

TWENTY-SECOND SEMIANNUAL REPORT ON
EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACTIVITIES

LETTER

FROM THE

CHAIRMAN, U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION
ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

TRANSMITTING

THE 22D SEMIANNUAL REPORT ON THE EDUCATIONAL
EXCHANGE ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED UNDER THE U.S.
INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACT OF
1948 (PUBLIC LAW 402, 80TH CONG.) FROM
JANUARY 1 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1959



AUGUST 25, 1959.—Referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs
and ordered to be printed

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1959

LETTER OF SUBMITTAL

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
THE U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION
ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE,
August 20, 1959.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SIR: The U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange submits herewith its 22d semiannual report on the educational exchange activities conducted under the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.) from January 1 through June 30, 1959.

This report fulfills the requirements of section 603 of the above-mentioned act which states that this Commission shall transmit—

* * * to the Congress a semiannual report of all programs and activities carried on under authority of this Act, including appraisals, where feasible, as to the effectiveness of the programs and such recommendations as shall have been made * * * to the Secretary of State for effectuating the purpose and objectives of this Act and the action taken to carry out such recommendations

The membership of the Commission is as follows:

Rufus H. Fitzgerald, chancellor emeritus, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa., Chairman;

Arthur H. Edens, president, Duke University, Durham, N.C., Vice Chairman;

Laird Bell, lawyer, member of the firm of Bell, Boyd, Marshall & Lloyd, Chicago, Ill.;

Franklin David Murphy, chancellor, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.;

Anna L. Rose Hawkes, dean emeritus, Mills College, and president of the American Association of University Women, Orleans, Vt.

A duplicate copy of this report is being furnished the Senate.

Very truly yours,

R. H. FITZGERALD,
*Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission
on Educational Exchange.*

(Enclosure: Advisory Commission's 22d semiannual report to the Congress.)

TWENTY-SECOND SEMIANNUAL REPORT
TO THE CONGRESS

BY THE

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON
EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

(January 1–June 30, 1959)

CONTENTS

	Page
I. Recommendations to the Secretary of State.....	1
II. Establishment of the Bureau of International Cultural Relations.....	6
III. Appraisals of the educational exchange program.....	7
Appendix I—Professional and social consequences of Fulbright and Smith-Mundt awards.....	9
Appendix II—A study of reactions to the State Department exchange program among returned Mexican grantees.....	13

TWENTY-SECOND SEMIANNUAL REPORT TO THE CONGRESS BY THE U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

I. RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE

A. SYSTEMATIC FOLLOWUP OF THE UNITED STATES AND UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS CULTURAL EXCHANGE AGREEMENT

Commission recommendation (submitted to the Secretary of State April 10, 1959)

Since its inception, this Commission has been interested in the special problems and potentialities involved in educational and cultural exchanges with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and other Eastern European countries. At its first meeting in September 1948 the Commission recommended official encouragement to such exchanges when conducted under reputable unofficial auspices, citing—

the positive gains which follow from such interchange in the correction of misinformation * * * (first semiannual report to the Congress, pp. 12-14).

In the more immediate past, the Commission approved Department initiative to request funds of the Congress to conduct a modest exchange program with certain countries of Eastern Europe (October 1957—recommendation reprinted in 19th semiannual report, pp. 7-8). The Commission has also kept itself informed through periodic reports from the Department concerning the cultural exchange agreement between the United States and the U.S.S.R. concluded in January of 1958.

This latter agreement has now been in effect a little over a year, and a considerable number of the exchange projects mentioned in it have been carried out on the reciprocal basis prescribed. The Commission is pleased that the agreement is being implemented satisfactorily by the contracting governments, and also that these exchanges have received cooperation and support from many educational, professional, community, and business organizations throughout the United States. In one particular respect, however, we believe more needs to be done in this country in order to achieve what should be a major objective of any effective exchange, the dissemination of knowledge and the improvement of understanding.

The war and subsequent barriers erected to communication between our respective peoples has meant that for at least two decades Americans were kept in a state of relative ignorance concerning progress in such aspects of Soviet society as education, science, and the arts. Certainly there were few opportunities for personal observation by American specialists in these fields.

To a considerable extent, at least, this situation has now changed as a result of the exchange agreement. American students, educators, artists (in both performing and visual arts), scientists, and athletes—to name some of the principal categories involved—have in the past year traveled fairly widely in the Soviet Union and observed developments in their fields at first hand.

It is important that the additional knowledge and insights gained should not stop with these few specialists. Several have indeed communicated their observations to others through writings and lectures, but we note the apparent absence of any systematic plan for encouraging more widespread dissemination of this information to professional colleagues and other interested persons. Measures to insure an American public well-informed concerning the society and institutions of the Soviet Union deserve, in our opinion, the highest priority. We can be sure that this aspect of the exchange is not neglected in the case of Soviet citizens on their return from corresponding visits to America.

