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This report contains the salient points brought out in two seminars on the training of foreign nationals in the United States. The seminars were conducted by the Foundation for Research on Human Behavior in the fall of 1954.

The subject chosen for these seminars was considered likely to interest both people responsible for planning and conducting international training and exchange programs, and social scientists who are more basically concerned with theory and research. Participants came from business organizations, government agencies, educational institutions, social research agencies and foundations. A complete list of participants in the two seminars appears on page 30.

One purpose of the seminars was to give participants a chance to exchange experience. A second was to widen their acquaintance with research studies having implications for the conduct of cross-cultural training programs. As seminar participants discussed their work and learned what others were doing, they not only picked up many specific ideas of value but gained a fresh perspective upon their problems. The seminars were also helpful in defining research through which program operators might gain a better understanding of problems of cross-cultural education and training. This in turn should lead to improved program operations in the future.

Discussion leaders were selected for their knowledge of research and their experience in dealing with the problems of cross-cultural education and training. The leaders were Bingham Dai, a Chinese-born and sociology-trained psychoanalyst now at Duke University, qualified by personal experience as well as by education and profession to discuss problems of training and acculturation; M. Brewster Smith, a social psychologist who is coordinating research in the field of cross-cultural education for the Social Science Research Council; John Bennett, cultural anthropologist at the Ohio State University, who has been studying Japanese students in this country; and Ronald Lippitt, psychologist at the Research Center for Group Dynamics at the University of Michigan, who has made evaluation studies of German leaders brought to this country under the U.S. Government "democratization" program. The Chairman was Samuel P. Hayes, Jr., Director of the Foundation for Research on Human Behavior, whose training had been in economics and social psychology and who had a prominent part in the United States Point IV Program, both in Washington and in Southeast Asia.

This report gives only the highlights of the research findings and the discussion—the points which are believed to be of most interest and practical value.

Substantial differences exist among the training programs conducted by different kinds of sponsors. Different objectives, for example, distinguish the programs sponsored by business, government, and private non-profit organizations. Training settings described range from academic to in-the-factory or field environments. Considerable differences were also found among the kinds of trainees normally sponsored by these several types of organizations, in terms of age, educational level, strength of backing in
the home country, maturity and other factors.

Nevertheless, the seminar revealed a surprising similarity in the problems faced by the different sponsoring agencies.

Most of the research findings brought out and discussed at the seminar dealt with training and trainees in the academic environment. Almost no formal research was reported on industrial training programs, in spite of the wealth of practical business experience with these problems. While there appear to be similarities in the solutions to the training problems encountered by all these organizations, an outstanding need is for more research in the industrial context, to analyze existing experience and to test the hypotheses developed from research in other settings.

The report of the seminar discussion which follows begins with a brief section on the importance of current training programs of foreign nationals, and then considers the relationship between program objectives and program operations. The major portion of the report is devoted to studying the factors affecting the success of training programs, both in the temporal sequence experienced by the foreign visitor (from the initial selection and preparation in his home country, through his sojourn in the United States, and after his return home), and in terms of several types of adjustment problems and learning factors common to more than one stage of a training program. The seminar report then makes comparisons among several of the training programs discussed, and ends on the subject of needed research and evaluation. It should be noted that several sections of the present report, including the bibliography, include some new material not reported at the seminar.
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I. IMPORTANCE OF TRAINING PROGRAMS

In 1954 about 34,000 foreign nationals were on college and university campuses in the United States under governmental or private auspices for study and training. The Institute of International Education also estimates that, during the year 1955, some 40,000 foreign nationals will study, train, or teach in the United States, and approximately 20,000 Americans will go abroad for similar purposes.

The Federal Government is by far the largest single sponsor of the foreign nationals brought here for study and training. During 1954, as part of its program for increasing the economic strength of cooperating countries through the exchange of technical knowledge, the Foreign Operations Administration (now the International Cooperation Administration) brought almost 5,000 foreign nationals to the United States for training. In the same year some 4,000 foreign nationals were brought here under programs of the International Educational Exchange Service of the Department of State. The armed services sponsored the training of another sizeable group.

Hundreds of American business concerns also bring personnel of foreign subsidiaries, their dealers and others here for training. It is estimated that some 1,200 foreign nationals are brought to the United States annually for training by business concerns.

The substantial training programs of the United Nations and its specialized agencies are not elaborated upon in this report.

Awards are granted for study in any country in which suitable study or training facilities are available. Many foreign students, of course, also come to the United States for training under the sponsorship of their own governments.

Finally, a small number of foreign nationals are brought here by foundations and other private non-profit sponsors to secure advanced technical training or to gain familiarity with American life. For example, about 125 foreign nationals now come here annually to live with American farm families under the International Farm Youth Exchange program sponsored by the National 4-H Club Foundation.

Clearly, the training of foreign nationals has become a sizeable enterprise. Its size, furthermore, can scarcely begin to suggest its importance. By and large those who come here for training are a select group. Many of them already occupy positions which enable them to make prompt use of the skills they acquire here and to spread new knowledge among their countrymen. Simply to have been in the United States often increases their influence. When they return home, they are called upon to interpret their experience to many others. As an example, it has been estimated that those who come here under the Farm Youth Exchange program—and they are young and not especially influential—make, on the average, 100 talks to some 10,000 people after their return home; each youth is also likely to be on the radio about fifteen times and to write or be the subject of fifty to sixty newspaper stories. In the aggregate, it is evident, those who study or are trained here can do an

enormous amount to foster an understanding and objective appreciation of American institutions, traditions and achievements and the democratic ideals Americans aspire to realize; or they can give wider currency to misconceptions which may happen to support the charges directed against this country by Communist or nationalist propaganda.

The impression these foreign nationals gain of the United States and much of the effectiveness of their training depend upon what happens to them during their stay here. The experience they have in the United States will affect their future attitudes toward this country as well as their effectiveness as users of the specific knowledge and skills they came here to acquire. Thus, the outcome of their stay is a matter of concern not only to the particular organization sponsoring their training but to the future of the free world.

Early Cross-Cultural Programs

The educational exchange of persons is an age-old activity. For centuries students have traveled to centers of learning in other lands. On the other hand, organized programs for training citizens of other lands are of relatively recent origin. In the United States such programs have mushroomed to their present proportions in the short period since the end of World War II.

Some of the programs were developed in response to urgent needs and suffered from inadequate planning as a result. The Government of the United States was pressed by two post-war needs: to foster a climate of opinion favorable to this country and to transmit, as rapidly as possible, knowledge which would enable both the war-torn and the economically less developed nations of the world to rebuild their economies and to improve their living conditions. Companies with substantial operations abroad were faced with the task of training nationals of other lands in all phases of modern business, so that they could update business practices in their own countries.

Besides the haste in developing them, the programs also suffered from the rather casual assumption at the beginning that any international educational exchange would almost automatically produce desirable results. Today it is recognized that this initial assumption was overly optimistic, and that the wrong kind of training experience may do more harm than good.

The objectives of many of the programs which came into existence after the war proved anything but easy of fulfillment. A representative of a government agency commented on the enormous difficulty of

"transmitting know-how rapidly from nation to nation—across the great gulfs of language and culture and tradition, and over the high and mutual barriers of ignorance and suspicion and pride which cause Americans and others alike narrowly to regard their own way as the right way and the stranger’s way as evil, and to resist change because it is change."

Experience reported by participants also showed that even programs which succeeded in achieving their particular objectives often had unfortunate secondary effects. For example, a business firm found that, while its program increased the technical competence of those trained, the difference in the standard of living between the United States and their own country made some trainees intensely dissatisfied after their return home. An international organization found that its program had the unexpected consequence of making some trainees “cocky,” and thus hindered their adjustment to their own home situations. Many of those who came for technical or academic training returned home with anti-American attitudes confirmed or even intensified. One dissatisfied failure may undo the good of a number of successes.

Current Critical Attitude

Even if the difficulties of cross-cultural education had not forced themselves upon the attention of those who were conducting programs, it is probable that the early attitude of easy optimism would have eventually yielded to a more questioning attitude. Once the frenzied task of getting into operation
was over, the problem of how training programs could be improved came increasingly to the fore. It soon became apparent that little was known about the actual results of some programs. Even when a certain amount of information was available, it was often difficult to say why a program had succeeded in this respect and failed in that, or to identify cause-and-effect relationships.

The recognition of these facts has focused attention on the need for evaluation and research. Some governmental agencies and business organizations have launched their own evaluation programs. Under the stimulus of the Committee on Cross-Cultural Education of the Social Science Research Council, a small but growing number of university social scientists have undertaken studies of foreign trainees and their adjustment problems both here and upon return to their homelands.

In general, the growing awareness of the complexity of cross-cultural education has stimulated stock-taking and question-raising. Eventually, and to some extent almost at once, these activities are likely to lead to better planned and more effective programs. The seminar discussion reported here reflected this need for taking inventory of what is now known and what is still to be learned about the various factors which determine the success or failure of cross-cultural educational and training programs.

What is known suggests many of the factors that are relevant without determining the exact weight of each. These weights will vary anyhow, with the program and situation. Responsible policy makers nevertheless want to plan as many phases of their programs as they can in the light of the best knowledge now available.
II. OBJECTIVES OF EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

One of the points to which the seminar discussion returned again and again was the importance of defining the objectives of a sponsored exchange program.

