least eight hours a day. After taking the job as a housekeeper, he sometimes worked for seven hours and sometimes eight, depending on whether there were extra rooms.

Lifu enjoyed interacting with kids during work. He did not like working in places where he could be easily seen by his supervisors. The supervisors would accuse him of not following the rules if they saw him. The supervisors required him to stare at the water, and to turn and check around him every three steps while walking. Lifu thought that the water was too shallow to drown people. Lifu felt helpless that he could not do anything about their strict rules.

Lifu did not like “troublemakers,” who completely disregarded his whistle or commands. He had no solutions to these situations, and the supervisor and manager would accuse him of not doing the work. When the customers did not listen to Lifu’s commands, Lifu sought help from
his supervisor. However, the area was very big and his supervisor walked slowly, so he was not able to respond to Lifu’s request immediately. Once, a supervisor shook his head and then left after failing to deal with a customer.

**Chunhua: English Learning**

Chunhua, female, 22, a housekeeper at OOO Inn.

Chunhua joined this Summer Work and Travel program for two reasons. First, she wanted to gain the ability to live independently. Second, she wanted to practice English speaking and listening as she planned to seek a job after graduation in a company engaging with international business in Shanghai. Her major was international business.

To improve her English, Chunhua sought opportunities to practice English with others. For example, when she saw that customers did not know how to use the waffle iron, she would go up to them and explain how to use it. She would also approach people when she saw them look puzzled or searching for things. Chunhua regarded herself as an introverted person who was outgoing among familiar people, but hardly spoke in front of strangers. She became more engaged in communication with strangers to achieve her goal to improve her English. After work, she also watched TV in her dorm to improve her listening. She liked to watch cartoons and American dramas. Because there were only a few channels available in the dorm, she just watched whatever was broadcast on TV and did not know what she was watching. She thought her listening improved a little bit compared to when she just arrived, because she had no problem with her bosses’ Indian accent now.

As a housekeeper, Chunhua did not have many chances to speak English. OOO Inn had about 30 rooms located on the first floor and second floor, and employed seven housekeepers in total. Three of them were Chinese J-1 students. The Chinese students, including Chunhua, were
usually assigned to rooms of customers who had checked out. The four local American employees were assigned to rooms of customers staying for another day. Therefore, when Chunhua went to clean the rooms, the customers had already left, so she did not have an opportunity to chat with the customers.

Before the Chinese students started their jobs at the OOO Inn, the American employees cleaned both the first-floor and second-floor rooms. After the Chinese students came, the Chinese students were mainly responsible for the first floor and the American employees were responsible for the second floor. This division separated Chunhua from her American coworkers and left her with little chance to communicate with them. The upside of this division is that it saved Chunhua some physical labor. Chunhua needed to wait until the bed sheets were cleaned, and then put them on a cart before cleaning a room. As the storage room was located on the first floor, Chunhua did not need to carry supplies up and down the stairs. Chunhua only saw her American coworkers when they went downstairs to get supplies. She tried to communicate with them, but she did not have time to talk to them during work. She said, “When we are working, for example, you want to eat an apple or do something else, the boss will come immediately and ask you to go back to work. You certainly do not have time to chat with them during work.” Chunhua thought that her boss could be watching her at any time.

Chunhua thought that she had a better understanding of American culture after coming to the US. She said, “Before coming, I thought they were quite open. However, after I came here, maybe because of the place where I am, I found that they were not like what I imagined. But what I feel good about them is that they are polite and warm. They will greet when meeting each other.” I asked what she meant by “open” (开放), she replied, “As I said a while ago that I like to watch America dramas, I thought they were open in every aspect.” I probed, “You mean
relationships between friends, sex, and every aspect?” She said, “Yes. Every aspect. I found it was not like what was depicted in TV series. Maybe it is because the series I watched were those kinds, which were about life in New York. Now I am in a village. It is different.”

Analysis

Lifu’s and Chunhua’s stories illustrated the multilevel connections between the United States and China. Lifu originally planned to immigrate to the US through higher education and later became more inclined to immigrate to Canada. Chunhua planned to improve her English in the US, and later seek a job in Shanghai, an international business hub in China. Their situations demonstrated the development of long-lasting transnational immigration and global business.

The classic push-pull theory utilized push factors (for example, natural disasters, population pressures, economic hardships, political turmoil or disturbances, environmental disadvantages) in the place of origin, and pull factors (for example, economic opportunities, political preferences, environmental advantages) in the place of destination to account for migration (Yang, 2010). The Chinese immigrated to the United States in significant numbers after the 1840s due to the push factors of the Taiping Rebellion, famine, and poverty in China and the pull factor of the California Gold Rush in the US (Perry, 2014). With the economic development of China, more Chinese have the mobility to seek high-quality education in the United States (Yang, 1999). Lifu’s immigration plan to the United States/Canada demonstrated the push factors of population pressures, political corruption, and limited civilization in China and the pull factors of quality education, economic advantages, and environmental advantages in the United States. On the contrary, Chunhua’s choice of major and career plan showed the operation of transnational corporations in China and the economic opportunities China offers to the world. The US’s cultural involvement in China through movies and televisions has also
helped establish American images and disseminate American norms, values, lifestyles and ideologies (Yang, 2010), even though those images are partial and biased as a result of deliberate construction and selection.

Lifu revealed his perception of the material disparities, as well as the ideological gap between the US and China. He regarded Americans as civilized and superior, and Chinese as uncivilized and inferior. These racial stereotypes have existed for a long time. In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the first European travelers to China described China as “an exotic yet backward and barbaric place,” emphasizing China as having “deceit, cunning, idolatry, despotism, xenophobia, cruelty, infanticide, and intellectual and sexual perversity” as summarized by Stuart Creighton Miller. These accounts emphasized the perceived Chinese inferiority (Perry, 2014). Lifu’s account showed that these stereotypes not only existed in Western minds, but also were internalized by Chinese people. Jones (2000) defined “internalized racism” as “acceptance by members of the stigmatized races of negative messages about their own abilities and intrinsic worth.” Lifu internalized negative messages of Chinese people. Some Chinese regard America as the land of dreams and many Chinese have a positive impression of the US. Meiting said that the United States was a world power and “many people yearn to come to the United States.” (能够来到美国是多少人梦寐以求的事情。) Participating in the Summer Work Travel Program served as a channel for the Chinese students to come to the United States and experience American culture.
CHAPTER SEVEN. BEING INTERNATIONAL, EXPERIENCING DISCRIMINATION AND PREJUDICE

This chapter will focus on Qiuyue’s experiences and supplement them with Lifu’s story and Jiabi’s account.

Qiuyue: “It’s discrimination.”

Qiuyue, Female, 20, a food host at Amazing Park.

“I want fewer hours.” Here are some transcripts from the interview with Qiuyue.

Interviewer: Do you always check the time?

Qiuyue: Yes.

Interviewer: How often?

Qiuyue: Very often. Very, very often. When there is no customer, I just click and check the time.

Interviewer: The second time you click, how do you feel?

Qiuyue: Why isn’t it 12 a.m. yet? Why isn’t it midnight? Why isn’t it 10 p.m. yet? Why time passes too slowly?

Interviewer: How do you feel when you are about to get off work?

Qiuyue: Happy.

Interviewer: Happy.

Qiuyue: No. Just tired. [Laughs]

Interviewer: [Laughs]

Qiuyue: Mostly tired.

Interviewer: Tired?
Qiuyue: Yeah. I just want to get back and sleep.

Qiuyue, a food host, expressed her feeling of the slow passing of time and tiredness during her work. A flash of happiness of getting off work was overridden by fatigue. She worked from 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. or 12 p.m., or even 2 a.m., six days a week. She made pretzels and took customers’ orders at her permanent location at Amazing Park. Sometimes when her location was not busy, she would be sent to other locations in the park to fry food or scoop ice cream.

Qiuyue did not really like to be sent other locations: “Some locations are more tiring, require more physical work, like scooping the ice creams. The ice creams are really hard, it’s not like soft ice cream. It’s quite tiring for the muscles. And also to stand and fry things is very tiring, and very hot. And you feel dizzy sometime, because let’s say, there is a huge long line of people, and you need to stand there and fry and pour the butter. It’s very tiring. Physically tiring.” Qiuyue felt physically exhausted. Many parts of her body hurt: “My feet, especially. And my back. And if I am scooping ice cream, my neck and sometimes my head hurt.”

Qiuyue said, “After a long day, I don’t want to wake up from sleep. I just want to sleep.” She still felt tired when she woke up in the next morning. She felt tired almost every day and even her day off was not enough to refresh her. When she was tired, she felt bad and did not like her job. When she was energetic, she felt good. However, she could not feel energetic for a whole day. She said, “In the morning, maybe I will feel good and then I’ll slowly be miserable, and depressed, and tired.”

Qiuyue could not have a rest when she felt tired. There were cameras in her workplace. “We just stand. Continue standing. Continue serving. You are not allowed to eat. You are not
allowed to sit. There is no chair to even sit on,” She stated. “Only when I am at my workplace, when I get busy, I forget about how tired I am.” However, Qiuyue did not want it to be busy: “I just want to stand there and do nothing most of the time, because I’m tired. But all around, it’s a business, nothing much can be done.” Because “if it get [is] busy, I [will] get more tired although I’ll forget the tiredness.”

Qiuyue did not want to work so much every day. “Because I’m really not here for the money, I’m here for more of the experience. So working so many hours for me is not really a good, not really a good thing.” said she, “I want fewer hours. I want to work 8 hours a day, not 12, 13 hours a day. Fewer hours. At least stick to my contract.” Before coming, Qiuyue chose to be food host and her contract stated that she would work 32 hours a week. Now, she worked for 60 hours a week. Her parents paid for her registration and program fees and tickets. She never thought about making a certain amount of money to subsidize her travel. Working too much left her no time to meet with local people. She tried to tell the employer that she wanted to work fewer hours but her request was refused, which made her angry.

“We don’t get what we deserve.” Another thing Qiuyue disliked is the lack of overtime pay: “The bad thing, the very, very bad thing is, since I always work overtime, always, like every day overtime. Actually, our hour [hourly wage] is 7.95 [dollars] but if you work overtime, it will be 11 dollars. But the company found a loophole but since we are seasonal workers, they will cut back our salary to 7.95 [dollars].” “We don’t get what we deserve.” “So I think it’s a discrimination.” Qiuyue’s hourly wage was 7.95 USD and she worked overtime every single day. She was unhappy that she did not have overtime pay because she was a seasonal worker. Both international students and domestic students working at Amazing Park did not have
overtime pay. International students working at other places such as Fun Waterpark, and Palatable Food Chain had overtime pay.

Qiuyue did not have the motivation to work at all and she felt that she was not fairly treated by her employer: “I think they treat us really bad. I am not, I don’t how to put in a sentence. But they don’t treat us like, uh, proper. We don’t have proper working hours or proper schedules. They don’t treat us like the way they want to be treated when they are working. So that’s one of bad things about it.” Qiuyue did not have a fixed work schedule, “Normally my supervisor will arrange the schedule. But it tends to get changed by our manager; like, he’ll simply, randomly [change the schedule into] whatever he likes. So it’s not fixed.” Qiuyue’s direct supervisor was responsible for arranging the schedule, which needed to be approved by the super manager. Qiuyue did not understand why the super manager randomly changed the schedule.

Another issue related to schedule are the work breaks. Qiuyue only had a one-hour break at 4 p.m. if she worked from 10 a.m. to 10 p.m., or at 7 p.m. if she worked from 10 a.m. to 1 a.m. or 2 a.m. She had to have lunch and dinner at the same time at the employee cafeteria, which did not sell Asian food. She had to have pizza and other American food instead. Working these hours left her no time to cook. Nor did she have a kitchen or ingredients to cook Asian food. She reported that she had a cold, coughed, and gained weight while working but she rarely got sick in her home country. Qiuyue would like to have two half-hour breaks rather than one one-hour break. She gave suggestions to her area manager but they did not work: “She did agree what I have to say. But she has no power to change it, because it all lies in the vice president Vice President of food host; which [who] I have never seen.”
Qiuyue had been thinking about transferring to other departments. She liked the work hours in the admission department and admission associates had chairs to sit on. However, it was not easy for her to transfer: “They’ll keep us here. We are, we cannot. It’s not easy for us to transfer because they want, they need the people. Because so many [employees] have already quit because of the stress and pressure. So they need the people.” The food department in which Qiuyue worked needed to keep current employees because many workers within the department had quit their jobs.

“I just tell them the good side of everything.” Even though being miserable in the work, Qiuyue always conveyed positive messages to her parents. “I don’t tell them anything because I know they’ll get worried. It’s not something I would like to do. I don’t want them to worry.” said Qiuyue, “I don’t tell them I’m tired. I just tell them the good side of everything.”

The good side of Qiuyue’s work is her small work team in her permanent location. She had two location supervisors and three coworkers, and she liked her supervisors and coworkers. Usually one supervisor and two workers worked at the same time. “The part I like is working in a team and doing, let’s say, when there is no customer, guest, around, I get to interact, and communicate and talk with my colleagues. So it’s very, very fun.” Qiuyue talked about travel, life and culture with her coworkers. She was told to always smile but even if she did not, her supervisors would not write it down. She stated, “Probably my supervisor understands how I feel. Because in the morning, they’ll ask how do you feel today. If I feel tired, if I feel sad, yeah, he’ll know. He’ll understand. Because since we are a quite small group, we know each other well. So let’s say if I’m having a bad day, they will know.”

As mentioned above, Qiuyue did not like to be sent to other locations. She liked her own location. “Good positions are only my location itself, my permanent location. I like my work. It’s
not very busy and I got, my coworkers are my family, my second family from home; that kind of thing. Yeah. I feel at home there, no pressure. They understand me. I understand them.” They were trying to get together after work but they did not have a common day off. So when she had a day off, Qiuyue either stayed in her dorm watching dramas or hung out with her Malaysian friends.

“I want them to stay, but I don’t want them to suffer.” Qiuyue stated that one of her coworkers quit the job: “Last week. Because she is so tired of working and last week, literally the hell week for us, because two of my colleagues got panic attack during sales.” Another coworker was about to transfer to another department, because, as internationals, they could not completely quit the job. Qiuyue had a mixed feeling about her coworkers’ leaving: “I want them to stay, but I don’t want them to suffer. They have bad health to begin with. There is no point in suffering. So it’s good for them to transfer.” She wanted time to pass fast as soon as possible because she did not want to work, but she did not want to leave her coworkers, either. She was burnt out, “After this, I don’t want to work anymore. You know I’m so tiring [tired].”

At the same time, many workers in other departments were trying to transfer to the food department to work more hours. Qiuyue did not really understand them. “Maybe they are not a food host. Maybe that’s why they want more hours, because they don’t understand how physically tiring it is.” said Qiuyue, “Almost everyone I know wants fewer hours in food host department.” Finally, some workers successfully transferred to the food department; Qiuyue stayed in the food department and requested more days off when she was about to finish her contract.

This was Qiuyue’s first job and first time to live alone. Her parents were very supportive of her choice to go to the US. Even though she suffered from the hard work, she also learned
independence, technical skills, communication skills, and being positive from her work and living experiences. She said, “I learn independence. I used to live with them [my parents]. And now I am really on my own without their money.” She added, “It’s quite, what do you call it, uh, good in a sense that I get to know what it is in the food service department. I learned a lot of new things.” By “new things,” she meant to operate the cash register, speak to the guests, and be happy for the guests. She described her effort in serving the guests happily: “Even you are having a bad day, but still the guest comes first at end of the day because we are serving them. So I learn to put my best mood forward. Be happy for them. Try to be happy for them.” In addition, she enjoyed her intercultural friendships: “It’s been quite fun knowing different people, different cultures, [and] different countries.”

**Lifu: Facing Prejudice**

Lifu started to work on June 18th and wanted to quit on June 22nd. He thought that the supervisors and managers were not nice. At least to him. Lifu felt that his supervisors was prejudiced against him. When he took out his cellphone to check the time, his supervisor took his phone and “threw” it in the HR office. Lifu spent one hour finding his phone. His coworkers went home at 10 p.m. after work. But he waited till 11 p.m. Lifu did not know why his manager was prejudiced against him. He did not think other people had issues with him.

The lifeguard who worked in the shift prior to Lifu let a 46 cm-tall kid to use a facility which required the minimum height of 48 cm. When Lifu took on the shift, the kid’s mother carried the kid and asked for a second try. Lifu told them it was not allowed. They told Lifu that they already played once. The kid was looking at Lifu. Seeing the kid’s eyes, Lifu let them play. The manager saw that, got angry at Lifu and fired him.
When asked whether he argued against his supervisors (顶撞), Lifu said of course not. He always talked to them nicely. When meeting them, Lifu greeted them smilingly, but they did not pay attention to Lifu. This annoyed him. Lifu encountered the same situation with some of his coworkers. Lifu first thought he and his coworkers were a team. However, some coworkers did not pay attention to him at all when he greeted them. Lifu then turned to focus on himself. Some coworkers sometimes helped him, such as helping him carry a heavy boat when the walking distance was very long.