While believing that the Department of State should encourage and stimulate these measures, we consider that they can more appropriately be carried out through private American sponsorship and financing. As a possible desirable first step in this direction, the Commission suggests a seminar-conference, or a series of such events, to be composed of the members of American delegations in education, science, and the arts, together with other persons having a special interest and special qualifications. The purpose of such a conference or conferences would be to exchange views and experiences and to consider additional steps that need to be taken if we are to derive maximum advantage for the public interest from these exchanges. The participants should constitute a number small enough, and the time allowed should be sufficient, to insure explorations in some depth of subjects under consideration.

We recommend, therefore, that the Department approach appropriate American institutions or foundations in order to obtain requisite private sponsorship and financing of such a conference or conferences. The interest of this Commission can, of course, be cited in this connection by the Department.

We would hope and expect that out of this initiative will come further ideas for sharing more widely the benefits of this program of exchange. We will look forward to learning from the Department, therefore, whether the recommended action is considered to be feasible, and of any results that may ensue from it.

Departmental reply (dated April 27, 1959, from Acting Secretary Herter)

As for the Commission's recommendation that the Department should encourage and stimulate measures to disseminate information about the U.S.S.R. gained by Americans who have recently visited that country, whether within the American-Soviet exchange agreement or otherwise, steps along this line have already been undertaken. The Department is in complete agreement with the Commission's recommendation and has recognized that it is not itself in a position to act as the disseminating agent.

Moreover, the function of spreading current factual information would appear, as the Commission states, to rest properly with the actual persons who have been in the Soviet Union and with private organizations as the views expressed and conclusions reached would not necessarily reflect those of the U.S. Government.

As a result of the Commission's recent meeting, Mr. Robert Thayer approached the Institute of International Education earlier this month with the suggestion that it organize and obtain financial support for periodic seminars. Recent American visitors to the U.S.S.R.—officials, delegation members, scientists, students, and tourists—would be invited to these seminars for the purpose of sharing and disseminating information concerning their experiences. Mr. Kenneth Holland, President of the Institute of International Education, accepted this suggestion and expressed the Institute's intention of immediately seeking funds from private sources to support the enterprise. It was understood by Mr. Thayer and Mr. Holland that officers of the Department of State would participate in the meetings envisaged.

With regard to scientific fields, the Department is considering making a similar suggestion to the National Academy of Sciences, which has been in touch with American scientists who have been visiting the U.S.S.R. and which is expected shortly to have an agreement with the Soviet Academy of Sciences for an expanded exchange between the two countries. The Commission's recommendation should prove helpful in taking up this matter with the National Academy.¹

B. THE GOVERNMENT'S CONCERN WITH FOREIGN STUDENTS ON AMERICAN CAMPUSES

Background

According to the census published by the Institute of International Education covering the academic year 1958-59, there were more than 47,000 foreign students on American campuses. Fewer than 10 percent of these students were brought to or supported in this country through assistance from the Department's international educational exchange program. Of those students for whom the source of financial support was specified by the census—more than four-fifths of the total—about half were reported as self-financed, over one-third were financially supported by private agencies, and about 6 percent were sponsored by foreign governments.

It is pertinent to consider the degree and character of the attention paid by the Federal Government, and particularly by the Department of State, to the preponderant numbers of foreign students who are not sponsored by this Government. These students constitute an important resource for furthering such national objectives as the promotion of a better understanding of the United States abroad and the provision of technical assistance through higher education.

The Department has, in fact, manifested a considerable interest in the general foreign student population from the very inception of an official cultural relations program. Prior to the passage of the Smith-Mundt Act in 1948 the Department lacked authority, or appro-

¹ On July 9, 1960, an agreement on the exchange of scientists between the National Academy of Sciences of the United States and the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. was signed.

priation, to conduct exchange programs except with the other American Republics and, in consequence, much of the time and attention of officers responsible for exchanges, in Washington and abroad, was given to questions relating to nonsponsored foreign students. As an evidence of this broad concern, for example, the Department encouraged colleges and universities to designate "foreign student advisers" from among their faculties, and largely as a result of official initiative a National Association of Foreign Student Advisers (NAFSA) was established in 1948. As this organization has grown and flourished, association with it has continued to be close: Department officers participate in its national and regional meetings, work closely with its board of directors and its numerous special committees, and serve as consultants and observers in furtherance of many of its projects for improving the lot of foreign students on American campuses.

Among the ways in which the Department has continued to make its interest in all foreign students apparent have been the following:

(1) *Close cooperation with private American organizations that work broadly with and for foreign students.*—Organizations deserving special mention, in addition to NAFSA, are the Institute of International Education, the Committee on Friendly Relations Among Foreign Students (particularly in connection with its port-of-entry reception services), and the United States National Student Association.

(2) *Frequent contact, through personal visits and correspondence, with college and university presidents and other campus officials.*—For example, 2 years ago the Director of the International Educational Exchange Service addressed letters to the presidents of 998 American college and university presidents, asking that institutions give increased consideration to devising means of maintaining relationships of long duration with their foreign alumni.

