

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20523
BIBLIOGRAPHIC INPUT SHEET

FOR AID USE ONLY

Batch 72

1. SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION	A. PRIMARY Education	JE30-0000-0000
	B. SECONDARY Development	

2. TITLE AND SUBTITLE
Orientation of AID trainees at the Washington International Center, a survey

3. AUTHOR(S)
Kimmel, P.R.; Perlman, Daniel; Hinds, Marjorie

4. DOCUMENT DATE 1969	5. NUMBER OF PAGES 138p.	6. ARC NUMBER ARC
--------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------

7. REFERENCE ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS

Am. Univ.

8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES (Sponsoring Organization, Publishers, Availability)

9. ABSTRACT

10. CONTROL NUMBER PN-RAB-625	11. PRICE OF DOCUMENT
12. DESCRIPTORS AID Evaluation Personnel development Surveys	13. PROJECT NUMBER
	14. CONTRACT NUMBER CSD-1809 GTS
	15. TYPE OF DOCUMENT

ORIENTATION OF A.I.D. TRAINEES
AT THE WASHINGTON INTERNATIONAL CENTER

A Survey by
DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION AND TRAINING RESEARCH INSTITUTE
of
The American University

July 1969

Prepared under Contract AID/csd-1809 for the Office of International Training, The Agency for International Development, U.S. Department of State. The findings, conclusions, and interpretations contained are those of the authors and not necessarily those of The Agency for International Development.

PREFACE

This interim report on the Washington International Center orientation program for the Agency for International Development/Office of International Training (AID/OIT) trainees has been prepared by Dr. Paul Kimmel, Principal Investigator for the study being conducted by The American University's Development Education and Training Research Institute (DETRI). He was assisted in the study by Mr. Daniel Perlman and Miss Marjorie Hinds, of the DETRI staff; Miss Cheryl Craver and Mrs. Frances Jaffe of DETRI typed the report manuscript.

Part I of the report includes a summary of principal findings, conclusions and recommendations of the study, to date. Part II provides the background, purpose and research approach of the study. The overall plan called for DETRI to conduct a survey study and for two eminent social scientists to prepare separate evaluative papers.

Part III contains the description of the instruments and procedures used in the DETRI survey portion of the study and its results. This survey was based on 522 AID trainees who took part in the Washington International Center orientation programs between June 17 and October 4, 1968.

Part IV is the report of Dr. Ernest LeFever, a political scientist with the Brookings Institution. Part V is the report of Dr. Edward Stewart, a psychologist with the University of Pittsburgh. These reports are based on independent observations that these scientists made of four different Washington International Center orientation programs. There was no requirement that these scientists collaborate or that their reports be in total agreement, although they are for the most

part, complementary. Differences in emphasis will be noted, but the careful reader will notice that these apparent contradictions between the two reports are, in fact, reconcilable.

For example, LeFever suggests that "each lecture should focus on the contemporary situation more than the historical" (IV-8), while Stewart writes that "most visitors are likely to derive a greater understanding from historical...treatment of an idea or event" than from "analytical, contemporary, and comparative explanations" (V-28). Neither scientist is recommending an exclusively "current events" or "chronicle" lecture approach. LeFever feels that the present situation in the United States is of more interest and utility to the AID participants than the distant past, while Stewart is saying that any idea and event the lecturer presents can more often be clarified and illustrated through historical examples and interpretations, than through comparative current facts and statistics.

The authors wish to express their appreciation to Dr. John Stabler and Dr. Forrest Clements, both of the AID/OIT for their helpful, professional advice and guidance. Thanks are also due to the Washington International Center staff, volunteers and lecturers for their cooperation and suggestions. Their support and advice have contributed immeasurably to the relevance and completeness of the survey.

Special gratitude is owed Mr. Arthur Richards, Washington International Center Director; Mr. James Coughlin, Assistant Executive Director of the Washington International Center, Dr. Robert Thompson, Vice President of Meridian House Foundation; and Mr. Andrew Berding, past Director, for their assistance in development and implementing this study. It was a measure of their dedication and faith in what the Center is doing that they willingly welcomed, and contributed to this study, which by design had to "look for problems."

As was expected, problems were found; but the authors also feel that the report documents that their dedication and faith are not misplaced.

The quality of the study reflects the suggestions of all of the individuals mentioned above, but, of course, they cannot be held responsible for any inadequacies which may exist in this report.

C O N T E N T S

I. PRINCIPAL FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, & RECOMMENDATIONS. I- 1

- Introduction I- 1
- Overall Evaluation of the Orientation Program . I- 1
- Evaluation of the Lecture Program I- 2
 - Overall Comparisons I- 2
 - Information & Belief Change I- 3
 - Lecture Impact. I- 4
 - Recommendations I- 5
- Other Aspects of the International Center Program I-10
- Summary, Listing of Recommendations I-11

II. BACKGROUND, PURPOSE, & RESEARCH APPROACH.II- 1

- Center ProgramII- 1
- Purpose & ApproachII- 4

III. INSTRUMENTS, PROCEDURES, & RESULTS OF THE DETRI STUDY OF THE WASHINGTON INTERNATIONAL CENTER'S FORMAL ORIENTATION PROGRAM III- 1

- Development of Instruments & Procedures . . . III- 1
 - Participants' Adjustment Problems III- 2
 - Participants' Knowledge of United States. III- 3
 - Participants' Ideas about United States . III- 3
 - Participants' Evaluation of the Center's Program III- 4
 - Pre-testing of Participants' Questionnaires III- 5
 - DETRI Staff Observational Categories. . . III- 8
 - Administrative Procedures III-10

Developmental Problems.III-13
(English words, political sensitivity, invasion of privacy, ingratiation, scheduling, administration of instru- ments, control group data)	
<u>Results & Conclusions</u>III-19
Participants' Background.III-20
Participants' Experiences during Orientation Week.III-25
Participants' Reactions to the ProgramIII-32
Information & Ideas about United StatesIII-38
Changes in Trainees' Information, Ideas, & Adjustment.III-42
Participant & Observer Evaluation of Lectures.III-46
Lecture Dynamics & OutcomesIII-49
<u>Synopsis & Interpretation of DETRI Survey</u>III-52
IV. EVALUATION BY A POLITICAL SCIENTIST.	IV- 1
<u>Terms of Reference.</u>	IV- 1
<u>Activities Observed</u>	IV- 4
<u>General Evaluation.</u>	IV- 5
<u>Recommendations for the Education Program</u>	IV- 6
Scope of the Four Primary Lectures.	IV- 7
Scope of the Secondary Lectures	IV- 8
Securing Qualified Lecturers.	IV- 8
Audio-Visual Aids	IV-10
Basic Fact Booklets	IV-11
Tours in the Washington Area.	IV-12
Outside Consultant.	IV-12

V. EVALUATION BY A CROSS-CULTURAL COMMUNICATIONS SPECIALIST.	V- 1
<u>Introduction.</u>	V- 1
<u>Constraints and Issues of the Orientation Program</u>	V- 2
<u>Analysis of the Program</u>	V- 4
Instruction and Accommodation: The	
Objectives.	V- 4
Instruction	V- 4
Accommodation	V- 7
Integration versus Fragmentation.	V- 8
Persuasion and Learning	V- 9
Traditional versus Cross-Cultural Concepts.	V-13
Repetition.	V-13
Depersonalization	V-14
Receiving Roles and Giving Roles.	V-15
The Active Role	V-16
The Guest Role.	V-16
The Student Role.	V-17
Some Effects of the Receiving Role.	V-18
<u>Reformulation of the Orientation Program According</u>	
<u>to Cross-Cultural Communication</u>	V-21
Objectives.	V-21
Perspectives of the program	V-22
Implementation of the Program: Practices	
and Styles.	V-23
Operational Activities.	V-25
Style of Presentation	V-26
Reserves of Meaning	V-27
Pedagogies.	V-28
Themes of the Program	V-29
Customs and Habits of the American People	V-29
Values and Attitudes of the American People	V-32

Role for the Visitor.V-33
FeasibilityV-34
<u>Summary</u>V-36
VI. BIBLIOGRAPHY.	VI- 1

PART I

PRINCIPAL FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The primary purposes of the current research study were to determine the extent to which the Washington International Center orientation programs for AID-sponsored trainees¹ are achieving their desired objectives, and to suggest modifications in these programs which are likely to enhance fulfillment of these objectives.

This interim report focuses on the overall effects of the regular one-week orientation program on AID Academic and Special-OJT trainees' knowledge and beliefs about the U.S. and adjustment to living in Washington. Specific aspects of this program were evaluated through the trainees' immediate and end-of-program reactions, and systematic observations by the DETRI professional staff conducting the study. Changes in the trainees' knowledge, beliefs and adjustment were measured by before-and-after program questionnaires.

In addition to data from the trainees and the DETRI staff, this report includes special evaluations of the Center's program made independently by two respected social scientists. The DETRI survey study focuses on the program as it currently exists. All findings, conclusions and recommendations from the survey are within the scope of the program as it is now organized. The evaluative reports by the social scientists, on the other hand, both examine the current program and suggest alternative procedures and techniques for orienting AID participants.

¹ Foreign nationals in training programs sponsored by AID are called "participants." In order to avoid monotonous repetition of this term, the word "trainee" is sometimes substituted. In this report, the meaning is identical and the two terms are treated as synonyms, used interchangeably.

Overall Evaluation of the Orientation Program

The overall reaction of the AID trainees to the one-week International Center program was generally favorable. One-third of the trainees surveyed at the conclusion of the week felt that the "program was perfect" and were "completely satisfied." None of the trainees indicated that the program was terrible and that they were "not at all satisfied." The general evaluations by the two social scientists were also favorable. Both consultants were especially impressed by the atmosphere created at the Center. As one wrote, "The atmosphere was one of order without regimentation, relaxation without license," (IV-7). Both consultants felt that this atmosphere enabled the trainees to overcome the fatigue of their trip and the shock of adapting to a new environment. Credit for the atmosphere was given to the Center staff and volunteers and the physical facility.

Those trainees who made several American friends and friends from other countries through the opportunities provided by the Center, especially the home hospitality program were more likely to be satisfied with the total program than were those who made fewer friends. Evidence suggests that association with trainees from the same home country tends to inhibit meeting Americans and people from other countries. It is recommended that the International Center's staff and volunteers continue to provide an atmosphere of congeniality and to assist trainees in meeting people from the United States and from countries other than their own.

Evaluation of the Lecture Program

Overall Comparisons

The major activity in the one-week Washington International Center orientation program is a series of eight lectures on different aspects of the United States and its people. The

lecture topics in order of presentation are: "Customs and Daily Life in the United States," "The Land and People of the United States," "U.S. Government and Politics," "The Family and Community," "Religious Life in the United States," "Education in the United States," "The Economy in the United States," and "Civil Liberties and Race Relations in the United States."

The lectures that the trainees found most interesting were those on race relations and on customs and daily life. Those which they found least interesting were on religion and the U.S. economy. The lectures which the trainees found most informative were on customs and daily life, the land and people, and the family and community. The lectures which they found least informative were on religious life, the economy, and education in the United States.

Information and Belief Change

Of thirty factual information questions about the United States asked of participants at the beginning of the orientation week, 55% were answered correctly. The proportion of correct replies rose to 65% when the same questions were repeated at the end of the week. This gain of 10% on the scores is representative when compared with information gained in analogous types of training programs, e.g., the armed services, special training schools, the Peace Corps and executive training programs.

The trainees' beliefs about the United States changed very little from Monday to Friday. This is also typical of findings in other studies of changes in beliefs. The trainees were usually favorably disposed toward the United States on Monday and became slightly more critical as the week progressed. This type of change is to be expected when generally favorable anticipations are compared with realities in a new cultural situation.

There was a positive relationship between change in information and change in beliefs about the United States. Trainees

who had misinformation about American family life, unemployment, and literacy tended to have a more negative image of those aspects of the United States corresponding to this misinformation than did trainees who had correct information. It is recommended that a simple, graphic, basic-facts booklet on the topics presented in the lectures be distributed to trainees at the beginning of the orientation program to handle such misconceptions and to provide a basis for discussions. Some of the information which should be included in this booklet can be found in Table 21 of Part III and on pages 3 to 5 and 12 to 13 of Part IV of this report.

Several of the information items were answered correctly and several of the belief statements were endorsed positively by a large majority of the trainees on both Monday and Friday.² Reiteration of this information or emphasis of these beliefs throughout the week is likely to have more detrimental than beneficial effects. Since this information is already known by many participants, its repetition frequently creates suspicion and skepticism.

Similarly, reiteration of instructions, such as "Please ask questions," may also be treated by the trainees as having hidden meanings and persuasive implications. It is recommended that the Center's program chairmen carefully monitor the entire week's presentations so that information such as that found in Tables 19 and 20 of Part III is not repeated more than once. Lecturers should be encouraged to try to create the conditions which will produce the trainee behavior they desire, e.g., asking questions, rather than relying on repeated verbal admonitions.³

²See Tables 19 and 20 in Part III of this report.

³Charles W. Merrifield, The Washington International Center as an Experiment in International Education (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1957), p. 115.