It was considered helpful, in determining the objectives of any program for training foreign nationals in the United States, to keep in mind a distinction between academic or technical learning on the one hand, and cultural or attitudinal learning on the other. The former term refers to learning of specific, goal-directed professional techniques and technical information available in the United States. Such learning takes place primarily in technical schools, industrial and business concerns, and certain courses of college training. The second term, cultural or attitudinal learning, refers to understanding and assimilating the values, attitudes and patterns of interpersonal behavior present in American culture. Most of this learning takes place outside the classroom or shop, in the course of a trainee's daily living experiences.

Another aspect to be considered in establishing objectives deals with the goals of the home country from which the trainee comes. These are important to understand in view of the large number of students and trainees either sponsored by their governments or by "prestigious" organizations; in either case these trainees are "national emissaries" and come reflecting a background of conscious planning which expresses the national goals of technical modernization, cultural advance or national status, as well as the individual goals of the trainee. Both national and individual goals must be taken into account in developing the objectives of a training program.

Any objective, once set, will have its own action implications. An academic program or one which aims at teaching certain skills must be centrally concerned with establishing the kind of situation in which such learning can easily take place. A program which seeks to cultivate understanding and a favorable attitude toward the United States must include experiences which, through real participation by the visitors, bring them deeper insights into American attitudes and institutions. A program which hopes to influence attitudes will probably have to be longer than one which is primarily devoted to the development of certain skills.

Admittedly, the measures to be taken to achieve a given objective are not always so obvious. For example, in deciding upon the optimum age of trainees for programs designed to increase understanding of the United States, two conflicting considerations are relevant. Younger people are more adaptable, which would seem to recommend them for selection. On the other hand, they are less influential and may not yet be well enough established at home to put their training to use, should they face situational obstacles. If they develop strong pro-U.S. views, this in some countries may interfere with their progress or even their employment in their home environment. They may also be less stable than older trainees in maintaining the changed attitudes that result from their training in the United States.

To develop definitions of objectives is not an easy task. It is seldom sufficient, for example, to say that a program is concerned with increasing the technical knowledge and skill of those trained. More likely, an in-
dustry training program, for example, will aim to increase the level of competence of all its employees performing a given task abroad, not just of those being trained in the U.S. The ability of the trainees to pass their skills on to others must therefore be taken into account. A government program immediately concerned with teaching skills might have as its ultimate objective a broad acceleration of technological progress in a number of different countries. In some countries the achievement of that general objective might depend upon changes in social organizations and, perhaps even before that, changes in cultural attitudes. However, a propagandistic goal is likely to be self-defeating, as foreign visitors are rightly very sensitive to and critical of this kind of objective.

The goals of a training program should be kept in mind in planning all its principal features in interaction with the practical situation in which the program operates. To furnish reliable guidance, those goals must be exactly and fully defined.

Important Secondary Goals

Organizations engaged in training foreign nationals can seldom limit their attention to one goal, even when that goal is broadly defined. Inevitably the effects of a stay in another country are numerous. In the absence of comprehensive planning, some of the “side effects” may be undesirable in the extreme—so undesirable, in some cases, as to nullify the gains from the attainment of the objective with which an organization may have been exclusively concerned. While pro or anti-United States attitudes are not primarily determined by personal satisfaction, even a program which succeeded in increasing the technical skill of participants, for example, might also produce so much in the way of frustration or “threats” to ego that the visitors would return to their native lands insecure and hostile toward the United States.

In view of such possible side effects, it was felt that even a short program, which may necessarily have to concentrate largely upon the attainment of a single and relatively simple goal, should also make explicit its secondary goals. The selection of such goals, it was pointed out, is to some extent simply a matter of thinking through the kind of consequences a program is likely to have in any case. However, once consequences are translated into objectives, ways of achieving them will often suggest themselves.
III. FACTORS AFFECTING THE SUCCESS OF TRAINING PROGRAMS

There are a number of factors which appear to determine the success or failure of a training program at particular time stages or phases of the training experience. These factors and phases of adjustment, shown in the table, are discussed in the sections which follow.

Another group of significant factors, consisting of the nature of the learning situation, important elements in the back-home personality and environment of the trainee, and internal conflict because of a desire to adjust to American cultural values and mores while retaining those of the homeland, are also considered. These factors are continuing in character, generally applying to several time stages of personal adjustment during the training program.

A. Pre-arrival Factors

The success or failure of training programs depends to a major extent on two steps which antedate the actual arrival of students or trainees on United States soil. These are the selection and orientation of trainees prior to their departure from the home country.

1. Problems of Selection

Discussants from every field represented at the seminars stressed the importance of selecting trainees who are well qualified in terms of the objectives of a given program.

The necessity of taking account of intellectual ability, aptitudes, age, personality, present skill and experience in selecting trainees was generally recognized by participants, and relatively little was said about these factors. Yet techniques and procedures for determining the ability of the trainee to learn while in a foreign country are still inadequate, and practice falls considerably short of what it should be.

The desirability of investigating the motivation of prospective trainees received considerable attention. Some people might want to go to a foreign country for training, it was pointed out, simply because they have not satisfactorily adjusted to their own society and want to escape from it. Obviously these persons are not good prospects in terms of the objectives of most training programs.

The desirability of investigating the values and ideology of prospective trainees, and feelings toward the United States, was also emphasized. Unfavorable attitudes do not automatically call for the elimination of a candidate, but may call for special planning of experiences and for extra efforts to interpret America. Where such attitudes are rigidly held, there is very little likelihood that the training experience will alter them.

The importance of still other factors important in selection (and in back-home application) has emerged only as a result of recent research. Noteworthy among these latter factors is the position of the prospective trainee in his home society: his status and present degree of responsibility. The person who has status—who, for example, comes from an important family or a high caste, or occupies an important position in business or in government—is of course in a strategic position both to influence opinion and to use—and perhaps get others to use—the knowledge and skill he acquires during his training. Moreover, a person's status is
likely to affect the benefit he derives from training. The trainee who has a good job to return to and feels secure is most likely to profit from his educational experience, to take personal and social problems in stride, and to readjust easily upon his return home. Studies indicate that, at least among Japanese, status is a factor of importance even among students and those just embarking upon their careers (33d). It is the trainees who feel they have an assured place in the power hierarchy at home, and who in consequence have high self-esteem and a feeling of confidence about their prospects on their return, who are most likely to profit from their training experience. A trainee who comes from a group which is low in the power hierarchy, or who for any other reason feels insecure, is more likely to feel under some compulsion to conform uncritically to American customs and ideas or, alternatively, to reject everything unfamiliar.

Summary of Adjustment Phases and Factors Affecting Training of Foreign Nationals in the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases of Adjustment</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Significant Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Preparation</td>
<td>Pre-arrival</td>
<td>Motivation for U.S. training, Goals and expectations, Time perspective, Status in home society, Sponsorship, Language facility, Values, Preconceptions about U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Spectator</td>
<td>Sojourn in U.S.</td>
<td>Culture contrasts, Felt national status, Self-esteem, Length of sojourn, Personal contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coming-to-terms</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overlapping membership, Open channels of communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pre-departure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Return adjustment</td>
<td>After Return to Homeland</td>
<td>Political relations with U.S., Public opinion of U.S., Prestige of U.S. training, Usefulness of training, Clique affiliations, Follow-up support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Numbers in parentheses refer to references in the bibliography.
Another factor which is closely related to status in the home society and which may influence the success of training, is the kind of organizational sponsorship a prospective trainee has in his home society. Strong sponsorship has been found to have a helpful effect, whether the sponsoring group is low or high in the power hierarchy. For example, Japanese trainees who are sponsored by some minority group—say, a group associated with the Christian church or some feminist organization—are not in as fortunate a position as those sponsored by some major power group, but they are more likely to feel secure and to profit from their training than trainees who come here with no organizational backing at all.

These factors of status and sponsorship also affect the training-adjustment period in the United States, and the degree of influence that a trainee will have upon his return home. For this reason the relationships between these and other background factors in the home society were discussed quite thoroughly in the seminar, as a possible guide to better identification and understanding of the adjustment problems of trainees coming from class societies (such as Japan’s) where these factors are especially significant.

An interesting new finding of cross-cultural research is that the feelings foreign nationals have about their own country’s status in relationship to the United States are likely to affect the success of their adjustment here. Even under the best of conditions, training in a foreign culture may create problems of adjustment. When trainees are personally secure and confident of the status of their country, the strain during the period of adjustment abroad is likely to be relatively slight. Preliminary findings from a recent study (33i) indicate that, so far as attitudes toward the United States are concerned, the relationship (gain or loss) between felt national status and the national status the foreign student perceives that Americans accord his nationality is considerably more important than accorded national status as such. Nevertheless, students from countries such as Japan which have suffered recent military defeat, and from countries such as India which have only recently achieved independence, often feel that their homeland is looked down upon, and may in consequence feel insecure or react defensively. Defensiveness may manifest itself either as hostility or withdrawal and thus constitute a serious obstacle to a satisfying adjustment and to learning.

2. Categories of Trainees

This section describes foreign students and trainees in several broad categories, largely related to the “back-home” factors discussed in the preceding section. These categories should be thought of, not as sharply separated types but, as groups with different tendencies.