(3) *Efforts to facilitate the entry of foreign students under conditions favorable to their study purposes.*—Department-issued regulations governing exchange-visitor visas were originally designed to extend certain privileges under this visa to foreign students, and other visitors, coming to this country under reputable private sponsorship. These regulations also undoubtedly contributed to improvements in provisions governing the "student visa" embodied in subsequent immigration legislation.

(4) *Sympathetic attention to the plight of foreign students suffering from political or economic dislocation in their home countries.*—The most striking illustration was the Department's program, after political overturn in China, of relief to destitute Chinese students from funds made available by the then Economic Cooperation Administration. On occasion, moreover, the Department has used its good offices with foreign governments to insure favorable dollar exchange rates for students in times of economic crisis in their home countries.

(5) *Cooperation in the preparation of special materials to assist foreign students or the institutions receiving them.*—Department officers have worked with competent private agencies to develop, among other things, standard English-language tests, orientation materials for all foreign students, and guides to assist in more accurate evaluation of foreign student credentials.

(6) *Counseling and guidance, through officers' overseas, of foreign students planning to come to the United States.*—The amount of such assistance varies from country to country, depending both on the

demand and on the press of other duties, but in some countries it is undoubtedly considerable. The Department works with the U.S. Information Agency to provide counseling materials and background instructions. Somewhat related is a recent pilot project undertaken with the Association of Graduate Schools whereby officers and screening committees in a few selected posts interview, on reference from the American university, certain applicants for admission to the graduate school. Information thus gained on language proficiency, academic and personal qualifications, and financial resources is passed on to the American institutions, where it has apparently proved most helpful.

Commission recommendation (dated June 15, 1959)

The Commission believes the Department is to be commended for these various activities in the interest of the movement of foreign students to, and their sojourn at, our American campuses. These activities should be continued and, where possible, intensified.

We believe further, however, that because of enrollment pressures and other problems confronting our educational institutions today that the time is ripe for the Government—principally the Department of State—to give thoughtful consideration to any further steps that might be taken to maintain the flow of foreign students and to improve its quality. Such consideration might take into account three possible areas of future action:

(1) *High-level governmental encouragement to educational institutions to maintain their traditional welcome to qualified students from other countries.*

We believe it would be of great value at this time if the President, the Secretary of State, and perhaps the Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs Committees would emphasize publicly the importance to the national interest and to the conduct of foreign relations of this country's continuing to be the host to large numbers of foreign students. Statements from such quarters should significantly assist educators in insuring that local support for student exchanges will be maintained and, if possible, increased. It would be most helpful, in fact, if such high-level Government recognition could be given to international programs in general carried out by our colleges and universities.

(2) *An increase in official services to foreign student applicants and to admitting institutions, with a view to improving the quality of the exchange.*

The success of a foreign student's sojourn in this country rests ultimately, in the Commission's judgment, on his success in obtaining the academic training that he needs. It is proper, therefore, for Government to do whatever is feasible to help in realizing this objective. Specifically, admission by our institutions of poorly qualified foreign applicants or placement of well-qualified applicants at institutions poorly equipped to provide desired training equally tend to defeat the educational and also the national interest objectives of this international movement of scholars. Recognizing that much has already been done in this area, we believe the Department should consider whether, particularly through the cultural staffs in our oversea missions, improved counseling of prospective foreign students and better guidance to admitting

institutions—especially at the graduate level—can be achieved. A selective increase in oversea staff for these purposes might be warranted. Greater use of American educators abroad under ICA contracts and on educational exchange grants to perform these services is also recommended.

(3) *Appropriate financial assistance should funds be made available for this specific purpose at no detriment to the international educational exchange program.*

Responsibility for necessary financial support for the admission, processing, and instruction of foreign students properly resides, in the Commission's view, with the student himself or his sponsor, or with educational institutions and local institutional and community resources. Local support to provide extra facilities and services specifically for the foreign student is also extensive throughout the United States, and should be encouraged.

The financial burden for education carried by endowments and local taxation is increasing, however, and financial assistance from other quarters to improve desirable services to foreign students—for example, orientation—may be necessary. Prospects for possible future assistance from Government along these lines, perhaps on a matching basis, should be explored. Such assistance, if it were deemed both feasible and appropriate, should be provided, however, from funds appropriated specifically for this purpose. It should definitely not be provided at the expense of the Government's ability to meet expanding needs in our foreign relations through the educational exchange program.

II. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL RELATIONS

In June 1953 the President submitted Reorganization Plan No. 8 to the Congress, providing for a separate U.S. Information Agency and lodging continuing administrative responsibility for the educational exchange program and related cultural relations activities in the Department of State.

In commenting favorably on the decision to continue the Department's jurisdiction over the exchange program, the Commission proposed certain factors to govern this relationship for which it requested "utmost consideration" (10th semiannual report to Congress). The factors proposed were these:

1. "Proper recognition, from the viewpoint of actual contribution and prestige," for the role of the exchange program in our foreign relations.