Lecture Impact

Factors which other studies have found to produce changes in information and beliefs among American students did not produce similar changes for the AID trainees. Student-centered lectures, repetition of lecture material, the number of questions and amount of discussion after the lecture, and the specific mentioning of information to be learned all correlated weakly and unsystematically with both information and belief change. The style of the speaker, the nature of the discussion, and the reactions of the trainees related to information change, belief change, and evaluations of the lecturer in different ways for each of the lecture topics.

A methodical presentation style was related to trainee information and belief changes and high evaluations for the lectures on the government and education. An ideological style was associated with such changes and evaluations when used by the land and people and the economy lecturers, but change was suppressed when this style was used by the government lecturers. A participant-centered approach was associated with higher evaluations of the lecturers on religion; whereas a pleasing, warm approach was related to similar evaluations of the lecturers on the U.S. economy. Discussions after the lectures on education tended to produce information change and high evaluations, whereas the debates which frequently followed the talks on civil liberties and race relations tended to suppress both.

Recommendations

These findings suggest some very obvious and some rather subtle implications for the Washington International Center's lecture program. As most speakers know, but sometimes forget when lecturing, it is extremely important when speaking to an international audience to make a simple presentation, avoiding

subtle rhetoric, involved comparisons, and elaborate illustrations. Because of the varied abilities of the trainees in comprehending the English language, it is necessary that speakers talk slowly and distinctly, using familiar words and concrete examples, but without being condescending. Although the presentations must be simple, the speaker must have extensive knowledge of his subject matter, especially facts and statistics, as the trainees often ask "how many" or "how often" questions.

A more subtle, but equally important, point is that speakers must be careful in using statistics to explain or prove their points. People from some other countries are not as "evidence-oriented" as Americans, and thus are not as impressed with numbers and data as we are. In such cases, historical examples and logical reasoning are more convincing than statistics. The use of an inductive style of thinking is also less familiar to many foreign visitors than it is to Americans.

It is recommended that whenever possible the speakers make their general points first and then interpret and elaborate them, rather than "deriving" them after an extensive presentation of evidence and background material. In addition to considering the trainees' ways of thinking, the speaker should always try to give as fair, balanced, and honest a picture as possible.

The discussion-seminar type presentation is recommended. This approach not only enables the lecturer to gain a clearer understanding of the trainees' interests, backgrounds, and information, and to answer their questions, but it also provides the trainees with experience in a teaching technique they are likely to encounter later in their U.S. sojourn. Such discussions must be carefully guided, so that all the trainees feel they are included, whether they ask questions or not. A discussion leader who merely asks for questions and allows the more articulate trainees to dominate

the discussion will be no more effective than a lecturer who speaks too rapidly, uses unfamiliar words, and is condescending.

A careful selection and utilization of visual aids, such as films, graphs, charts, diagrams, and slides, is likely to facilitate the involvement of the trainees in discussions and to communicate more effectively than words to those trainees whose English language capabilities are limited.

Increasing the involvement and participation of the trainees in the lecture program should facilitate the Center's goals of providing instruction and helping participants accommodate to life in the United States. Frequently the only information on accommodation is given in the briefing on the Washington area and the lecture on customs and daily life, with the other seven lecture topics being devoted almost exclusively to the instructional function. A clearer understanding of the participants' needs and interests (as revealed by their more active participation in the lecture program) should enable speakers to provide information and ideas which will facilitate the trainees' accommodation to life in Washington and subsequently throughout the United States.

It is recommended that consideration be given to providing the total lecture program with more coherence and unity than presently exists. Many trainees indicate that they have a feeling of disjunction and fragmentation as they proceed through the lecture program. If the trainees are to develop a coherent picture of the United States, a greater unity of concepts and principles used may be necessary.

Encouraging the lecturers to discuss the conceptions the trainees have of different aspects of the United States (rather than following a fixed lecture format or set of information objectives) should help the trainees to integrate new material within their own store of information.

Also, the program chairmen could conduct a final discussion after the last formal lecture presentation to allow trainees to assimilate information they have received during the week.⁴

Program chairmen should be given a greater role in coordinating and monitoring the presentations of the speakers to implement the suggestions made above. Special emphasis within the monitoring role should be focused on the selection of the speakers and their early performance. (Specific suggestions for the various lecture topics are discussed next.)

It is recommended that the lecturers who are now speaking on each of the different topics be convened periodically to confer on the approaches and subject matter they are using. It is suggested that the lecturers on the topics of the land and people and the U.S. economy be encouraged to deal primarily with the contemporary American scene and to focus on current problems. It is likely that the generally favorable disposition of most of the trainees toward both of these topic areas will facilitate discussions of value issues and comparisons between their own country situations and the United States. Both of these topics lend themselves to a much fuller and more imaginative use of visual aids. Films, slides, graphs, charts, diagrams, and pictures should be considered and discussed for their potential to improve communication and encourage understanding.

Lecturers on the topics of the U.S. Government and U.S. education should be encouraged to use factual and historical

⁴It is recognized that this suggestion implies a major program revision; a feasibility study would be required. It was beyond the scope of the present study to conduct such an effort; for this reason, the suggestion is made in the form of recommended consideration, rather than recommended change.

approaches in developing their talks, as opposed to theoretical, rhetorical or value-oriented approaches. The trainees' greater knowledge of these two aspects of the United States plus the somewhat less favorable images they have of them may make an inductive and comparative lecture style appear invidious and propagandistic. More learning and belief change and higher satisfaction is likely to accompany a deductive approach in which the significance of American concepts and institutions are developed according to our own traditions and past experiences.

The lecturers on the topics of customs and daily life in the United States and the family and community should be encouraged to be as specific and personal in their presentations as possible. The participants usually find it easy to identify with speakers who use such an approach. The more demographic, sociological or anthropological style of presentation for either of these topics is to be avoided, as it is perceived as being depersonalizing and of little relevance by many of the trainees. (A more complete discussion of the specific customs and habits that could be used in making the presentation on customs and daily life are presented on pages 31-33, Part V.) The conceptual frame of reference for both of these presentations should be the individual visitor and the individual American.

Although it is likely that most trainees will be intimately involved with religious life and race relations in the United States at some time during their training sojourns, they do not typically have as much general information about these topics as they do about government and education, nor do they identify as easily with the speakers as they do with those on customs and daily life and the family and community. Thus, lecturers on these topics should be encouraged to focus on the trainee's

possible U.S. experiences in terms that he can easily comprehend. Ideological discussions of general American problems or self-deprecating and self-enhancing statements by speakers who work in these areas are not likely to provide information that the trainees will find utilizable during their sojourn.

It is recommended that discussions of the common types of discrimination that the trainees may experience in the United States and on religious facilities and activities available to them in different parts of the country be made a part of these talks. The more realistic and detailed this kind of information can be, the more likely the trainees are to understand and learn it. Debates with trainees on either of these topics are especially to be avoided, as they detract from understanding.

Other Aspects of the International Center Program

In addition to the lectures that the trainees hear at the International Center, they are also provided airport reception, home hospitality, tours to Capitol Hill and to the Washington community or a Washington high school, coffee breaks, and evening activities. With the exception of the airport reception and the two tours, all of these activities are voluntary. They are under the direction of a permanent staff member at the International Center and are manned almost entirely by volunteers. The general reaction of the trainees to these other aspects of the International Center program are as favorable or more favorable than they are to the lecture program, with the exception of the evening activities.

Trainees were especially pleased with airport reception, the Capitol Hill tour, and their visits to American homes. Over 90% of the trainees interviewed had received airport reception and gone on the Capitol Hill tour.

Home visits are often scheduled after the participants' 5-day program at the Washington International Center, usually on the following weekend.⁵ It is recommended that whenever possible trainees be provided the opportunity to visit an American home between Monday and Thursday of the week they are at the International Center, so that they may discuss and evaluate their experiences with the staff, volunteers, and lecturers at the Center. Both the tours and the home visits provide excellent opportunities for examining the trainees' perceptions of and accommodation to American life in common real world situations.

The aspect of the International Center program that is most in need of further examination and change is the evening activities. On any given evening less than 2 out of 5 of the trainees surveyed in this study participated in these activities. It is apparent from the low evaluation of the evening programs that they are not meeting the trainees' needs, interests, and availability.

It is recommended that this program be re-evaluated in terms of the background and interests of present trainees and the contemporary Washington scene. Specific criteria should be developed for specific groups of trainees the program is trying to reach. At present it serves many and sometimes contradictory goals, such as entertainment, education, a refuge, and a place to meet people. Trying to be everything for all of the trainees available on a given evening is self-defeating.

Summary, Listing of Recommendations

Listed below are the major recommendations made in Part I of this report. This list is presented only as a convenient

⁵About 60% of the trainees interviewed had not visited an American home by the Friday afternoon of their program.

synopsis for program management. It should not be read out of context. To understand the reasons for and implications of each recommendation, the reader must be familiar with all of Part I (page references are given after each recommendation). A complete comprehension, of course, requires a reading of the entire report.

1. Make more use of trainees' information and experiences:
 - a. The conceptions the trainees have of different aspects of the United States and their interests in our society should be ascertained and discussed in the lectures (I-7);
 - b. trainees' experiences on their tours and visits to Capitol Hill, American homes, American high schools or the Washington community should be discussed during the program (I-11);
 - c. the total lecture program should be given more coherence by having the program chairmen monitor all of the presentations and conduct a final discussion to assimilate the information received and experiences they have had during the week (I-7);
 - d. a discussion-seminar presentation style should be used by lecturers with special emphasis on making all of the participants feel included in the process (I-6); and
 - e. ideas, information and instructions that are well-known by most trainees should not be repeated more than once during the program (I-4).
2. Place a new emphasis on the trainees' social accommodation:
 - a. The Washington International Center should re-evaluate the evening program to develop specific goals that suit the backgrounds and interests of the

- trainees and the contemporary scene in Washington (I-11); and
- b. the Center should continue to provide an atmosphere of congeniality at the Center and to assist trainees in meeting people from the United States and countries other than their own (I-2).
3. Augment the clarity of the lecture presentations:
- a. A simple, graphic, basic-facts booklet on the lecture topics should be prepared and presented to each trainee at the beginning of the orientation program (I-4);
 - b. more use should be made of visual aids such as films, graphs, charts, diagrams, pictures and slides (I-7);
 - c. lecturers should make simple presentations, speaking slowly and distinctly, and using familiar words and concrete examples, without being condescending (I-5, I-6); and
 - d. lecturers should outline their general points first and then interpret and elaborate them as much as possible through historical examples and logical reasoning (I-6).
4. Suggestions for lecture presentations by topic:
- a. Speakers on customs and daily life and the family and community should be specific and personal in their presentations (I-9);
 - b. speakers on the land and people and the economy of the United States should deal primarily with contemporary America and current problems (I-8);
 - c. speakers on the U.S. Government and U.S. education should use factual and historical material in presenting their topics (I-8, I-9); and

- d. speakers on religion in the United States and on race relations should present realistic and detailed information and examples on experiences the trainees may have in these areas during their sojourns and avoid ideological discussion and debates (I-9, I-10).

PART II

BACKGROUND, PURPOSE, AND RESEARCH APPROACH

The Washington International Center Program

The major objectives of the Washington International Center orientation program for AID trainees, the subject of this study, are specified in the Center's 1965 program outline (see Appendix A, pp 1-16). "The week-long program at the Washington International Center is based on the conviction that an individual will gain more from his stay in a foreign country-- whether his program be cultural, educational, or technical-- if he begins it in a calm frame of mind, with at least a basic understanding of the country, its culture, its people and its government. To this end, the Center's staff, volunteers and lecturers seek to establish an atmosphere of sympathetic understanding, in which friendliness, candor, and a spirit of helpful guidance enhance the learning process."

While in one sense each weekly program offered by the Center is a unique combination of participants, speakers and volunteers, there is a "typical" pattern which characterizes the program. The AID trainee flies into Washington, D.C. to begin his training sojourn during the latter part of a week. He is met at the airport by a volunteer from the Center's Airport Reception staff. After introducing herself, she gives the trainee a briefing at the airport to acquaint him with the city, with tipping, and with American banking and monetary systems. She also furnishes his hotel reservations and informs him of the Center's program and when he is to appear there. She then assists him in obtaining his luggage and transportation to

his hotel.

Prior to arriving at the Center for the regular program on Monday morning, many AID trainees take the tour to Mt. Vernon, offered by the Center every Saturday morning. They may also attend a briefing at the Center which provides information on the Washington street system, bus routes, housing, restaurants and food, dry cleaning, laundry and other services, and answers questions on daily life in Washington and the United States.

At 9:00 on Monday morning, the trainee's formal orientation program begins. (See Appendix A, p.17, for illustrative program.) He is welcomed by the Center's Executive Director, who delivers a short introduction to the program and has all the trainees introduce themselves. The Executive Director then introduces a representative of the United States government from AID's Office of International Training. This official presents the government's welcome, explaining the opportunities and responsibilities the participants will have during and after their United States sojourn. Following these opening remarks, tea and coffee are served by the Center's hospitality volunteers, and the participants get acquainted with other trainees who will be accompanying them through the orientation program.

The trainees are introduced to their program chairman, who presents a talk on "Customs and Daily Life in the United States." On Monday afternoon, a lecture on "The Land and People of the United States" is given by a historian or geographer from a Washington university.