Among the large group of students and trainees from foreign countries visiting the United States each year it is necessary to make a broad distinction between those from European countries, Canada, and the more advanced Latin American nations on the one hand, and those from the so-called “underdeveloped” countries of Asia, Africa, the Middle East and Latin America on the other. In type of response to American life, rate and motivation for learning, and adjustment to the home society after return, differences are found between these two groups. Such differences do not always hold true with respect to individuals; here the usual exceptions to group generalization are to be found. Nevertheless, administrators of training programs may reasonably anticipate that a trainee from Germany will probably look at America and his own role in the program quite differently from a trainee from India. Research in the cross-cultural learning situation has demonstrated that these very broad differences exist.

What are these differences? In the first place, the trainee from an “underdeveloped” nation, or one which has completed its modernization only recently (e.g., Japan), is aware of the “tutor” role the United States may have played or is playing with respect to his country’s institutions. He is likely therefore to “look up” to America and to the
American who plays the role of instructor; and he is just as likely to feel anxious and perhaps even resentful of his "subordinate" position in this situation as he is to respect it. The trainee is also likely to be imbued with a strong consciousness of the importance of his learning experience to his own country. In contrast to the European trainee, who is usually viewing America as a coordinate or equal culture, and mainly interested in his own career, the trainee from underdeveloped or recently modernized lands feels that his role as a learner singles him out back home. He feels that he is contributing (or worries about not contributing adequately) to his country's changing institutions. He is highly motivated; or he may be over-anxious. In any event, his special position vis-à-vis the U.S. and his own society introduces tensions into the training situation which are usually less marked for the European student.

While these group generalizations based on country of origin of the trainee appear to have considerable weight, individual differences are, of course, important. Research appears to show that over and above the differences due to country of origin, trainees—from the same or different countries—differ among themselves on the basis of certain definite factors. These factors are not only the usual ones based on individual differences in socialization, but also those due to differing relationships of the individuals to the program of change in their country. Not all trainees from underdeveloped countries have identical patterns of relationship to their society and its prestigious organizations; not all are able to perceive themselves in the role of "learner for the national good."

What is responsible for the differing relationships of these individuals to the "central stream" in the home society? In a program of modernization there always exist individuals whose objectives and personal interests are not completely in tune with the official protocol of change. Left-wing ideologists, intellectuals wishing to break with tradition, people who have failed in the accepted system of domestic education, or who otherwise are not completely identified with the groups in power, appear in America in varying student or trainee capacities. Some of these may be close to the conforming group, but others are not. Some are from strongly-organized "deviant" groups in their own countries (many Christians from Asian nations are in this category); others are sponsored by important groups at home, but secretly deny the identification this implies; still others are virtual "isolates," in a process of flight from frustrations or pressures at home. In short, modernization produces not only a group of highly-identified and motivated learners who are sent abroad by the main power groups, but also people who to some degree have been excluded or pushed into alienation. In virtually every training program a few of these individuals are to be found, even though training programs in industry and government probably hold a majority of the identified group.

We may divide trainees from underdeveloped and recently modernized countries, then, into two large groups: those who might be called the "conformers" and those who might be called the "deviates." These terms are descriptive only of tendencies and within them many differences of degree exist. Nevertheless, these designations may help administrators to predict the outcome or success of a learning experience, and also to predict much about how the learned material will be put to use at home, after return from abroad.

The "conformer" identifies himself with those groups living in the current of officially-announced goals of national modernization and development, planned and implemented by the government and the more important organizations in the political, financial and educational fields. In most cases, trainees from these groups seek training abroad in technical and administrative areas. They are usually persons with high status and strong sponsorship. Although they tend to be conservative, they are apt to be objective and analytic in this country. They accept without deep personal involvement or inward change the new ideas and behavior needed to accomplish the tasks for
which they were sent abroad. Adjustment to
the foreign culture is therefore relatively
easy for them. However, among the trainees
from the conforming group may be some
from highly orthodox sects who desire in-
novation and change only within patterns of
traditional cultural values and "national
honor." These persons tend to be hyper-
nationalist and may reject many American
values during their stay in this country. The
"conformers", as a group, stand a good
chance of using their new knowledge for
socially-defined ends in their own countries,
and also of being accepted and employed to
implement these ends.

The "deviates," on the other hand, find it
more difficult to apply their knowledge and
to find rewarding and socially useful tasks,
although this by no means implies that they
cannot do so. The "deviate," whether an
"ideologist" or an "isolate," is more apt to
become deeply involved emotionally and in-
tellectually in the foreign culture. The
"ideologist" is looking toward the liberal and
progressive aspects of American culture
with the hope of introducing them in his own
society. The "isolate," having largely re-
jected his own national identification, may
have gone abroad not only for an education,
but even in hope of settling there. If he re-
turns to his home country, he is likely to
have a difficult readjustment and to be found
in the fringe areas of his society, in liaison
positions, in foreign branches of Western
companies and the like.

Typical differences in career lines can be
traced between these two main groups of
trainees. In the case of the Japanese, the
"deviate" type of student or trainee—if he
has "made good"—characteristically has
moved from job to job, in a process of "sell-
ing himself," to some sector of the society
or economy or professional world that may
finally accept him. A high proportion are
found in the competitive individualistic
spheres of the Japanese economy: pioneers
of a new manufacturing process; advertising
men; and the like. Still others are found in
the "liaison" occupations: doctors to the
foreign colony; interpreters for foreign
business houses, etc. All these may be
socially useful occupations, but they are
less directly part of the officially-planned
scheme of modernization. Still others,
particularly those "deviates" who are mem-
ers of some well-knit small "deviant"
group, like Christianity (in Japan), find sat-
sification in remaining in this group through-
out their career and lifetime.

On the other hand, the career lines of the
"conformer" Japanese overseas students in-
dicate stable movement in established pro-
fessional and industrial channels, already
available to them at the time they went
overseas, and open to them upon their re-
turn. A large number of the line positions
of Japanese institutions are filled by "con-
formers" who were sent overseas by their
organization in order to acquire needed
training.

In a sense, then, the "conformer" type of
trainee never leaves his own country. He
departs physically, but remains psycholog-
ically, in the sense of preserving his
identifications and connections. Of course,
the longer he stays in the United States the
greater the risk of cultural alienation—that
is, the learning of new social habits which to
certain extent render him less fit for easy
adjustment back in the home social world.
But considerable cultural alienation will not
endanger the career of the individual who is
certain of social and professional acceptance
at home. The "deviate" person, on the other
hand, suffers not only cultural alienation, but
is likely to be socially alienated upon return
as well. This makes his return role a very
difficult one.

The origins of this process must be traced
back to the ambivalent reactions of the home
country to the United States. While we may
be looked up to as a tutor, we may also be
resented as a superior, and spurned because
of that superiority—either as manifested by
the American or as erroneously perceived
by the foreigner. Back home, the American-
trained national cannot expect to find respect
and acceptance merely because he has re-
ceived an American education or training;
this will happen only if such training is val-
ued in his particular groups and organiza-
tions. The home society reserves the right
to set up its own standards of acceptance, and its own evaluations of the meaning of an American education.

Exceptions to these rules are found only in periods of exceptionally rapid and intense learning from the West. There have been times in Japan's history when anything American was an automatic mark of prestige, and when all students educated in America found acceptance back home. But these periods have been relatively rare—when the society lacked its own domestic elite educational system, and in the early Occupation period. In all other periods, America has been used by the Japanese, but not necessarily loved, and the evaluations of the returned foreign student have followed the complex and ambivalent attitudes pertaining thereto. At the present time, when America is widely suspected in Asian countries undergoing a surge of nationalism, it is hardly to be expected that American prestige will transfer automatically to the trainee. It may, but only if this is understood in his initial "departure role" in his own society.

The categories of students described above bear a marked similarity to the types of visiting trainee described in a later section dealing with what has been called "the overlapping membership conflict," and a few comparisons are noted there. However, as the two studies had different objectives, dealt with different nationality groups, and were characterized by different techniques, a systematic comparison between the two sets of types would be premature at this stage. In any generalizations about types of trainees, these "back-home" factors must be taken into account in anticipating the probable attitudes, roles and behavior of foreign students while in this country, and in predicting their probable success upon returning home.

Many other factors beside these back-home elements affect the individual's learning experience and his later effectiveness. The length of the sojourn is important. The amount of language ability will also affect the learning process and the identity problem in various ways. The nature of the training or educational program itself is also an important factor. How much contact with "ordinary Americans" does it afford? Or, is it focused on intensive or extensive learning goals? The goals of the trainee himself also make a great difference, as has been mentioned. Is he anticipating a broadly informative or "general improvement" type of experience, or a narrowly and intensively conceived one? The orientation programs vary widely: Some are insults to the intelligence of the visitor; others are excellently conceived as a means of formulating objectives and clarifying knowledge gained. In general, the "conformer" type of trainee takes what comes, and makes allowances for frustrations—assuming that his own objectives are not too seriously violated, or his nationalistic suspicions of American motives too pronounced. The "deviate" trainee, on the other hand, is likely to have very individual and unpredictable reactions, depending upon his own particular personal situation and problems. In general, he is probably more positively attached to the United States than the "conformer," since he is alienated from his own country in some degree from the start, but such positive attachment is frequently very unstable, and can swing to the other extreme if he finds that America, too, has failed him.