2. "Appropriate importance and emphasis," as respects the identity of the program, "in departmental administrative status, through title nomenclature and otherwise."

3. "Adequate administrative support and authority within the Department * * *."

4. "Full cooperation and support in developing and justifying budget * * * which will insure adequate funds" to carry out the program.

Since this recommendation was submitted the educational exchange program—in spite of an inadequate budget and other difficulties—has

continued to demonstrate its effectiveness in our relationships with the rest of the world, and the Commission has continued to favor administration of the program by the Department of State.

Not until this year, however, have administrative steps been taken that promise to accord completely with the Commission's recommendations. The establishment on June 1 of the Bureau of International Cultural Relations within the Department is a most welcome action and has the Commission's hearty endorsement. It is entirely fitting thus to recognize administratively the coordinate role played by international cultural relations, including educational exchange—along with more traditional relations in other spheres—in our conduct of foreign affairs. Under the direction of Mr. Robert H. Thayer, special assistant to the Secretary in this field, and Mr. Saxton Bradford, his Deputy, we are confident that the new Bureau will move to achieve in all respects the proper recognition, appropriate emphasis, adequate authority, and full support cited by the Commission as necessary in its earlier recommendation.

One further step remains, however, if these officers are to possess the prestige and authority for accomplishing these and other desiderata. This step must be taken by the Congress. The Senate has passed a bill (S. 455) granting legislative authority for the appointment of an assistant to the Secretary of State to coordinate the Government's programs of cultural and educational exchange. Companion bills (H.R. 6008 and others) have been introduced in the House. The Commission would like to emphasize the desirability of affirmative action by the Congress in its current session to provide a stable legislative base for this important work.

III. APPRAISALS OF THE EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

In the authorizing statute (U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, sec. 603), the Commission was enjoined to include in its reports to the Congress "appraisals, where feasible, as to the effectiveness of the several programs." We are pleased to include as appendixes to this report two such appraisals.

Appendix I consists of a summary of findings resulting from a survey, conducted under a Department of State contract with the University of Kansas, of over 800 Americans in 9 Midwestern States who have taught, studied, or engaged in research in all parts of the world under the exchange program. These findings tell an impressive story—no less graphic for being told largely in statistical terms—of the improved international understanding and friendship that has resulted from grants awarded for these purposes.

The survey is a timely reminder that, while a great deal remains to be done in enlarging the horizons of the American people by improving knowledge of the people, cultures, and languages of other nations, much has already been achieved in this urgently important task through programs such as those made possible by the Smith-Mundt and Fulbright Acts. Had it not been for the existence of these programs for slightly more than a decade, our lacks in these regards would undoubtedly be much more evident than they are, our national ability to cope with our world responsibilities much weaker—and our international position even more parlous.

The conclusions of another study, conducted on quite a different scale, are also heartening. This study, just completed by International Research Associates under contract, surveys the reactions of nationals of a single country—Mexico—who have visited the United States under exchange grants.

The fact that countries are geographic neighbors in the community of nations is of course no guarantee that their citizens will be knowledgeable about each other or that relationships will not be clouded by misunderstanding. The conclusions offered by this study provide gratifying evidence that new knowledge and changed impressions result from well-planned visits even from close neighbors, and that these effects tend to be lasting ones. These conclusions, preceded by brief introductory data, are reprinted as appendix II of this report.

The Commission considers both these appraisals as providing further demonstration of the quiet effectiveness of the Government's exchange programs, and of the reasons why they merit the whole-hearted support of our Government and of the American people.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX I

PROFESSIONAL AND SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES OF FULBRIGHT AND SMITH-MUNDT AWARDS

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Purpose of the survey

In the summer of 1956, the International Educational Exchange Service negotiated a contract with the University of Kansas for a study of returned American grantees. The purposes of the study were to measure the effectiveness of the Americans in their contacts (a) with their hosts while they were overseas, (b) with their hosts after their return to the United States, and (c) with their compatriots in American communities and educational institutions after their return.

Design and method of the research

The survey focused on 803 former award holders from 9 contiguous States in the middle part of the United States, including Arkansas, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, and South Dakota.

A combination of personal interviews and questionnaires was used to collect the information. Interviews were held in 31 communities in the 9 States with 182 former grantees and with 103 of the grantees' administrative superiors; questionnaires were completed and returned by 803 of the former grantees, including 90 of those who had been interviewed.

An attempt was made to include all grantees who had received awards during the period 1947 through 1955. Of the 131 former award holders not included, 56 could not be located, 62 were outside the United States, 9 were deceased, and 4 chose not to fill out the questionnaire.

Slightly over half of those included in the sample (52 percent) went abroad as students, 20 percent as teachers, 14 percent as research scholars, and 14 percent as lecturers. Incidentally, about two-thirds of all were male. They went to 35 countries and territories; 31 of which participated in the program under the Fulbright Act.¹ Those who went to Guatemala, Mexico, Brazil, and Syria received their grants under the Smith-Mundt Act.