Usually the university lecturers discuss their topic for approximately one hour and then conduct a question-and-answer session for approximately 30 minutes. Each lecturer is given an outline suggesting the material he is to cover in his talk, but a great deal of freedom in deciding what information to present and the format of the presentation is per-

mitted.¹

On Tuesday, the morning lecture on U.S. Government and politics is given by a political scientist. This lecture is followed by a tour of Capitol Hill, which usually includes a visit to the White House, the Library of Congress, the Supreme Court, and the U.S. Capitol.

The Wednesday morning program includes two lectures, the first on the family and community in the United States, the second on religious life in the United States. The former lecture is given by a sociologist, social worker or psychologist from a local university, while the latter is usually presented by a panel of three speakers who represent the three principal religions in this country. One member of the panel presents a general picture of religious life in the United States, while the other two serve as discussants. Wednesday afternoon is left free so that the trainee can take care of business that he may have with his embassy, AID or other agencies in the Washington area.

Thursday morning's lecture on education is given by an educator. During the school year this culminates in a tour to an area high school. In the summer, a visit to the Washington community or to a college supplants the high school tour.

On Friday, two lectures are given. In the morning a lecture on the U.S. economy is presented, usually by a professor of economics. Either before or after this lecture, a film is shown on a government-sponsored project, such as the Tennessee Valley Authority. The formal educational program

¹The DETRI observers rated each lecturer on how closely he followed the suggested outline for his topic. About 52% of the lecturers were rated below the middle of this 7-point scale. Only one lecturer of the 145 was rated as following the outline completely. (See Appendix for complete data.)

ends with the Friday afternoon lecture on civil liberties and race relations. This lecture is usually given by someone in the field of race relations, frequently a Negro. Following the discussion, the Executive Director thanks the trainees for their participation in the program and presents each with a certificate. (If the trainee has not attended the Mt. Vernon tour prior to beginning his program, he frequently will go the Saturday morning after the formal program.)

A voluntary evening program offered by the Center begins at 7:30 every evening. It includes English language practice, movies, an international circle, and other events sponsored by various community and civic organizations in the Washington area. Home hospitality is provided if the trainee desires to meet an American family. If possible, it is arranged to take place during the week of the trainee's formal educational program. However, it is often scheduled for the following week to allow home hospitality volunteers more time to prepare for the visitors. Home hospitality may include an evening meal, an overnight stay or other social activities with American families.

Purposes and Approach of the Study

The primary purposes of this research study are to determine the extent to which the Washington International Center orientation programs for AID participants are achieving their desired objectives and to suggest modifications or adjustments in these programs which are likely to enhance fulfillment of the desired objectives.

To accomplish these purposes, a three-year project was initiated, which involves short-range and long-range evaluations. This interim report includes the development and findings of the short-range evaluation effort. The final

report in late 1970 will present both short and long-range results.

The short-range evaluation concentrates on overall effects on the participant of the one-week Washington International Center program, as assessed by before and after measurements of the participant's knowledge about and attitudes toward the United States, as well as his adjustment to the United States during that week. In addition, the immediate reactions of the participants to specific aspects of the program (e.g., the lectures, home hospitality, tours) were obtained.

The DETRI professional staff conducting the study also made systematic observations of the weekly programs attended by the participants from June 17 through October 4, 1968.

The final major component of the short-range plan was to invite two respected social scientists--one a political scientist experienced in international relations, the other a cross-cultural communications specialist--to observe the Washington International Center program and to prepare special evaluative reports. Part IV of this report contains the report prepared by Dr. Ernest W. Lefever, political scientist of the Brookings Institution staff. The report of Dr. Edward C. Stewart, psychologist at the University of Pittsburgh, is in Part V.

The long-range evaluation focuses on the effects of the Center's program on the participants' sojourn in the United States. Data are being collected in exit-interviews, just prior to the participant's return home after his training program is completed. Participants who attended the International Center will be compared with participants who did not attend the Center on such factors as personal and social adjustment during their sojourn and the nature and the frequency of any difficulties they experienced.

PART III

INSTRUMENTS, PROCEDURES, AND RESULTS OF THE DETRI STUDY OF THE WASHINGTON INTERNATIONAL CENTER'S FORMAL ORIENTATION PROGRAM

Development of Instruments and Procedures

During the initial phase of the study the investigators: (1) reviewed the research literature on orientation programs, experiences of foreign visitors in the United States, and relevant methodological and substantive references in social psychology; (2) attended three weeks of orientation sessions at the Washington International Center as participant observers; (3) met with Washington International Center and AID officials jointly to discuss plans for research instruments and procedures; and (4) carefully reviewed the Center's program outline (see Appendix A, p.1) to become thoroughly familiar with the broad objectives of the program and the specific lecture material suggested for each of the seven outside lecturers.

Given the complexity of the International Center's orientation program and the heterogeneity of the AID trainees, it was decided with the advice and consent of relevant AID and Washington International Center personnel, that the instruments and procedures would be developed to focus specifically on (1) the trainees' problems in adjusting to the United States during their first week here, (2) their knowledge of U.S. institutions and customs, (3) their ideas about Americans and the United States, and (4) their evaluations of the Center's orientation program.

To measure the AID trainees' knowledge and attitudes about the United States, and difficulties upon arrival, they

were given a structured questionnaire before they began the Washington International Center's orientation program. The same questionnaire administered at the end of the program shows any changes in the participant's information, ideas and problems in adjusting. By comparing any such changes that occurred with similar information from a control group of foreign visitors who had not gone through the Center's program, it would be possible to identify effects that the orientation program itself had upon the AID trainee's problem solving, information gathering, and attitude change. The evaluation of specific aspects of the Washington International Center program and overall reaction to it were measured during and immediately after the orientation program.

Participants' Adjustment Problems

In developing items to measure the participant's physical, social, linguistic, and logistic problems in the United States, the DETRI staff drew upon its experience in the exit-interview project (Lybrand, et al., 1967), as well as on the publications of other investigators (Selltiz, et al., 1963; Longest, 1968; The U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, 1966).

The format for these adjustment problem items was taken from the exit-interview questionnaire. This format was developed to present a simple visual structure that all the AID trainees could understand. All of these items were presented as difficulties that other people similar to the participants have had, so that they did not feel alone or unusual in indicating that they had such difficulties. The participants responded by checking one of three categories: "not true," "sometimes true," or "often true" for me.

The content of the difficulties was based partially on questionnaire items from DETRI's exit-interview project.

However, some of these items were found to be too specific for a new arrival to the United States to answer meaningfully. Thus, the difficulties list was generalized by adding some items and revising others.

Participants' Knowledge of the United States

The information items used in this study do not have many predecessors. Although some authors (Shiro, 1965; and Longest, 1968) have developed instruments to measure how much foreign visitors have learned from orientation programs, the content of the different programs varied sufficiently to make most of the questions used in these studies inappropriate for the current study. Therefore, the items had to be developed from observations of the International Center's program, major points on the Center program outline, and suggestions of AID and Washington International Center staff.

Careful consideration was given to the format for the information questions. Fill-in, short answer, and essay questions were rejected primarily because they required greater facility in written English than other formats; an ability which varies widely among AID trainees. This left true-false and multiple-choice questions. The multiple-choice type format was selected because: (1) it provides a more sensitive measure of an individual's knowledge since it requires one choice from among four rather than one from among two; (2) it is less likely to produce response sets, i.e., the tendency of the individual to use one response when filling out a questionnaire (Cronbach, 1946); and (3) it enables learners to gain useful information from incorrect items as well as testing their knowledge of correct items.

Participants' Ideas about Americans and the United States

In developing the attitudinal items, special attention was given to the research of Selltiz, et al., (1963) and to

an unpublished study by Dr. Forrest Clements. Also drawn upon was DETRI's experience with the individual interviews conducted as part of the exit-interview project (Kimmel, et al., 1968).

The attitude items were constructed to measure stereotypes that some AID trainees have of the United States, and specific images of life in the United States suggested by some of the Center's program lecturers. A few attitudinal items were developed to relate directly to information items so that comparisons could be made between information and attitudes trainees may have.

Most of the items were formulated to implicitly or explicitly make an evaluative judgment about the United States, i.e., as statements of opinion rather than statements of fact. For example, the attitude item of American wives working was written, "too many U.S. wives work outside the home," rather than "many American wives work." An equal number of items favorable and unfavorable to Americans and the United States were developed to register participants' tendencies to respond either positively or negatively without regard to item content. For clarity of analysis, each item covered only one idea. A statement such as "because so many wives work outside the home, they keep house poorly," was avoided, as it expresses two ideas and a causal relationship. A negative answer to this item would be extremely difficult to interpret.

Participants' Evaluations of the Washington International Center Program

The Friday version of the printed questionnaire examined participant satisfaction with specific aspects of the orientation program ranging from the airport reception through the evening activities. In addition, trainees were asked to rate their satisfaction with the entire program. Three categories were used to measure the participants' satisfaction with

the specific features of the program, and a 7-point rating scale to measure their overall satisfaction with the total program.

The participants were also asked to fill out a 1-page form immediately after each lecture they attended. This form was designed to obtain detailed information the participants would have difficulty recalling later in the week, and to elicit their immediate evaluations of the speakers they heard.

There were four types of questions asked the trainees following the lectures. The first type, simple yes-no questions, concentrated on the trainees' participation in the discussion of the lecture topic. Such participation, as previous studies of the Washington International Center have suggested (Stone and Flack, 1957; and Merrifield, 1957) and a number of experiments have demonstrated (see McGeoch and Irion, 1952), usually facilitates learning of lecture information.

The second type of question asked about difficulties the participants experienced with the lecture presentations. These problems were presented in the same format as the problems the trainees might have had during their first week in the United States (see above).

The third type of question asked the participants to rate on a 5-point scale how much of the lecture they had understood.

The final type of question asked participants to make evaluations of the lecturers. There were two 7-point scales here, one to measure the participants' interest in the lecture, and the other to measure the utility of the information presented.

Pre-testing of Participant Questionnaires

Since many of the items in the participants' Monday and Friday questionnaires and the post-lecture reaction forms were developed conceptually, it was imperative to pre-test them before beginning the study. A sample of 104 regular AID parti-

cipants provided help, advice, and data of the original forms of the questionnaires. Pre-testing began Monday, April 15, 1968 and continued through Friday, June 14, 1968.

The pre-test data were used to select information items of two different types. First, several items were chosen which a high percentage of participants answered correctly both before and after the orientation program. These items were to establish the trainees' confidence with taking the questionnaire, and thereby motivate them to try to answer more difficult questions. These items can also be used to check the validity of the participants' data. It is reasonable to assume that those participants who answer most of these easy questions incorrectly are either careless or lack sufficient English language ability to understand the items. Finally, if the percentage of right answers on these items is high in the data gathered during the formal survey, it represents information which most trainees have acquired prior to the orientation program, and which needs little reiteration.

Most of the information items selected for the final questionnaire were those which a higher percentage of trainees in the pre-test answered correctly after the orientation program than they had before it. These items provide a measure of information that has been learned during the week at the Washington International Center orientation program.

Pre-test data were examined in several ways to select the attitude items for the final questionnaire. Those attitude items which a high proportion of trainees indicated that they had "never heard" were rejected. Such items were either difficult for the trainees to understand or were not a salient portion of their ideas about the United States. Those items which participants either believed or disbelieved on both the Monday and Friday pre-test questionnaires were

retained because they represent commonly held attitudes toward the United States which are resistant--though not necessarily impervious--to change. Such stable attitudes should influence the trainees' evaluation of their sojourn experiences. A majority of the attitude items selected were those on which the trainees' answers changed somewhat from before to after the orientation program. These items were selected to represent attitudes which were possibly affected by the Washington International Center program.

The pre-test results indicated that the format for the attitudinal items needed revision. The original form of the items used only one positive (believe) and one negative (don't believe) category. The middle category in this form was "never heard of this item." The pre-test results showed that more choices were required so a 5-point rating scale was developed: (1) strongly believe, (2) believe somewhat, (3) cannot make a decision, (4) disbelieve somewhat, and (5) strongly disbelieve. The category, "cannot make a decision," was established to discourage those participants who are reluctant to reveal their opinions from relying on a non-evaluative category.

The other items in the Monday-Friday questionnaires were based on previous DETRI research and were found to need little or no revision.

Pre-testing revealed that trainees completed the post-lecture evaluation forms more rapidly than had been anticipated. Consequently, this form was expanded to obtain more comprehensive data. The two 7-point rating scales used to measure the participants' evaluations of the speakers were dropped and five new questions were substituted. In these five items the trainees were asked to compare the speaker they had heard with the best teachers in their home country in terms of:

(1) friendliness, (2) believability, (3) knowledge, (4) interest, and (5) overall presentation.

Since the pre-test results indicated that most of the trainees responded with very high evaluations of the lecturers on the post-lecture 7-point scales, two evaluation items were added to the Friday questionnaire. In these items trainees were asked to rank order all of the lectures they had attended--once in terms of content interest and once in terms of content information. These ranking questions were designed to guide trainees to consider the lectures on a relative basis. These rank orders provided more comparative information for analysis than did the absolute ratings used in the pre-test post-lecture forms.