In digesting these research findings about back-home starting points one can say that the state of relations between the United States and the country of the trainee is one important consideration for the program administrator. A second is the type of connections or identifications the trainee has with his society and culture. A third is the prestige of the group sending him to this country. A fourth is the possible conflict between the goals of the program and the goals of the trainee and his country or sponsoring groups. The last three factors represent possible differences between trainees from the same country, which should be taken into account by the program planner, those selecting the trainees, and the trainer in the United States.

Insofar as selection of trainees from a given country is concerned, it would be an error to conclude that one should choose trainees only from conforming groups. For
a program which seeks to anticipate social change, it might prove sound strategy deliberately to choose some trainees from deviant groups. Even though their adjustment might be difficult in the United States, and their influence at home slight at first, it would be advantageous to have, among groups likely to become important in the future, members with a deep understanding of American thought and ways. (19)

3. Language Facility

Many promising candidates of course must be eliminated from consideration, or their training deferred, when knowledge of English is made a requirement of selection for a training program. Furthermore, requiring a knowledge of English is likely to be characterized by some disappointed candidates as an example of "Yankee cultural imperialism." Is it necessary that trainees know English?

The predominant view at the seminar was that considerable facility in English should be demanded of candidates for most training programs. There are exceptions, of course. For example, some organizations bring over students from a given country in large enough numbers to justify the employment of a translator or a teacher who speaks the students' language. But in most cases, it was emphasized, a knowledge of English is indispensable for forming good social relationships, which do a great deal to determine the pleasantness and meaning of a visitor's stay. It is in social situations that most of the informal learning of American ways of doing things takes place. It is through the nuances of language that the foreign visitor must grasp the social cues which enable him to adjust to our culture. Students who come here from a culture which differs markedly from America's have perhaps the greatest need for facility in English, to help in their adjustment process.

At the Ann Arbor seminar, the representative of the English Language Institute at the University of Michigan made a number of points of importance to program planners and administrators.

Claims about knowledge of English are not to be relied upon. Tests are now available which permit program planners to determine how much time will be required to teach English to a prospective candidate in view of the purpose and expense of a particular training program. The decision can then be made whether or not this much added time is justified. Anyone whose judgement and objectivity can be trusted can give these tests whether or not he has special qualifications in the field of language. The tests can be given abroad, with written instructions to those giving them.

The English Language Institute rejects the notion that there are those who cannot learn a second language, but recognizes differences of ability in this as in other fields. There is a very low positive correlation between speed of learning English and general intellectual ability. On the other hand, among foreign students in the United States, there is a fairly high correlation between facility in English and academic success.

Experience indicates that foreign students can seldom gain adequate English facility rapidly by such informal means as living with an American family, going to movies or dating American girls.

Persons who come here not knowing any English usually make a mistake in believing that they can pick up the language in two months of intensive study. Of those who take intensive course work at the English Language Institute, one-third require four or even six months of work for real understanding and use of the language. Another one-third get a fair minimum in two months but still need special attention in regular course work. The remaining one-third may be said to communicate fairly successfully when they arrive, but they also benefit from further work.

4. At-Home Orientation Programs

Even well-qualified candidates for training abroad are likely to face some difficulty in adjusting to a foreign culture, and if the process of selection is carefully handled it will uncover some of the specific factors likely to cause difficulty. The best time and
place for beginning to deal with these factors is while trainees are still in their homeland. Good at-home orientation programs can do a great deal to ease adjustment problems and to put trainees in the right frame of mind to profit from their stay here.

Orientation programs present an ideal opportunity, for example, to discover trainees' motives for seeking training abroad. It may be assumed that at least some of these motives will become known during the period when candidates are being chosen. The benefits which may be derived from training can be thoroughly covered during the orientation sessions, so that desirable motives for undertaking training can be strengthened. It is equally important, however, that there be a frank discussion of the undesirable or unrealistic goals some candidates may have, so that they can adjust their expectations as quickly as possible.

The goals and expectations of most participants, it was felt, are likely to be too high rather than too low. For example, many trainees may have unrealistic notions about how much they can accomplish in a stay of six months or a year. Again, some may not have faced up to the disadvantages their training entails. It represents an interruption of their career; it may cause them to be looked upon with suspicion by those who dislike the United States or have a low estimation of the kind of training available here. Trainees should be warned of these possibilities, both to spare them later disillusionment and to compel them to accept responsibility for their training. Once they have done this, they are far more likely to take the training seriously and to benefit from it.

In other matters, too, trainees may have unrealistic ideas which can be corrected during the orientation period. For example, some may have mistaken notions about how hard they will have to work and how much free time they will have while they are here. Others will have misconceptions about the United States, and relatively few will have as much knowledge of this country as is desirable. While they are still in their homeland, trainees should be given the essential background information they will need to smooth their adjustment. If they come from a culture which differs markedly from ours, emphasis should be placed on the differences, so that they will arouse a minimum of difficulty later on. For example, if trainees come from a culture in which only lower-caste people are expected to perform manual work, they should probably be acquainted with the quite different attitude which prevails in this country. Such briefing is, of course, indispensable if they themselves are likely to be asked to master an operation by working in factory or field.

For those planning or responsible for pre-departure orientation, another general caution, which links orientation to the later phases of adjustment, should be noted. Until the trainee is actually involved in the process of cross-cultural adjustment, he is likely to be impervious to much of even the best orientation and may fail to register information for which he will later see the need. This is not to say that orientation is useless, but that the "orienter", too, can set his sights too high. It seems probable that orientation in the sheer mechanics of living in the United States and attaining professional goals (e.g. Internal Revenue regulations, formal academic requirements) is more likely to be appreciated at this stage than general orientation to American history and institutions of the U.S.A.

B. Sojourn Factors

The several studies sponsored by the Committee on Cross-Cultural Education of the Social Science Research Council indicate that the stay of foreign students in the United States usually falls into a fairly regular pattern. This pattern has four more or less distinct phases.

1. The Spectator Phase

First of all, there is a "spectator" stage. During this stage the trainee is essentially a "tourist" and does not feel personally involved in the local culture. He is simply observing the new sights and experiences
which come his way, having an exciting ad-
venture. He has not been forced to face up
to the problems he will later have to meet in
order to achieve his objectives, or has not
yet buckled down to solving them.

As a result of this sense of being free of
responsibility, his predominant mood, even
in the face of some confusion and vexation,
is likely to be one of curiosity, surprise
and interest. Since he does not yet feel per-
sonally involved in American life and ways,
he can disassociate himself from anything
unpleasant, and is likely to feel quite well
satisfied.

2. The Involvement Phase

These feelings, of course, are unstable.
Sooner or later, if the trainee is here for
any length of time, the first glow fades. The
trainee enters what might be called the “in-
volve ment phase” of his sojourn. Problems
which cannot be sidestepped arise in both the
learning and social spheres. In part because
the trainee’s initial expectations are likely
to have been unrealistic, he is apt to experi-
ce a number of disappointments. His self-
estem may be deflated. He may be sub-
jected to highly disagreeable inner tensions.
He finds he has surprising difficulty in
adapting himself to American life.

To some extent, doubtless, the shedding of
 illusions characteristic of this stage is not
only necessary but desirable. Some degree
of frustration and tension, or “work anxiety”
is essential, for learning requires attitude
change and the acquiring of new points of
view. Some shift in attitude is probably also
indispensable if the trainee is to assess
realistically the United States and the ex-
periences he has here.

Unfortunately, the changes which occur
during the involvement phase cannot be de-
pended upon to stop at precisely the point
which is most desirable. Ordinarily they do
not. They may proceed to a point where the
trainee feels disillusioned and even actually
depressed. In this mood he may withdraw
into his shell or else exhibit so much hos-
tility as to invite negative reactions from all
but the most sympathetic and understanding
people with whom he comes in contact.
These negative reactions may deepen or
prolong the trainee’s period of maladjust-
ment and make it more difficult for him to
work out any satisfactory adjustment. The
period of his stay may even come to an end
without his overcoming the difficulties of
this second phase.

3. The Coming-to-terms Phase

If matters work out more fortunately,
however, the trainee eventually enters a
period in which he effects at least a partial
solution of his problems and comes to terms
with himself, the United States and the train-
ing experience. By this time, to be sure, his
expectations may be somewhat lower than
when he arrived, but this very fact may en-
able him to secure a measure of satisfaction
from what he is actually able to accomplish.
This period of adjustment usually represents
an up-swing in the trainee’s outlook which
coincides with the acquisition of adequate
language skills, progress in the learning
situation, the establishment of satisfying
personal relationships, and at least a partial
resolution of various personal and emotional
problems.

4. The Pre-departure Phase

Toward the end of a trainee’s stay in the
U. S., a fourth phase may usually be distin-
guished in which problems of home readjust-
ment come to the fore. He is then likely to
give more thought to the problem of how he
is going to make use of his training after his
return. This phase of his stay provides a
made-to-order opportunity for helping him
pull together what he has learned, focusing
his attention upon ways and means of adapt-
ing what he has learned to the situation in
his homeland, and helping him develop a plan
and the most effective strategy to follow in
using his training and his experience most
effectively.

The pre-departure period provides a good
opportunity for dealing with a number of
other important educational tasks. It is a
good time, for example, to help the student
work through any conflict he still feels be-
tween culture values in the United States and in his homeland. It is a good time to help him synthesize the things he has learned—and to fit them into a still larger framework, should that be desirable. Finally, the pre-departure period provides an opportunity for correcting misconceptions about the United States and for giving the student an introduction to those aspects of American life for which he has hitherto had no time.