Lifu found that several of his male supervisors treated girls well, especially beautiful girls, and that female supervisors treated boys smilingly. Lifu did not have much contact with female supervisors.

**Jiabi: Inhumane Treatment and Invisible Internationals**

Jiabi said the employers did not violate labor laws when treating the American employees because the Americans knew about laws. But the international students did not know about American laws. Also, the employers took advantage of the international students’ visa status. If the international students argued with the employers and were fired, they would be deported to their home countries. The example Jiabi gave is that the employers did not allow the students to have a rest, even when they were sick or very tired. One day, Jiabi read an article about a lawsuit in a newspaper. Some employees sued their company in the name of “inhuman treatment.” She read the items of inhuman treatment they listed in the newspaper and found many international students in M Town also experienced those items. One item is working over ten hours a day. Jiabi knew that some students were willing to work over ten hours but she also knew some students did not want to work longer hours. “He had worked over seventy hours a week. He was very, very tired and did not want to work anymore. He asked his boss whether it was OK that he
did not go to work the next day. The boss said no, telling the student, “If you don’t work, your points will be deducted. If your points are deducted, you will be deported.” Jiabi thought the employers went too far when they forced the international students to work.

As Jiabi was a local resident, I asked her about the attitude toward international students of the local people around her. Jiabi said that generally speaking, the local residents did not have contact with international students. But her neighbors liked the Chinese students whom Jiabi brought to her home. I asked whether the local residents knew that many international students were working in M Town. Jiabi said that sometimes the local residents saw some international faces but did not ask and did not know much about them. For example, once she talked about international students with her colleagues, she found that they did not know there were so many international students before she told them. Even if the local people went to the amusement parks for fun, they did not care much about the environments or notice the existence of many international students.

The employers even coaxed the local employees. Jiabi said the employers treated internationals students very strictly but “looked the other way” on the local employees. (所谓哄着就是说那些雇主可以对，对国际学生要求非常严格，但是对当地员工就是睁一只眼闭一只眼。) For example, at Palatable Food Chain restaurant, the local employees could eat whatever they wanted but the international students could not have any at all. Also, the Palatable Food Chain restaurant manager did not allow the international students to clock in when the business was slow after they reported to work. She never heard this happen before in the US and regarded it as unfair. (这简直都是没有道理的。)
According to Zhigui who worked at Palatable Food Chain, the American workers could eat for free but Chinese students needed to pay half the price. The Chinese students sometimes ate without pay sneakily.

**Analysis**

Jones (2000) conceptualizes racism on three levels: institutional racism, personally mediated racism, and internalized racism. Jones (2000) defines institutional racism as “differential access to the goods, services, and opportunities of society by race,” and personally mediated racism as “prejudice and discrimination, where prejudice means differential assumptions about the abilities, motives, and intentions of others according to their race, and discrimination means differential actions toward others according to their race.” The stories told above illustrated personally mediated racism and institutional racism against internationals. Van Laer and Janssens (2011) argued that studying discrimination and prejudice only from individual psychological processes lost structural roots of discrimination in society. In this chapter, I will focus on institutional racism against internationals. Jones (2000) pointed out that institutionalized racism included both material and political forms. “With regard to material conditions, examples include differential access to quality education, sound housing, gainful employment, appropriate medical facilities, and a clean environment” (Jones, 2000). Many international students did not have space, facilities, raw materials, or time to cook food; some international students even had no access to regular breaks and meals. The denial of access to food and breaks suggest institutional racism against international students in the material form.

Jones (2000) also stated that institutional racism could be legalized. Discriminatory legislation against ethnic minority groups has a long history in the United States (Dalmag & Rothman, 2011; Wilson, Gutierrez, & Chao, 2013). Here I will focus on anti-Chinese legislation
in the US. In 1848, the discovery of gold in California brought thousands of Chinese to work in the gold fields in California. In 1864, the United States Congress passed “An act to encourage immigration,” and thereafter agencies were established to facilitate the immigration process. California hosted the majority of the Chinese population in the US, which accumulated to 71% by 1880. The regional White community felt threatened after the influx of Chinese immigrants, which evoked anti-Chinese sentiment in California. The Chinese were accused of intensifying local job competition and were stereotyped as deficient and incapable of being American citizens. White miners advocated for laws to reduce foreign competition. In 1850, California enacted the Foreign Miners’ Tax, a fee placed on all miners who were not American citizens. Even though this law did little to slow immigration, special taxation placed on the Chinese became one of the more prevalent discriminatory government policies. Newspaper editors urged additional taxes. For example, The Daily Alta California had requested making the Chinese “subjects of special legislation” in 1854.

The California anti-Chinese campaign finally persuaded federal lawmakers into replacing open immigration policies with immigration restrictions against the Chinese (Perry, 2014). In 1882, the United States passed a public law titled “An act to execute certain treaty stipulations relating to Chinese” (22 Stat. 58 1864-1883), also known as the Chinese Exclusion Act, barring most Chinese from entering the United States. In the following years, the United States continued to pass laws against Chinese immigrants.

The American Civil Rights Movement in the 1950s and 1960s advocated against racial discrimination and abolished many discriminatory acts toward disadvantages minority groups. In 1965, a law titled “An act to amend the immigration and nationality act” was passed to lift immigration restrictions (79 Stat. 911 1962). Many Americans tended to believe that the Civil
Rights Movement eliminated racism and achieved equality between White people and people of color in the United States (Thompson & Neville, 1999). However, this project revealed that even though immigration restrictions have been removed, discriminatory acts toward ethnic minorities are still pervasive in the workplace in the US. International students who suffered from unfair treatment encountered all kinds of barriers to resisting injustice, including language, legal status, time constraints, and limited knowledge about American laws.
CHAPTER EIGHT. BEING CHINESE, ENCOUNTERING DISCRIMINATION AND STEREOTYPES

This chapter will focus on Zhigui’s experiences and the problems of discrimination against and stereotypes of Chinese.

Zhigui: Endure Discrimination

Zhigui, Male, 20, a kitchen hand at Palatable Food Chain and Delicious Restaurant, and also a housekeeper at EEE Inn.

A long-term plan. Zhigui had many expectations of this trip to the United States. He wanted to experience American culture, to make some money and, most importantly, to investigate the market in the United States. Zhigui majored in railway engineering and signed an internship in China before leaving China for the US. However, he did not plan to stay in the railway system for a long term. He wanted to start his own business in international trade. Zhigui wanted to surpass his grandfather, who was a peasant, and his father, who was a businessman.

Zhigui regarded this trip as a small part of his career plan. He believed that entry-level work experience was important for career development. According to him, if he experienced what others did not, his career would grow faster. Zhigui thought that only a small part of the student workers had the same thought as he did. He thought that the majority of the student workers came from wealthy families. Zhigui gave an example of his friend, Quanyi. Quanyi’s family did business in real estates and was a millionaire. Quanyi participated in the Summer Work Travel Program and worked in a small town by a fall. He obtained an international driver’s license and bought a car in the US. He only worked five to eight hours per day and had weekends off. In his spare time, Quanyi traveled around with his car. Zhigui thought Quanyi spent some money to come to the US to travel and enjoy life.
Zhigui was the only son in his family. His mother worried about his safety and did not approve his trip to the United States. Zhigui’s father supported his choice to go outside of his hometown and pursue a better career. Zhigui’s school granted Zhigui 5,000 CNY (= 800 USD) for this trip. Zhigui’s father sponsored him 10,000 CNY (= 1,600 USD). Zhigui used his savings during college to cover the remaining costs. Zhigui was determined to come to the US and told his parents a “white lie.” Zhigui told them that he came to the US to study rather than to work. Zhigui planned to tell the truth to his father after he went back to China.

**Rough beginning.** Zhigui found that he could not use his bank card issued in China after he arrived in the US on June 16th. He only had a 20-CNY bill with him. He did not have money to pay rent or go shopping. He borrowed 500 USD from one of his roommates. After paying 300 USD for rent, 100 USD for deposit, and 25 USD for a fee, he had 75 USD left. On the first day of work, Zhigui spent 50 USD on food and daily supplies and only had 25 USD left. In an urgent need for money, Zhigui decided to find a part-time job. On June 18th, Zhigui started with his second job at Delicious Restaurant that served Chinese food to customers. At first, Zhigui worked at Palatable Food Chain in the morning and at Delicious Restaurant in the afternoon. Later, he worked at Delicious Restaurant from 10:30 a.m. to 6 p.m. and at Palatable Food Chain from 6 p.m. to close. Zhigui paid 400 USD back to his roommate in the first week and paid off 500 USD in the second week.

**Working at three jobs.** Delicious Restaurant employed another Chinese student who also wanted to work in morning shifts. Zhigui had several mornings without work, so he decided to find a third job near where he was working. He failed four times because it was his third week and many vacancies had already been filled. He decided to try the last time at EEE Inn. He filled an application form there and was told to wait for notification. After he left, he had been waiting
until the second day but did not receive any notification, so he went to EEE Inn again to check his application status. The boss offered to give him a trial for the job during that weekend. Zhigui went back in the weekend and was employed by EEE Inn after he completed his trial.

Since then, Zhigui worked from 9:30 a.m. to 2 p.m. at EEE Inn, from 2 p.m. to 6 p.m. at Delicious Restaurant, and from 6 p.m. to close at Palatable Food Chain. Palatable Food Chain was closed at 12 a.m. or 1 a.m. or 2 a.m. or 3 a.m., depending on the business. Zhigui had breakfast at EEE Inn before work, lunch at Delicious Restaurant at 2:30 p.m., and dinner at Palatable Food Chain. Zhigui did not need to spend money on food during work.

Zhigui usually had an about 10-minute rest when he was in the restrooms. He was very tired at about 10 p.m. at Palatable Food Chain and went to rest in the restrooms at that time. At first, his coworkers did not understand him and complained that he stayed in the restrooms too long. Zhigui did not care about how others thought about him. He did not tell his bosses that he had three jobs, either. After taking a short break in the restrooms and having some coffee, Zhigui could work two more hours. Later on, other workers got used to his going to the restrooms at that time. Zhigui could have taken formal non-paid breaks, but he did not want to waste time or money.

After returning home from work, Zhigui did not go to sleep immediately. Instead, he played with his cellphone for one or two hours to learn about the daily life of the future colleagues in the railway system where Zhigui would have his internship. Oftentimes, Zhigui went to bed at 3 a.m., got up at 9:10 a.m., and then worked for a whole day. He took Tuesday nights off to attend Bible studies in Amy and Ben’s house, and Thursday nights off to visit Jiabi or have a walk. Sometimes when he was extremely tired and not able to perform his duty, Zhigui
asked a couple of days off from his bosses. The bosses at Delicious Restaurant and EEE Inn understood him and approved his requests.

When he felt very tired during work, Zhigui would do something else to distract himself, such as drinking coffee, taking trash out, or handling the boxes. When he took trash out or disposed of the boxes, he usually took some time to rest a little bit with his eyes closed, or to play with his cellphone using Wi-Fi from the neighboring building.

Zhigui worked for about 100 hours per week and earned about 5,000 USD in the first two months. Sometimes, he exhausted himself. One day, Zhigui went home at 2:30 a.m. after overtime work. He laid on the bed playing with his cellphone and fell asleep. The next morning, he found that he slept with his shoes and dirty clothes on and did not take a shower. He felt that his shoulders could fall apart.

Racial conflicts with Jamaican coworkers. Palatable Food Chain employed about twenty or thirty Americans, seven Chinese students and five Jamaican students. Americans and Jamaicans had regular contact with customers; Chinese students worked as kitchen hands or cleaners. Zhigui hated his Jamaicans coworkers because they often put Chinese students to work. Zhigui put up with them and did what they commanded. Every time when Zhigui was about to lose his temper, he told himself that the Jamaicans were passersby and it was not necessary to be angry. Being angry would make himself tired. Zhigui did not like to cooperate with his Jamaican coworkers and tried to avoid working together with them.

According to Zhigui, when the managers made schedules, they satisfied Americans’ and Jamaicans’ needs first. Chinese students’ needs were not considered. It was difficult for Chinese students to change shifts, too. Occasionally when the managers were happy, they would consider Chinese students. The Jamaicans were good at English so that they could take orders, attend to
customers, and sometimes deliver orders. They did not like hard work, such as carrying heavy things. Zhigui felt that Chinese students worked more than Jamaicans. However, when the business was slow, the managers usually sent Chinese students home. Zhigui thought the managers’ sending Chinese students home was because Chinese students were not good at English. Some Chinese students blushed when they could not express themselves clearly in English, especially after other people laughed at them.

According to Zhigui, the Jamaicans had a superficial good relationship with a manager because they spoke ill of the manager behind the manager’s back. When managers were in the workplace, the managers assigned work to the employees. When managers were not there, the Jamaicans did whatever they wanted. Two Chinese students who were lovers could not tolerate the Jamaicans anymore and complained to the managers. The managers said that they had no solution to the situation, and the two Chinese students chose to quit their jobs. Zhigui also wanted to leave, but he managed to stay silent and endure.

The top manager told the Chinese students that Jamaicans may be from poor families and came to the US to earn money, and that Chinese students were from wealthier families and came to travel. The top managers asked the Chinese students not to care about what the Jamaicans did. Since then, the Chinese students regarded the Jamaicans as people at a different level, to put it mildly, and as dogs, to put it unpleasantly. When referring to Jamaicans, the Chinese students often said, “The dogs are coming.”

Zhigui had also lived with some Jamaicans for one month and a half by the time of the interview. Zhigui felt those Jamaicans were very economical. He found that some of them stole the Chinese students’ food in the refrigerator and took Zhigui’s help for granted. Because Zhigui worked in a Chinese restaurant, some Jamaicans asked him to bring meals back every day. Once,
Zhigui brought food for a Jamaican tenant on the first day and promised to bring food again on the next day. However, Zhigui failed to keep his promise because his boss was in the restaurant that day and he could not take food away. Because of this, that Jamaican got mad at Zhigui. Zhigui felt that Jamaicans were very realistic. When being with Jamaicans, Zhigui looked happy but actually was thinking Jamaicans were useless and would always stay at the lower level.

**Encountering White landlords’ stereotypes of Chinese.** Zhigui lived in a house before he moved out to a new place. The house had two floors. The landlord couple and four Chinese students lived on the first floor, and twelve students lived on the second floor. There were three bedrooms on the second floor and every four students shared one bedroom. Zhigui’s bedroom on the first floor was big, but other bedrooms on the second floor were small. There was only one bathroom on the second floor and one on the first floor. Sometimes students lived on the second floor came downstairs to use the bathroom on the first floor, and vice versa, especially when their work schedules were the same.

Zhigui said his landlords were not nice but strict and did not like Chinese. One day when he and his friends took a taxi, the taxi driver said that Zhigui’s landlords were not nice. Zhigui and his three roommates shared the bathroom with the landlords. Every time after Zhigui and his roommates used the bathroom, they had to clean every drop of water, either in the bathtub or on the floor. Once, the Chinese boys left some pee or water on the toilet and were not aware of it during night. The next day, the landlords accused them for a whole day, saying that they dirtied the whole toilet. The landlords also thought the Chinese students did whatever they wanted and were not mature. Zhigui thought it might be because the Chinese students were not good at English and did not communicate enough with the landlords. Once, a Chinese student did not go to work because the manager at Palatable Food Chain did not let him clock in during work, and
he wanted to change his job. The landlord told him that if he did not go to work, he would be deported. According to Zhigui’s interpretation, the landlords thought Chinese students were arrogant and had their own way after this incident.

**Intercultural adaptation.** For some time, Zhigui ate hamburgers rather than rice and found he was not used to American food. Since he started to work at Delicious Restaurant, he could have Chinese food for lunch. Zhigui did not like the transportation system in M Town, either. The bus came every one hour, had a long route, and was never on time.

Zhigui also had two embarrassed experiences. One is his eating experience at a restaurant. When he arrived in the US, he and his friends ate at a fast food restaurant and left without cleaning their table. The American customers stared at them when they left. Zhigui did not know what was wrong at that time, but figured it out that night after asking a coworker about it. In China, workers at restaurants took care of the tables, and customers did not need to clean them by themselves. Since then, Zhigui knew what he should do after eating at a fast food restaurant in the US. The other is his conversation with a lady. Zhigui asked a female cashier about her age and marriage status, and she refused to answer. Zhigui felt embarrassed and concluded that Americans did not like to be asked about age and marriage status.