DETRI Staff Observational Categories

Observational data were gathered by the DETRI staff on the lecturers as they presented themselves to the trainees during the orientation program. Of the many ways of studying group behavior and learning situations that exist, systematic observation was considered the best method for the present study as it interfered least with the program being assessed and it sensitized the observer providing him with a common frame of reference. Using this technique, the researcher records his observations of the group and of the speaker according to a predetermined set of categories. Only from such a common frame of reference can comparative data be collected by different observers evaluating a variety of lectures and lecturers.

The DETRI staff learned from its initial observations at the Center that the presentations resembled academic classroom situations. Thus, research on student learning (McGeoch and Irion, 1952) was used to develop some of the observational categories. It has been found that the more often a point is made, the more apt students are to learn it. Thus, cate-

gories were constructed to count the number of allusions made by each speaker to items of information and belief asked of the trainees on the questionnaires. Other research has shown that students learn and retain more information when this information is systematically organized and illustrated. Thus, categories were generated to assess the speaker's organization of his material and illustration of his points.

Additional categories were developed in consideration of findings on teacher characteristics and styles. A study of 6,000 American school teachers revealed three different patterns of teacher behavior (Ryans, 1960). Three of the observational categories were adapted from this research.

Research on student-centered teaching in the United States also contributed to the observational categories. Three dimensions of student-centered teaching were measured by DETRI observational categories including (1) fitting lecture content to the needs and backgrounds of the trainees, (2) involving the trainees in group discussions, and (3) discussing the trainees' personal feelings and ideas.¹

The trainees' varied levels of proficiency in English and the fact that they heard each lecturer on only one occasion made it necessary to assess the speaker's use of visual aids, his physical appearance, his use of English, and noises and interruptions which might cause distractions during the lecture.

The DETRI staff also observed and coded the group discussions subsequent to the lectures. These codes were based

¹In many ways, student-centered teaching is similar to the style of presentation suggested by the 1952 Conference on the Washington International Center, and the Merrifield report (1957), p.115.

on research in the area of small group problem-solving (Bales, 1950).

When the DETRI staff began its pre-testing of the before-after questionnaires and the trainees' post-lecture reaction forms, the observational categories were in rudimentary form. Thus, this instrument underwent continuous revision and elaboration throughout the pre-test period. Investigations were made of the reliability of this instrument by comparing observational ratings made of some of the same lectures by three DETRI staff members. Reliability was found to be satisfactory on the categories developed by the last week of the pre-test. Unreliable categories were dropped from the final instrument.

Administrative Procedures

After pre-testing and consultation with the staff of the Washington International Center, it was decided that the best time to secure before-orientation data from AID trainees was immediately prior to the introductory remarks given by the Center's Executive Director. One hour was allowed for the administration of the printed questionnaire which included a 15 minute introduction and discussion of instructions (leaving 45 minutes for the trainees to complete the form).

When the trainees arrived at the Center they were greeted by Washington International Center staff members and volunteer hostesses. Those participating in the DETRI survey were given a special name tag to aid the DETRI staff in identifying them and directed to the library at the Center where the before-questionnaire was administered. (An additional room was used when more than 25 AID trainees appeared on Monday morning.)

While the trainees were assembling, the DETRI staff member administering the questionnaires set up a large drawing board on which he printed his name in a row of boxes as the trainees

were asked to do in the questionnaire. He then wrote the day's date. When all the trainees were seated, the administration of the questionnaire was begun with a standardized introduction. (The text of this introduction appears in Appendix B, p.33.) This introduction was based primarily on the exit-interview model (Lybrand, et al., 1967) and was modified in accordance with the Center and AID staff members' suggestions and pre-test experience.

After concluding the introduction and answering any questions, the questionnaire administrator explained how to complete the questionnaire by giving illustrative examples of each type of item. Trainees were again given opportunity for questioning before they began. While the participants were completing the questionnaire, DETRI staff members moved about the library answering individual questions. Participants were unobtrusively observed to see that they were following the instructions and were understanding the different types of items.

Most of the trainees had sufficient time to complete the questionnaires before they were asked to stop. As they finished, the questionnaire administrator examined their responses for multiple checks on the information items, skipped pages, omitted items and other incomplete or inaccurate information. The trainees were asked not to omit any items but to give their best guess.

On Friday, following the last lecture and presentation of certificates to the trainees, the DETRI questionnaire administrator reminded the trainees of their appointment to complete the after-questionnaire. After the coffee break, the DETRI staff member assembled the trainees in two lecture rooms upstairs at the Center; in one room those who had taken the Monday questionnaire, in the second, those who had begun

the program after the Monday questionnaire administration. The second group required both the Monday introduction and the Friday instructions (see Appendix B, p.35). The trainees were allowed to remain in the classrooms on Friday afternoons until they completed the after-questionnaire. The usual time was about one hour. A DETRI staff member monitored the administration of this instrument, checked completed questionnaires and thanked all trainees for their participation in the study.

The post-lecture reaction forms for trainees were administered directly after each of the eight lectures in the formal orientation program. On Monday morning after the Program Chairman finished his lecture on customs and daily life, he recognized the DETRI staff member who had been observing the lecture, and mentioned the DETRI evaluation survey. The trainees who had taken the questionnaire were asked to fill out the post-lecture reaction form by the questionnaire administrator. These forms were self-explanatory and required very little introduction at any time throughout the week. The post-lecture reaction forms were monitored in the same manner as the questionnaires.

A DETRI staff member was present during each lecture. He generally sat at the back of the room where observation ratings were made as unobtrusively as possible. From this position, he could best observe any interruptions, activity in the room, and the identity of trainees asking questions and joining the group discussions. He took no part in the discussions, although on a few occasions a question was directed to him.

At the beginning of the lecture, the observer noted the time the lecture began and rated physical characteristics of the speaker. All of the other ratings were made during the lecture and group discussion, except the overall evaluations

were completed as soon as possible following the lecture and and the administration of the post-lecture reaction forms.

Developmental Problems

In developing and pre-testing the instruments and procedures, several general methodological, substantive, and administrative problems had to be overcome.

One major problem was to use English words suitable for trainees with varying degrees of English language ability. Not only was it necessary to select words for the questionnaires and introductory remarks that the trainees would understand, but it was also important to use words which have common connotations when translated by people from different cultural backgrounds. Several steps were taken to deal with the English language problem. First, in constructing questionnaire items, the Thorndike-Lorge (1944) word count was consulted to select only frequently used English words for the questions. Second, a draft version of the questionnaires and introductory remarks was given to the staff of the American Language Institute at Georgetown University for revisions and simplification. Finally, the questionnaire administrator present while trainees were filling out pre-test forms ascertained the trainees' comprehension of the items and instructions. Difficulties were noted, discussed, and when problems were not idiosyncratic, changes were made.

A second general problem was that of the political sensitivity of the questionnaire items and the possibility of invasion of privacy of the trainee in the study. To prevent either the content or the procedures of the study from violating government or professional ethical codes, several steps were taken. Before any item was pre-tested, it was evaluated by professionals at DETRI from both perspectives. Any item of a slightly objectionable nature was rejected.

During the pre-testing, the trainees' comments were elicited and analyzed for negative reactions. Any item construed by any trainee to be sensitive was either rewritten or dropped from the final version of the questionnaire. The final draft of the pre-test instruments was reviewed and approved by both AID and Washington International Center officials, including one former Assistant Secretary of State. Finally, no participant who objected to taking part in the study or to answering a specific item in any of the questionnaires was coerced. Their agreement to participate as individuals was, in this sense, a voluntary act.

A third general problem was that of ingratiation: the tendency of people being evaluated to answer questions in a manner which they believe is desired by the researcher, rather than revealing their true opinions. Numerous steps were taken to minimize the effects of the ingratiation factor. First, in developing measures of the trainees' satisfaction with the program, response categories which made distinctions among variations in liking (as opposed to using some dislike categories) were selected. That is, rather than asking participants whether they were satisfied, neutral, or dissatisfied with some aspect of the program, they were asked to state if they were completely satisfied, very satisfied, or somewhat satisfied. Second, as mentioned above, the trainees were asked to rank order the lectures on two different dimensions. A rank order, due to its comparative nature, is not subject to ingratiation in terms of the responses given. Third, on the 7-point scale used to rate the overall program, labels are given only to the highest (number 1 position) and the lowest category in the scale. These end categories were made so extreme that they are used less often than the end categories in evaluation scales noted in other research studies. Thus,

trainees more often used the scale's other five points which are unlabeled and defined by the trainee himself. Such self-definitions avoid the problems of cultural differences and word meanings, as well as eliciting a better description of response than ingratiation usually allows (Cantril and Kilpatrick, 1960; Cantril, 1965). Fourth, in administering the questionnaire, the DETRI staff created a more candid atmosphere by stressing the fact that the study was being done by an independent, university-based research group, not affiliated with AID or the Washington International Center. The non-personal form of reporting the data was emphasized to prevent trainees from feeling that their comments could be identified. Trainees were also told that their answers could not in any way affect their future relationship with AID or the Center. The administrator stressed the fact that recommendations for improvement of the program would only be valuable to the International Center if the trainees were as honest as possible. Finally, the extent of ingratiation that remained was checked by determining the consistency between the trainees' evaluations and their written answers on questions asking about difficulties they had experienced with the program. Pre-test results showed a very high level of consistency.

A fourth general problem was that of scheduling and obtaining the AID trainees who were intended to be in the formal research study. Ideally, the sample was designed to include all English-speaking AID trainees attending the regular Center orientation sessions during the 19 weeks of formal data collection.²

²The sample did not include non-English speaking observation training team members, trainees at the International Center not sponsored by AID, or participants attending special orientation programs at the International Center.

The sampling goal was largely achieved, although some English-speaking AID trainees who attended regular orientation programs did not fill out one or more of DETRI's questionnaires.³

Scheduling difficulty was the major reason for this. The data collection procedures were designed for an ideal 5-day formal orientation program. However, some trainees did not follow this pattern.

It proved administratively unfeasible to give the before-measure at any other time than before the program began on Monday morning. Thus, trainees who began their orientation on other days of the week did not fill out this questionnaire. Whenever possible, arrangements were made to administer the after-questionnaire to trainees who attended at least three days of the formal orientation program whether their program ended on Friday or not. Some trainees did not get the full 5-day program because other commitments required them to leave Washington prior to the end of the full week.

Lack of coordination and cooperation from the trainees was another reason that complete data was not obtained in every case. Some trainees could not be given the questionnaire on Monday because they arrived at the Center too late. Others left the Center at the end of their program without returning to complete the after-questionnaire. In general, however, inadequate trainee cooperation was not an important cause of

³The total sample who completed one questionnaire or more included 522 trainees. The before-measure on Monday morning was completed by 417 trainees; 432 took the after-measure on Friday afternoon; 340 took both questionnaires; and 264 had complete data on both forms. The 264 were the sample used to assess learning and attitude changes. A total of 109 trainees had complete questionnaire data plus all 8 post-lecture reaction forms.

missing data.

Missing post-lecture reaction forms are primarily accounted for by participants not attending one or more lectures during their orientation week. Occasionally, participants failed to cooperate in filling out these forms but again the major loss of data had to do with scheduling problems.⁴

Although the sample of participants used to assess information and attitude change was about half the total sample size, analysis showed that these participants did not differ from the larger group on any significant background characteristics. Thus, the results and recommendations in this study are expected to apply to all participants observed and interviewed. Analysis of the data from participants who took part in less than the full 5-day program will provide important information on the value of attending the entire Washington International Center orientation program.

The data from the participants who filled out only the after-measures is used to measure the effects that participation in the Monday morning questionnaire had upon the trainees' learning and attitude change during the week. Previous research has shown (Campbell and Stanley, 1963) that the taking of a questionnaire or an interview prior to participation in some regular program may influence the participant's behavior during that program. A comparison of results of those participants who took only the Friday questionnaire with those of participants who filled out both the Monday and Friday questionnaires shows that filling out the Monday questionnaire did not affect participant behavior, information and attitude change.

⁴The number of trainees who filled out post-lecture reaction forms for each lecture topic is as follows: Customs and Daily Life - 331; Land and People - 302; Government - 412; Family - 376; Religion - 333; Education - 373; Civil Rights - 391; Economics - 381.

The fifth set of problems had to do with administration of the instruments during the formal program. Procedures were devised to deal with late-comers on Monday morning. Any participants who arrived between 8:40 and 9:00 A.M. were greeted by the Center volunteer and directed to a second room at the Center. A DETRI staff member met them there, briefly explained the study and testing procedures, and directed them into the library where the other trainees were in the process of answering the questionnaire. Since all trainees were required to be at the opening remarks at 9:30, those arriving after 9:00 A.M. were not permitted to begin the questionnaire as pre-testing indicated there would not be enough time for them to complete it.

It was found that many participants forgot about the Friday questionnaire administration and scheduled other appointments (often with their AID Program Officer) Friday afternoon. To remind them of this commitment, formal appointment cards were handed out to each trainee after he had completed the Monday morning questionnaire. These appointment cards contained the time and place at which the Friday questionnaire would be administered. In addition, announcements were made throughout the week concerning the study and the participants' part in it.

Another administrative problem was the identification of participants taking part in the study when they were part of a larger group of foreign visitors attending the International Center orientation program. During the pre-testing it was decided to give these trainees special name tags so that they could be easily identified.