The report contains 11 chapters; to name but a few, there are such titles as "Overseas Experiences of Grantees," "Professional Gains From the Overseas Experience," "Sharing Experiences With the Community," "The Role of the Grantees' Families," and "Adverse Consequences of the Awards."

POSITIONS OF GRANTEES AT THE TIME OF THE STUDY

All grantees

About half of the grantees (47 percent) were teaching or conducting research in a college or university at the time of the study; 17 percent were teaching in secondary and elementary schools; 12 percent were students; 3 percent were actors, artists, musicians, and writers; 3 percent were housewives; 2 percent were businessmen; 1 percent each were lawyers and physicians, social workers and public health specialists, and public administrators; 12 percent were employed in unspecified fields, and 1 percent were unemployed.

Student grantees

Because of the high career mobility in the student category, separate figures on the 413 who responded to the questionnaire are provided here. Thus, 159 were teaching or conducting research in colleges and universities; 89 were still

¹ Australia, Austria, Belgium, Burma, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, India, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Korea, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, and the United Kingdom (including British Guiana, British West Indies, Jamaica, Singapore, and Trinidad).

students; 34 were teaching in secondary and elementary schools; 22 were actors, artists, musicians, and writers; 13 were businessmen; 6 were public administrators; 2 were physicians; and 1 each was a lawyer and a public health specialist; 62 were in unspecified positions, and 6 were unemployed.

OVERSEAS CONTACTS WITH FOREIGN NATIONALS

The grantees

Of the 803 grantees included, 97 percent became "close friends" of 11,158 foreign nationals; 98 percent visited in 10,806 foreign homes—an average of 13 and 12, respectively, for each grantee. Some 32 percent collaborated with foreign nationals on research, and the 39 percent who taught had 37,229 regular students.

Over 85 percent had contact with almost 15,000 foreign students outside the strictly academic setting; and 97 percent got to know 19,158 other foreign nationals well enough to exchange views and chat occasionally about local customs, American life, and other such topics—about 24 each. A total of 45 percent of the grantees, mostly students, did not make professional appearances outside the classroom; however, 53 percent of the total group lectured in their professional fields and presented concerts and art exhibits on 4,282 occasions to foreign audiences totaling an estimated 210,235—an average of 10 each who appeared, with an average audience of 50. About half the total number did not talk publicly on "general topics about American culture," but the 51 percent who did make such appearances before 3,271 foreign audiences, to an estimated 87,842 persons. In sum, the professional speeches, concerts, and art exhibits, as well as the talks and speeches on American culture came to a total of over 7,500 public appearances attended by about 298,077 foreign nationals.

The grantees' families

Of the 803 who filled out the questionnaire, 41 percent (329) were married at the time of the grant; 65 percent of these (220) had children, and the families (some without children) of 85 percent of the married grantees (280) accompanied them overseas. Of this group, 96 percent thought it advisable for married grantees to take their families with them. Some of the families, 7 percent, failed to associate with families of the host country; but about half (47 percent) associated with 1 to 5 foreign families, a fifth (20 percent) associated with 6 to 10, and over a quarter (26 percent) associated with 11 or more; thus, the American families were associated with an estimated 1,600 foreign families. Over half of the grantees with families thought these relationships were stronger than those they had established as individuals.

Members of the families of the grantees were international communicators, also. Some member, usually the wife, of 36 percent of the grantees' families gave talks on American culture on about 521 occasions to an estimated audience of 16,485 foreign nationals. Adding these figures to totals on the grantees' formal communication efforts described above, there were about 8,021 public appearances attended by about 314,562 foreign nationals.

Evaluation—Desirables and undesirables

Of the total number, 96 percent thought the experience was one of the most valuable of their lives; 97 percent said that it had increased their interest in international affairs, 96 percent said they had a greater perspective on the United States, 93 percent said they now have more sympathy for their host countries; 94 percent believed they had corrected erroneous stereotypes about American life while abroad; and 93 percent indicated that they would be willing to accept another grant.

Certain negative items were included in the study for the purpose of eliciting accounts of unpleasant experiences and to test the validity of certain positive items. In response to some of these, 17 percent of the grantees said they found people at their host institution to be uncooperative, and 41 percent said the host country did not make maximum use of their abilities. Only a few, 9 percent, felt that differences in living comforts made their stay abroad unpleasant; and a few less, 7 percent, said they would have been reluctant to accept the award if they had known what the total cost, financially, was to be.

CONTACT WITH HOSTS SINCE RETURN HOME

Personal and informal

Since their return to the United States, 94 percent of the grantees have maintained contact with individuals abroad on an informal or personal basis, 60 percent

have entertained in their homes foreign visitors whom they met while abroad or whom someone they met while abroad referred to them, and 29 percent have assisted foreign nationals to come to the United States for other than educational purposes.