Zhigui changed his way of thinking toward individualist culture in the United States. In China, people always relied on interpersonal relationships. In the US, Zhigui knew that nobody would give him credit if he could not perform his job well, so he worked very hard. Occasionally, he loafed on the job. When he wanted to find another job, he first asked Ben and Amy for help, and later realized that he should rely on himself. So he tried to find a job on his own.
At Palatable Food Chain, the managers always assigned the American workers to deliver food and did not assign the Jamaicans for delivery. When the managers were absent, the Jamaicans delivered food occasionally. The Chinese students did not deliver food because of their limited English. Zhigui regretted a little bit that he did not learn English well before he came to the US. He thought that if he were good at English, he would have performed one hundred times better than the Jamaicans. Zhigui made some improvements in English during his stay in the US, but still could not completely understand others when talking in English. Zhigui believed personality also had an impact on the Chinese students’ workplace behaviors. He said that Chinese people were inclined to follow the rules. When managers said something, Chinese would do so and dared not to do anything else. (我们中国人比较喜欢墨守成规，经理说这样，他们就这样，不敢大胆去做。)

Zhigui mentioned the word “endurance” several times during the interview. He not only tolerated his Jamaican coworkers, but also some customers. Once at EEE Inn, a customer made the toilet very dirty and asked Zhigui to clean it. Zhigui was not happy to do it because that went beyond his duty, but he still cleaned the toilet. He said that he was young, overseas, and afraid of losing his job, so he chose to endure. No matter how unreasonable the customers were, they would not hurt him. He would just feel more tired and could recover after sleep.

Others

Other participants reported unpleasant experiences with their landlords. When describing his living conditions, Lifu said that he lived with mice. When Lifu arrived in the US, his landlord said the mouse problem was because of former Chinese tenants. Jiabi offered another example. Some Chinese students working at Palatable Food Chain lived far from the bus stop and the workplace. A student noticed a suspicious behavior on her way back home. She reported to her
agency and complained that the living conditions were not as good as stated on her contract. The agency then contacted the landlords and requested the landlords to secure the student’s safety. As a result, the landlords were unhappy and thought that student made trouble for them. They ordered her to move out of their house.

Analysis

Zhigui’s experience has revealed racial discrimination against Chinese by White people. I found another story of a Chinese female who experienced discrimination in a journalist report (Jiang, 2013) as follows.

The Chinese girl Yuke said that her direct supervisor, Linda, was not nice to Chinese girls. One day, she mispronounced coke as water. Then Linda ridiculed her, “Don’t you Chinese distinguish between coke and water? Do you take a shower in coke?” She also made a move pretending pouring that cup of coke on Yuke’s head. Yuke was mad and said to her, “I came to the US. I can speak English and I don’t lose my face. If you go to China, you will lose your face if you can’t speak Chinese.” Later, Yuke’s American coworker took Yuke to complain to the super manager Tiffany. Tiffany arranged a meeting in the company and let Linda apologize to Yuke after knowing the fact. (“但我们的直属上司琳达对中国女生很不客气。”一天，雨柯顺口把可乐说成了水，琳达嘲笑雨柯：“你们中国人都不分可乐和水吗？难道你们洗澡的时候都是用可乐洗的吗？”然后还做了一个把那杯可乐浇到雨柯脑袋上的动作。雨柯当场发飙：“我到美国来，我会说英语我不丢脸；你如果到中国，不会说中文才丢脸。”)
These stories have demonstrated the pervasiveness of racism against Chinese in the US. Since the former three chapters have introduced the history of US racism against Chinese, here I will focus on the issue with Jamaicans as well as Chinese students’ coping strategies in conflict.

**History of Jamaica.** Jamaica, located in the Caribbean Sea, became a Spanish colony soon after it was discovered by Columbus in 1494. England (later the United Kingdom) took over Jamaica in 1655 and possessed it till August 6, 1962 when Jamaica gained full independence. During this time, Jamaica was heavily dependent on slaves to support its sugar plantations and export trade. After the abolition of the slave trade in 1807 (Meditz & Hanratty, 1987) and the Emancipation of slavery in 1838 in Jamaica, the British imported Indian and Chinese workers as indentured servants to supplement the labor pool (Shibata, 2005). Despite some economic development, increasing inequality accompanied the first decade of Jamaica’s development after national independence. Jamaica has been deeply in debt. In June 2014, Jamaica’s national debt was 175,525,000,000 USD, accounting for 136.4% of its GDP, ranking among the most indebted countries per capita (Ministry of Commerce of the People’s Republic of China, 2014, August 14). In response to its debt problem, Jamaica’s government sought help from international organizations, liberalized its domestic market, and withdrew from providing welfare for Jamaicans. Meditz and Hanratty (1987) illustrated the process as follows:

Due to rising foreign and local debt, accompanied by large fiscal deficits, the government sought International Monetary Fund (IMF) financing from the United States and others. The international bankers imposed IMF austerity measures (with a greater than 25% interest rate per year)…. Supported by multilateral financial institutions, Jamaica has, since the early 1980s, sought to implement structural reforms aimed at fostering private sector activity and increasing the role of market forces in resource allocation….Emphasis
has been placed on maintaining strict fiscal discipline, greater openness to trade and financial flows, market liberalisation and reduction in the size of government. (Meditz & Hanratty, 1987).

Market liberalization and foreign trade have long-term effects on Jamaica’s foreign relations and national development. The United States has been Jamaica’s largest trade partner and second largest donor party (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China, 2014, September 10); the European Union has been Jamaica’s largest donor party and second largest trade partner (Ministry of Commerce of the People’s Republic of China, 2014, November 25).

Jamaica’s history offers an example of the process of globalization and uneven development, which has been analyzed by Ellwood (2001). Ellwood argued that structural adjustment contributed to creating and sustaining poverty in the indebted countries:

In return for new loans to poor countries, lenders in the 1980s and 1990s insisted on “structural adjustment” to increase their chances of being paid back. This meant cutting government spending on things like healthcare and education—their very services on which poor people (and women and children in particular) rely. Many of these countries have ended up spending more on servicing their debts than on the basic needs of their citizens. (Ellwood, 2001, p. 50)

Most of the increase in debt during the 1990s was to pay interest on existing loans. It was not used for productive investment or to tackle poverty. In six of the eight years from 1990 to 1997, developing countries paid out more in debt service (interest plus repayments) than they received in new loans—a total transfer from the poor South to the rich North of $77 billion. (Ellwood, 2001, p. 47)
Ellwood suggested that it is the south that paid the north, which supported the world system theory. As Frank noted, “the contemporary underdevelopment is in large part the historical product of past and continuing economic and other relations between satellite underdeveloped and the now developed metropolitan countries” (Frank, 1969, p. 18).

The history of Jamaica has partly explained the economic disparities between the United States and Jamaica. I met a Jamaican male who was responsible for taking trash bags out of trash cans and pulling the garbage trolley to the dumpsters. He worked 10 hours per day and 7 days a week to make money. Even though Jamaican workers were economically disadvantaged, they had linguistic advantages over Chinese students as the official language in Jamaica is English. I am not sure whether the discrimination of Jamaicans against Chinese reported by Zhigui was related to the anti-Chinese sentiment in Jamaica. Jamaica had anti-Chinese riots in 1918, 1938 and 1965 (Johnson, 1982). The Chinese population was very small in Jamaica and they remained a distinct ethnic minority (Shibata, 2005).

**Asian philosophy.** Facing discrimination and prejudice, Zhigui decided to endure. When encountering conflicts with coworkers, Chunhua kept silent. Zhigui and Chunhua both adopted nonassertive approaches. In one study, Jun (2012) found that Asian Americans tended to utilize nonassertive approaches in response to racial discriminatory messages due to internal/environmental factors including emotional shock and humiliation, a lack of knowledge of proper responses, peer pressure, and strategic intent. Zhigui’s approach fits in the nonassertive strategy “deciding it’s not worth it” identified by Jun. Jun offered a narrative by one participant as follows:

I responded by smiling and telling her that I did not have a problem in this area ... However, she persisted in assuming I would have difficulties and verbalized this
assumption numerous times. In the end I simply ignored any mention of this subject and answered her other questions.

With regard to Zhigui, he knew that he would leave and it was not worth arguing with his Jamaican coworkers. He and his Chinese coworkers also reassured themselves by calling Jamaicans names. Zhigui’s two Chinese coworkers took action by appealing to the super manager and resigning from their jobs. Many factors affected the strategies adopted by the Chinese students, including seriousness of the issue, personal philosophy, and available resources.

Yuan (2010) reviewed comparative studies on conflict management between Chinese and Americans. The result showed that many studies concluded that Chinese people tended to avoid conflict or comply, while Americans were more likely to compete or solve problems. Yuan proposed two possible explanations of Chinese people’s approach: language barriers in intercultural contexts and the influence of Confucianism. Keeping harmonious within a group and preserving face are important to Chinese people. Therefore, avoiding conflict sometimes is necessary to maintain harmony (Yuan, 2010). Chunhua’s choice of keeping silent and maintaining harmony demonstrate the idea of Confucianism. Zhigui’s account shows the language barrier for Chinese students to arguing back when receiving unfair treatment.
CHAPTER NINE. PERSONAL TRANSFORMATION

This chapter will focus on Meiting and the influence of overseas experiences on individuals’ perceptions and behaviors.

Meiting: Adjustment and Gains

Meiting, female, 21, a housekeeper at DDD Inn.

Unlike other participants who enrolled for this Summer Work Travel Program mainly for themselves, Meiting enrolled because her close friend wanted a partner for the trip. Meiting’s friend was an English major and would like to join this program to improve her English, but did not want to come alone. Meiting majored in administrative management which did not require English proficiency. Meiting decided to enroll for this program to accompany her friend and broaden her own horizons. Before she came to the United States, Meiting knew that she would work as a housekeeper and had no expectations of her job. Meiting looked forward to other aspects that she could experience in the US.

Ironically, Meiting’s friend’s visa was denied three times and did not come to the US because her job offer was from 2013. The job offer for 2014 needed to be printed off and signed in the United States. Meiting’s job offer was also from 2013, but the visa official did not ask her for the job documentation. Meiting applied for a group visa with other students the first time and was denied. The second time, Meiting applied alone, and her visa was approved.

Poor English. Meiting’s English was poor. She learned some English in the middle school and high school but forgot most of it after graduation. She could only enunciate individual words when speaking in English. Meiting flew from Shanghai to the US alone. After getting off the plane, Meiting followed other people to the U.S. customs. A staff member told her that she needed to go to window No.59. Meiting did not hear the number and just stared at that employee.
Finally, the employee led Meiting to Window No.59, telling her “You are here.” Another staff member asked Meiting questions and also prepared the answers for her; Meiting only needed to say “Yes” or “No.” That was easy for her and she successfully processed through customs.

Meiting needed to go to Terminal Three to catch her next flight. She did not know the English word for “terminal,” so she showed her guide to a stranger for help. She did not understand what the stranger said, but she heard the word “subway.” Then she took the subway to Terminal Three. Meiting’s layover was one hour and a half, but she spent two hours transferring. Fortunately, the flight that Meiting needed to catch was delayed and she made it just in time. After leaving the airport, Meiting went to take the Greyhound bus. However, it only operated from 12 p.m. to 5 p.m., and Meiting arrived after 8 p.m. Meiting waited at the bus station till 12:30 p.m. in the next day and did not sleep at all. She took the bus to M Town and slept on the bus for one hour and a half. After getting off the bus, Meiting took a taxi to DDD Inn. Three Chinese coworkers was waiting for her at DDD Inn and translated for her when she was communicating with the supervisors.

When Meiting arrived in the US, she could not speak English and relied on her Chinese coworkers as translators. If she was alone, she would say “What?” again and again; other people would use hands to describe; then she could understand. Before she came to the US, Meiting felt that her English was too poor to communicate. She knew that she needed external assistance. She did not expect that the three Chinese coworkers’ English would be good. One of them majored in English; one majored in hotel management; and another’s major was related to food.

Now Meiting could speak a bit more English and guess what Americans spoke. However, it was still not enough to communicate naturally.
Adjustment. Upon waking up on the airplane, Meiting spoke her dialect with the person sitting next to her. Then she realized that she was in the US and should speak English. Other than language barrier, Meiting was not used to American food. In addition, Meiting also experienced cultural differences. She did not like to be hugged or kissed by Americans. She only verbally greeted people in China and did not understand why Americans hugged each other. Later on, Meiting gradually got used to American customs. One habit Meiting failed to change was to take naps. Meiting was used to taking afternoon naps, but did not have nap time now. She felt that Americans were strange not to take a nap. After lunch, Meiting always felt very sleepy.

Meiting did not think nationality, ethnicity, gender, age, religion, marriage status, or health conditions had an impact on her work or living. She did not plan to assimilate into American culture. She just wanted to know about America on this trip and would definitely go back to China after finishing her job. She did not plan to improve her English after she went back to China, unless her job required it. Elsewhere during the interview, Meiting said that she admired students who were studying in the US. She said she might study in the US in the future.

Meiting lived in an apartment with the other three Chinese coworkers. She brought a kettle with her from China. She had planned to bring a wok, but others persuaded her not to do so. She felt excited when she found out there was cookware in the apartment. At first there was no light in the living room. Ben installed a light for them. Her bike broke down, and Ben repaired it for her. The only thing Meiting did not like about her apartment was that it had no Wi-Fi.

A typical day. Meiting, and her Chinese coworkers, took a bus to DDD Inn and had breakfast there. After receiving the worksheet, the first thing they would do was to check whether the customers left tips. They would feel upset when there was no tip, especially, when
the room was very dirty. Meiting worked from 9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. She was scheduled to have a half-hour break for lunch, but she decided how long she would rest. If one of the four Chinese workers finished work earlier, that person would rest a little bit and then help the others. After getting off at 5:30 p.m., they would go to Walmart to buy groceries. Then they took a bus back home and cooked dinner. They each had a partner and took turns cooking dinner for that day and lunch for the next day. They four took turns one by one doing the dishes. After dinner, they went out to the nearby building, which was a hotel and had Wi-Fi. Meiting had contact with her family using Wi-Fi. They four took turns taking a shower after surfing the Internet. After shower, Meiting watched videos that she downloaded during work. Then Meiting went to bed.

**Easy Job.** DDD Inn actually needed ten employees, who included four Jamaicans and six Chinese, but two Chinese failed to obtain their visas.

Meiting had work experience prior to this trip. After she graduated from high school, she worked as a shopping guide in a clothing store. She had to constantly stand and was not allowed to use her cellphone to check time. During college, she worked as a tour guide and waitress in a high-end restaurant in Beijing, China. Compared to her former jobs, Meiting felt that her current job in the US was “so easy.” She said, “At least, you live like a normal person. You don’t need to watch when others are eating, or stand when others are sitting.” (至少跟正常人一样，不用别人吃着你看着，别人坐着你站着这样子。) Nobody supervised her during work, and she could check her cellphone sneakily. When she did not feel like working, she would go to find her Chinese coworkers and chat with them for a while. Sometimes, she turned on the radio in the rooms at DDD Inn, listening to music or audio talk. Meiting also used her cellphone to download a famous Chinese reality show “Dad, where are you going?” (爸爸去哪儿) during work.
The only two expectations Meiting had from her job were a clean room and tips. If the room was clean, Meiting would feel OK. If the room was dirty, Meiting would get very hot, sweaty and tired after cleaning it. What she did not like was that the front desk told her to clean one room, but interrupted her and asked her to clean a different room quickly because the customers were coming. Then Meiting needed to rush.

Meiting was satisfied with her work hours but still wanted more hours to earn extra money. Most of the time she could work more than forty hours per week. Many of her friends in the United States worked less than forty hours. Meiting also felt that the local coworkers treated her nicely, especially two of them. She knew that local employees at Fun Waterpark and Amazing Park did not treat Chinese students well. She also heard that the coworkers of other students who came to the US through Tengfei Agency were not friendly to the students, either.

Meiting was not satisfied with her minimum wage, 7.95 USD per hour, which was the lowest among all the students who came through the same agency. Some students were paid 9 USD per hour, but needed to pay rent, while Meiting did not need to pay rent. Meiting thought that she earned less because she was a housekeeper. She was assigned as a housekeeper because her English was poor. Housekeeping did not require her to speak English.

**Impression and gains.** Before Meiting came to the US, a senior student told her that Americans were very nice and would try to help people if they were in need. Meiting felt so in the United States. Meiting made many friends and thought that she would cry when she left the US. She also believed that this work experience would benefit her career because entry-level work experience was necessary to become a manager.

Meiting liked the slow pace in M Town. She said that living in China was very stressful. “In each day, if you do not work and do not have money to spend, you will be very anxious,”
said Meiting. She stated that the three big problems in China were housing, education, and health care. Meiting thought that the United States solved all the problems for its people.

Meiting also liked the general environment in the service industry in the US because Americans respected service workers. She liked the idea of paying tips, too. She did not like the service industry in China because customers there were arrogant and looked down upon service workers. For instance, if a worker made the customers unhappy, the customers might refuse to pay, or have an attitude, or accuse the worker, or complain to the worker’s supervisor.