Though these opportunities are only beginning to be appreciated, some highly promising means of making the most of the pre-departure period have already been developed. One business firm holds long interviews with all returning trainees. These interviews, which are tape recorded, give the students a chance to synthesize their impressions. By giving them a chance to "sound off," it is felt that they provide a measure of cathartic relief. Since the students are encouraged to offer criticisms and to indicate when they feel that a given problem is handled better in their homeland than it is in the United States, the interviews also contribute to the feeling that training is a two-way affair and that the company too is learning from them.

The Foreign Operations Administration (now the International Cooperation Administration) developed a still more ambitious program for utilizing the pre-departure period. The agency felt that for students to make good use of their new knowledge or skill on their return they would have to have some understanding of the way their particular specialty fitted in with other specialties and with broad problems of economic development. It was also desired to give returning students a better understanding of the United States than they had been able to secure during the time when they were concentrating on their technical training.

As a means of achieving both objectives, a two-week seminar, called the Institute on Economic Development, was planned for departing students. A mimeographed FOA document describes the purposes of the seminar in this way:

"It is designed to show how agricultural and industrial techniques intermesh, how public health, education, administration, and public works all relate to and support agricultural and industrial growth. Each specialist will learn how his work fits into a larger pattern. This large lesson can be taught by showing how the various specialties developed and supported each other in the growth of the United States. Partly, the Institute will be a case study of aspects of United States growth useful to an understanding of growth in the under-developed countries today.

An effort should also be made to develop an exchange of information on problems and approaches among the various under-developed countries which will be represented.

The first Institute was held in the summer of 1954 at Vanderbilt University. The FOA (ICA) felt this was so successful that it plans to hold similar Institutes in various parts of the country at various times, so that a substantial portion of all participants in FOA (ICA) technical training programs can have the benefit of this kind of pre-departure experience.

5. The U-Shaped Curve

The normal pattern of adjustment by a foreign visitor or trainee in the United State, from the spectator through the pre-departure phase, has been described as a U-shaped curve, with lower personal satisfaction associated with the involvement (second phase) and early part of the coming-to-terms (third) phases. This U-shaped curve of adjustment, whose components have been described in the preceding sections, is sketched in the figure on the next page. The figure is schematic. The height, the steepness and the time span of the various phases vary in accordance with numerous factors. They vary for different nationality groups; they vary for each individual trainee. Japanese students, for example, are likely to require at least a year to work through the severe problems they usually face in adjusting to American life. Students from northern European countries, particularly if they arrive with a good command of English, may work through their problems in a fraction of the time. In this respect as in others, there are
wide differences among groups and individuals. There is no such person as "the" foreign student. Nevertheless, it is obviously desirable for those who conduct training programs to have a general impression of the various phases through which foreign trainees are likely to pass, and the sketch may help to visualize the entire process. A number of the operating implications of the pattern are presented in a later section of this report.

6. The Learning Situation

Throughout the foreign visitor's sojourn in the United States, the kind of situations in which learning takes place are of major importance to the success of the training program. Discussion at the seminars was directed at both the immediate learning situation, and the social environment (the out-of-school or workshop learning situation). It was pointed out that in either situation the trainee's learning is a function of his personality and his environment, both present and past. The immediate learning situation is one within which interaction between the trainee and the trainer takes place, but the whole social environment—including the host-culture—conditions this learning, as do also the trainee's home culture, his experience, and his professional, social and family ties. This dual-culture environment of the trainee is illustrated in the figure opposite:

A Generalized U-shaped Curve Relates the Foreign National's Adjustment to His Length of Sojourn in the United States.

NOTE: This U-shaped curve shows, schematically, the usual drop in a trainee's satisfaction after the initial spectator phase is over, and as he becomes involved in and concerned about his adjustment problems. The trainee ordinarily reaches a trough reflecting his adjustment difficulties and a low level of satisfaction, until he begins to "come-to-terms" with American culture, making whatever adjustments he can with the help of those around him. If his visit lasts long enough for him to come-to-terms with American ways and ideas, he may reach and maintain a reasonable level of satisfaction and personal adjustment by the time he must get ready for his departure. At this stage he has a last chance to complete his adjustment and reorient himself to his return home and the application of his training. All dimensions of this curve are variable depending on the individual, his background and his training experience in this country.
The Trainee's Learning is Related to His Personality and His Environment, Past and Present.

The creation of a favorable learning situation is of course an important goal of all educational and training programs. The personality and competence of teachers, and the relationship of teachers and students, are among the most important elements of the immediate learning situation.

The Special Importance of the Out-of-School Environment

The "home" life of students, their living arrangements, their social life and their out-of-school environment also inevitably affect the learning process. In the case of foreign students these factors often play a particularly significant role. In most cases the foreign student is separated from his family and close friends. He feels uprooted and lonely, no longer a part of a social structure in which he plays a part, possibly a significant one.

Inevitably these feelings lead the foreign student to hope for new ties which in some measure will replace the ones temporarily severed. One of his deepest longings is for close personal relationships with at least some of the people he meets here. The openness and cordiality which appear to prevail even in many quite casual relationships in this country may encourage him in these expectations.

One particularly keen desire of the foreign student may be to partake of American family life, to be invited into the home on an easy, informal basis. Curiosity as well as loneliness may contribute to this desire—curiosity about such matters as the amount of independence and influence the wife enjoys in this country as compared to his own, and the relations of parents and children.

If the desires of the foreign student for good personal relationships are frustrated, his self-esteem, perhaps already affected by economic or cultural contrasts, by poor facility in English, etc., is likely to suffer further. On the other hand, if he establishes good social relationships, the resulting self-confidence may help him to progress more rapidly with his training. Such relationships have also been found to be one of the most potent forces for destroying unfavorable stereotypes and for catalyzing changes in international attitudes. More and more, organizations are advisedly extending themselves to arrange some social opportunities for trainees, including whenever feasible some contacts for each trainee with people who speak his native tongue.

Foreign students are often dependent upon their American friends for advice and help about social matters. Though they are eager for such advice, they are easily wounded when they receive it. They can often accept help only when it is given by someone they know and like, and then only when the hints are tactful and well timed. If some impersonal means can be found for offering the hints, so much the better. Sometimes the students themselves take care of this by jokes and references in skits.

7. Training Trainers

In both the immediate learning situation and the social environment, recognition of the trainee's personal and cultural characteristics is a major responsibility of trainers. Sensitivity to these factors, and flexibility and imagination in reacting to them, is highly important.

It follows that those who are going to train nationals of other countries should be se-
lected on the basis of personality considera-
tions as well as technical competence. It is
essential to find trainers who are warm and
secure, who are sensitive and perceptive,
and who like, respect and are at ease with
people from an alien culture.

It is probably desirable to provide some
sort of training for the trainers themselves.
Even though such training may make some
teachers self-conscious and stiff, such an
effect is probably temporary and the risk is
more than compensated by the many valuable
results. On the other hand, training pro-
grams should not be too ambitious. Those
who are going to teach should not feel over-
whelmed by precautionary measures and
special techniques.

The one indispensable goal of training
programs for trainers is to give those who
do not already have it some sense of the
relativity of cultural values. With such a
sense, they will be more effective teachers.
They will keep in mind and frequently point
out that the American way of doing or view-
ing something is one among many; and of
course their very humility will make the
merits of the American approach more ac-
ceptable. Without such a sense, they are
likely to give the impression that the Ameri-
can approach is the only right one and thus
precipitate defensive reactions among their
students. As has already been indicated,
such reactions constitute formidable barri-
ers to learning.

Beyond imbuing trainers with a sense of
the relativity of cultural values, training for
trainers might well include the following
areas:

a. Characteristics of our own culture. It
is of course difficult for anyone to isolate
and identify the assumptions by which he
lives and breathes. Yet some aspects of
American culture, while taken for granted
in this country, are likely to strike foreig-
ners as very strange or even emotionally
disturbing. Perhaps the most important
reason for training American trainers is to
make them more conscious of our own
"culture-bound" values which are not ac-
cepted by foreigners as having universal
validity. (28) Recognizing some characteris-
tics of our own culture as they are likely to
appear to foreigners will make any trainer
better.

b. Characteristics of foreign cultural
groups. Although it takes a long time to be-
come expert in even a single foreign culture,
certain recurrent traits or features of cul-
tural groups can be singled out to be watched
for. Trainers should be given help in learn-
ing some of the salient characteristics of
the major foreign cultural groups with which
they will come in contact.

c. Reassurance about personal biases.
Trainers should not be made to feel guilty
about biases or "culture-boundedness" which
they are making a genuine effort to root out;
the job cannot be done overnight. Bias,
where it exists, should be faced rather than
ignored. The very fact of facing it will help
the trainer to eradicate it, and to curb and
control it in the meantime.

d. Sensitivity to problems of students.
Trainers should be aware of the difficulties
their students may be experiencing. Ideally,
trainers should know at just what point each
student is, in terms of his personal adjust-
ment, and exactly what kinds of problems
are worrying him. Of course, it is seldom
practicable for trainers to secure exact and
detailed information of this kind. It may be
feasible, however, to give them some gener-
al information about the kinds of problems
foreign students frequently face and some
tips that will help them to interpret the re-
sponses and attitudes of groups and individu-
al students. Teachers may otherwise easily
attach the wrong meaning to the behavior of
their students. For example, they may re-
gard questions as implied criticisms rather
than taking them for what they usually are—
wholesome indications that learning is taking
place. Or, insecurity and defensiveness on
the part of some trainees, resulting from
the problem of felt national status mentioned
earlier, may exist and may be apparent to
the trainer. Rather than bringing this sensi-
tive area into the open for discussion (where
attempts at therapy could easily be bungled),
it was recommended that those conducting
either pre-training orientation or training
itself be particularly careful of the trainee's feelings and avoid giving unnecessary af­
fronts or reacting personally to defensively motivated resentment shown by trainees.