Professional and educational

More than half of the grantees, 52 percent, have communicated with foreign nationals regarding applications to come to the United States for educational purposes, 31 percent have donated or arranged to be donated American books and periodicals to foreign libraries and educational institutions, 20 percent have made direct arrangements with American universities and foundations for foreign nationals to be sponsored in the United States, and 9 percent have served as foreign student advisers.

COMMUNICATION WITH AMERICANS SINCE RETURN

Attention given to compatriots

In sharing their experiences with their American communities, 99 percent of the grantees said they had talked informally with friends about their experience and shown them pictures and slides. Similarly, 99 percent have given 13,374 speeches to an estimated total audience of 458,260 fellow Americans. Twenty percent, about 160, have participated on radio and television programs, and 62 percent, about 500, stated that articles had appeared in American newspapers describing some of their experiences and observations on international affairs. About half the grantees were members of local organizations with an international bent; for one-fourth of the total number this was either a new interest or a stronger one than they had had before their educational exchange experience. In addition, 95 percent had advised other Americans wishing to go abroad, 78 percent had referred Americans going abroad to foreign colleagues and friends, 64 percent had helped Americans apply for grants to go abroad, 45 percent had arranged correspondence between their American and foreign national acquaintances, 13 percent had served on applicant screening committees of overseas grant programs, and 7 percent had served as Fulbright advisers.

Professional gains

A large number of the grantees (92 percent) thought the award had been professionally beneficial; research scholars (96 percent) were more likely to think so than individuals in the other categories. With varying frequency individuals in each of the categories specified such benefits; in all, they mentioned new perspectives in their fields of specialization (90 percent), new skills, i.e., language for language teachers (67 percent), changes in teaching and research emphasis (26 percent), new sources of data and ideas (56 percent), new materials (80 percent), new courses (11 percent), consultations with professionals abroad (69 percent), new positions, fellowships, and assistantships (39 percent), promotions and salary increases (32 percent), recognition from colleagues (68 percent).

Of a much more tangible nature were the publications and other such accomplishments which have resulted from the grantees' educational exchange experience, as follows: (a) A total of 63 books and monographs have been published; (b) a total of 748 journal articles, newspaper articles, and book reviews have been published; (c) a total of 437 papers and speeches have been delivered at professional meetings; (d) one documentary film and four filmstrips have been created; (e) a total of 89 theses or dissertations have been completed; (f) a total of 54 new courses have been introduced, 18 of which are in the nature of "area studies," including separate courses having to do with the history, government, economics, literature, and philosophy of other cultures; (g) a total of 243 paintings, works of sculpture and musical compositions have resulted from or been influenced by the work abroad; and (h) a total of 441 concerts, recitals, and exhibits have resulted from or been influenced by grantees' overseas experiences.

In addition, some of the grantees were working on (a) 72 books, musical compositions, and so forth; (b) 141 articles and book reviews, and (c) 42 theses and dissertations.

Adverse consequences

Some of the grantees were disappointed that they were unable to use their educational exchange experience to the extent they would have liked, the most salient factor from their viewpoint having had to do with their American colleagues and administrative superiors. Some 39 percent thought that their school or employer had not taken full advantage of the contributions they could make as a

result of their experiences, and 12 percent thought the educational exchange experience was not regarded highly where they worked. There were indications that the untraveled colleagues of 4 percent were at least indifferent or at most jealous. The supervisors of 3 percent apparently were not in favor of overseas experience.

Some grantees thought their careers and work had been retarded; for example, 4 percent said that going abroad had weakened their professional contacts in the United States, 10 percent said that any overseas experience was unimportant in their fields, and 7 percent said the award interfered with the research they were conducting in the United States. Only 1 percent said they had suffered because they had failed to complete the professional work they had planned while abroad. In all, 13 percent thought the award had delayed their advancement to some extent and 1 percent said that accepting the award had hindered their professional careers.

SUGGESTIONS FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

Program operations

Although the study was not designed to test the strengths and weaknesses of program operations, a few suggestions of this kind were offered. The married grantees frequently recommended that more funds be allotted to help defray the added expense of taking their families with them. Other suggestions had to do with (a) taking slides of America to show friends abroad; (b) arriving in the host country early enough to take full advantage of certain cultural events; (c) providing more information about schools abroad, especially for those with school-age children; (d) providing more information concerning income-tax regulations; (e) providing more information on the closeness of the overseas institutional affiliation; (f) allowing Far East grantees an opportunity to take the longer route home; (g) sending more information to American universities about the mechanics of setting up permanent exchange programs with foreign universities; (h) making provisions for more teams to go abroad; (i) increasing the opportunities for other types of cultural relations while overseas, such as meetings and field trips; and (j) making systematic provision for short-term followup research awards. An important suggestion concerned the timing of notifications of award. Many of the grantees felt that it would be a real improvement in the program if grantees were notified earlier than is often the case. A good many of the grantees frequently expressed the wish that their services be utilized in recruitment of candidates, in predeparture orientation of Americans and in orientation of foreign grantees.