Working in the service industry could change Meiting’s own behavior as a customer. She said that she threw towels everywhere when she slept in a hotel in the past. In the future, she would try not to use the towels or supplies, or at least put all towels together, because she now understood how tiring housekeeping was. After working as a shopping guide before college, Meiting also tried not to try on clothes if she did not plan to buy them, and would buy if she tried on the clothes.

Agency Information. Wende, a senior student from Meiting’s university, participated in the Summer Work Travel Program three times and established his own company as an agency for this program. The first time, Wende went to California. His job was to cut fruit in a grocery store, and he also found another part-time job. Wende earned about 70,000 CNY (= about 11,000 USD) in that summer. The second time, Wende worked eight hours a day as a luggage carrier in a five-star hotel in Florida. The third time, he worked in a hotel again. This year Wende advertised his company and promoted the Summer Work Travel Program at different universities all over China. More than one hundred students enrolled for the program through his company, and dozens of students made it to the US except those whose visas were denied. Meiting was one of the students who successfully came to the US through Wende’s company.
Meiting said that Wende explained all the advantages and disadvantages of this trip to her. He said that she might encounter many difficulties and have complaints in the first month, but would start to live her life in the second month, and be loath to leave in the end.

Wende provided English training for Meiting for a month from the basics. In the second to last week, Wende trained Meiting to apply for a visa. In the last week, one of Wende’s partners who had previously worked as a housekeeper trained Meiting for her job, such as teaching her the English words like bed sheet, pillow and towel. Wende also accompanied Meiting when she applied for her visa for a second time. In the US, Meiting contacted Wende whenever she had questions. Wende was ready to help her and always reminded her when she needed to do some paperwork.

Others

The same as Meiting, Zhigui also regarded the entry-level work experience beneficial to his career. However, some participants had a different opinion. Lifu had some prior work experience in China. When he was a freshman, he worked every Sunday during the semester as a telephone salesperson for the company opened by his friend’s brother. It was very challenging and rewarding in terms of persuasion and sales for Lifu. During summer and winter breaks, Lifu also worked in the service industry, such as serving customers and sweeping the floor. In retrospect, he would not consider working in the service industry anymore because he felt it was of no use to his career. His prior work was only for pocket money, and he thought he was very naive at that time. He wished that he had worked in jobs which required more abilities. He thought that service work, such as washing and serving dishes anymore, did not require mental work. Lifu wanted to have his own business someday. His friend’s boss taught his friend to sell, which was useful to career development according to Lifu. Lifu said, “Put it straightforward, go
to higher-end and don’t be a loser.”(像我朋友，大老板带他做销售，推销这种，这种当然很有用。说白了，就是往高端走，不做屌丝。) Xiayin, a food host at Amazing Park, also said that she did not want to do this kind of work anymore, but it was more about tiredness than career development.

**Analysis**

The above stories document the multilevel impacts of overseas experiences on the international students.

First, the participants experienced cultural differences, including language, food, practices, customs, and values. Meiting did not realize that she was in a new environment until she spoke Chinese dialect to the person in the next chair after she woke up on the airplane. Xiayin felt embarrassed when customers did not understand her because of her strong accent. Meiting and many other Chinese students were not used to American food. Those who did not have access to Chinese food missed Chinese food a lot. Some routine practices between the US and China are different. Zhigui and his friends did not throw away their trash on the table the first time they ate in a fast food restaurant in the US. They felt puzzled that other customers stared at them when they left. In China, fast food restaurant workers clean tables for customers. Meiting found the difference in greetings between the US and China. She only verbally greeted people in China and did not understand why Americans hugged each other. At first, she did not like to be hugged or kissed by Americans. Later on, she got used to it. Participants could also change their behavior according to the perceived cultural differences between the US and China. Zhigui remembered that the US endorses individualism after he asked others to help him find another job, and then he relied on himself to find a job.
Second, the overseas experience changed the Chinese students’ perceptions of the United States and their own countries. Many students came with the image of the United States as “a world power.” Meiting felt that coming to the United States was a dream come true. However, after coming, Qiuyue found that the mall in M Town was poorer than the malls where she lived in Malaysia; Meiting did not feel excited anymore; and Chunhua found Americans were not as open as showed in American dramas. The United States made a positive impression on other participants in other aspects. As discussed in Chapter Six, Lifu further confirmed the superiority of Americans and the inferiority of Chinese, after experiencing the gap in civility between the two countries.

Third, engaging in entry-level service work had impacts on the participants’ perceptions of service work. Xiayin did not have work experience prior to this trip to the United States. After experiencing the tiredness of service work, she did not want to engage in this kind of work anymore. Lifu felt the entry-level service work was useless to his career, and he preferred to engage in marketing. On the contrary, both Meiting who majored in management and Zhigui who planned to establish his own business regarded this work experience in the service industry as beneficial. Meiting, who had prior work experience, felt her job as a housekeeper was easy. She thought the general environment for service work in the US was much better than in China, because customers in the US had respect for service workers.

Fourth, the work experience in the US changed participants’ behaviors in different ways. Meiting learned to show respect for service workers as she knew how tiring their work was. She said that she would not toss towels around in hotels in the future, but organize them or not use supplies. Meiting and Chenxi had the idea of pursuing a degree in the United States. Others saw economic opportunities in the Summer Travel Work industry. Zhigui planned to earn some
money through his traveling plan, even though he failed in the end. Wende started his own business as an agency after participating the Summer Work Travel Program three times.
CHAPTER TEN. CHRISTIANITY AND ASSIMILATION

A faith-based non-profit organization established by an American couple, Amy and Ben, played an important role in enriching the international students’ cultural exchange in the United States. Amy and Ben’s Chinese friend, Jiabi, joined them in organizing Bible studies for the international students. A local church, Middle Church, called upon local families to participate in a friendship family program with the international students. In this chapter, I will introduce the activities local Christians engaged in with the international students in a time order, based on my field notes and interviews with Amy, Jiabi and the Chinese students.

Diaries in the Research Field

May 27, 2014, Tuesday, “Getting invited.” Lianghui invited me to her dorm, and I met another Chinese Malaysian, Xiayin, in her dorm. Xiayin planned to go shopping tomorrow and asked me whether I would like to join her. I agreed, and she was excited to go out with me. Xiayin also asked me whether I would like to have dinner at an American couple’s house after shopping tomorrow. The couple had retired from work and took care of J-1 students voluntarily. They would offer dinner and organized Bible study in their house. I was fine with Bible study and agreed to participate. Xiayin was a Christian and obtained contact information of the couple from her agency before she came to the United States.

May 28, 2014, Wednesday, “Meeting Amy and Ben.” On the bus to the mall, Lianghui and I met Lianghui’s friend, Calvin, who was also Chinese Malaysian. Calvin was about 22 years old and worked at the food service department. I felt that Calvin was shy and quiet because he did not talk a lot. As today was Wednesday, the buses operated by Amazing Park sent employees to the mall at 12 p.m. and 1 p.m., and picked them up at 1 p.m. and 6:45 p.m. Calvin planned to go to a bank to open an account today. He arrived at the bus stop before 12 p.m. and waited for
the bus till 1 p.m. Lianghui then invited him to go shopping and have dinner in Amy and Ben’s house. Calvin agreed to join us.

At 5:30 p.m., Amy and Ben went to the mall to pick us up. Ben wore a T-shirt with a Chinese character “夏,” which he bought in the Chinatown in San Francisco. He could speak a little bit Chinese, such as “Xie Xie” (Thank you.) and “Mei Guan Xi” (No problem. /No worry.). On the way to their house, Amy and Ben donated something to Goodwill. In their house, Ben showed us three big suitcases and two small ones, which they collected from neighbors, to see if we needed them. I did not take any suitcase. Amy gave me two hangers, which I could use in my dorm to hang towels. After we introduced ourselves to each other, Ben offered to give me a ride back to my school after I finished my job in M Town.

Amy and Ben asked everyone to write down their contact details on a notebook. They kept records of every student who had visited their house. They took pictures every time they had activities with the students and printed off some of the pictures. I looked through several albums and saw many gifts in their house which were given by the students they had helped.

From the next week on, Amy and Ben organized Bible studies in their house every Tuesday till August, except for a few times. I attended every Bible study in their house.

**June 10, 2014, Tuesday, “Meeting Jiabi.”** Tonight, Jiabi showed up during the Bible study. She asked every student to introduce themselves, and she took notes of the information in her notebook. During the interview with her in August, Jiabi told me about her stories with the international students.

Jiabi moved to M Town in 2009. In that summer, she saw many Chinese faces in Walmart. Out of curiosity, she approached those Chinese students and found that they were here for summer work. After knowing them, she found that the students were in need of all kinds of
help. The regular activities Jiabi organized were Bible studies and trips to local churches. She also organized other activities according to the students’ needs, such as providing transportation for phone sim card shopping and grocery shopping. Once, at 11 p.m., a girl broke her arm and asked for Jiabi to take her to the hospital.

At first, Jiabi did not know the American couple, Ben and Amy. She heard about them from Chinese students. One day, when some Chinese students were about to leave M Town, Jiabi met Ben and Amy in the Chinese students’ home. Later, Jiabi served as an interpreter in Ben and Amy’s Bible studies. Jiabi also organized Bible studies by herself in her own house.

Jiabi felt happy to be able to help the students. The happiest moment for her was to witness students’ acceptance of Jesus and being baptized. She knew that she only had two months to help the students. If the students could find Jesus, it would be their lifelong luck. She may never see the students again, but Jesus will be together with them forever and help them with whatever difficulties they might have in the future. She felt surprised when one Chinese female student, Fangfang, chose to be baptized in a church activity. That was Fangfang’s first time attending a church gathering. Fangfang’s English teacher in her high school was a Christian. After being baptized, Fangfang arranged her Sundays for church activities and also attended church activities on Thursdays and Fridays. She said she did not want to travel around anymore. She could always come back to visit New York City and it would remain the same. But she wanted to spend more time with people in the church and know more about God before she went back to China. Jiabi said, “My God is such an attractive god. I never thought He could attract someone to the extent that she does not want to travel to New York or Chicago.”

June, 2014, “Reaching Chinese girls working at OOO Inn.” Amy and Ben helped the Chinese students who worked at OOO Inn last year. She knew the phone number of the phone in
the room where the Chinese students lived. This year, Amy asked Jiabi to call that phone number. One day, Jiabi called in and Chunhua picked up the phone. When the phone rang, Chunhua was nervous because no one called them before at night. After hearing Chinese from Jiabi, Chunhua was excited. Jiabi introduced herself, Amy and Ben, to Chunhua and told her that Amy and Ben would like to help them get around the town. Chunhua planned to have a second job before she came to the US to make extra money, but she realized that she did not have a fixed schedule or transportation to get a second job. She did not like housekeeping and planned to quit and find a different job. Chunhua felt reassured that she knew a Chinese here and could get around with the American couple. Then she decided not to quit her job.

**June 21, 2014, Saturday, “Shopping trip.”** Amy was a member of Kohl’s Department Store, which offered additional 30 percent off for members in those days. Therefore, Amy and Ben organized shopping trips for some international students. Ben picked me, Chenxi, and another boy up at Amazing Park and drove us to his house. In his house, I met four Chinese girls, including Chunhua. Three of them came from mainland China and worked at OOO Inn. One of them came from Hong Kong and worked at Amazing Park. Chunhua pulled me into a WeChat group of J-1 Chinese students. As the four girls went shopping yesterday, Ben took them to Dollar General this time. Amy took me, Chenxi and the boy to Kohl’s.

When we went by Walmart in Amy’s car, Amy told me that the government in M Town would build sidewalks along the roads. I asked about the source of funding. She said that the government probably got funding from the federal government. More and more non-local people came to M Town and many of them did not drive. Some people rode bicycles on the roads, and it was dangerous. Several accidents happened in these years.
At Kohl’s, Amy bought some clothes; I bought a shirt for myself; Chenxi bought some chocolate as gifts for her family members in Malaysia; and the boy bought a pair of pants which had 90 percent off. Amy swiped her card to pay for the things we bought to get the additional 30 percent off. Also, Amy could get a $10.00 cash coupon if the one-time shopping was over 50 USD. Chenxi found the chocolate at Kohl’s was much cheaper than that in Malaysia. After shopping at Kohl’s, we went to Meijer to go grocery shopping. Then we went back to Amy and Ben’s house and reimbursed cash to Amy.

When I was in Ben’s car, Ben talked about his experience in helping international students. Ben worked at a three-shift job for ten years, which affected his sleeping schedule. Having retired for years, he still could not sleep in the early morning. One morning, Ben drove to the train station in M Town to see whether some students needed transportation. Some students found it expensive to take a taxi and then came to Ben. Ben drove away from the train station first because he did not want the taxi drivers to think that he was taking their business. Then Ben returned and told the students that he would not charge them anything. Ben gave them his business cards and many leaflets about M Town. The only thing Ben asked them to do was to “like” his community page on Facebook. By the time Ben was telling this story, he had not received the “like” yet. Ben asked people for whom he provided free transportation to “like” this page and most of them did not do it. Their FB community page provides much needed local information and help. The students said “Thank you” but did not follow through with “liking” their FB page as he requested. Ben said, “It’s 3 or 5 dollars gas. They are not like you and I. We are friends. But it’s fine.” Ben was frustrated about this situation.

June 25, 2014, Wednesday, “Bible study.” Amy and Ben went to their elder daughter’s house on Monday and back to M Town on Tuesday. The Bible study for this week was put off to
Wednesday. In Amy’s house, Amy was disappointed that the boys working at Palatable Food Chain did not come even though they confirmed they would come. Amy had prepared a lot of food for the students. Two new girls from Fun Waterpark showed up this time.

June 26, 2014, Thursday, “Being a guide.” Amy and Ben asked Chenxi and me to help them design a new business card. Chenxi designed the card for them, and I helped Amy download the files Chenxi sent to them online. Amy and Ben treated Chenxi and me to a dinner at a Chinese Buffet.

After dinner, we visited an apartment to look for some Chinese students, where Chinese students lived last year. Amy and Ben asked Chenxi and me to greet the students first. I knocked on the door and found out the four girls in the apartment were from Jamaica instead of China. They provided information about the location of the Chinese girls’ house. Amy and Ben gave the Jamaican girls some leaflets about M Town, and then we drove to the Chinese girls’ place. In the car, I saw two girls eating ice cream while walking toward their house. I got out of the car first and greeted them warmly. One of them first thought I knew them. I introduced myself to them and talked about why I was there. Then I took them to meet Amy and Ben. We all talked for a while. Before we left, Amy asked the girls to leave contact information and took a picture of the two girls, Chenxi and me.

I told Amy that I worried that they had too many students to take care of. She said that God helped her to know who would stay. She told me that many students they helped did not contact them later. As for why she took care of Asian students, Amy said that she already knew about their culture and how to cook the foods they liked. It was better for them to specialize in one group.
During the interview with Jiabi, I asked whether she considered helping students from other countries. Jiabi said that there were too many Chinese students to take care of all of them. She would also have cultural gaps and language barriers to take care of students from other countries. She defined Chinese, not by country, but by language. She also helped Chinese Malaysians who can speak Chinese.

**July, 2014, “Involvement of Middle Church.”** In 2014, a local church, Middle Church, organized a friendship family program with YY Agency for the J-1 students. Jiabi did not know whether the church or the agent initiated this program. But she guessed it was the church because YY Agency had been engaged in the J-1 program in M Town for many years and had not done such a thing before. Jiabi attended the friendship family program meeting with host families and YY Agency representatives. YY Agency first thought it was good enough to have about twenty host families. It turned out more than fifty families were willing to join the program and pair with the students.

In the past years, many students had to ride a bike to the Amazing Park to work, and it was very unsafe. People in the Middle Church saw that and reported to the Amazing Park. At the end of August and in the early September in 2013, the park provided bus transportation for the student employees at night after the public transportation was not available. Jiabi thought it was a good interaction. She thought it was necessary to have a channel to report problems to the employers, otherwise there would be no way to correct the employers’ wrongdoings.

Lifu, a Chinese boy, participated in the friendship family program. There were not friendship families when he first came. Later on, Lifu got an email that he could find a friendship family from the agency. Lifu joined the program and had contact with his friendship family once or twice a week. The family took him to their house, asked him to go to church, and offered to
provide transportation for him to places where the public buses did not go. Lifu thought his friendship family were extremely nice and regarded the friendship program a good program.

**July 4, 2014, Friday, “Watching fireworks.”** Today was Independence Day and there were fireworks in M Town. Amazing Park provided their annual fireworks display. Amy and Ben took me and other students to Amazing Park to watch the fireworks. A lot of people were there, and the traffic was terrible on the way back. It took one hour to move about a few miles. Amy and Ben decided not to come to Amazing Park for the fireworks the next year.

**July 6, 2014, Sunday, “Trip to church in Middle City.”** Yesterday, Jiabi drove me to Middle City, the biggest city near M Town. I stayed overnight in an apartment owned by a church. On Sunday, I went to the church to attend the monthly Jubilee, a big gathering of both Chinese and American Christians. I met a girl mentioned by Ben before, whose personality was similar to me according to him. After singing songs, reading Scripture, and worshiping, the Chinese Christians had a potluck. The Chinese dishes looked awesome.