To insure that the trainees did not leave the lecture rooms before filling out the post-lecture reaction forms, the Program Chairman in charge of each session reminded the trainees who were taking part in the study to stay. This reminder

was usually given before the question-and-answer period after each lecture. Occasionally, the lecturer would overlook the announcement and a DETRI staff member would then remind trainees.

The DETRI observers rated all but three of the lectures given during the formal data collection. The three lectures not attended were the result of unanticipated multiple groups. On some occasions large groups were sectioned into smaller groups during the week and an extra observer was required to rate the two simultaneous lectures. A similar problem in administration sometimes occurred on Friday afternoons when trainees required special attention because of other appointments and commitments. At least two and frequently three DETRI staff members were at the International Center on Friday afternoons to handle the different groups of participants filling out the after-questionnaire.

The sixth general developmental problem concerns the control group of foreign visitors. To provide comparable information on the adjustment that foreign visitors to this country make during a week in Washington independent of the program provided by the Washington International Center, the research design called for a group of 75 trainees to be individually surveyed who were not part of the AID training program. So that their data would be comparable to those of the visitors surveyed at the Center, it was necessary to administer similar questionnaires at times similar to those in the study.

It was found to be impossible to locate foreign visitors who had training programs comparable to those of the AID special participants. Consequently, it was agreed that only academic students from foreign countries would be included in the comparison group. With the help of the National Association of Foreign Student Advisors, five local universities were contacted to provide the sample of 75 required by the research

design.

Several attempts were made to involve foreign students in the research study. In spite of these different approaches and a financial inducement, only 11 completed sets of questionnaires were collected. Because of the small number of questionnaires it was decided that the analysis of data by control groups would have to be omitted from the research design.

Results and Conclusions

This section of the report presents some of the statistically significant results of information gathered at the Washington International Center between June 17, 1968 and October 4, 1968. All of the data presented in this section comes from the before and after questionnaires administered to participants after each formal lecture, and the observational ratings made by the DETRI staff.

Participants' Backgrounds

Table 1

Q. What regions of the world were the participants from?

REGION	PERCENTAGE (%)
NESA	30.3
FE	29.7
AFR	24.5
LA	14.6

TOTAL N	(522)

The participants surveyed at the Washington International Center more often came from the Near East-South Asia and the Far East regions than they did from Latin America. This distribution of participants by region is similar to that of the DETRI exit-interview project results. The percent of participants from Latin America in Academic and Special training programs is lower because a substantial proportion of the Latin American trainees take part in observational training programs.

Table 2

Q. How many years of education did the trainees have?

YEARS OF EDUCATION	PERCENTAGE (%)
7 - 11 (years)	7.6
12	6.9
13 - 15	26.2
16	19.2
17 - 18	24.4
19 and over	15.7

TOTAL N	(432)

About 15% of the AID trainees who participated in the Washington International Center survey had the equivalent of an American high school education or less. Another 45% had the equivalent of some college or a college degree, while 40% of these AID trainees had more years of education than the college graduate in the United States. These figures on education are comparable to those presented in the 1969 DETRI exit-interview report on 2,400 AID participants.

Table 3

Q. What were the ages of the participants?

AGE	PERCENTAGE (%)
21 - 27	19.9
28 - 30	13.3
31 - 34	23.1
35 - 39	23.5
40 - 45	12.8
46 and over	6.4

TOTAL N	(467)

The median age of the AID trainees in the International Center study was 33. This is about the same age as the median age of trainees in the 1969 DETRI exit-interview report.

Table 4

Q. What was the sex of the participants?

SEX	PERCENTAGE (%)
Male	85.0
Female	15.0

TOTAL N	(473)

Table 5

Q. What was the marital status of the participants?

MARITAL STATUS	PERCENTAGE (%)
Single	68.0
Married	31.1
Other	.8

TOTAL N	(472)

The distributions of the participants taking part in the Washington International Center study by sex and by marital status are almost identical with the distributions of the AID trainees reported upon in the DETRI exit-interview report, 1969.

Table 6

Q. How familiar were the participants with the English language?

ENGLISH	PERCENTAGE (%)
Main language used in school	52.9
Studied over 5 years	26.8
Studied 3 to 5 years	9.6
Studied 1 or 2 years	8.2
Studied less than 1 year	2.5

TOTAL N	(417)

Over half of the participants indicated that English was the main language used in most of their school courses. At the other extreme about one participant out of forty who took part in the survey (2.5) indicated that they had had less than 1 year of English language training prior to coming to the United States.

Participants' Experiences during Orientation Week

Table 7

Q. How long had the participants been in the United States before they began the Centers' orientation program?

TIME IN THE UNITED STATES	PERCENTAGE (%)
1 or 2 days	15.0
3 to 6 days	69.7
7 to 14 days	12.6
15 or more days	2.6

TOTAL N	(417)

The large majority (84.7%) of the AID trainees in the survey had been in Washington for less than one week when they began the orientation program at the International Center. Only 2.6% had been in this country for over two weeks prior to beginning the program.

Table 8

Q. How often did participants engage in social and recreational activities during the week they attended the Center's program?

ACTIVITY	PERCENTAGE PARTICIPATING (%)			
	Never	1-2 times	3-5 times	6 or more times
Talking to people:				
- from other countries	.9	13.0	27.8	58.3
- from the United States	.9	14.4	26.6	58.1
- from own country	2.5	15.7	25.9	55.8
Walking around Washington	2.1	19.7	36.3	41.9
Watching television	5.8	25.9	30.8	37.5
Writing letters	3.7	36.0	35.0	25.0
Reading bouks, news, etc.	1.9	37.0	43.3	17.8
Relaxing	10.0	42.8	26.6	20.6
Shopping	7.2	44.0	36.8	12.0
Going to AID	3.0	74.3	20.6	2.1
Going to evening program	49.5	35.2	10.6	4.6
Going to own embassy	30.3	63.2	5.8	.7
Visiting American home	55.8	40.7	3.2	.2
Going to movies	75.5	22.7	1.9	0.0
TOTAL N	(432)			

The activity most frequently engaged in by trainees outside the formal orientation program was talking to people. Relational analyses showed that the same trainees who said

they talked with Americans were likely to say they talked with people from other countries (not including their own). Those who said they talked with people from their home country, however, were somewhat less likely to say they talked with people from other countries and much less likely to say they talked with Americans.

The second and third most frequently engaged in activities were walking around Washington (sightseeing), and watching television. Activities that were seldom engaged by a majority of the AID trainees surveyed included the evening programs at the International Center, visiting American homes, and going to American movies. Three out of 4 participants did not go to an American movie during the week of the orientation program.

Table 9

Q. What general problems confronted participants before they began their orientation programs at the Center?

PROBLEM	PERCENTAGE (%)		
	No Trouble	A Little Trouble	A Lot of Trouble
Prices too high	16.8	52.9	30.3
Transportation	44.4	41.8	13.8
Food	35.6	50.9	13.5
Entertainment	57.9	32.9	9.1
Housing	58.5	33.5	7.9
Weather	66.8	27.1	6.2
Speaking English	72.4	24.7	2.9
Understanding English	65.9	31.5	2.6
TOTAL N	(417)		

The problem most frequently reported by participants on Monday morning was that they found prices in the United States too high. Other problems indicated by a majority of the participants included U.S. food and transportation. The problem least often reported was difficulty with the English language. About 2 out of 3 trainees indicated they had no difficulty understanding or speaking English.

Table 10

Q. What specific difficulties did participants experience before they began their orientation program at the Center?

DIFFICULTY	PERCENTAGE (%)		
	Never a Problem	Sometimes a Problem	Often a Problem
Feeling lonely	51.8	39.4	8.8
Disliking taste of food	44.1	47.4	8.6
Sleeping	59.7	33.5	6.8
Feeling appetite loss	56.6	37.9	6.5
Feeling homesick	55.9	38.5	6.6
Feeling rushed	65.0	36.3	4.7
Not enough to do	75.3	20.3	4.4
Feeling tired & weak	62.0	34.7	3.2
Having headaches	77.4	19.4	3.2
Digesting food	71.8	25.9	2.4
Feeling nervous	83.8	15.0	1.2
TOTAL N	(417)		

The specific difficulty most frequently reported was the taste of American food. Over half (55.9%) indicated that the taste of American food was sometimes or often a problem for them. About 45% indicated that they did not feel like eating during their first few days in the United States. Almost half of the participants indicated that they had some problem with feeling lonely or feeling homesick during this time. Difficulties that did not cause problems for most of the trainees included not having enough to do, having headaches,

and feeling nervous.

Table 11

Q. What kinds of experiences did the participants have with people in the United States?

EXPERIENCE IN UNITED STATES	PERCENTAGE (%)		
	Not true	Somewhat true	Very true
People helped	6.7	22.7	70.6
People respected	10.6	49.1	40.3
People were interested	12.5	54.9	32.6
People were rude	87.5	9.0	3.5
People were unfriendly	84.3	0.9	4.9
TOTAL N	(432)		

In view of the fact that the major activity engaged in by most participants was talking to other people, it is interesting to note that the experiences most participants had with people in the United States were positive. Only about 1 participant in 8 cited rude or unfriendly people, whereas about 7 participants in 8 indicated that people helped him, respected him and were interested in him.

Table 12

Q. Did the participants meet any people in the United States that they came to consider their friends?

FRIEND'S NATIONALITY	PERCENTAGE (%)	
	Made Friends	No Friends
U.S. citizens	69.4	30.6
Other	83.3	16.7
TOTAL N	(432)	

In light of the positive experiences that trainees had with people in the United States it is not surprising that a majority of them made friends with the people they met. About 15% more of the trainees made friends with people from countries other than the United States than made friends with U.S. citizens. It is the impression of the research staff that many of the acquaintances of the trainees came from the same region, and frequently the same countries, as did the trainees themselves.

Table 13

Q. How many friends did the participants make through the orientation program?

FRIEND'S NATIONALITY	PERCENTAGE (%)				NO FRIENDS MADE
	NUMBER OF FRIENDS MADE				
	0-1	2-3	4-9	10 or more	
U.S. citizen	17.1	26.1	19.4	7.1	30.1
Other	11.8	27.6	28.0	17.3	15.3
TOTAL N	(432)				

Not only did the trainees more often make friends with people from countries other than the United States, but they also made more of these friends. Almost half of the trainees indicated that they made 4 or more friends through the Center orientation program who were from countries other than the United States. About 1 out of 4 trainees indicated they met this many American friends through the orientation program.

Relational analyses showed that the same trainees who said they made American friends were likely to say they made friends from other countries through the orientation program.

Participants' Reactions to the Center Program

Table 14

Q. How satisfied were the participants with their entire experience at the Washington International Center?

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE (%)
1 (Completely satisfied)	34.7
2	41.7
3	16.5
4	5.7
5	1.4
6	0
7 (Not at all satisfied)	0

TOTAL N	(432)

One out of 3 of the trainees indicated that the Washington International Center program as a whole was perfect and that they were completely satisfied with it. (This is a "1" rating on the scale.) Only 7.1% of the trainees evaluated the total program at or below the middle point on the rating scale. None of these trainees rated the program at either of the lowest two scale points.

Table 15

Q. How satisfied were the participants with the different aspects of the program?

PROGRAM ASPECTS	PERCENTAGE (%) SATISFIED			TOTAL N*
	Completely satisfied	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	
Airport Reception	67.9	22.0	10.1	396
Home Visit	61.2	32.0	6.7	178
Capitol Hill Tour	54.2	39.4	6.4	391
Washington Briefing	48.2	40.0	11.8	423
High School/Community Tour	45.8	39.1	15.1	332
Coffee breaks	35.5	49.3	15.2	428
Printed Material	29.5	53.3	17.2	424
Lectures	30.4	51.6	18.0	428
Evening Program	26.8	36.8	36.4	209

*The number of participants who reported taking part in each program aspect varies. Percentages are based on those who participated.

More than half of the participants who filled out the Friday afternoon questionnaire indicated that they had not yet participated in a visit to an American home (58.8%) or in the evening programs (51.6%) at the Center. About 1 out of 4 (23.1%) said they had not taken the Thursday tour to a high school or its summer alternative the Washington community tour. all of the other program aspects were participated in by over 90% of the participants.

The program aspect receiving the highest evaluation was airport reception. Also highly rated were the home visits that were made and the Capitol Hill tour. At the other extreme, those participants who attended evening programs were usually less satisfied with this aspect of the Washington International Center program than with any other.

Table 16

Q. How satisfied were the participants with the different evening activities at the Center?

EVENING ACTIVITIES	PERCENTAGE (%)			TOTAL N*
	Completely satisfied	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	
Folk dancing	40.6	37.8	21.6	74
English session	30.1	50.0	19.9	106
Movies at Center	30.5	46.3	23.2	164
Arts & crafts	35.3	36.5	28.2	85
Open house	29.5	45.7	24.8	105

*The number of participants who reported taking part in each program varies. Percentages are based on those who participated.

None of the separate evening activities were attended by a majority of the participants during their week at the Center. (One activity that was not evaluated by participants was the Friday evening program which took place after the administration of the questionnaire.) The movies were the most popular with about 2 out of 5 trainees attending (48%). All of the other activities were attended by less than 1 out of 4 trainees: folk dancing-17.1%, language practice 24.5%,

arts and crafts 19.7%, and open house 24.3% attendance.