On the subject of their own orientation, some of the grantees who were interviewed said that they had been concerned, confused, or dissatisfied because they had not known exactly what was expected of them in their host institutions. Some mentioned that they were unsure of what was expected in their overseas peer relationships. Similarly, the professors' relations with students outside class, the discussion method inside class, the American student-foreign professor relationship, and the accepted expectations of friendship patterns in the host country—all of which, incidentally, are often referred to in literature of this type—were mentioned as trouble spots by some of the grantees.

Suggestions for Fulbright advisers

Many of the grantees suggested that Fulbright advisers circulate lists of resident former grantees, and hold panel discussions and reunions, in order that they might meet others on their campus who had had an educational exchange experience. Some grantees felt it would be helpful to provide name and address lists of former grantees who had returned to the area from the same host country. Many of the individuals who were interviewed indicated their willingness to correspond with grantees who were returning to the area. Incidentally, in locating the grantees to be included in the study it was found that less than 10 percent of the Fulbright advisers had complete records regarding former grantees on their campuses; some were aware of less than half of the former award holders in residence. As a partial solution, it was suggested that returning grantees be instructed to notify the Fulbright adviser nearest their home of their return. A large number of the former grantees who were interviewed indicated that they were interested in helping with the program; presumably, they were just waiting to be called upon. Many recognized that the Fulbright advisers generally are overburdened; many, however, felt that some of their suggestions would lighten the workload.

APPENDIX II

A STUDY OF REACTIONS TO THE STATE DEPARTMENT EXCHANGE PROGRAM AMONG RETURNED MEXICAN GRANTEES

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study of Mexicans who have participated in the exchange program of the U.S. Department of State, since 1952, was designed to determine opinions about and attitudes toward various aspects of the exchange visit.

The investigation covered the grantee's experiences with the program during the period prior to his departure for the United States, his stay in the United States, and his activities after his return to Mexico.

METHOD AND SAMPLE

The study is based on detailed interviews with 151 former participants in the exchange program.

Three groups of grantees are represented in the sample: Teachers (40 percent), leaders and specialists (34 percent), and students (23 percent).²

Two-thirds of the grantees who participated in the exchange program during the period covered by the study are men, two-thirds are no more than 40 years of age, and two-thirds are residents of Mexico City. There are, however, notable differences in the composition of the three groups of grantees.

Grantees who visited the United States in the capacity of teachers account for most of the women in the sample. Nine out of ten of those who went as leaders, specialists, and students are men.

The student grantees are the youngest of the three groups—69 percent are now under 31 years of age. The teacher group is somewhat older: only 35 percent are under 31. And the leaders and specialists are the oldest group, with only 16 percent under 31 years of age.

Most (76 percent) of the teachers and leaders and specialists are residents of Mexico City, whereas only half of the student grantees who went to the United States come from the capital.

The sample is fairly homogeneous with respect to occupation. Half (50 percent) of the grantees who were interviewed are currently working in the field of education. Most of the remainder are executives in private enterprise (13 percent) and professionals in such fields as engineering, the sciences (12 percent) and communications (9 percent).

Almost all (95 percent) of the grantees who visited the United States in the teacher group are still active in the field of education. The leader and specialist group consists primarily of individuals in the communications (26 percent) field (journalism, radio, television, etc.), executives in business and industry (22 percent), and government officials (18 percent). Close to half (46 percent) of those who participated in the exchange program as students are now engaged in professional activities and the next largest group (20 percent) are functioning as executives in private enterprise.

The majority of the grantees hold responsible positions: 56 percent have supervisory responsibility. As might be expected, the leaders and specialists—an older group—tend to carry the heaviest responsibility, 32 percent of them supervise more than 10 people, as compared with 14 percent of the students and 9 percent of the teachers.

CONCLUSIONS

I. GRANTEES' REACTIONS TO THEIR STAY IN THE UNITED STATES

A. Nature of the visit

The majority of the grantees who were interviewed had visited the United States between 1955 and 1958 and were back in Mexico within 6 months of their departure.

² The number of lecturers and research scholars interviewed was too small to be identified statistically.

During their stay in the United States, the three groups of grantees were exposed to rather different environments. Teachers for the most part divided their time between courses at universities and observation of education in action. They stayed in private homes and dormitories. Leaders and specialists spent most of their time in practical observation, living in hotels. And students spent the bulk of their time at universities, lodged in boarding houses and dormitories.

Despite the differences in their activities, almost every grantee took advantage of opportunities to participate in some type of social activity, and 85 percent visited with Americans in their homes.

B. Reactions to the experience

An overwhelming majority of the grantees (87 percent) rated their stay in the United States "very enjoyable" and the generally high level of satisfaction is further supported by the fact that very few reported having had problems in adjusting to life in the States. They felt that they had been well received and came away with the impression that the United States treats its visitors from foreign countries well.

C. Changes in impressions about the United States

In spite of the fact that a number of the grantees had made previous visits to the United States and considered themselves quite well-informed on the subject, almost every grantee returned to Mexico feeling that he had learned something new about the United States which was of value to him.