Amy and Ben planned to take four girls to the Chinese grocery stores in Middle City and tour around. They came by the church to greet me and Jiabi. Jiabi asked all of them to stay and have lunch together at the potluck. We chatted during lunch.

**July 8, 2014, Tuesday, “Big Bible study group.”** Jiabi drove her car to help pick up four students for the Bible study. Fifteen people attended the Bible study and it was noisy. Amy told me that some students came to her house not for Bible study but for chatting. She asked me to help edit an information sheet for J-1 students. I found it easy to achieve what she wanted. She was grateful for my help.

**July 22, 2014, Tuesday, “Bible study.”** To secure the quality of Bible study, Amy tried to limit the number of students who attended. She told Zhigui not to bring new friends. However,
Zhigui still brought a 14-year-old boy, the son of Xinping who owned Delicious Restaurant. The boy grew up in China and immigrated to the United States later. He could speak Chinese but could not write Chinese characters. His English was not as good as native speakers. Zhigui and the boy brought donuts and spring rolls for the Bible study. Zhigui told me that Xinping wanted his son to be more outgoing and participate in more activities. Because of this, Amy was glad to make room in the study for Xinping’s son. After the Bible study, Ben gave out a lot of travel brochures because students were now planning their US travels. Jiabi helped drive the girls working at OOO Inn home because Ben’s car was in the driving school.

**July 29, 2014, Tuesday, “Sharing during Bible study.”** In Ben and Amy’s house, Dongdong was very unhappy and complained about her boss. Dongdong and the other two girls working at OOO Inn asked for two days off next week to visit Chicago. Their boss agreed but gave them a mean face. Dongdong also complained that their boss always asked them to work faster. If they finished their job too fast, they would not have enough work hours. They only worked for five hours each day these two days.

**August 12, 2014, Tuesday, “Watching movies.”** Yesterday night, I took two plates of Orange Chicken home from my workplace. After Best Food Chain closed for the day, the leftovers would be thrown out. I decided to take some leftovers home and give them to Amy and Ben. Ben drove to my place and picked them up for the movie night on Tuesday. Instead of organizing a Bible study, Amy decided to play a movie for the students. I did not attend the movie night.

Amy and Ben played movies several times at their home. They recommended Joy Luck Club and God’s Not Dead to me and I watched them by myself later on. Joy Luck Club was based on Amy Tan’s family novel about four Chinese mothers who immigrated to the United
States and their American-born daughters. God’s Not Dead narrated how a Christian freshman converted an atheist philosophy professor into Christian through lots of efforts.

**August 15, 2014, Friday, “Attending a concert.”** Today was my last day of work. Amy and Ben would take many students to a concert held downtown tonight. I did not plan to attend the concert because I was scheduled to work tonight. I had worked for forty hours this week, so I would have overtime pay if I continued to work tonight. However, when I went to Best Food Chain and my manager found that I had already worked so many hours, she asked me to go home. Even though I could not get the overtime pay if I left, I decided to attend the concert because I missed my friends and wanted to say goodbye to OOO Inn girls.

At the concert, I met three students who worked at Palatable Food Chain. One of them asked me which majors in the United States had greater employment potentials. I told her that I did not know. She was about to graduate from her English major. She then needed to study in Hong Kong, which would cost a lot of money. Because she needed to spend so much money, she would rather come to study in the United States.

**October, 2014, “Reunion in China and Malaysia.”** Amy and Ben missed their Chinese friends and traveled to mainland China, Taiwan, and Malaysia to get together with them in October.

**Analysis**

Amy, Ben, Jiabi, and Middle Church not only provided service for the international students, but also exposed them to Christianity and American culture. Amy, Ben, and Jiabi utilized resources they had accumulated over the years and personal relationships to reach out to the international students. Here is a summary of the strategies they had used: (1) picking up international students at the train station; (2) putting up business cards at bus stops; (3)
contacting employers who knew about Amy and Ben’s voluntary work and asking the employers to pass information to international students; (4) calling or visiting apartments where former international students lived; (5) contacting foreign agencies to ask them to pass information to international students; and (6) spreading information through students who had already known Amy, Ben and Jiabi. Middle Church reached out to the international students through collaboration with YY Sponsor.

Amy, Ben and Jiabi maintained contact with the international students through many kinds of communication channels: (1) cellphone; (2) Facebook; (3) WeChat; and (4) QQ, a popular Chinese instant message app. They organized many kinds of activities and offered a lot of help to the international students, such as (1) organizing Bible studies, the most important activity; (2) organizing clothes and grocery shopping trips in town and out of town; (3) providing entertainment opportunities—swimming, concert, movies, eating outside and others; (4) providing free things such as hangers, bags, suitcases, plugs, and others; (5) providing things at a cheap price or collecting a deposit, such as cellphones and bikes; and (6) providing information and service regarding opening bank accounts, booking tickets, ordering online, traveling and others. Once, Ben also helped some European boys working on an island with their visas and social security cards. When they entered the United States, the U.S. customs staff members put wrong countries of origin on their documents, and therefore they could not get their social security cards. Their English was limited, and their employers did not take care of them. Ben called immigration offices on behalf of them to solve the issue.

The international students received practical assistance from Amy, Ben and Jiabi and knew more about Bible and Christianity. They made friends with each other in the gatherings, shared their happiness, concerns and complaints with each other, and rewarded Amy, Ben and
Jiabi with gifts and friendships. Some students changed their views about the Christian religion. One Chinese student decided to be baptized, and one Chinese Malaysian Buddhist was considering abandoning Buddhism for Christianity.

Missionaries, voluntarily serving for immigrants, have a long history around the world. In Bryan’s (2004) study of the Chinese settlement in Jamaica from 1854 to 1970, he found that missionaries played an important role in bringing Chinese into Christianity. Bryan stated that the Chinese community was more prone to accept Christian teaching away from their homeland. The clergy offered practical assistance on legal matters to new immigrants who lacked proficiency in English.
CHAPTER ELEVEN. A PERSONAL JOURNEY

This chapter will document my own experiences in the research field with foci on organizational tensions and interpersonal racism.

Diaries in the Research Field

I worked at Best Food Chain restaurant located in Amazing Park. I started working on May 21st and quit on August 19th. The restaurant consists of two parts: front of the house and back of the house. I was a front of house associate. My job was to run the cash register as well as take care of the dining room when I had spare time during work.

My work hours varied across time. I worked for about 16 hours per week when I started and worked for about 40 hours per week in the final week. The fewest hours I had for a week was 12 hours. I usually worked from 12 p.m. to 4 p.m. and had one or two days off each week.

May 21, 2014, “First day of work.” I greeted customers with a smile when I sold food at the steam table. But I did not have any feelings at all. I did not think that I was happy when I smiled at that moment. When customers were gone, I put away my smile. I did not look forward to many customers. I would be very busy when there were too many customers, but too few customers was not good, either. Having nothing to do would make me feel bored. When there was nobody, I would sit on the manager’s chair for a while. I did not want the manager to see me sitting there, so I just sat for a short while.

I burned my finger when I touched the hot trays. It reminded me of what a coworker told me yesterday. She said that I would get used to burning my fingers.

In the afternoon, my stomach was upset because I did not digest well. I clocked at 5:30 p.m. to take my one-hour break so that I could avoid the rush hour. I took some food and walked back to my dorm. I took off the apron, shoes, and laid on the bed. I felt so tired and dizzy. I did
not fall asleep. But the 15-minute break refreshed me. I got up and ate a little bit and headed back to work.

During sleep at night, I had several dreams. I remembered that when I fell asleep and woke up, my dreams were related to work or documenting work.

**May 24, 2014, “Cleaning.”** I kept walking in and out, getting trays and sending them back to the steam line. My wrist was not as sore as when I stood in the steam line. Most of the time, I just stood in the closet by myself. For wiping trays, I hated fortune cookies, sauce, orange chicken and birds. They all made the trays hard to wipe clean. There was no seat and no table in the closet for me to wipe the trays. Sometimes, I squatted and wiped the trays on the floor. I said to myself, “Why don’t you make arrangement for me since you need me to do this job every day?”

Today was less busy than last time. I felt bored just wiping and wiping plates. I wanted to do something else. But wiping plates was the easiest job. I did not need to talk to people and did not need to focus. I could think whatever I wanted. I could control my speed, while selling food and checking out depended on the flow of customers.

**May 26, 2014, “Tearing eyes and boredom.”** At about 3 p.m., my eyes felt uncomfortable. At about 3:30 p.m., my eyes really hurt and burst out tears. I sat on a chair and had a rest. I wanted to have a break at that time, but my break time was 4:30 p.m. I saw my manager there and gave up the idea of taking an early break. Fortunately, it was not busy at that time. After taking some rest, I felt better. Then I wiped trays with my eyes closed. In three consecutive days, my eyes hurt during work.

Having cleaned the dining room for several days, I felt very bored because I did not have a chance to speak during work. I thought that cleaning the dining room was the easiest job and
doubted that the manager put me in this position because my English was not good enough to 
communication with customers. I did not want to just wipe trays every day. I did not feel that I 
realized my value.

**June 5, 2014, “Running a cash register.”** This morning, I told my manager that I would 
like to learn to run a cash register. At noon, she asked me to learn from a cashier, Xixi. I stood 
there and watched for one hour. When it was very busy at 1 p.m., the manager asked whether I 
could do it on my own. I said yes. When I just started to run a register, I was very nervous, and 
my body was shaking. I did not greet customers as suggested because I was concentrating on the 
cash and being fast. I got better later on. I had one dollar more than the reported amount of 
money at the end of the day, after I returned 50 USD to another cashier who forgot the bill in the 
register.

**June 18, 2014, “Cooking.”** I had told my managers and coworkers that I would like to 
learn to cook. In the afternoon, a cook asked me to come over to his area and taught me to cook 
orange chicken. Later, the assistant manager came and asked me to go back to my own position 
when I was done. The cook offered to take care of the dining room for me for a while. When he 
was cleaning the dining room, I cooked two bowls of orange chicken. I felt good that I learned 
new things.

I was not as fortunate the next time. On another day, when there was no customer, I went 
to see how a coworker cooked chow mein. He was ready to teach me. However, the assistant 
manager came soon and asked me to go back to cleaning the dining room. She said that I was 
scheduled to cook but not today. I did not learn to cook that day. In the second half of the 
summer, many front of house associates were fired or quit their jobs. The manager had enough 
cooks and needed me on the register. Therefore, I never worked as a cook.
June 22, 2014, “Entertainment.” I went to the associate recreation center with Lianghui and Chenxi. We played table tennis first and badminton next. Chenxi said to me, “You have cells for sports.” (你好有运动细胞。) When I was playing, she was tired and sitting on the ground. She said, “I am very happy. I am not happy at work even though I feel relaxed. I am happy when playing badminton even though I feel tired.” (我很快乐。我上班很轻松，但我不开心。我打球很累，但我很开心。)

I sometimes went to the recreation center with a coworker to play pool, table tennis, chess and Catan, a board game. I felt very relaxed and happy during exercise. However, this did not last long as I had more and more work hours later and contributed more time to conducting interviews.

July 1, 2014, “Short of money.” I had a nap before going to work so that I would not feel very sleepy during work. After I clocked in, the assistant manager said that she would show me something. When she was looking for an email, I thought that my drawer was short yesterday. What surprised me was that my cash bag was 98 USD short. I totally did not understand. She said she did not understand either. I told her that I did not make any mistake so that I did not count my money after I unassigned the drawer. There was no way that I could verify whether I was short. She just asked me to be cautious and always count my money. She said my drawer was always pretty good. I thanked her for being so nice. I had seen that the manager shouted at other cashiers in front of other coworkers when they were short of money.

Before I left, I asked the assistant manager why the cashiers did not get paid for counting money. The cashiers were required to clock out before counting money at that time. She said this was Best Food Chain’s policy and that she was not the one who made this decision. Later after several incidences of being short of money, counting drawers became mandatory and paid.
However, the cashiers were never paid for the time to send our cash bags to the cash control, which took 15 extra minutes. Only after I quit my job, I knew from Beth that it was the manager who was supposed to take all the cash bags to the cash control every day.

I did not think that other people came to my drawer and stole money yesterday. The only thing that might have happened was that I dropped the money on the floor and someone else picked it up and did not hand it over to me.

I was unhappy and thinking about this issue the whole afternoon. At night, I went to Amy and Ben’s house for the Bible study. Xiayin noticed that I was upset. After learning Ten Commandments, I told Amy about what happened to me. I guessed that I dropped off the money on the ground. She did not think so. She was suspicious of the situation when she heard that my manager was nice to me. She thought it must be someone’s theft. One of her daughter’s friends was going through the same issue.

**July 19, 2014, “Trip to Amish communities.”** Yesterday night, I left M Town and came to a suburb where local Chinese Christians gathered. My right wrist hurt during the whole night. This morning, I found it slanted and was worried. A Chinese Christian said that he would consult doctors in the group. In the morning, I went to Amish communities with my Christian friends. We had lunch in a buffet serving organic food. I had a buggy ride and talked to the Amish girl who drove the buggy. After I went back to the Christian center, I found my wrist better. Jiabi told me that she could take me to see a doctor. I did not want to bother her or waste my Sunday when I could do homework and conduct interviews.

**August 1, 2014, “American vs. Chinese.”** My manager made egg, sausage, bacon, cake, and potatoes today. She saw Xixi put syrup instead of cream on the cake and said it was not American. I told her that the potatoes tasted like Chinese food. Another time, my manager saw
me writing down numbers in a notebook while counting and said it was too Chinese. She did not want me to use any notebook and did not listen to my explanation.

Even though my coworkers knew I was Chinese, one coworker asked me several times what some Japanese words meant. She confused the Chinese language and the Japanese language. Another coworker asked Xixi an old-fashioned question that whether China had Nike, which reflects the stereotypes of underdeveloped China in her mind.

August 4, 2014, “No free water.” Today, the area manager told my direct manager that we no longer offered free water. My manager put the tray of water cups into the closet. I knew this decision would make my life even harder. I posted on a social networking site:

Had a tough day. Today I was told that we no longer offer free water. Medium soft drink, 4.28 dollars (after tax), no refill. Smart water 5.60 (after tax). Sigh~ I’m not the one who made this decision or earns the money, but the one who listens to complaints, sees the angry face, and explains once and again.

August 7, 2014, “Witness friendship.” Carolyn, a coworker of mine, and I were walking together. We met another coworker Perry. Perry gave Carolyn a hug. I asked why she gave this hug. Carolyn said that she bought Diana, another coworker, a smart phone last night. Carolyn said that Diana was a hardworking person, and said to her, “You deserve a gift.” Carolyn would not give Diana a simple phone as Carolyn would buy herself a good smart phone if needed. Therefore, Carolyn would also buy Diana a good phone. I did not ask about the price of the phone. It was a Verizon smart phone.

August 18, 2014, “Hearing complaints.” At the bus stop, I met Dongxue and her friend who worked at Amazing Park. They complained to me and consented to have me report their complaints in my thesis.
Dongxue’s friend made the following statement:

I feel they don’t treat us as humans. Once I went to work at 12 p.m., my supervisor asked me to wait and see whether I need to work today. I waited till 1 p.m. and then was told to start working. During work, I was told to take a one-hour break. I lost two hours. When it was busy, I only had a half-hour break in one day. (我觉得他们不把我们当人看。有一次我十二点去上班，supervisor 让我等看需不需要我工作，我等到一点钟才告诉我让我上班，上班之后还让我休息了一个小时。我两个小时就没有了。忙的时候一天只有半个小时休息。)

Dongxue added to her friend’s account:

I felt that (they) have us at their disposal. My work hours are not enough. My supervisor said that (an employee) must take a half-hour break every two to six hours and a one-hour break every eight hour during work. It is forcing you to take one to two hours break. (感觉像呼之即来挥之即去。我的时间本来不够，supervisor 还说每工作两到六个小时必须休息半个小时，工作到八个小时必须休息一个小时。就是强迫你休息一到两个小时。)

Dongxue’s friend replied, “We were also told about that. But it completely depends on him. When there are a few customers, (he) will ask you to take a break. When there are many customers, (he) won’t let you take a break.” (我们也有说，但完全他说了算。人少就让你休息，人多就不让你休息。)

Dongxue and her friend also talked about being sent home. One day, Amazing Park closed one gate earlier than scheduled. Dongxue was unhappy about that. She said, “Amazing Park should be nicer to the employees. Since they come to work, it should give them work. It
should not close early and send them home. I hate being sent home.” (应该对员工好一点，既然要他们来工作，就应该给他们工作，不应该早关门让他们早回家。我很讨厌被送回家。)

**Analysis**

My personal work experience revealed tensions and cooperation in the organization. Wrench and Punyanunt-Carter (2012) posited ten dialectical tensions between what the organizations want and what the workers want in organizations as follows: (1) what the organization needs/want vs. what workers need/want; (2) minimize costs vs. maximize salary/benefit package; (3) systemization of job duties vs. autonomy to do one’s job; (4) ability to streamline the organization vs. job stability; (5) agreement vs. dissent; (6) transparency vs. privacy; (7) conventionality vs. innovation; (8) organization-focused vs. self-focused; (9) permanence vs. change; (10) rights of the organization vs. rights of the individual; and (10) work life vs. social life.