Other Recommendations

Not only the relationship between teacher and students but the whole training situation
should be put on a basis of mutuality. Every­thing possible should be done to convey
the idea: "You are learning from us, we are also learning from you." Such an attitude is
desirable not only because it makes students more receptive to what we have to teach
them, but because it may make us receptive to what they have to teach us. This may be
considerable, even when students come from countries which lag behind the United States
in technological development. There are other things which we can learn from them.

Trainees should have someone, other than
their teacher, to whom they can turn when
they are puzzled or unhappy. Counselors are
often utilized with good results. Difficulties
which trainees might hesitate to bring up
with the teachers themselves can often be
threshed out with counselors. Trainees may
also find it easier to discuss personal prob­
lems with them.

It may be worth-while to give trainees
opportunities to discuss their problems in
group sessions as well as in individual con­
ferences. In group sessions, finding that
others share their difficulties and dissatis­
factsions, they may be less reticent about
expressing their feelings. Group discussions
also provide an opportunity for pooling ideas
for dealing with personal or intellectual
problems.

Especially where students are trained in
groups, it is sometimes desirable for them
to have a spokesman through whom they can
voice any complaints. The spokesman may
be formally elected or simply a natural
leader in whom the members of the group
find it easy to confide.

8. The Overlapping Membership Conflict

An important component of most trainee's
adjustment problems, during the sojourn
stages described in the sections on the
U-shaped curve, is what has been termed the
"overlapping membership conflict." This
conflict has been touched upon in the section
on the learning situation. Almost anyone
who goes to another land to study may find
himself in conflict because of his desire on
the one hand to win acceptance in the host
country and adjust to its mores and values,
and his equally natural desire on the other
hand to retain his identification with his
homeland. The most thorough recent study
of this "overlapping membership conflict"
was with members of German leader teams
coming to this country (24), but the results
were believed to have some degree of appli­
cation to trainees from other countries as
well. Where this conflict exists, it may
extend into the period after the trainee's
return home. This study of German leaders
is noteworthy in that it represents the only
systematic research available which follows
the same individuals both through their so­
journ in the United States and their readjust­
ment back home.

The German trainees studied dealt with
the conflict in one of the three following
ways:

a. Adjustment: Emphasis upon the United
States. Some trainees simply blanked out
their back-home ties. In their desire to ad­
just to the United States and to those with
whom they came in contact, they showed an
uncritical willingness to accept the superi­
ority of the American way of doing things.
They did not even ask such natural questions
as whether a practice might not have to be
adapted in some way in order to work in
Germany or whether it could hope to win
acceptance there. When they came in con­
tact with someone who disparaged a German
practice or viewpoint, they were all too
ready to agree with him.

The study identified a number of the fac­
tors which were responsible for this par­
ticular solution. Most of those who adopted,
or rather fell into it, had weak back-home
identification and sponsorship. A few had
deep feelings of national inferiority. By and
large these uncritical adaptors not only had
little to hang onto in their homeland; they
had made a poor adjustment there, which they were eager to forget. Unconsciously they were looking for a new base, a place where they could develop a feeling of "belonging." These trainees were called "situational adapters" who follow the axiom "when in Rome do as the Romans do." They also adapt again quickly when they get home. In some cases the already-strong inclination of these trainees to conform to American values was reinforced by the pressures put upon them by some of those responsible for their training.

b. Rejection of the United States: Emphasis Upon Back Home. A second group of trainees refused to see anything good about the United States. They staunchly and sometimes rather desperately held on to their ties to the homeland.

At the unconscious level some members of this group also had a weak sense of identification with Germany, but they reacted to it in altogether different fashion. They felt guilty about their disaffection and anxious about the possibility that they might find America more attractive than the homeland. To forestall the danger they unconsciously sought a basis for rejecting everything American.

Other members of this group came here with strong prejudices against the United States. These people tended to view everything they saw or learned about this country selectively; they sought out the flaws which would confirm their preconceptions.

Some of these rejectors were found to have a nagging, continuous consciousness of the problems and responsibilities which had to be faced upon their return to Germany. This feeling was especially prevalent among strongly-sponsored trainees. It is possible that they felt that there was some conflict between the demands of the sponsoring institution and their acceptance of American ways and values. They appeared to be asking themselves, in effect: "How would it look back home if I indicated I liked this?"

c. State of Even Balance. A third, smaller group of trainees achieved a balance between the pull of back-home ties and the attractions of American culture. Instead of accepting or rejecting everything, they tried to evaluate each aspect of American life objectively, on the basis of its merits. They were selective and discriminating. This was called the "smorgasbord" approach.

Obviously the people in this group had the best mental "set" to profit from the training experience. They were testing and weighing what they saw and heard. They raised questions in an attempt to assimilate what they learned and to apply it to the situation they would face on their return. "Granted that this is O.K. here, how would it fit in back home?" "How would this procedure have to be changed to work in Germany?" Unfortunately, because they raised questions, these trainees were sometimes grouped mistakenly with the rejectors by American hosts and teachers. Their questions were not always answered as patiently and carefully as they should have been.

Because they were constantly attempting to fit their learning experience to the situation back home, these trainees were better prepared for this later adjustment.

The three categories of German leaders described above have some similarities to the types of students and trainees described earlier in this report in the section on categories of trainees. The German "situational adaptors" are to some extent like the "isolated" and also the "ideologists" in regard to the ease with which they lose all or part of their back-home ties, and accept American ideas and values. The German "rejectors" appear to bear a resemblance to the minor sub-group of "conformers" who might be identified as hyper-nationalist, but the comparison is limited. Those Germans who achieved a balance between the pull of back-home ties and American culture, and who adopted a "smorgasbord" or selective approach, are quite similar to the main group of "conformers." The lack of greater correspondence between these two classifications (and their terminology) has already been explained by the fact that they were derived from two separate research studies, with different objectives, methods, and with
different nationality groups. Further research on other dimensions and nationality groups may reveal more common denominators than are now apparent.

Like the information about the trainees' typical adjustment phases, the material about the overlapping membership conflict is of suggestive value rather than a generalization which holds true for any and all foreign nationals. While the study reported was a thorough one, it was based on a small sample from a single country. One discussion leader was of the opinion that some trainees, who feel secure about both their personal and national status, might be able to escape the overlapping membership conflict almost entirely, retaining their back-home identification while selectively accepting certain aspects of American life and culture.

A factor which is likely to reduce the intensity of the conflict is a continuing membership in a third group such as a business organization which lessens the strain and stress of overlapping membership in two national cultures. Particularly when that organization is influential and is respected in both countries, the consciousness of belonging to it may give the trainees such a strong sense of security that he will feel no urgent pressure of conflicting membership claims from either the United States or his homeland. To a considerable extent the trainee so situated may remain within the "culture" of the third organization—which provides a transition between the two national cultures. In some cases, the "company" or "organizational environment" is so strong as to provide a "prefabricated environment" or a "greased tube," insulating the trainee from American life during his stay in this country and enabling him to move easily between the two cultures. Even so, relatively few trainees escape entirely from the conflict of overlapping membership.

### C. Factors after Return Home

Most present programs for the training of foreign nationals have practical, utilitarian goals: They seek to promote the use of the knowledge or skill they seek to impart. Thus the test of their success is what happens when trainees return to their homes. This requires attention to the factors which determine the kind of adjustment trainees make on their return, the kind of jobs they secure, and the amount of influence they exert. The importance of some of these factors has only become evident as a result of several pioneering research studies of returnees.

Return adjustment, it is believed, is easiest for trainees whose home culture is similar to ours. But there are many exceptions to this principle. For example, despite many similarities between the culture of the United States and Germany, all but one of the German leaders studied experienced a sense of depression upon returning home. This feeling gradually lessened. Yet, even at the time the returnees were interviewed, some eight months after their return, half of them were having problems handling their negative reactions to their social climate and to the way Germans behaved to one another. They reacted negatively to these perceptions despite the fact that they personally had experienced less difficulty in being reaccepted than they had anticipated. They themselves had changed while away, and as a consequence of that change had become more critical.

Among the Japanese returnees studied there appeared to be a direct relationship between the degree of their personal involvement during their adjustment in the United States and the difficulty they had in readjusting to Japan upon their return. For all trainee types except the "conformers", personal involvement appeared to be a prerequisite to successful adjustment in this country:

The abilities that seem to be required for successful American adjustment are: a certain degree of "Americanization"; a certain amount of alienation from Japan; general outgoingness; the ability to deal with people on an equal level; informality. These all seem to be real obstacles to readjustment to Japan.
Acceptance Back Home

As is to be expected, status and sponsorship exert a decisive influence upon the readiness with which trainees are accepted upon their return. Those who are well-sponsored seldom have great difficulty getting back in.