The evening activity receiving the highest evaluation was the American folk dancing.

Table 17

Q. Which lectures did the participants feel were most and least useful in helping them to understand the United States?

LECTURES	PERCENTAGE (%)		
	Rank 1 or 2	Rank 7 or last	Differ- ence
Customs & daily life	39.4	14.8	+24.6
Land & people	28.4	15.3	+13.1
Family & community	29.0	18.5	+11.5
Race relations	33.8	26.3	+ 7.0
Government & politics	23.2	22.3	+ .9
Education	18.3	26.3	- 8.0
Economy	15.5	33.2	-17.7
Religion	11.6	42.1	-30.5
TOTAL N	(432)		

The lecture which the trainees most often ranked high in terms of helping them understand the United States was the lecture on customs and daily life given by the program chairmen. The lectures on the land and people of the United States, the family and community, and race relations were more often ranked high than low by the trainees on Friday afternoon. At the other extreme, the lectures on religious life in the United States and the U.S. economy were much more often given a low rank by the trainees in terms of helping them understand the United States.

Table 18

Q. Which lectures did the participants feel were most and least interesting?

LECTURES	PERCENTAGE (%)		
	Rank 1 or 2	Rank 7 or last	Differ- ence
Race relations	42.0	22.6	+19.4
Customs & daily life	33.7	17.8	+15.9
Family & community	24.1	18.4	+ 5.7
Land & people	20.3	21.4	- 1.1
Government & politics	21.1	22.3	- 1.2
Education	21.6	24.5	- 2.9
Economy	23.2	33.2	-10.0
Religion	13.3	39.6	-26.3
TOTAL N	(432)		

The lectures on race relations in the United States and customs and daily life were ranked 1 and 2 respectively in terms of their relative interest to the trainees. The lecture on religious life in the United States received the lowest rank on this dimension.

Information and Ideas about the United States

Table 19 presents ideas about the United States that at least 80% of the trainees indicated they believed on both Monday and Friday.

Table 19
Highly Stable Participant Beliefs

ATTITUDE ITEM	PERCENTAGE (%)	
	BELIEVE-MONDAY	BELIEVE-FRIDAY
Newspapers are free to criticize government in the United States	90.5	95.0
Life is very fast in the United States	92.0	94.7
People are hard-working in the United States	93.2	93.9
Competition between businessmen leads to better products	90.9	93.9
Opportunities for Negroes in the United States are improving	88.6	87.8
U.S. churches work for social improvement	81.0	87.8
People in the United States are well-educated	82.2	85.9
People do not waste their natural resources in the United States	81.8	84.5
TOTAL N	(264)	

The reader will notice that all of the items in Table 19 are favorable to the United States. (A possible exception is the

second item "Life is very fast in the U.S.") As was mentioned in Part II, the 35 belief items from which these came were evenly divided between statements which were unfavorable and favorable. Thus, it appears that the large majority of the trainees have a generally favorable image of the United States.

The unfavorable item most frequently believed by the trainees was "White men in the U.S. can get better jobs than Negro men." This statement was endorsed by 72% of the trainees on Monday and 82% on Friday.

Table 20 presents the answers to the six multiple choice information questions which at least 85% of the trainees answered correctly on both Monday and Friday.

Table 20
Highly Stable Participant Knowledge

INFORMATION ITEM	PERCENTAGE (%)	
	Correct-Monday	Correct-Friday
Volunteers have a sense of community responsibility	94.7	95.8
One may ask as many questions as necessary in the United States	88.2	92.4
The U.S. Congress votes on proposed laws	86.3	89.4
The U.S. Constitution allows free choice of religion	90.1	88.6
The fee for buying travelers checks is 1%	84.5	87.5
Membership in a U.S. political party is based on free choice	82.2	84.5
TOTAL N	(264)	

Three of the questions most often answered correctly ask about information covered in the Center briefing on the Washington area. Since approximately 95% of the trainees had heard this briefing prior to filling out the Monday morning questionnaire, it is possible that this information was learned before the formal program being assessed began, rather than being knowledge they brought to the United States. To ascertain the briefing's responsibility for the high proportion of correct answers on these three questions, the trainees who had heard the briefing before the Monday questionnaire administration were compared with those who had not.

The results of this comparison show that there is no difference in the knowledge of participants who had heard the Washington briefings and of those who had not. Thus, it is likely that all six items in Table 20 represent knowledge the participants bring with them to the United States.

The nine statements presented in Table 21 represent incorrect answers chosen by at least 30% of all the trainees who took the Friday afternoon questionnaire. Thus, these statements represent misinformation that these trainees have as they begin their U.S. sojourns.

Table 21
Participant Misinformation on Friday

INCORRECT INFORMATION ITEM	PERCENTAGE (%) WRONG ON FRIDAY
Average income for Negro families in the United States is \$3,000 a year. (The correct alternative is \$5,500.)	54.9
The U.S. Government's largest source of income is taxes on profits of U.S. companies.	53.9
The U.S. Government encourages farmers to produce as much food as they can.	52.3
Fifty percent or more of the married women in the United States have jobs outside the home.	46.2
Twenty percent or more of the U.S. population is Negro.	45.6
Ninety-five percent of Americans belong to a religious group.	45.0
Ten percent or more of workers in the United States is unemployed.	36.6
Most elderly people in the United States live in homes for the old.	31.5
The U.S. Government has done nothing to provide Negroes equal employment opportunities.	31.0
TOTAL N	(432)

Correct information was given for each of these items by some of the lecturers in the formal orientation programs observed by DETRI. However, the data analyses did not reveal any strong or systematic relationships between the mentioning of the correct information and the participants' choosing the correct answer on any of these nine items.

There were some systematic relationships, however, between having information and believing certain statements about the United States. For example, trainees who stated that 50% or more of the married women in the United States worked outside the home tended to believe that too many U.S. wives work. Participants who answered that 10% or more of the workers in the United States were unemployed tended to believe that automation causes unemployment. Those participants who indicated that elderly people in this country live in homes for the old tended to believe that older people in the United States are ignored by their relatives. The trainees who thought that 10% or more of the American population could neither read nor write tended to believe that people in the United States are not well-educated. Finally, the trainees who felt that 50% or more of American marriages end in divorce tended to believe that too many people in the United States get divorced.

Changes in Participants' Information, Ideas, and Adjustment

By comparing the answers given by the 264 AID trainees who completed both the Monday and Friday questionnaires, changes in their knowledge, ideas, and adjustment in the United States were measured.

On the 30 multiple-choice information items, the 264 participants got an average of 16.6 items correct on Monday and 19.5 items correct on Friday. This is an average gain of 10%, from 55% correct to 65% correct. In terms of individuals, 28 of the 264 trainees (10.6%) had lower scores on Friday

afternoon than on Monday morning, (lost information); 22 of the trainees (8.3%) had the same score on both questionnaires; and 214 of the 264 trainees (80.6%) had a higher score on Friday than on Monday (gained information). The lowest score on Monday was 8, the highest was 25. The lowest score on Friday was 10 and the highest was 28.

Table 22 presents the five information items on which at least 20% of the trainees gained information from Monday to Friday.

Table 22
Information Most Often Learned

INFORMATION ITEM LEARNED	PERCENTAGE (%)			
	Wrong to Right	Right to Wrong	Net Gain	Right on Friday
One in 5 U.S. families moves 200 miles each year	47.0	3.0	44.0	72.7
Each state in the United States has 2 Senators	39.0	2.0	37.0	77.6
American Indians may leave reservations whenever they desire	27.0	3.0	24.0	73.9
10% of the U.S. pop- ulation is Negro	26.0	3.0	23.0	53.0
Money for U.S. pri- mary and secondary schools comes from local taxes	28.0	7.0	21.0	68.6
TOTAL N	(264)			

The reader will note that each of the five items in Table 22 comes from a different lecture topic area. It is also of interest that the fourth most often learned item--10% of the U.S. population is Negro--is also an item that over 30% of the trainees still have incorrect on Friday afternoon (see Table 21).

The total amount of possible change for a trainee's beliefs concerning the United States was 120 (4 points change per attitude statement times 30 belief statements). The average amount of change for the 264 trainees was 2.6, or 2.2% of the total change possible. Fifty-two percent (52%) of the belief statements were checked in identical scale positions on both Monday and Friday. It is clear that an extremely small amount of change in the trainees' beliefs occurred during the week that they were at the Washington International Center.

Table 23 presents the five attitude items on which there was a net change of at least 14%.

Table 23
Beliefs Most Often Acquired

BELIEF ITEMS	PERCENTAGE (%)			
	Change from disbelieve on Monday to <u>believe</u> on Friday	Change from believe on Monday to <u>disbelieve</u> on Friday	Net change	Believe on Fri- day
Owners of big corpora- tions do not treat their workers fairly	31.0	12.0	19.0	16.7
Older people in the United States are ig- nored by their rela- tives	39.0	22.0	17.0	46.6
Young people in the United States marry at a very early age	33.0	17.0	16.0	65.5
Members of U.S. fam- ilies do not spend much time together	36.0	21.0	15.0	57.2
Only rich people in the United States have enough money to go to universities	34.0	20.0	14.0	38.2
TOTAL	N (264)			

All five of these beliefs are to some extent critical of life in the United States. This is not surprising, since research has shown that peoples' attitudes toward positively regarded, but unexperienced events and objects, generally become more negative when these events and objects are actually experienced. The reader should note, however, that although the net change was negative on all of these items, at least

1 out of 8 participants changed his ideas in the positive direction on the five items.

There was even less change in the trainees' statements of general problems and specific difficulties (see Tables 9 and 10) than there was change in their beliefs about the United States. None of the problems or difficulties changed more than 6% from Monday to Friday for the 264 trainees. The five items on which the greatest amount of change occurred were: (1) understanding English (6% improvement), (2) feeling unable to eat (6% improvement), (3) feeling that there was not enough to do (6% improvement), (4) disliking the taste of American food (4% loss), and (5) feeling homesick (4% loss).

Analysis of relations among background factors and information, belief and adjustment changes in the trainees showed that changes in information, beliefs and general problems tended to go together. That is, the trainees who changed in one of these areas tended to change in the other two. This relationship did not hold for changes in specific difficulties (Table 10).

It was also found that those trainees who answered more information items correctly on Monday had less information change during the week, and those trainees who had a more favorable image of the United States on Monday had more belief change than those who had a more negative image.

The region of the world from which the trainees came, previous visits to the United States, and years of education did not relate to information or belief change. Those trainees who had more English language training had somewhat more information change than did those who had less English language background.

Participant and Observer Evaluations of Lecturers

In general, the DETRI staff observation ratings and the

trainee ratings of the same lecturers did not coincide. The highest degree of agreement was between the DETRI staff's count of the number of questions asked at each lecture and the trainees' answering that they had or had not asked questions, ($r=+.46$). Other positive relationships included the judgment of distracting noises during the lecture ($r=+.36$), the speed of the lecturer's speech ($r=+.27$), and the volume of the lecturer's voice ($r=+.26$). Since the other judgments showed little or no agreement between the trainee and the observer ratings, these ratings were separated in the further analyses of the data. The purpose of these analyses was to discover the dynamics of the lecture process as seen by the trainees and the DETRI observers. (Some of the data gathered on the post-lecture reaction forms and the DETRI observation ratings are presented illustratively in Appendix C, pp. 1-22.)

The dynamics of the lecture are measured by nine of the items on the trainees' post-lecture reaction forms and 18 ratings made on the DETRI observation rating forms. The items on the trainees' post-lecture reaction forms include: (1) questions asked; (2) opportunity to ask questions; (3) trainee's understanding of the lecturer; (4) softness of speech; (5) noise in the room; (6) lecturer's organization; and (7) amount of daydreaming. All of these ratings except understanding are based on single items in the post-lecture reaction forms. Understanding is a combination of the trainee's rating of the speed of the speaker, the speaker's use of difficult words and the amount of the lecture which the trainees understood.

Analysis of the DETRI observations revealed seven distinct and independent factors; four represent different styles of speaking, and three represent different types of discussions following the lecture presentation. The first speaker style

found is labeled "participant-centered." It includes the DETRI observation ratings of the lecturer's involvement of the trainees in the lecture, discussion of himself and his values, use of international references, and volume. The second speaker style is labeled "pleasing" and includes the observational ratings of the lecturer's dramatization of his points, use of humor, understanding of the trainees, warmth of personality, and overall presentation and interest levels. The third speaker style is labeled "methodical" and includes the observation ratings of the lecturer's degree of organization, use of facts and dates, repetition of points, use of a chronological approach, and authority on answering questions and presenting material. The fourth speaker style considers the lecturer's use of visual aids, emotion, ideology, and the number of evaluative judgments in his presentation. This style is labeled "ideological."

The first type of discussion revealed by the data analysis of the question-and-answer period is labeled "inquiry." This encompasses the lecturer-trainee interaction which elaborates points presented in the talk. The second type of discussion is labeled "clarification." This is the type of interaction in which trainees ask for more information to clarify aspects of the formal presentation which have not been understood. The third type of interaction is labeled "debate." This type of discussion includes critical evaluations by trainees and the lecturer of their respective value positions.