**Dialectical tensions.** The tensions I felt during my work included minimize costs vs. maximize salary/benefits, systemization vs. autonomy, conventionality vs. innovation, and transparency vs. privacy, and rights of the organization vs. rights of the individual.

(1) Minimize costs vs. maximize salary/benefits. My manager tried to minimize costs by scheduling fewer workers on slow days, or sending people home earlier when the business got slow because of bad weather. When I began to work as a cashier, I was not paid to count my drawer. Later after several incidences of shorting money, counting drawers became mandatory and was paid. However, the cashiers still did not get paid for the time to send cash bags to the cash control, which took 15 extra minutes very time.
(2) Systemization vs. autonomy and conventionality vs. innovation. Systemization was not obvious in the front of house because selling food, checking customers out, and cleaning the dining room did not require many skills. However, in the back of the house, cutting vegetables, making sauce, and cooking food had very specific procedures. The workers in the back of the house had to follow the detailed instructions. One cook did not feel a sense of achievement because he just followed the procedures and could not make a recipe on his own. Another cook added water into chow mein to make it easier to separate but this was prohibited.

(3). Transparency vs. privacy and rights of the organization vs. rights of the Individual. There were several cameras in the dining room and one camera in the back of house but no camera in the closet. Best Food Chain restaurant wanted to put every employee’s behavior under supervision, especially cashiers’. Many front of house associates always carried cellphones with them and checked their phone sneakily beside their pockets or in the closet. According to our associate handbook, we needed to be cautious when sharing information about Best Food Chain and were not allowed to represent Best Food Chain. From an individual’s standpoint, work is part of life and we should have the rights to share what we do and how we feel.

Racism. My personal experiences also resonated with the literature on racism against Asian Americans. Jun (2012) identified six themes of racial discriminatory messages against Asian Americans. One of them was “Asian Americans are all the same,” in terms of their physical looks, nationality, culture and preference. Jun provided one narrative offered by a Chinese woman as follows, which echoed with my experience in being asked about the Japanese language.

A Caucasian woman, a stranger, walked up to me, smiled, and said “Konichiwa!” I said, “... I’m not Japanese.” She told me “It means ‘Hello!’ in Japanese.” I said “... I know. I’m
Chinese. Good bye.” It was really awkward on my part and confusing ... Perhaps the lady was trying to be outgoing ...Whatever her reasons, though, it was almost humiliating to first be addressed in a language believed to be mine, and then, when I professed to not being of the race she thought I was, to be then “educated” by this stranger?

Sue et al. (2007) identified the theme of “invalidation of interethnic differences” and “pathologizing values/communications styles” in the study of microaggressions against Asian Americans. Confusing Asian Americans from different nations and cultural backgrounds suggested racial insensitivity. Pathologizing values/communications styles meant that values and/or communication styles of people of color were abnormal. Sue et al. gave an example of a Vietnamese American male who was teased by friends for using chopsticks as a utensil. He stated that eating with forks, knives, and spoons is the right/correct way to eat and “the American way.” The Vietnamese American’s experience echoed with my Chinese coworker’s way of eating and my way of counting being invalidated.
CHAPTER TWELVE. NOT A GOODBYE

This is a story of girl who died in 2013 in a car accident in M Town, which had been told by Ben and Amy many times to students who came in 2014.

Ben, Amy, and Jiabi met Yiyi in the summer of 2013. Yiyi was from China and worked at Fun Waterpark. She had been to their home numerous times over the summer, enjoying swimming, shopping, dinners and other activities. She had attended one or two Bible studies.

In September, on Yiyi’s last night in M Town, she was planning to go to an American friend’s home to say “good-bye.” The friend’s father offered her a ride on the back of his motorcycle. A few blocks from her apartment, a car made a left turn in front of the motorcycle. Yiyi was thrown 50 feet into the air and landed on the roadway. She was in critical shape and was not conscious.

The police officer notified her roommates, who in turn called Ben and Amy. Ben and Amy then called Jiabi to meet them at the apartment where Yiyi lived. They were informed that the situation was very grave and that they should head to the trauma hospital in Middle City if they wanted to see Yiyi.

Jiabi was able to talk in Chinese to the gathered friends of Yiyi. She found one who was able to make a telephone call to Yiyi’s parents. However, the mother decided that it was a prank call and hung up the phone. They were not able to make contact with her immediate family after that. An uncle was tracked down so a call was placed to him. He became the go-between for contacting Yiyi’s family.

Ben, Amy, and Jiabi went to the hospital that night. Yiyi was still in surgery. They waited for over an hour and were told that the surgeons were not able to stop the extent of the
internal bleeding. Yiyi died shortly thereafter. They were able to go to see Yiyi and be near her to offer their prayers and presence.

When Yiyi’s father, uncle, and cousin came a few weeks later to claim Yiyi’s body, they were much comforted in the fact that Yiyi was not alone at the hospital. Ben, Amy, and Jiabi were able to provide much love and comfort to the family.

Yiyi’s father had not seen her in the last two years as his job kept him out at sea. He was extremely depressed. Jiabi was able to locate a Christian Chinese man who spoke his dialect. This man shared Christ’s love and offered to pray with Yiyi’s father. The father was completely transformed and hopeful after this experience.

Amy, Ben and Jiabi became representatives for Yiyi’s family in the lawsuit. The case had not been closed by the time of the interview. They were still keeping in touch with a lawyer about the case.

Amy and Ben had an album of Yiyi’s photos and showed it to new students who visited their house. Even though Yiyi had left the world, she still lived in people’s memories.

In September 2014, a girl from last year told Ben that her friend, a J-1 student, died from a car crash in Alaska recently. Sweat, injuries, tears, and death came along with excitement, joys, and happiness in the experiences of the international students. The stories would die away if not being documented or told. This chapter is in memory of Yiyi as well as thousands of J-1 students who come and go every year unnoticed.
CHAPTER THIRTEEN. REFLEXIVITY AND LIMITATIONS

Not only what we study, but also how we study it matters in research. Reflexivity, the “capacity we all have to be constantly aware of ourselves as acting in the process of acting” (Tomlinson, 1999, p. 25), has been an increasingly important consideration in qualitative research. It is a “concept and methodological strategy dwelling at the heart of autoethnography and cultural critique (Berry & Clair, 2011)” (Berry, 2013, p. 211).

Reflexivity enables the researcher to be aware of what is outside of awareness, such as mainstream oppression and our own positionality, limitations, and biases. Auerbach and Silverstein (2003) claimed that “accepting the responsibility for examining oneself increases the probability that the research process will not be exploitative or oppressive for the participants” (p. 126). The goal of reflexivity is to advocate “social reform, often by uncovering power imbalances and cultural oppression,” and to build “more inclusive spaces and movement for all cultural bodies” (Berry, 2013, p. 214). So in conducting this research, I have been reflecting on my own standpoint and biases, even though the reflexive process is “complex, knotty, and uncomfortable” (Berry, 2013, p. 211-212).

In addition to interrogating power relations and promoting diversity and equality in research, reflexivity can also open space for methodological considerations and enhancements. Through analyzing a single interview on intercultural contribution to workplace practice, Holliday (2012) posited that the researcher’s participation— introduction, guidance, moderating— made a considerable contribution to digging deep and at the same time preserved space for autonomous emergence of the unexpected. By reflecting on their field roles in studying care workers, Jansson and Nikolaidou (2013) revealed how they unconsciously adjusted their
identities to their research participants’ multi-layered identities as a strategy to be accepted by the participants and to understand them better.

**Reflexivity**

In what follows, I will reflect on the ways in which I implemented the research methods and made accommodations in different situations.

**Evolution of the project.** When I initiated this thesis project, I searched literature on student worker, part-time work and summer employment. I found scholarly debates over the impact of part-time/term work on domestic students and a call for qualitative research. After entering the field, I found the literature was not pertinent to the phenomenon because summer employment was quite different from term employment. I let the data rather than literature guide my project. I intended to investigate the experiences of both the international students and the domestic students. I shifted my focus to international students, as a result of the limitation of time. When studying the Italian immigrant communities, Whyte (1981) did not know what his focus should be until he had stayed in the field for eighteen months. For an ethnographic project, field experience is essential for the establishment and shift of research focus.

**Researcher’s roles.** I had multiples roles in the field, that is, a person, a worker and a researcher. These three roles were both complementary and contradictory. As for complement, the role of a worker gave me the opportunity to be a researcher, and being a good worker and researcher strengthened my self-affirmation. With regard to contradiction, the major conflict is about time. As an ordinary person, I wanted to hang out with my friends after work and have fun, but most of the time, I had to stay in my dorm, writing my fieldnotes or conducting interviews. As a person, I needed afternoon naps which I had been doing for twenty years, but as a worker, I had to obey my time schedule and work in the afternoon. I went to the recreation center almost
every day for about two weeks. I really enjoyed that period of time, but I had to give it up because I had more work hours and also needed more time to search for information about PhD programs as well as doing research. This time conflict had been accompanying me in the field most of the time. Sometimes, I was so overwhelmed that I did not write fieldnotes for about one week, and had to make up for it when I had spare time. As doing my research was my priority, and I also needed to work to maintain my job and earn money, I suppressed my personal need for fun.

**Subjectivity.** The majority of the international workers I met held a J-1 Cultural Exchange Program Visa while I held an F-1 student visa. My friends were curious about my experiences. They asked me for information about shopping, dining, and applying for jobs. A Chinese girl even asked me to show her my school ID. People proactively came to me and chat with me, which enriched my autoethnography notes.

I was deeply aware of the impact of my own identity on the research. My gender, race, age, national origin, and other identity markers affected how I was perceived and treated by others and how I perceived myself. I was one of the two Chinese employees in Best Food Chain, which was a Chinese fast food restaurant and mainly employed Americans. I felt a bit frustrated that one coworker asked me several times what some Japanese words meant. She confused the Chinese language and the Japanese language. I was also unwilling to engage in conversations when my coworkers told sex jokes or asked me to teach them to curse in Chinese. An interview participant, Meiting, told me during the interview that she admired that I could study in the United States and she might do so in the future. Zhigui, a Chinese student, described Chinese students’ resentment toward Jamaican students and told me the derogatory terms Chinese
students used to refer to Jamaicans. If I were not a Chinese, I doubt whether Zhigui would still disclose this much information about racial conflicts.

I played a part in rapport building and the recruitment process. In one Bible study in July, when the students in Amy and Ben’s house were eating cake and ice cream, I explained a little bit about my research and passed around my recruitment notices. I asked them to contact me if they were interested. Obviously, students who were familiar with me were more interested in talking to me.

I, as an interviewer, controlled the progress of the interview. For example, Amy cried when she talked about Yiyi’s death. I felt sad and almost cried, but I did not want to cry because I had to control the interview. At that time, the interview could stop because I finished my questions, but I did not want it to stop at one point when the interviewee was sad. Therefore, I asked more questions to make her feel normal.

I acknowledge the subjectivity of this research, and I collaborated with the participants in making this project. My identity and activities influenced on who would talk to me, what they would tell me, and how they would share their stories.

**Linguistic advantages and disadvantages.** I regard being able to conduct interviews in both Chinese and English as my linguistic advantage. Some participants only spoke English. Some participants were fluent in both English and Chinese. Some participants’ English was very limited. Being able to speak Chinese provided me with the opportunity to explore the lived experiences of Chinese students who could speak little English. In a similar vein, not being able to speak other languages is my linguistic disadvantage. I made friends with a female Polish student whose English was limited. I had difficulty in understanding her and making her
understand me. Therefore, I would have faced linguistic barriers if I intended to interview people who were fluent in neither English nor Chinese.

**Recruitment methods.** I recruited participants mainly based on my personal relationships. The advantage is that I had established a rapport with the participant, which is important to self-disclosure during the interview. The disadvantage is that my sample was constrained within my personal relationships and that the conclusions were less transferable. To counter the above negative effect, I employed purposive sampling method to achieve variations in gender, age, ethnicity, nationality, job positions, and linguistic abilities. The purposive sampling method turned out to be a wise choice as students from different classes and in different job positions provided distinguishable perceptions of their experiences in the Summer Work Travel Program.

**Locations and channels.** The interview channels and locations could affect the quality of the interviews. In the four interviews conducted in the public restaurants, workers or customers occasionally interrupted my conversations with the participants. The background noise also affected the quality of recordings. Conducting interviews in public settings, especially where participants work, could make participants more reticent to openly reveal negative information. For example, a participant told me a negative point about her supervisor in her car after we left her workplace where we had the interview.

Unexpected incidents may also interrupt interviews in private space such as a dorm or an apartment. To give an example, during the interview with Meiting, a few repairmen went in the apartment twice to examine the bathroom and living room. Since the interview was interrupted; I was hungry; and Meiting and her roommates had not had breakfast yet, I decided to have lunch with them first and resume the interview later.
In all three online interviews, I experienced Internet interruptions several times. They not only wasted the participants’ time and my time, but also affected our mood. Face-to-face interviews and online video interviews enabled me to observe the participants’ nonverbal behaviors, offered me a sense of trust from them, and provided me with more opportunities to interact with them. I conducted audio interviews with two participants whom I had not met by the time of the interviews. The participants requested audio talk as they felt more comfortable doing so. I also felt more comfortable to chat with strangers via audio equipment than via video equipment. Audio interviews were more appropriate when the researcher had not met the participants.

**Disturbance.** The activities the participants engaged in also had an impact on the interview process. For example, Yihua cooked rice using a small pan when we started the interview. He walked away to check whether the rice was ready about three times during the conversation. He needed to cook it at that time because his roommate would come back at noon to use the utensils. Yihua shared the utensils with his roommate.

The digital device I used in the interviews may also have negative influence. When the interview with Amy just started, Amy was nervous, bent over the desk, and spoke to my laptop, which was recording. She spoke formally and did not look at me. I wanted to relax her and make her talk to me. As the interview went on, she relaxed herself, sat straight but leaned slightly on the desk, and looked at me.

**Asking questions in the right way.** The way a question is formatted has an impact on how the participant interprets and responds to the question. Therefore, a researcher should be very careful in wording the interview questions. Patton (2002) gave an example of taking care asking “why?” If the researcher asked “Why did you join the program?” the participants could
respond at any or all of the following levels: programmatic reason, personality reason, information reason, social influence reason, economic reason, outcomes reason, personal motivation reason, and philosophical reason. Patton (2002) suggested the interviewer decide which of these levels is most important to the research and format questions in more specified ways, such as “What was it about the program that attracted you to it?” and “Other people sometimes influence what we do. What other people, if any, played a role in your joining this program?” (p. 364). As this project is exploratory, I intended to understand the phenomenon from a holist perspective, and investigate all the factors leading the international students to join this Summer Work Travel Program. I avoided the vague question of “Why did you the program?” by asking the participants to describe the procedures from knowing the program to becoming part of the program. However, I made another mistake illustrated by Patton (2002). He noted,

> When used as a probe, “Why” questions can imply that a person’s response was somehow inappropriate. “Why did you do that?” may sound like doubt that an action (or feeling) was justified. A simple “Tell me more, if you will, about your thinking on that” may be more inviting. (p. 364).

During the interview with Qiuyue, I was excited to know more about her experiences and used “Why?” as immediate responses to her accounts. The first time Qiuyue heard the “Why?” she asked me what I meant by “Why?” I realized that a simple “Why?” question is a confusing and lazy way to approach the interview.

**Flexibility.** On August 16, I interviewed both Jiabi and Beth in the afternoon. I first thought about interviewing Zhigui between the two interviews. I was glad that I did not do so. I thought the interview with Jiabi could end by 2 p.m. But actually it lasted till 3:30 p.m.
Interviewing is labor intensive, and I also needed rest between interviews. It is always good to allow enough time between two interviews in case of special situations.

**Anonymity and confidentiality.** I changed two pseudonyms to avoid confusion as suggested my committee members: One was similar to an existing city name and the other was similar to an existing company. I also replaced a real business name with a general description to preserve anonymity. I sent and received informed consent forms to the participants via email. I thought the emails disclosed their identity. Therefore, I deleted my email correspondences with the participants, after I downloaded the informed consent forms they sent back to me. In addition, the email addresses provided by the participants on the debriefing forms may disclose identity. I have not thought up a good idea to deal with this situation. I may delete the debriefing forms and the emails after I send out the summary of this study to the participants.