One interesting and rather surprising finding of the Japanese study is that there may be an unfavorable attitude toward trainees as a group. Japanese exchangees represent a deviant and rather alienated part of the general student and intellectual population from which they are drawn: noticeably pro-Western, more interested in Christianity, more hostile to Japan. Whereas students of a previous generation (before Japanese educational institutions gave as good training as they now do) were interested in acquiring skills and knowledge of use to Japan, students today go abroad to study for personal and ideological reasons. As a consequence the returned students are less highly regarded by their compatriots. They also are often looked down upon because it is not felt that the best students go abroad to study. With some exceptions, returned students are regarded as of the second rank; their selection for foreign study is believed to be based more on language skill than on general ability.

Both in Japan and India, though for somewhat different reasons, age also affects the acceptance of returnees. Young Japanese students who study abroad usually have an escape motive and usually lack the peer-group associations so important for advancement in their country. Because they are young they are likely to change more while abroad, and change makes them more difficult to assimilate upon their return. Older students, in contrast, usually have established peer-group associations before they go abroad. Their sojourn abroad is likely to give them polish and skill without leading to any fundamental personality changes or alienation from their homeland. Moreover, the positions to which they return are usually better established.

In India, clique associations are less important, but older persons are more likely to have positions where they can apply what they have learned than are young people who may secure their first job after their foreign training. In India, it is generally people in the 40-50 age group who are in positions where they can make innovations. On the basis of a study of some 110 Indians who had studied in the United States or in England it appeared that older students had a clearer understanding of what they wanted out of their foreign sojourn, and in consequence had done a better job of selecting kinds of training which could be applied upon their return.

Another interesting finding was that the training of a “team”—a group sent abroad either as a unit or at scattered intervals, but working together at home—was particularly helpful in getting ideas used. When a number of foreign-trained students are given the opportunity to work together, they do not have to waste energy in overcoming resistances, and their mutual support and confidence in their training may make them more venturesome in applying it.

The power and popularity of the United States and the prestige of American education are other factors which will help to determine the value of study here. Indeed, they will inevitably influence the way the returnee himself speaks of his sojourn. If he returns at a time when the climate of public opinion in his homeland is hostile to the United States, he may have to feign an anti-Americanism he does not feel in order to be accepted; and he may find his training an asset of dubious value. On the other hand, if he returns at a time when the climate of opinion is favorable, he may try to make social and professional capital out of his stay here even though he feels somewhat resentful toward the United States, and he may find many doors open to him because of his American training.

Thus, in the generally pro-American atmosphere of pre-Communist China, students who had been trained in the United States had very little difficulty in readjusting and in finding choice positions irrespective of status and sponsorship. Now, of course, a
student with the same training would have a different, and more difficult, readjustment to make.

The kind of welcome given a returning student may also depend upon the amount of prestige American education enjoys in his country, and this may vary field by field. It is worth noting that many unpredictable factors may influence the evaluations made by foreigners. For example, among Indians one factor that tends to debase the value of American academic degrees is the feeling that some American colleges are too charitable toward mediocre foreign students.

The Value of Follow-up Support

Beyond offering a good program and preparing the student to meet a wide variety of situations, a training organization can do little about the factors which will determine whether a returnee makes a good readjustment and is effectively utilized in his home society. There is, however, one way in which the organization may be able to help: it may find ways of providing follow-up support.

Business organizations, of course, are active in providing follow-up support for their trainees, and the value of this continuing activity was attested to by business representatives at the seminar. Follow-up is provided in a variety of ways. Executives from the United States visit field offices in other countries, making a special effort to see how employees trained in this country are faring. Trainees recently returned from the United States are encouraged and helped by those previously trained abroad and by their American associates to put their training into practice. The advancement of those trained in the United States depends to a considerable extent on their effective utilization of training abroad, so that continuing importance is attached to it.

To be effective, it was agreed, follow-up support other than that provided by employing organizations must be provided with considerable finesse. First of all, it must be completely non-coercive—offered to returnees, rather than thrust upon them. Secondly, the support must be made available in a way which will not complicate the returnee's problem of securing acceptance. In countries where there is a strong current of anti-American feeling, this means that it is best not to offer help through an agency of the U.S. Government. It must be channeled through the colleagues or superiors of those it is desired to reach or through some acceptable organization. One government agency is thinking of offering returnees an associate membership in the American professional organization in the field in which they were trained. Returnees will then receive a steady stream of material which will serve to remind them of their training and bring their learning up to date, and they will receive this material from a source which will cause them no difficulty and may well enhance their status.

Another effective means of providing follow-up is by informal meetings of the “alumni” of a given training program. The people thus brought together are likely to have encountered very much the same kind of problems. A get-together gives them a chance to compare notes on how best to meet these problems. It also gives them an opportunity to trade experience on the best ways of getting the techniques and ideas they learned here accepted. According to those who have had experience with these meetings, the discovery that some members of the group have been able to apply something that they learned nearly always has an encouraging effect on the others.

Alumni meetings may backfire, however. If most of those who attend a meeting feel disappointed and frustrated, they may simply reinforce each other's disaffection. This danger may be reduced by encouraging alumni meetings on the basis of occupation or some other common interest.

The International Foreign Youth Exchange program provides an example of how effective alumni groups of Americans who have been abroad can be when they have a mutual interest in the program. Upon the completion of their intensive training activities, some U.S. delegates sent abroad by IFYE
began to ask how they could contribute to the further success of the organization's program. Since 1953, former delegates in increasing numbers have been cooperating with project leaders, assisting with public relations and fund-raising, helping to select and orient new delegates, and in a half-dozen other ways actively contributing to the success of current training programs.

Especially in under-developed countries, but often in countries with advanced technologies as well, one of the best means of providing follow-up support is by offering returnees whatever materials they may need to use their training. In India, the most effective programs were those which supplied trainees with needed materials and equipment. The value of one foundation's training program is reported to have been enhanced by providing trainees with a film of their visit and a selected package of books. Other foundations too have found it worth-while to provide trainees with the technical equipment they needed to apply their training upon their return.

The value of offering returnees some kind of follow-up support is evident. It is the one additional measure program administrators can take to save former students from the frustration likely to possess them if they find no way of using what they have learned and come to the conclusion that they have interrupted their life to no good purpose. A trainee's experience after his return to his homeland will inevitably affect his ultimate evaluation of his training. If he is severely frustrated, he may turn against the United States.

It is to be noted, therefore, that adjustment to American culture during the period of training does not of itself guarantee the trainee's successful readjustment to his home country following his return.
IV. COMPARISONS BETWEEN PROGRAMS

The differences that exist among the programs conducted by different kinds of sponsors have been referred to in several parts of this report. The programs sponsored by business organizations are apparently the most successful. The reasons for this are at least as significant as the fact itself. Among the more important reasons are the following:

1. Business programs tend to have simpler aims. In most cases they are primarily or even exclusively concerned with some very specific kind of training, for example transmitting technical knowledge or skill. Obviously such programs present fewer difficulties than programs which have more general and abstract objectives, involving attitude changes.

2. Business trainees usually have strong sponsorship: full financial support and the assurance of a job—sometimes even the prospect of a better job—upon their return home.

3. Business representatives are generally older and more responsible than students who come here to go to college or to take part in some government-sponsored programs.

4. Membership in a business organization, particularly when it is strong and respected, eases the overlapping membership conflict.

5. The schedule of business trainees is usually worked out in advance in considerable detail. In consequence they have a relatively cloistered experience, whereas academic students, at the other extreme, may be almost entirely on their own resources and thus subject to vicissitudes which can be foreseen and offset only in small part.

6. Business trainees are on a more nearly equal footing with their associates than are the trainees in academic or government sponsored programs. They are working “on the same team” as their trainers, not just “learning from” them.

7. Back-home follow-up support is relatively easy to provide and usually quite effective.
The Urgent Need for Evaluation and Research

Like many other subjects discussed above, these comparisons call attention to the need for further evaluation and research. The comparisons are based primarily on general impressions, supported by the small amount of evidence about individual programs which has been systematically gathered. Little definite knowledge has been accumulated on programs. The few research studies which have been made have focused largely on academic students. Though Government and to a greater extent business programs often offer built-in opportunities for evaluation, only a meager beginning at evaluation has thus far been made. In one Government program which entails an expenditure of more than one hundred million dollars a year, no more than fifty thousand dollars is being spent annually on the evaluation of results!

The need for careful evaluation of operating programs is evident. Defining program goals more specifically should greatly facilitate the task of evaluation. However, good evaluation studies must also strive to detect unanticipated “side effects” of a program. Ideally they should seek to measure long-range as well as immediate effects.

Evaluation implies, and indeed in practice consists of, measuring performance against a predetermined goal. Research, on the other hand, is, or should be, an inquiry into the nature of the processes involved. The most valuable studies of operating programs should have a research as well as an evaluation orientation. They should seek to discover the specific factors responsible for the success or failure of a given program; or, as matters more often work out in practice, the factors responsible for a program’s relative success in one area of knowledge, or with one nationality group, and relative lack of success with another. Administrators, and indeed all concerned with training programs, need to know quite specifically which methods and procedures are effective and which ineffective. While program leaders may be shrewd and successful in what they are doing, they may not know exactly why a particular approach is effective. Some of the disadvantages of this lack of appraisal are obvious. The leaders may try to utilize a “successful” technique in a situation in which it is not appropriate, or, alternatively, fail to use it in still other situations where it would work. And of course, until knowledge is conceptualized in terms of working hypotheses and theory it cannot be easily exchanged and made available to others.