The close contact with Americans and the opportunity to observe life in the United States firsthand led almost half of the grantees to change some of their preconceived notions, and the change, most often, was in a favorable direction.

Changes in impressions occurred most frequently among exchangeees who had never been to the United States before, and among the youngest (22-30 years) grantees.

In general, the grantees came away with a more favorable picture of American family life, the friendliness and integrity of individuals, the interest in religion, and the level of culture and interest in cultural activities.

At the same time, however, the exchange visit highlighted the prevalence of racial discrimination for a sizable minority. A small group of grantees experienced discriminatory treatment personally. Others observed it and noted it with disapproval.

D. Current attitudes toward the United States

In spite of minor disappointments and some criticisms of American life, the indications are that most of the returned exchangeees currently hold a favorable attitude toward the United States, a substantial part of which may be attributed to the exchange visit.

Having observed things for themselves, they now tend to feel that their fellow-Mexicans are too harsh in some of their judgments of the United States. This is particularly the case with respect to the image of American family life, opinions about discrimination against Mexicans, and charges of imperialism.

They themselves are inclined to the view that U.S. interest in Mexico, as manifested by the exchange program, is devoid of self-interest. They believe that the purpose of the program is to stimulate greater friendship between the two countries, to foster mutual understanding, and to help Mexico progress in every phase of its development.

II. THE RETURN

A. Maintenance of U.S. contacts

In the period since their return to Mexico, almost all the grantees have maintained some contact with individuals or organizations in the United States. The largest proportions have kept in touch with Americans they met during their stay in the States, and read professional or technical journals published in the United States.

At the moment, three-quarters of the returned exchangeees are in touch with others who have participated in the exchange program, and there is widespread interest in a newsletter which would inform returned grantees of the activities of those who have visited the States under the auspices of the State Department.

B. Dissemination of impressions about the United States

Since their return, the grantees have been quite active in communicating their impressions to others. Most often, this communication has been informal in nature. Friends and associates have plied the grantees with questions about

day-to-day life in the United States, their experiences during the trip and their observations in their field of specialization. The grantees have responded to this interest by relating their experiences and impressions. Those aspects of American life which impressed the grantees most strongly are the ones which have received the greatest attention in these conversations. Family life, the integrity of individuals, treatment of the Negroes, religious life, and social matters in general have more often been the topic of discussion than political and economic aspects of American life.

The grantees have also functioned as formal communicants of their impressions. Close to half have given speeches on their studies in the United States and their personal experiences. About one-third have published articles based on their visit. The educational system and family life have most often been the subject of discussion in these speeches and articles.

The activities of the grantees themselves in communicating their impressions have been supplemented by coverage in the local Mexican press and radio. The news of the grantee's forthcoming trip was reported in almost all cases; and about half the grantees stated that there has been press and radio coverage of the reports they have given about their exchange visit.

C. The grantees' experiences since the return to Mexico

A sizable proportion of the grantees appear to have improved their employment status since their return from the exchange trip. Half report that they now carry more responsibility in their jobs, and about two out of five have increased their incomes since their visit to the States.

Although a minority stated that returned grantees may encounter some resistance from their colleagues and supervisors, the majority of these respondents have been able without undue difficulty to apply what they learned in the United States to their work in Mexico.

In spite of this, however, the opinion is widespread among the grantees that obstacles, primarily those of an economic nature (the level of development, limited resources and labor), exist to the adoption of U.S. methods in Mexico.

III. REACTIONS TO THE PROGRAM

On the whole, the grantees expressed a fairly high degree of satisfaction with the way in which the exchange visit worked out, from the point of view of giving them what they wanted in the way of study or training in the United States. The minority (29 percent) who had some difficulty in this respect most often attributed the problem to deficiency in their knowledge of English.

At the same time, however, almost every grantee was able to suggest some way in which the program might be improved. The suggestions which occurred most frequently referred to ways of making the stay in the United States still more productive in terms of the grantee's field of special interest.

Essentially, what the grantees suggest is that they be permitted to spend more time in the United States in order to do justice to their field of specialization, and that the time they spend be concentrated more heavily on their area of special interest, rather than dispersed over a variety of activities.

In this connection, a number of respondents who had traveled in a group suggested that such groups be composed of individuals whose interests and level of preparation are similar, and that care be exercised in the selection of grantees so that groups will not be held back by individuals whose grasp of English is inadequate to the demands of the situation.

Another fairly common suggestion referred to the period prior to departure. The greatest lack in this respect appears to have been in the area of program planning. Judging from their comments, a number of grantees felt that they had not received adequate information about where they were going and what they were going to do when they arrived in the United States. A more detailed and complete itinerary was requested by those who had been through this experience.

Others recommended that future grantees be briefed more intensively on the customs they would encounter in the United States, given details about the places they would visit, as well as information about the operations in their field of specialization, so that they would be prepared for the situations they would find upon arrival.

Other recommendations included some provision to insure facility with the language and an increase in the living allowance.