**Difficulties and pain.** The research process was not always smooth or pleasant. Frustration, anxiety, and tiredness came along with the sense of fulfillment. Because of long-time transcribing on the laptop, my left thumb muscle felt painful for three days in July. As I sat in front of my laptop all day to read and type in February, my shoulders, right side of my waist, and right wrist felt very sore.

During the process of translating Chinese into English, I encountered some linguistic problems. First, the Chinese language does not have articles or the concepts of “noncount” and “count.” For example, I do not know whether the participant referred to “a towel” or “towels” when she said “maojin,” the Chinese word for “towel.” Second, the pronouns for “he/him” and “she/her” have the same pronunciation in Chinese. Sometimes, I could not specify the gender of the person referred to by the participants. I first used “he/she” when the person’s gender was not clear, but later replaced “he/she” with “that person” or “that individual” as suggested by APA
stylebook. Second, spoken Chinese often leaves out the action agent. For example, I do not know who the subject is in the sentence “Deport you.” said by a participant. Third, the Chinese language has a lot of idioms which are hard to translate into English.

Overcoming difficulties brings a sense of fulfillment. Here is a note of the interview with Andrew:

I received a short message from Andrew. He said that he would be available for a phone interview in a few minutes. All of sudden, I had to hurry up to be prepared for the interview. I took out the digital recorder, opened the total recorder, and created folders. I did not know how to present him the informed consent form. At first, I thought speaking to him briefly. Later, I had an idea. I used the QQ software on my laptop to send the consent form to the QQ app on my cellphone. I copied the messages on the QQ app on my phone and sent them to Andrew via short message. He read them for a while and consented all of them. Later after the interview was done, I still asked for his email address. I offered to check the options for him and then sent him the final version. To ensure confidentiality, I deleted the email immediately after I sent it.

I was nervous and rushed when I first received the short message from Andrew. I overcame the difficulty of sending the informed consent form by thinking up the idea of utilizing QQ and cellphones. I felt a sense of accomplishment and innovation when I solved the problem.

**Self-encouragement.** I actively sought for encouragement to counter the anxiety in the research process. For example, when I was worried about whether I could obtain the approval letter from Amazing Park, I felt very happy when I read “An important letter will be granted to you.” from a fortune cookie. When I was worried about my research proposal, I felt encouraged
when I read “A tempting proposal will present itself to you.” from another fortune cookie. I do not have a belief in fortune cookies but they did reassure me in the research process.

**Limitations**

The research process was far from perfect and satisfactory. The number of interviews I actually conducted was smaller than the number of people consenting to participate, which was smaller than the number of people I had given my recruitment notices. As aforementioned, I stopped recruiting Chinese students when I did not hear new information from the interviews. However, there was much more to know about other groups. I tried to recruit more supervisors, American students and local workers, and students from other countries. Even though that might surpass the scope of this study, interviews with them could provide directions for future research.

In what follows, I will list some of the interviews I wished I had conducted.

**June 25, 2014.** Today I was supposed to go to Amy and Ben’s house for the Bible study with a Chinese girl who was fired by Amazing Park. She was responsible for cleaning the floor in the park. Her skin was burned from exposure to the sun. She requested to change her department and then was fired. She was thinking about looking for another job in M Town, but her mother asked her to go back to China. She did not show up that night because she was packing her luggage. She flew back to China later. I tried to reach her via Facebook but failed.

**July 15, 2014.** I visited two islands where I also wanted to recruit some participants. I found that the girl who sold the ticket for golf carts on one island was from Russia. I thought about talking to her. Because of the limitation of time and my enjoyment of the trip, I completely forgot about recruiting participants. On the way back, I gave a recruitment notice to a local male student who worked on the boat. I intended to ask him to pass my recruitment notices to the international students who worked on the islands. He said that he did not know whether there
were internationals. I finally did not ask him to do this favor because I was not familiar with him, and he did not know much about the situation.

**July 31, 2014.** Ben drove me to a hotel to recruit the owner, whom Ben had contacted before. We found she was not there. I wrote a brief note to her and Ben signed it. Then we went to a Japanese restaurant to recruit its Chinese owner. He was not there, either. I asked an employee in the restaurant to pass my contact to him. Ben used a good metaphor, “We casted the hooks into the pool and waited for the fish to bite.” The two owners never contacted me.

**August 16, 2014.** Scheduling a meeting back and forth can be time-consuming. A girl consented to participate in my study but was not sure about her available time. She first told me that she could do it on Sunday afternoon or Saturday morning. Later, she said she might request extra hours on Saturday morning. She would get the final result on Saturday morning. She did get the extra hours. Later, she remembered that she needed to go to Walmart on Sunday afternoon. So I could not interview her on Sunday, either.

In addition to above four cases, I also recruited a Chinese male who was studying in Czech Republic, and a Brazil female from 2013. When studying the Black community, Goffman (2014) never felt that she had collected enough data. She left the field as the funding ran out. I had similar feelings that I wanted to know more about participants and the program. However, I had left the field when a new semester was drawing near.

This project only focused on the experiences of Chinese students, which could not be generalized to other racial groups, such as Jamaicans and Europeans. This study revealed that socio-economic status and linguistic abilities of the individuals and their nationalities had a great influence in shaping the experiences of the international students. I will further elaborate on it in the concluding chapter. Future studies could investigate experiences of other racial groups.
CHAPTER FOURTEEN. CONCLUSION

This chapter will conclude the whole manuscript by answering the research questions posited in Chapter Two and calling for actions against the abusive acts revealed by the participants.

Who Were Those International Students?

What about the program motivated them to participate in it? Even though they are under the same category of “international students” and came to the US through the same Summer Travel Work Program, they were more heterogeneous than homogeneous in race, class, national origin, and religion. Lifu, a junior, who was planning to transfer to another school in the United States and then immigrate, came to improve his English. Chunhua, a senior, who was planning to find a job in the international business industry after graduation, came to improve her English. Meiting, a junior, whose English was very limited, enrolled for the program to accompany her friend and experience American culture. Lianghui, a graduate, who had graduated and was proficient in both English and Chinese, came to experience American culture and look for job opportunities. Qiuyue, a sophomore, whose mother tongue was English, came to experience American culture and travel. Renrong, a junior, came to experiencing living independently. Chenxi, a graduate in fashion design, came to expand social networks in the fashion industry. In summary, the Chinese students I interviewed reported the following reasons for which they participated in the Summer Work Travel Program: (1) experiencing American culture; (2) traveling; (3) improving English; (4) looking for job opportunities; (5) accompanying friends; (6) expanding personal social networks; and (7) gaining independence. Other goals reported by other Chinese students and students from other countries included visiting friends and making money.
How Did the Chinese Students Know About the Program?

Program promotion at their own universities by agencies and school officials was the main channel through which the participants knew about the program. For example, Qiuyue knew about the program through program promotion by an agency. Some officials in Zhigui’s university recommended Zhigui to participate in the program and offered him some funding. Personal relationships and word-of-mouth communication also played a role in disseminating program information. Xiayin heard about the program from her friends and became interested in it. Employers may also go to source countries to recruit participants. Before I left the field, the recruitment team at Amazing Park was preparing trips to Europe to recruit participants for the next year.

What Were the Themes in the Chinese Students’ Experiences?

Five major themes identified from the data are racialization, racism, internalized racism, personal transformation, and religious assimilation. The Chinese students came to the United States and experienced the complex racial landscape in the US. They had encounters with other races and ethnicities and imposed meanings on different groups, witnessed racism of White people against Black people, and experienced discrimination and prejudice against themselves. The experiences in the United States changed their perceptions of the United States and themselves, and their behaviors in different ways. The students came with the image of the United States as “a world power,” “openness,” “freedom,” and “individualism.” Some students were surprised when they knew about the high rate of unemployment in Detroit or when they found that American coworkers did not have a college degree. Some students had the idea of seeking jobs or higher education in the United States after this program. One student confirmed the inferiority and lack of civility of people in his own country and the superiority and civility of
people in the United States, even though he witnessed racism and poor behaviors of some American customers. Not every host employer or sponsor organized cross-cultural activities for the participants. Christian missionaries and local churches played an important role in engaging the international students with cross-cultural activities and providing them with practical assistance.

**What Lessons Can Be Learned From This Project?**

This project offers many insights into the Summer Work Travel Program that I have shown through storytelling. It can also enlighten us about racism, intersectionality and globalization. First, this project finds that racism is still pervasive, either in overt or covert forms, countering the statement that America is in a post-racial era. Structural, interpersonal and intrapersonal discrimination and prejudice are relevant in international students’ experiences. This phenomenon calls for efforts from all aspects of society to eliminate discrimination and prejudice.

Second, this study demonstrates that race intersects with class, linguistic abilities, as well as job positions in shaping the international students’ experience. Students came to the United States with different motivations and prior experience, partly determined by their socio-economic status. Students from well-off backgrounds emphasized cultural exchange and cared less about wages. They were less likely to have prior work experience in the entry-level service industry, and more easily to get tired when doing physical work. They were more proficient in English, encountered fewer or no language barriers in the US, and had a higher chance to be placed in job positions that required verbal communication in English. In addition, they were more likely to point out discrimination and prejudice. On the contrary, students from lower-income backgrounds cared more about wages and wanted more work hours. They were more
likely to have prior work experience and were less proficient in English. That being said, I am not suggesting that there are only two groups of students divided by class because class is a continuum, not a dichotomous attribute. The job positions and locations also had impacts on international students’ lived experiences. Different job types required different amount of physical work and offered different communicative opportunities. Some admission associates in theme parks had chairs to sit on, while some students constantly stood for a whole day. Some students worked inside buildings, while others worked outside and suffered from sunburn. Students assigned to geographically isolated workplaces had fewer opportunities to engage in cultural exchange with other international students.

Third, this project shows the legacy of colonization and uneven development. What language one speaks is not only related to that personal’s socio-economic status as discussed in the above paragraph, but also related to the history and foreign relations of the individual’s country. Chapter Eight has shown that Jamaican students had linguistic advantages over Chinese students because Jamaica’s official language is English. Speaking English is part of the legacy of more than two-hundred-year colonization British colonization in Jamaica. As an exportation-dependent country, Jamaica is in deep debt and lags far behind the US economically. The material gap also exists between China and the US and serves as a basis for racism, as suggested by Marxian historical materialism. In return, ideology can affect material conditions; racism can affect the well-beings of targeted individuals. Language transmits knowledge and culture, serves as a tool for community building, and is a source of power (Foucault, 1980). People have been contending over the right of preserving their own languages. Historically, Malaysian politicians tried to eliminate education in the Chinese language, and Chinese Malaysians endeavored to protest against the discriminatory policy and preserved Chinese education in Malaysia.
Linguistic identity is also an indispensable part of self-identification. The choice of language can suggest a person’s identification in multicultural and multi-linguistic environment.

Fourth, this project suggests that the lack of understanding between people from different countries. The Summer Work Travel Program is designated for cultural exchange, especially to make people from other countries better understand the United States. As a matter of fact, Americans should also have a better understanding of other countries. For example, China has become the second largest economy in the world. Questions, such as whether China has Nike’s products, are old fashioned. Some Americans’ perceptions of China lag behind the development of China. In a similar vein, some Chinese perceive the United States as a world power and fail to realize the post-industrial recession part of the U.S. economy. Even though people often refer to the terms “globalization” and “global village,” individuals often have limited knowledge of the histories and realities of other countries, especially peripheral countries. I realized the limitation of my knowledge, and learned a lot about other countries during the research process.

**What Problems About the Program Did the Participants Reveal?**

Even though the State Department promulgated regulations pertaining to the Summer Work Travel Program with an emphasis on cultural exchange, many participants reported practices executed by host employers against the regulations, such as not sticking to the work hours on the contract (either too many hours or too few hours), separating international students from American workers, threatening to deport participants to keep them on the job, and finding reasons to fire participants when overstaffed. In addition, on the State Department website, I only found numbers of participants and sponsors in 2012. The above text reflects violations of original purpose of the Exchange Visitor Program, inadequate oversight from State Department, and lack of transparency, echoing with conclusions from previous studies (GAO, 2005; Maitra,
2013). GAO (2005) revealed that State officials made just eight visits to its 206 designated Summer Work Travel and/or Trainee sponsors in the last four years. Maitra (2013) pointed out the lack of effective mechanisms to address complaints, the lack of effective sanctions, and the risks of outsourcing oversight to sponsors. In this study, participants working at Amazing Park reported that their sponsor required them to fill a questionnaire survey of their experiences in the US every month, but the surveys did not make a difference in improving their lives. This small exploratory project is by no means generalizable to the large Summer Work Program. However, the problems revealed in this study are worth attention and action.

**What Can Be Done to Improve the Operation of This Program?**

GAO (2005) suggested Secretary of State fully implement a compliance unit to better monitor exchange program activities and address deficiencies, as well as develop strategies to obtain data. Maitra (2013) advised to engage the Labor Department as a partial solution. I certainly agree with the above suggestions and propose additional ones based on my research: (1) the State Department should provide official reports of the general experiences of former participants in the Summer Work Travel Program on its current website or a new website specifically designed for the program. Some agencies exaggerated the earnings that could be made during work in the US or provided atypical examples to lure potential participants. If the State Department could provide official reports and make them accessible to all participants, the above problem may be avoided and the public at large could also supervise the operation of this program; (2) sponsors should provide basic legal education for all participants either in the form of pamphlets or through face-to-face meetings. Participants should be informed of their rights and obligations in the US. Some employers provided disclaimers, or mainly informed participants of their obligations as employees, or even threatened to deport participants. If
participants are more aware of their rights, they will be less likely to be subject to their employers’ unfair treatment; (3) the State Department or sponsors should help participants obtain free or affordable legal assistance or counseling when they encounter problems. Some employers did not allow a few European students to work because something was wrong with the students’ legal documents. The employers did not help them but let them alone. Thanks to a local Christian who helped the students out. In another case, a Chinese female student, working as a sweeper, was fired after she requested changing a job position as she was allergic to sunshine. If participants are aware of their rights, employers or landlords will be less likely to violate or abuse relevant regulations; (4) cultural involvement of local communities in the Summer Work Travel Program should be encouraged. A local church organized local families as voluntary friendship families with international students. The families served as a showcase of American culture, provided practical assistance to students, and pressured some employers to make feasible accommodations for students. Local communities can help the Summer Work Travel Program achieve its primary purpose of “cultural exchange.”

What Impact Did This Project Have on My Personal Life?

I acknowledge that the research findings are not an objective reflection of an objective phenomenon. I made the project and the project made me. I have grown as a person, a researcher and a student during the research process. This project extended my exploration of identity, race, and cultural adaptation in the United States. The graduate studies in the US highlighted my perceptions of race and racism. In the first class of Race and Communication, I thought different ethnic groups got along well in China, and stated that I did not feel racism in China. Later on, I realized my statement was not true. I did not see racism in China because I was a member of the Han ethnic group, the dominant ethnic group in China. I never introduced myself as a Chinese
when I was in China, but I always introduced myself as Chinese when meeting with new people in the US. I never felt so strong that I am Chinese before I came to the US. Shifting from a member of the ethnic majority group in China to a member of an ethnic minority group in the US, I became more aware of racial issues in the US and could relate to all kinds of disadvantaged groups. My pursuit of social justice is one of the reasons why I chose to study the lived experiences of international students participating in the Summer Work Travel Program. Their stories about racism and suffering revealed the underbelly of the U.S. society and confirmed the value of this research. The research has ended, but my cross-cultural journey continues. In spring 2015, I flew from the US to China. On the flight from Detroit to Seattle, I asked for tea and was given black tea; on the flight from Seattle to Beijing, I asked for tea but was given green tea. Green tea is more popular in China. Offers of different types of tea on the airplanes reminded me of the cultural difference between the US and China. From drinks to dressing to language to social networks, each individual’s life is not made of givens, but of choices. The question of who I am and who I want to become will continue to accompany me during my graduate studies.
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APPENDIX A. RECRUITMENT NOTICE FOR SERVICE WORKERS

RECRUITMENT NOTICE

Service Workers

WANTED FOR STUDY

Hi. I’m looking for your story about being a service worker.

My name is Jing Jiang, a master’s student in the School of Media and Communication at Bowling Green State University. I am very interested in interviewing service workers about their working experiences and their perceptions of their jobs. How do you perceive your job? What do you get from your work? How do you feel as a service worker?

Please talk to me about your experiences and insights. The study involves interviews that last around an hour. The interviews are informal and conversational. The interviews are confidential, and your agreement to participate is completely voluntary.

This study has been approved by the HSRB (Human Subject Review Board) at Bowling Green State University. Advisor of this study is Dr. Radhika Gajjala.

If you are interested in talking with me, you can call me or text me at (419) 819 ****, or email me at j****@bgsu.edu, or send me a message via Facebook (URL: https://www.facebook.com/jing. ****).

Thank you for your time and interest in this study.