Some Implications for Training Programs

Both the overlapping membership conflict and the U-shaped adjustment pattern have certain implications for the conduct of training programs. These implications pertain to (1) the length of programs; (2) the desirability of some degree of flexibility; (3) the careful planning of experiences; (4) careful preparation of the learning situation, including both environmental factors and the selection and training of teachers and others who will come in close contact with trainees and (5) the need for continuing observation, consultation and guidance.

The duration of most training programs
for foreign nationals has been fixed in advance. Numerous factors make it difficult to provide programs of indeterminate length. For example, many student exchange programs limit a grantee to a year, or two years at most, in the belief that he may become alienated from his homeland if he stays away too long. In addition, some advance planning is necessary to arrange for facilities and training personnel, and this itself limits flexibility. Budgeting also imposes some limitations on flexibility.

It must be admitted, moreover, that the research done to date provides no clear-cut indications as to the best point to break off a training program. The findings of the study of German leaders, for example, do little to clarify this particular matter. The first group of leaders studied, who were here for a year,

... gave more evidence of having internalized American values, and of having made more specific plans for contributions back home. But the follow-up interviews show more disillusionment and regression to original views for those who had the longer visit than for others. On the other hand, many of those who only stayed six months continued to change in the six months after they returned home. It appears that perhaps the shorter visit to the host country was just long enough to stir things up, challenging old assumptions and suggesting new ones, but the visitors returned home before the new ideas had time to crystallize. At home, they continued to question and re-evaluate the old assumptions, in a situation where they could test them against current German realities. So the changes created less emotional conflict and were more compatible with the home situation. (24)

As illustrated by the U-curve, those who were here only long enough to sink down in the trough associated with the involvement phase and the first part of the coming-to-terms phase left feeling more critical. The data suggest the possibility that, in the case of these Germans, developments after return cancelled out the apparent disadvantages of leaving before completely coming to terms with American society and culture.

What are needed are parallel follow-up data on trainees returning to other countries. So much may hinge on the return situation and back-home readjustment that policies based solely on attitudes and adjustment during the sojourn in the United States may be misguided. For example, the data for Japan suggest that the cultural gap to be bridged is so great that students leaving the United States before they make their more time-consuming adjustment in the coming-to-terms phase, do not continue at home this adjustment to American values.

The available findings question the advisability of uniform fixed-term programs for all countries. Some flexibility would help to avoid terminating training programs at the point when trainees are likely to be experiencing most adjustive stress. If they are allowed to remain until they are better adjusted, or are returned before they slip into the trough of the curve, the usefulness of their training experience is likely to be enhanced. The training program of each individual or group might be left flexible enough so that it could be revised in the light of the kinds and rapidity of adjustment made.

Some programs, of course, already are relatively flexible. Still other programs, especially short ones, must be pre-planned to a large extent. Where there is some leeway for changes, however, those directly responsible for operating programs should be empowered to make adjustments in the light of the learning and adjustment phases of individual trainees.

Some Specific Problems, and Implications

Almost every facet of cross-cultural education deserves further study. Practically nothing is really known, for example, about the combination of characteristics which makes a person a desirable candidate for a given kind of training program. Much more must be found out about the significance of the various individual factors considered in making selections—age, status, sponsorship, intellectual ability, psychological make-up, motivation, language facility, and so on. What is the actual effect of these factors, individually and in various clusters, upon (1) a
student's adjustment and achievement while he is here for training and (2) his return adjustment and subsequent career? What variables are important for classification and measurement under the general label of nationality?

The categories of trainees developed largely from research on Japanese students and German leaders do not yet give a clear-cut general classification that is applicable to all countries. It is to be hoped that further research will throw more light on how the various personality characteristics, national-cultural and situational factors, described in previous sections, can be weighted and combined in any individual case to provide a sound basis for predicting the success of training abroad, readjustment back home, and effective use of the training.

How much influence does the out-of-school environment have upon learning—to what extent is the foreign student handicapped in his studies if he fails to make a satisfactory social adjustment? How regularly does poor adjustment lead later to negative attitudes toward this country or to the information or skills learned here? To what extent does a trainer's awareness of cultural differences and acceptance of them determine his effectiveness?

What is the most effective kind of program for developing more favorable attitudes toward the United States? Existing research deals largely with attitude formation and change during the sojourn in this country. The problem of attitude transfer, from sojourn to return home situations, has been relatively neglected. Apparently, some programs which aim directly at creating favorable attitudes may be at a psychological disadvantage in comparison with programs primarily concerned with something else.

How does the location of training relate to its effectiveness? Most U.S. sponsored programs have involved training in the United States, without examining explicitly the advantages and disadvantages of training in some third country. Where facilities are available, third-country training operations are likely to be markedly less expensive. They may also be more effective, when home-country conditions can be more closely approximated, lessening the problems of personal adjustment for trainees. There might be more systematic experimentation with programs in which part of the training is given in the United States and part in a third country, to determine the relative advantages and disadvantages for those different kinds of training.

Research has concentrated on effects on the individual foreign trainees, with little attention to the impact of his sojourn and training on the trainees' associates and home community. There is a need for studies of the immediate and long-range impact of exchange programs on both the socio-cultural developments in other countries and the climate of opinion toward the United States. In some countries, it may be that more people have to be reached than have been reached thus far, if exchange programs are to have any measurable impact. Just how many people from a given country have to be brought into the training program at various levels, for a cross-cultural education program to have an appreciable effect back home?

What effects does the presence of substantial numbers of foreign visitors and trainees have on the people and institutions of the communities in the United States in which they are located? No study has been made of the impact of exchangees on host nationals or host institutions. This neglect distorts our view of cross-cultural education as an interaction process. Furthermore, as U.S. educational institutions face the expected wave of population pressure, they may be able to accept foreign students only by excluding some American students within their normal constituencies. Proponents of exchange programs, national policy makers and administrators of educational institutions all need information on the impact of foreign students on campus and American community life and judgments on the optimal numbers of foreign students.

Most research has concerned some aspect of the sojourn in the United States. Only one study (24) shows both the sojourn and the re-
turn of the same individuals. Long-term follow-up studies are needed, as many interesting and important problems can only be studied after return. We also know that expressions of attitude are heavily subject to situational influences. When studies are limited to the sojourn itself, expressions of attitude may be cautiously interpreted.

The Need for Close Liaison between Operations and Research

Cross-cultural education is a operationally defined program area in which theoretical problems studied by anthropologists, sociologists, psychologists, and other social scientists intersect with the operating problems of program administrators and trainers. Yet there are many gaps between the research findings and the practical rules and recommendations for those directing training programs. This is due to the exploratory nature of present research and also to the real differences in the experiences of different nationality groups.

Further cooperation between social scientists and administrators will answer many of the questions referred to in the previous section, and offers the following advantages for cross-cultural education programs:

Increasing control of the influential factors found to make for successful training,
More effective long-term follow-up of trainees that is not expensive individual "case-work" but a continuing part of the whole program plan,
More profitable and constructive use of program records which are already being collected.

Only if evaluation and research are built into cross-cultural education programs will this come about.
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THE FOUNDATION FOR RESEARCH ON HUMAN BEHAVIOR

Scientific methods are as applicable to problems of human behavior as they are to problems of the physical sciences, yet our society has lagged far behind in the use of those methods to study social behavior. Moreover, the technical language that scientists employ makes it difficult for others to understand, use and criticize research results. The basic goals of the Foundation for Research on Human Behavior are to promote the wider application of scientific methods to the study of problems of human behavior, to improve two-way communication between those who carry out and those who use social science research, and to encourage full utilization of research results in the operation of organizations.

Good research is often expensive, in studying human behavior as in all science. Experience has shown that sound research programs must have adequate and stable financing, in order to keep an able staff intact and to carry over valuable experience from one study to another. An immediate goal of the Foundation is to increase the amount and stability of financial support for fact-finding research in the social sciences.

ORIGIN

The Foundation was incorporated in Michigan in 1952. Although its offices, in Ann Arbor, are provided by the University of Michigan, it has no organic connection with the University, or with any other organization. A generous five-years grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation has assured an adequate trial period for the new ideas represented by the Foundation, during which time the Foundation expects to become self-supporting. Substantial annual contributions to the Foundation for the support of research on human behavior are being made by leading industrial concerns. A small permanent staff organizes seminars, publishes research highlights and summaries, and administers grants to qualified research agencies for projects arising out of seminar discussions and other meetings. (The Foundation itself does no research).

THE SEMINAR PROGRAM

The seminar on "Training Foreign Nationals in the United States" is one of a series conducted by the Foundation for Research on Human Behavior in different fields of research on behavior.

Other seminars conducted by the Foundation have dealt with "Psychological Surveys in Business Forecasting", "Training in Human Relations", "Leadership Patterns and Organizational Effectiveness" and "Administering Research Organizations."

Other important areas in which research projects will be supported by the Foundation are indicated by the titles of other seminars planned for 1956 and 1957.

- Public Communication and Influence
- Mediation of Disputes
- Consumer Motivation
- Overcoming Resistance to Change
- Selection and Training of Americans for Service Abroad

The purpose of these seminars is to bring new research to the attention of potential users, to clarify the uses to which research may be put, and to direct new research toward problems of practical as well as scientific importance.