These speaker styles and types of discussion do not necessarily characterize a given lecturer or question period. It is possible for one lecturer to use all four styles in a single presentation and for the interactions following to encompass all three types of discussion.

These DETRI observation factors plus the seven trainee

reactions were used to represent the dynamics of the lectures evaluated at the Washington International Center.

Lecture Dynamics and Outcomes

To ascertain the impact of these lecture dynamics on the trainees, it was necessary to derive a single measure or index to represent the outcomes of each lecture for each trainee. The trainee outcomes used included: (1) the trainee's evaluation of the lecturer; (2) the trainee's rating of the lecture relative to other lectures he heard; (3) the trainee's change in information for the lecture; and (4) the trainee's change in beliefs for the lecture. The trainee's evaluation of the lecturer is based on the five ratings made immediately after the presentation. His rating of the lecture relative to other lecturers he has heard is based on the rankings he gives on the Friday questionnaire. His information and belief change is based on the specific items from the Monday and Friday questionnaires that relate to the lecture topic. These four different factors were combined for each lecture to give a single "participant index." This index represents the impact of a given lecture on the trainee.

Analysis of the data on the lectures on customs and daily life in the United States revealed that none of the 14 measures of lecture dynamics (seven observer factors and seven participant-reactions factors) discriminated between the high and low scorers on the participant index. For this topic, then, none of the speaker styles, discussions, or post-lecture ratings related to participant information change, belief change, speaker evaluation and lecture ranking.

Although all of the speaker styles were used by lecturers on this topic, the "participant-centered" style was used far more often than it was by lecturers on any of the other topics. The customs and daily life lecturers using the

"methodical" style might produce more participant understanding and attitude change on this topic.

Analysis of the land and people lectures indicates the "ideological" speaker style is likely to produce higher scores on the participant index. This style of presentation is used a moderate number of times by the land and people lecturers.⁵

Relative to other lecturers, the speakers on the land and people more often used the "methodical" style of presentation. The data suggest that this style reduces the trainees' understanding of the lecture for this topic, whereas the "ideological" style enhances this understanding.

The "ideological" speaker style is likely to produce lower scores on the participant index when used in the government lectures. This style is particularly correlated with lower trainee evaluations of the lecturers.⁶ On the other hand, the "methodical" style tends to increase scores on the participant index and is associated with increased participant understanding of the speaker and a higher evaluation.

The family and community speakers used the "ideological" style of speaking more often than did the speakers on other topics. They also frequently used the "pleasing" speaking style. Neither of these discriminated between the high and low scores on the participant index, although participants tended to give family and community lecturers using the "pleasing" style lower evaluations than those using other speaker styles. The amount of daydreaming the participants rated themselves as doing and the understanding they had of lecturers did

⁵Nine of the 35 ideological statements made in land and people lectures which were relevant to questionnaire statements were coded as presenting negative images of the United States.

⁶Ten of the 14 ideological statements made in government lectures which were relevant to belief statements were coded as presenting negative images of the United States.

discriminate between high and low scorers on the participant index. Those who said they were thinking about other matters or did not understand the lecture had lower scores on the index.

The speaking style that differentiated between the high and low scorers on the participant index for the religion lectures was the "participant-centered" approach. This approach was used least often by the religion lecturers relative to other lecturers. (The style they used relatively more often was the "ideological" approach.) When the "participant-centered" approach was used, the trainees gave the lecturers high evaluations, although information and belief changes were relatively small. Trainee ratings of little noise in the room and high understanding of the speakers also produced high scores on the index. The data suggest that participant understanding on this topic relates to information change and is produced by asking questions of the lecturers.

Discussions between the trainees and the education lecturers are likely to produce higher scores on the participant index. Both "inquiry" and "clarification" discussion discriminate between high and low scoring trainees. The speaker style which is likely to give higher scores on the participant index on this topic is the "methodical" approach. It is used somewhat less frequently by the education lecturers than by other lecturers on different topics. When it is used, however, the trainees tend to give high evaluations and not to daydream during the lecture. Daydreaming is one of the two participant reactions which lowers scores on the participant index. The other is noise in the room during the lecture.

The education lecturers least often use the "ideological" approach, which on this topic is associated with trainee understanding of the presentation. Trainee understanding, in turn, is correlated with information change.

In the economics lectures, both the "pleasing" approach and the "ideological" approach produce higher scores on the participant index. The data suggest that the "pleasing" approach is associated with higher evaluations and more belief change, but is not particularly related to information change. The "pleasing" approach is used relatively less often by economics lecturers than by the lecturers on other topics, whereas the "ideological" approach is used a moderate number of times.⁷

None of the speaking styles differentiate between high and low scorers on the participant index for the topic of civil liberties and race relations. The only post-lecture rating which is related to the index is the amount of understanding the participants have of the lecturers. Those who give higher ratings of understanding tend to have higher scores on the index, especially in terms of information and belief change. A factor which produces lower scores on the participant index is the "debate" type of discussion between the civil liberties lecturers and the participants. These "debates" (which the data suggest are most frequently engaged in by African trainees) tend to inhibit information and belief change.

Synopsis and Interpretation of DETRI Survey Results

The analyses of participant and observer data gathered between June 17 and October 4, 1968 show that the 522 AID participants who attended the International Center formal orientation program during this period considered it very satisfactory.

⁷ Fifteen of 28 ideological statements made in the economics lectures, which were relevant to questionnaire belief statements, were coded as presenting negative images of the United States.

They were especially pleased with the airport reception, Capitol Hill tour and their visits to American homes. However, over half of the trainees did not visit an American home during the week that they attended the Center. Because home visits provide participants direct encounters with American life, a valuable opportunity for examining the trainees' perceptions of and accommodation to the United States is lost if the visits take place after the formal orientation at the Washington International Center is over.

The one aspect of the orientation program that seems least satisfactory to the trainees is the evening activities program. This is a voluntary aspect that is taken advantage of by only 40% of the trainees.

The goals of the orientation program are to provide foreign visitors with information about the United States and to facilitate adjustment to living in this country. The results of this survey suggest that these two goals are not unrelated. Those trainees who gain more information from Monday to Friday and who change some of their beliefs about this country are less likely to have problems with living in Washington. Also, participant satisfaction with the formal orientation program tends to be related to having fewer problems with living in Washington.

The leisure time activity most frequently engaged in by the trainees was talking to people. Most of the trainees had pleasant experiences with people in the United States and made friends with both U.S. citizens and foreign visitors from other countries. Many of their U.S. friends were made at the Center and through the home hospitality program offered by the Center, again emphasizing the importance of making home visits available to all trainees.

The aspect of the program which is most highly related

to the trainees' overall evaluations of the International Center is the formal lecture presentations. This is not surprising, as almost half of the trainees' time at the Center is devoted to lectures on eight different topics about life in the United States. The most highly ranked lectures in terms of the trainees' interests were the talks on civil liberties and race relations in the United States and U.S. customs and daily life. They found lectures on the U.S. economy and religion in the United States the least interesting.

In terms of contributing to their understanding of the United States, the trainees ranked the lectures on U.S. customs and daily life and the land and people of the United States as most helpful. They indicated that the talks on U.S. education, the U.S. economy, and religion in the United States were least helpful.

The trainees' English language training varied and, as one would expect, there was a relationship between the English training a participant had and the amount of information he obtained from the orientation lectures. Trainees had more difficulty understanding the lectures on the U.S. economy and the U.S. Government than any others.

At the beginning of the week trainees answered an average of 55% of the information items on the questionnaire correctly. By the end of the week, there was an average correct score of 65%.⁸ Analyses revealed no systematic relationships between the number of lectures attended, the lecturers' mentioning the correct answers to the questionnaire items, or filling out the questionnaire on Monday and the trainees' scores on the Friday questionnaire.

⁸Improvement on 5 of the 30 items accounted for much of this learning.

The trainees began the week with a generally favorable image of the United States which changed very little from Monday to Friday. Change that did occur was more often in a critical direction than in a positive direction. The five belief statements on which the trainees changed most all statements presented a negative image of the United States.

There was a positive relationship between change of information and change in beliefs about the United States. Trainees who had misinformation regarding statistics on American family life, employment, and literacy tended to have a more negative image of the United States in these areas than trainees who had correct information. There were nine information items on which at least 30% of the trainees had such misinformation at the end of the orientation program. On the other hand, there were five information and nine attitude items that were answered correctly or endorsed positively by a large majority of the AID trainees on both Monday and Friday. Since this information is already known by so many participants, its reiteration may be thought to be for purposes other than the communication of information.

It was difficult to find lecture factors which related to changes in the trainees' information and beliefs about the United States. Factors which produce change in attitudes and learning among American students did not relate to similar changes for the AID trainees. Such things as student-centered lectures, repetition of material, number of questions and amount of discussion, and the specific mentioning of the information to be learned correlated weakly and unsystematically with both information and attitude change.

An overall participant index was developed for each trainee on each lecture he attended which included information change, belief change, and evaluations made of the lecture and the

lecturer. This index was related to seven ratings he made of each lecture and seven speaker and discussion styles from observations made by the DETRI staff.

It was found that a "methodical" speaker style was related to higher index scores for the lectures on the U.S. Government and U.S. education. An "ideological" speaker style tended to raise the scores when used in the land and people and U.S. economy lectures, but to suppress them when used in the U.S. Government lectures. A "participant-centered" approach was associated with higher evaluations of the lecturers on the U.S. economy.

Discussions between the lecturers and the trainees tended to raise the scores on the participant index after talks on education. On the topic of civil liberties, discussions tended to be of a more critical and argumentative nature which had to effect of suppressing the scores on the index.

Noises and interruptions during the lectures on the U.S. Government, religion, and U.S. education were associated with lower scores on the participant index. Lack of understanding of the lecturer suppressed index scores for the lectures in U.S. Government, family and community, religion in the U.S. and civil liberties and race relations. Trainees who indicated they were "thinking about other things" during the lectures on family and community and U.S. education scored lower on the participant index than those who did not indicate they were distracted. For all of the topics except land and people and the economy of the United States, participants who indicated after the lecture that they had had the opportunity to ask questions were more likely to learn information on the topic than participants who did not feel they had this opportunity.

All of these findings on participant reactions and lecture effectiveness support common-sense notions and give confidence

in the reliability of the trainee data. Some of them suggest that for most trainees, seminar-discussion type presentations are desirable. It not only enables the lecturer to have a clearer understanding of his audience's interests, backgrounds and information, and to answer their questions; but it also provides the participants with experience in a teaching technique they are likely to encounter later in their U.S. sojourns.

ORIENTATION OF A.I.D. TRAINEES
AT THE WASHINGTON INTERNATIONAL CENTER

An Evaluation by a Political Scientist
Ernest W. Lefever

This report, based largely on observing the Washington International Center orientation program for two weeks in September, 1968, is an independent appraisal, though a part of a larger evaluation of the program. I have talked informally with other persons involved in the AID survey, but my conclusions are based upon my own standards and drawn from my own observations.

I have looked at the program through the eyes of a political scientist, a researcher and writer in foreign affairs, who has traveled extensively in Europe, Asia, and Africa. My approach has been sympathetic because I believe the AID training program makes a constructive contribution to U.S. foreign policy objectives and that the Center has played and is playing a significant role in this program.

Terms of Reference

Taking the Center's memorandum, "Program Outline: Objectives and Concepts," April 1, 1965, as the basic point of reference, this review focuses on those goals designed to introduce the foreign visitor to certain essential institutions and facts of American society, especially in the areas of economics, education, and race, and with special reference to the role of the Federal Government.

Each visitor, however simple or sophisticated, brings an imperfect image of America with him. His knowledge is

fragmentary and in most cases this fragmentary knowledge has been partially distorted by innocent ignorance or deliberate propaganda. One of the collateral goals of the total training experience is to enable the participants to correct the blurred image in the direction of a fair, if not full, picture of the aspirations, achievements, and problems of the United States.

In this slow process of image-correction, the Center plays a limited but crucial role by providing the visitor with his first opportunity on this visit to gain some basic facts and insights about aspects of American life that are widely misunderstood abroad, even by the best informed and most friendly. First impressions are important, but they have serious limitations. The visitors are tired and confused. The program is strenuous. The capacity to assimilate new facts, ideas, and opinions under these circumstances is limited. Such assimilation will take place largely after the visitor leaves Washington and finds himself in a more leisurely, more relaxed, less confused state. There is much, however, the first week can do to set the tone for the experience ahead.

Recognizing these inherent limitations of 5- or 6-day orientation program, to say nothing of shorter periods at the Center, I have focused on, but not confined myself, to a number of major questions of interest to most of the visitors and about which many of them are ill informed or confused. The following are illustrative:

1. American Economy

- a. What is the per capita income and how is it distributed?
- b. What do we mean by "poverty?" How many "poor" Americans? How do they live? How does a

- family on "welfare" live?
- c. What can an average skilled worker buy with one hour or one week of labor? An unskilled worker? A man receiving the legal minimum wage?
 - d. To what extent is the United States a "welfare state?"
 - e. How are Americans taxed? How effective is tax collection?
 - f. Do powerful financial-industrial interests "run" the American economy? What role does the Government play? Small business? Consumer demand and preference?