Jing Jiang
School of Media and Communication,
302 West Hall,
Bowling Green, OH 43403
j****@bgsu.edu
+1(419) 819 ****
招募公告

急需

服务性行业员工

作为研究对象

你好！我正在寻找你在服务性行业工作的故事。

我是姜静，博林格林州立大学媒体与传播学院的硕士研究生。我想要了解服务性行业员工的工作经历和对工作的认知：你如何看待你的工作？你从工作中得到了什么？作为服务性员工你有怎样的感受？

你愿意在轻松的环境中跟我聊聊你的工作经历和认知吗？采访大约需要一个小时。参与自愿，信息保密。

如果你对我的研究感兴趣，请给我打电话或发短信+(1)419 819 ****），或发邮件（j****@bgsu.edu），或者在我的 Facebook 上留言（地址：https://www.facebook.com/jing.****）。

注 1: 这项研究得到了博林格林州立大学 Human Subject Review Board（伦理审查委员会）的评审许可。指导老师是 Radhika Gajjala 博士。

注 2: 服务性行业是相对工业产品制造而言的，服务对象是顾客，所涉行业包括餐饮，住宿，娱乐等等。

感谢你的支持！

Jing Jiang
School of Media and Communication,
302 West Hall,
Bowling Green, OH 43403
j****@bgsu.edu
+1(419) 819 ****
APPENDIX C. RECRUITMENT NOTICE FOR SUPERVISORS

RECRUITEMENT NOTICE

Service Work Supervisors

WANTED FOR STUDY

Hi. I’m looking for your story about being a service work supervisor.

My name is Jing Jiang, a master’s student in the School of Media and Communication at Bowling Green State University. I am very interested in interviewing service work supervisors about their working experiences and perceptions of service work. How do you perceive the service work? What characteristics do you think are important to a service worker? How do you communicate with the service workers?

Please talk to me about your experiences and insights. The study involves interviews that last around an hour. The interviews are informal and conversational. The interviews are confidential, and your agreement to participate is completely voluntary.

This study has been approved by the HSRB (Human Subject Review Board) at Bowling Green State University. Advisor of this study is Dr. Radhika Gajjala.

If you are interested in talking with me, you can call me or text me at +1(419) 819 ****, or email me at j****@bgsu.edu, or send me a message via Facebook (URL: https://www.facebook.com/jing. ****).

Thank you for your time and interest in this study.

Jing Jiang
School of Media and Communication,
302 West Hall,
Bowling Green, OH 43403
J****@bgsu.edu
+1(419) 819 ****
招募公告

急需

服务性行业主管

作为研究对象

你好！我正在寻找你在服务性行业工作的故事。

我是姜静，博林格林州立大学媒体与传播学院的硕士研究生。我想要了解服务性行业主管的工作经历和对服务性工作的认知：你如何看待服务性工作？你认为服务性行业员工应该具备什么样的品质？你如何激励你的员工？

你愿意在轻松的环境中跟我聊聊你的工作经历和认知吗？采访大约需要一个小时。参与自愿，信息保密。

如果你对我的研究感兴趣，请给我打电话或发短信（+(1) 419 819 ****），或发邮件（j****@bgsu.edu），或者在我的Facebook上留言（地址：https://www.facebook.com/jing.****）。

注 1：这项研究得到了博林格林州立大学Human Subject Review Board（伦理审查委员会）的评审许可。指导老师是Radhika Gajjala博士。

注 2：服务性行业是相对工业产品制造而言的，服务对象是顾客，所涉行业包括餐饮，住宿，娱乐等等。

Jing Jiang
School of Media and Communication,
302 West Hall,
Bowling Green, OH 43403
J****@bgsu.edu
+1(419) 819 ****
APPENDIX E. INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR SERVICE WORKERS

Topic: Understanding Service Workers
Principle Investigator: Jing Jiang
A Master’s student in the School of Media and Communication, Bowling Green State University
Advisor: Dr. Radhika Gajjala,
A professor in the School of Media and Communication and American Cultural Studies, BGSU

INTRODUCTION:

You are invited to participate in a research study. You must be at least 18 years old to participate in this study. Please read carefully the information provided below before agreeing to participate in this study. If you have any questions or concerns regarding your participation in this study, please contact Jing Jiang by mail, phone, or e-mail using the following contact information: School of Media and Communication, 302 West Hall, Bowling Green, OH 43403 United States; Phone: +1(419) 819 ****; E-mail: j****@bgsu.edu. You can also contact the advisor Dr. Radhika Gajjala at radhik@bgsu.edu or 419-372-****.

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this study is to examine service workers’ working experiences, feelings, perceptions of their roles and contributions, and barriers to enhance themselves. Participation in this study may not benefit you directly but you may learn more about yourself through reflection during the interview. More broadly, it will provide invaluable insight into service work, temporary employment, and part-time jobs, and add to prior knowledge in organizational communication, intercultural communication, and interpersonal communication. If applicable, the researcher will treat you to a couple of coffee/tea when interviewing to thank you for your time.

PROCEDURE:

You will be interviewed by the researcher face to face or via Skype/QQ/Wechat. The interview will
be conducted outside of work, at the researcher’s dorm, or a coffee house/restaurant or elsewhere you suggest. If the interview is conducted via technology, you can choose wherever you feel comfortable to have video/audio talk with the researcher. The interview will be conducted in English or Chinese.

The interview will be audio-taped unless you disapprove audio-taping. It will take about 60 minutes to complete the interview. The audio-tape will be transcribed by the researcher. The interview questions are regarding your working experience (e.g. a typical day), perceptions (e.g. your role and contribution), feelings, and expectations. You may ask questions about the research procedures; I will be happy to answer them immediately. When you check the questions at the end of this form, you are giving your permission for me to use your interview answers and recorded interactions.

**VOLUNTARY NATURE:**

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. This means that you choose whether or not to participate in this study. You may discontinue participation at any time and decline to answer any specific question without penalty. Deciding to participate or not will not affect your relationship with Bowling Green State University.

**CONFIDENTIALITY PROTECTION:**

The information you provide in this study is confidential. Your name will not be collected or documented in consent form, audiotape, transcript, or following analysis process. You will be assigned a pseudonym and there is no identifier linking the pseudonym to your real name. The consent forms will be kept in a locked filing cabinet in Dr. Radhika Gajjala’s office on the BGSU campus. The audiotape and transcripts will be stored in the researcher’s laptop. The audiotape will be erased once transcription is done, before April 30\textsuperscript{th}, 2015.

The responses in this study will be analyzed together to see what can be learned from all the
responses collectively; Individual quotes may be used to clarify some concepts, but no real names at all will be attached to any individual talk. Transcripts of the interactions may be reproduced in whole or in part for use in presentations, such as professional conferences, or written products, such as papers and journal articles. No identifying information will be associated with the transcript and other products that result from this study.

**RISKS:**

Participation in this study involves minimal risk, that is, risk of participation is no greater than that experienced in daily life. You may experience discomfort when discussing some issues such as conflict, anxiety, and other unpleasant moments during the interview. As mentioned above, you are free to decline to answer specific questions during the interview or you can inform the researcher at the beginning of the interview not to ask those questions. The researcher will take every precaution to ensure your confidentiality. For more information regarding the processes please refer to the previous paragraph.

**CONTACT INFORMATION:**

If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, you may contact the Human Subjects Review Board Administrator at Bowling Green State University at:

Bowling Green State University Human Subjects Review Board
Office of Research Compliance 309A University Hall Bowling Green, OH 43403
Tel: +1 (419) 372-7716
Email: hsrbi@bgsu.edu

You don’t need to sign your name in this consent form; you only need to check the questions and sign a date on the last page of this form.

You will be given a copy of this form.

Thank you for your time.

Investigator’s Name: Jing Jiang
Investigator’s Signature _____________________________ Date ___________
I have been informed of the purposes, procedures, risks and benefits of this study. I have had the opportunity to have all my questions answered and I have been informed that my participation is completely voluntary. I further have been informed that immediately following the interaction(s) I will be given the opportunity to have my portion of the tape removed.

I agree to participate in this research by checking one of each pair of options.

A. ___ I consent to participate in this research.

___ I do not consent to participate in this research (If you check this option, you do not need to check the following questions).

B. ___ I consent to have my interactions audio-taped.

___ I do not consent to have my interactions audio-taped.

C. ___ I consent to have my taped interactions transcribed into written form.

___ I do not consent to have my interactions transcribed.

D. ___ I consent to the use of the written transcription in presentations and written products resulting from the study, provided that neither my name nor other identifying information will be associated with the transcript.

___ I do not consent to the use of my written transcription in presentations or written products resulting from the study.

__________________________________
Date
I hereby agree to abide by the participant’s above instructions.

__________________________________   ____________________
Investigator’s Signature       Date
主题：对服务性行业员工的调查研究

首要调查员：姜静

博林格林州立大学传媒学院硕士研究生

指导老师：Radhika Gajjala博士

博林格林州立大学传媒学院及美国文化研究所教授

导言：

诚邀你参加一项研究调查。年满18岁即可参与。在同意参与前，请仔细阅读以下信息。如果你有任何疑问，请以信件、电话或电子邮件的方式联系姜静。联系方式如下：地址：School of Media and Communication, 302 West Hall, Bowling Green, OH 43403, United States；电话：+1(419)819 ****；电子邮件：jjiang@bgsu.edu。你也可以通过电子邮件（radhik@bgsu.edu）或者电话（+1(419)372 ****）联系本研究的指导老师 Radhika Gajjala 博士。

目的：

本研究旨在了解服务性行业员工的工作经历和感受，对工作角色和贡献的认知，以及在提升自我的过程中遇到的障碍。参与本研究可能不会给你带来直接收益，但是你能在采访中更加了解自己。更进一步说，你的参与将提供有关服务性行业工作、短期雇佣和兼职工作的重要信息，并拓宽组织传播、跨文化传播和人际传播的知识领域。如果条件允许，研究者会在访谈过程中请你
喝一杯咖啡/茶以感谢你抽空参与。

步骤:

研究者将以面对面的方式或通过 Skype/QQ/Wechat 对你进行访谈。访谈会安排在你的工作时间之外，访谈地点在研究者的宿舍，或在咖啡馆/餐馆，或者在其他你推荐的地方。如果访谈借助科技终端，你可任意选择地点来跟研究者进行视频或语音通话。访谈将以英语或者中文进行。

如果你不介意，访谈将会被录音。整个访谈将持续大约 60 分钟。研究者将会对访谈录音进行录音整理。访谈问题关涉你的工作经历（例如：典型的一天）、认知（例如：你的角色和贡献）、感受和期待。如果你有关于研究步骤的疑惑，我很乐意及时为你解答。如果你在这份知情同意书的结尾部分勾选相应选项，即表明你许可我使用你的访谈回答和录音。

自愿原则:

参与本项研究完全自愿，即你自主选择参加或者不参加。你可以拒绝回答任意你不愿谈论的问题，也可在任何时候终止参与并且不会承担任何后果。参与本研究与否不会影响你跟博林格林州立大学的关系。

保密措施:

你在本研究中提供的信息将会被保密。你的名字不会收集和记录在知情同意书、录音、录音整理以及后续的研究过程中。你将分配到一个化名，并且化名和你的真名没有联系。知情同意书会锁在博林格林州立大学校园中 Radhika Gajjala 博士的办公室的文件箱中。录音和录音整理会被储存在研究者的笔记本里。录音会在录音整理结束后删除，且会在 2015 年 4 月 30 日前。

本研究所得回答将会被集中分析，以得出具有普遍性的结论。个人的话语可能会被引用以澄清一些概念，但在任何个人对话中都不会有真名出现。录音整理可能会以全部或者部分的形式在
口头展示中（如专业会议）或者在书面报告中（如论文和期刊文章）重复使用。身份识别信息不会与录音整理与其他来自于本研究的成果相联系。

风险:

参与本研究风险非常小，它不会大于日常生活所承受的风险。在访谈中，你可能会在讨论一些话题的时候感到不舒服，比如冲突、焦虑和其他不开心的事情。如上所述，你可以拒绝回答访谈中的任意问题，也可以在访谈前告知研究者不要提某些问题。研究者会尽其所能以保证信息保密。更多关于保密的程序请参考上段。

联系信息:

如果你对研究对象的权利有任何疑问，你可以通过以下方式联系博林格林州立大学伦理审查委员会：
Bowling Green State University Human Subjects Review Board Office of Research Compliance 309A University Hall Bowling Green, OH 43403 Tel: +1 (419) 372-7716 Email: hsrb@bgsu.edu

你不需要在本知情同意书上签署你的名字，你只需要勾选问题的答案并且在本书最后一页上签署日期。

你将得到此知情同意书的一个副本。

感谢你的支持！

调查员姓名：姜静
调查员签名：____________________________ 签署日期：______________
我已经被告知此研究的目的、步骤、风险和收益。我已有机会澄清我所有的疑问。我也被告知我的参与是完全自愿的。我也被告知在访谈结束后，我有权要求删除访谈录音。

我以勾选每一对问题的方式表明是否同意参与此项研究。

A. __________ 我同意参与此项研究。

__________ 我不同意参与此项研究（如果你选择了此选项，你不需要继续回答下面的的问
题）。

B. __________ 我同意对我的访谈进行录音。

__________ 我不同意对我的访谈进行录音。

C. __________ 我同意将我的录音整理成书面形式。

__________ 我不同意将我的录音整理成书面形式。

D. __________ 我同意在我的名字和其他辨认信息都不会跟录音整理材料相联系的情况下，在展示的书面作品中使用此研究所得书面录音材料。

__________ 我不同意在展示的书面作品中使用此研究所得书面录音材料。

__________________________________   ____________________

调查员签名

我在此遵守参与者的上述指示。

__________________________________   ____________________

日期
APPENDIX G. DEBRIEFING FORM

Debriefing Form

Thank you for your time and effort in participating the interview. Your participation provides crucial information for me in understanding service workers’ experiences and perceptions and gaining insights in intercultural differences.

After completing the interview, some participants may be interested in the project and would like to find more information about it (e.g., results and implications of this project). If you would like this information, please feel free to contact me (phone, mail, or email). I would be glad to provide a copy of the results when they become available in several months. Because I will deliver such information electronically, please provide your email address below and return this form to me.

I would like to thank you again for your participation. I greatly appreciate your time, effort, and assistance in this study.

Your Email Address (Optional: ONLY if you want to receive a summary of the results in a few months)

___________________________________________

Jing Jiang, Principal Investigator
School of Media and Communication
Bowling Green State University
302 West Hall
Bowling Green, OH 43403
+1(419)-819-****
j****@bgsu.edu
APPENDIX H. INTERVIEW GUIDE

Topic: Understanding Service Workers

Principle Investigator: Jing Jiang, a Master’s student
School of Media and Communication, Bowling Green State University

Specific Questions for Service Worker

Note: Basically, these questions are about your experiences as a service worker.

Part I Background Information

1, Please tell me about the background information about your current job(s).

   1a, Which day did you arrive in the United States?

   1b, How did you know about this Summer Work Travel Program?

   1c, Why did you choose your current job or why were you replaced on this job?

   1d, What did your parents/family members think about your job?

2, Please describe a typical day from getting up to going to bed.

   2a, What is your duty during work? (In detail)

   2b, Please describe your work team.

       How many workers do you have? Where are they from?

       How many supervisors do you have? Where are they from?

Part II Work Identity

3, 3a, What part of work do you like? Why?

   3b, What part of work do you dislike? Why?
4, 4a, What kind of customers do you like?
   Please give me some examples.

4b, What kind of customers do you dislike?
   Please give me some examples.

5, What do you get from your work? Which is most important to you?
   5a, If given a chance to choose again, would you choose this job?
   5b, Do you think this working experience is useful to your career? If so, how?

**Part III Cultural Identity**

6, How was your cultural adaptation to the US when you just arrived?
   6a, Did you have any difficulty in adaptation? If so, what is it?
   6b, Was there any impressive experience? If so, what is it?

7, With whom do you often hang out? Why?
   7a, With whom do you often talk to among your coworkers? Why?
   7b, What topics do you talk about?

8, About identity:
   8a, Do you think your ethnic/racial background matters in your work? In your social life? Why?
   8b, Do you think your nationality matters in your work? In your social life? Why?
8c, Do you think your education background matters in your work? In your social life? Why?

8d, Do you think your English level matters in your work? In your social life? Why?

8e, Do you think your gender matters in your work? In your social life? Why?

8f, Do you think your age matters in your work? In your social life? Why?

**Part V Others**

9, Do you have prior working experience as a service worker?
   If so, please tell me about the time, place, employment length, why you quit the job(s), and the similarities and differences between your current job and prior job(s).

10, If given a chance to give suggestions, what would you like to give
   
   14a, To your employer? (Hint: wage, schedule, transportation, etc.)
   
   14b, To your sponsor? (Hint: fee, job type, location, information, etc.)
   
   14c, To other relevant parties? (Hint: Landlord & rent, friendship family, etc.)
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