2. American Education

- a. What change does an average American child have for a full secondary education? Full college? Graduate training? Compare with Britain, Germany, Canada.
- b. What are the chances of an adequate education for an average American Negro child compared to an average white child? Compare with the average child in Britain, Germany, Canada.
- c. What is the quality of American education at all levels, compared with that of selected developed countries?
- d. Are there any significant color barriers to education at any level?

3. Civil Rights and Race

- a. Are there any legal barriers to full equality before the law, or to equal opportunity in employment and education for any American?
- b. Are Negroes discriminated against in the U.S. Armed Services or in any civilian agency of the Federal Government?
- c. How fully do American Negroes participate in American political decisions?
- d. What are the multiple causes of "race riots" that occurred in some American cities?

- e. What are the various meanings of "black power?" How many Negroes advocate, participate in, or condone violence? Compare Negro and white crime statistics; what are the reasons for the differences?

4. Government and Politics

- a. How responsive is the American political system to the "will of the people?" Does the majority prevail?
- b. How does the American system protect the rights of the minority, whether it be a political minority, or a racial, religious, or regional group?
- c. What are the comparative roles of ideology and pragmatism in American politics?
- d. Do powerful "economic interests" run the U.S. Government? What is the role of "pressure groups?"
- e. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the federal system? How does our system of separation of powers work?
- f. What is meant by "rule of law" and "limited government?"
- g. What is the meaning of "freedom of religion" and separation of church and state?

Activities Observed

With questions such as these in mind, I observed the Center's program for two weeks in September 1968 to ascertain the effectiveness of the educational program. My primary focus was on the relevance and quality of the lectures and the discussions they precipitated. I attended eighteen lectures given to some six different groups representing a wide range of trainees. I also went on a Capitol Hill tour and a Washington tour, saw a film on the T.V.A., and participated in several social activities, including morning

teas and an evening program. In all these activities I attempted to observe the substance and character of communication between the Americans (staff, government officials, guest lecturers, and volunteers) and the trainees.

Supplementing this, I talked informally and unsystematically with Center staff, volunteers, and trainees as the occasion arose. This included substantial conversations with two volunteers. I read some Center publications, including annual reports, program memoranda, and material related to the work of the volunteers. I read the materials in the AID Participant Handbook.

It should be understood that my observations are more impressionistic than "scientific," if by the latter one means observations based upon quantifiable data from a wide sample of situations or persons. I have attempted to judge what I saw and heard in terms of the Center's purpose to transmit to foreign visitors basic facts and insights about crucial areas of America--in terms of my special competence. I will make some observations and recommendations in secondary areas as well.

General Evaluation

. When one walks into Meridian House, one immediately senses a high-morale atmosphere. The beautiful physical surroundings are enhanced by a mood of purposeful activity and quiet efficiency. Even during the two weeks of peak activity in September, the staff and volunteers remained calm and collected, ever attentive to the needs of individual visitors. Morale always reflects the quality of leadership at the top, which in this case appeared to be firm, clear, and understanding. The staff and volunteers seemed to relate their daily tasks to the basic purpose of the Center.

A friendly, low-key mood was maintained in individual and group contacts with the trainees. At no time did I hear a harsh word or an expression of exasperation uttered to a foreign visitor. The atmosphere was one of order without regimentation, relaxation without license. This was also true of the field trips.

The aspects of volunteer work I was able to observe were of a high quality, carried out with efficiency, sympathy, and courtesy. The cooperation between staff and volunteers appeared excellent.

Given its terms of reference and the constraints of time and budget, the Center is doing an excellent job of orienting visitors to American life. The program serves the purpose well. I have no fundamental criticisms to make, though I will make some specific recommendations for strengthening the educational program within its present scope and terms of reference.

Recommendations for the Educational Program

To help the visitor develop appreciation for the major institutions and achievements of our society, the Center should continue to foster an informal atmosphere of open discussion, informed by a calm, factual, and balanced picture of major aspects of contemporary American life. In his Center orientation the trainee should not be exposed to spokesmen of the militant extremes, but rather to the rich diversity of views held by the vast majority of the American people. As far as I observed, this is the present policy and practice of the Center.

In the broadest sense, every facet of the Center's program from airport reception to departure is educational, and "home hospitality" may be the most valuable of all. But

here I am concerned primarily with the lectures and discussions dealing with major social and political questions, and only secondarily with those on the land and people, family and community, customs and daily life, and religious life. The four primary relevant lecture topics are: "U.S. Government and Politics;" "Education in the United States," "The Economy of the United States," and "Civil Liberties and Race Relations in the United States."

Scope of the Four Primary Lectures

The breadth and content of these lectures as defined in the "Objectives and Concepts" is quite satisfactory, but each lecture probably covers too much ground for the limited time available. This suggests three recommendations:

a) Each lecture should focus on the contemporary situation more than the historical, and within the present and near-present it should emphasize the crucial interest areas, such as those identified in Section A above.

b) Assuming that U.S. foreign policy, for a variety of reasons, should not be the topic of a full lecture, and recognizing that it is listed as an optional section of the government and politics lecture, I recommend that foreign policy become a required portion of this lecture and that this portion focus on the actual role of the United States since World War II, emphasizing the inescapable involvement and responsibilities of a great power in world politics. To allow time for this, the civil rights section of this lecture could be omitted, since an entire lecture is devoted to that topic.

c) I recommend that the word "liberties" be eliminated from the title of the fourth primary topic, so it reads: "Civil Rights and Race Relations." The Government is primarily

concerned with the guaranteeing of rights, not liberties. This suggestion is made simply in the interests of precision.

Scope of the Secondary Lectures

Here, too, the emphasis should be on the contemporary situation, focusing upon current developments, controversial issues and widely misunderstood facts. The Washington International Center program outline provides a satisfactory guide.

Securing Qualified Lecturers

Of crucial importance is the improvement of the substance and communication of the educational lectures, if the quality I observed is typical, which is probably the case, since the majority of speakers I heard have been speakers for some time according to Center records. A good lecturer is one who has a thorough knowledge of his topic, can present it in simple language, has the capacity to focus on the crucial issues, and the ability to use concrete and familiar examples. He should be brief, clear, and simple without being condescending, and must evoke good questions and answer them well. He must be fair, factual, balanced, and honest. Seven out of the 15 lecturers I observed failed to meet basic standards of good performance, and three of them were unacceptable. The following recommendations apply to both the primary and secondary topics except where otherwise stated.

a) Consideration should be given to augmenting the full-time staff by one or two persons qualified to give some or all of the four basic lectures. If the right persons were employed, first-class performance would be assured and administrative work reduced. The staff approach would have one major handicap--it would eliminate the variety of outside contact which is clearly an asset. If there is a choice

between quality performance and variety, quality clearly comes first. If possible, the Center should have both quality and variety. This point also applies to the secondary lectures.

b) Whether the lectures are given by staff, by outside specialists, or a combination, the selection process should be tightened up by the application of strict standards and a monitoring system. The standards are easy to write. Finding lecturers who meet them and continue to do so in repeat performances requires careful, if unobtrusive, monitoring by the Center administration or an outside consultant. Such continuing appraisal on a spot-check basis should involve actual observation, supplemented by quiet conversations with selected trainees.

c) In presenting "religious life" the panel approach is a good one because it dramatizes American diversity and tolerance, but it has limitations as well. A highly-skilled single lecturer is better than a lack-luster panel, and the chances of a good panel are not too great given the short time. The panel leader that I observed on two occasions, who spoke about 35 or 40 minutes each time, was only fair, where at least two of the panelists (who were given about five minutes each) were superior, one clearly being excellent. Under these circumstances the time of the two junior panelists tends to be wasted. Another approach would be to give spokesmen of each faith equal time; this would at least avoid having a mediocre speaker dominate the discussion. In short, quality is more important than format. For this topic I believe teachers of religion are better than pastors of churches, and theologically trained men are better than laymen.

Audio-Visual Aids

The spoken word, especially in a foreign language, has

serious limitations in transmitting new facts and new insights, particularly under the pressure of time, during a tight schedule, and when the learner has just arrived from distant shores. During my fortnight of observation virtually no use was made of visual aids, except for the showing of the T.V.A. film in an economic development session. This sound film was supplemented by a poorly-led discussion. Occasionally a speaker would write a word or two on a blackboard, but there were no graphs, charts, diagrams, or pictures. A map of the United States was occasionally pointed to, but it was not the best one for the purpose. It was a physical-political map that was hard to read from a distance. States were not clear, and the United States was not compared to other areas of the earth in a graphic way. My observation suggests the following recommendations, all based on the substantive guidelines developed in Section A above:

a) Consideration should be given to securing a simpler map of the United States with clearly marked states, and fitted with two or three transparent overflaps, each bearing the outline of a familiar area of the world such as India, Japan, or Western Europe, on the same scale to dramatically compare the size of the two.

b) Though the message is more important than the media, consideration should be given to motion pictures for getting across certain kinds of data or insights. The titles of the some 56 films presently in the Center library suggest that few of them are appropriate for presenting the basic information of the four primary lecturers. They tend to be too specific, too sectional, and oriented toward secondary topics. They appear most appropriate for the optional evening

programs. Nevertheless, these and other films (produced by many sources) ought to be examined with the view of finding a half dozen that present graphically and interestingly the basic material. A combination presentation (15-minute film, 15-minute lecture, assuming each is first rate) may be the ideal format for stimulating a useful discussion of any of the topics.

c) Flip charts provide the most economical and feasible visual aids to supplement (and guide) the four basic lectures. With four to six such charts much, if not most, of the material (including some insights) could be presented in a simple, graphic, and comprehensible form for the primary and secondary lectures. Bar graphs are excellent for comparing quantities and trends. Pie graphs are most useful for depicting proportions; and so on. Slides can do the same job as charts, but they are more complicated to use.

d) Supplementing flip charts, or as a last resort, substituting for them, the lecturers should be encouraged to make a thoughtful use of the blackboard. A few numbers, lines, or charts can go a long way to clarify orally-presented data.

Basic Fact Booklets

A crucial need is a basic, up-to-date fact booklet on each of the primary and secondary topics. Such a booklet would serve as a guide to the lecturer, provide the basis for flip charts or other visual aids, and become a reference each trainee could take with him from the Center. The questions noted in Section A, and similar questions in other areas, could serve as the basis for the data to be included. Perhaps such booklets have already been prepared by the U.S. Information Agency and could be adapted to Center use. These booklets could be

as short as 20 pages. They should include visual aids whenever appropriate. Additional sources of information should be listed.

What I have in mind here is much simpler and more graphic than the excellent 100-page booklet, The U.S.A.: Its Land, Its People, Its Industries, drawn from Compton's Pictured Encyclopedia, 1966, and distributed at the Center. This primer is too complete and detailed. Its print is too small. And it does not focus on the most interesting issues. It does not answer the most pressing questions on race, civil rights, riots, "poverty," etc., with which the trainee will be greeted upon his return from the United States. Considerable data on the people, education, and the economy which the small fact booklets should have is found in The U.S.A., pages 431-447.

Tours in the Washington Area

These tours are most valuable and should be continued along their present lines. Trainees should be encouraged to ask numerous questions en route.

Outside Consultants

In the Center's continuous effort to improve its excellent educational program it may be appropriate to consider retaining an outside consultant to discuss with the Executive Director these and other recommendations and possible ways of implementing promising suggestions.

ORIENTATION OF A.I.D. TRAINEES
AT THE WASHINGTON INTERNATIONAL CENTER

An Evaluation by a Cross-Cultural Communications Specialist
Edward C. Stewart

A. Introduction

The purpose of this report is to provide a brief analysis of the one-week orientation program conducted by the Washington International Center (WIC) for the benefit of international visitors. The report is based on my personal experiences which began in the Fall of 1964 when I was a "participant" in one of the Center orientation programs. My contacts with the Center continued for the next two years as a member of a host family. During the month of August 1968, I again became a "participant" in the orientation program for the purpose of writing this analysis. For two weeks, August 5 to 9, and again August 12 to 16, I attended all of the formal sessions, joined the tours conducted for the visitors, and participated in the evening activities of the Center. I took notes on the content of the formal sessions, recording extensive observations on question and answer periods and on the interactions between visitors on the one hand and staff, speakers, and volunteers on the other.

During the second of these two programs, I lived at Sutton House, where many of the program visitors are housed; there, I attempted to learn about their non-Center experiences of the week in Washington. In my role of "participant" I had the opportunity to become acquainted with a number of visitors, to renew old acquaintances at the Center with staff members, and to develop new relationships.

The notes and the observations which I made while attending the two orientation sessions were reviewed with foreign students who once were participants at the Center, who then were studying at the University of Pittsburgh in the Fall of 1968. I also called upon my own experience and familiarity with foreign students who attended orientation courses and conducted academic work at the University of Pittsburgh. My notes and observations, as corroborated by these discussions with, and the experiences of the foreign students at the University of Pittsburgh, gradually shaped up into five critical issues which are employed in this report to characterize the orientation program at the Center. The report also includes suggestions for modification of the existing program.

An effort has been made to base this report on empirical observations; the conclusions advanced, however, cannot be considered to rest on objective information. In the final analysis, the report represents the impressions and judgments of the writer.

Constraints and Issues of the Orientation Program

The program of the Washington International Center, "Introduction to the United States," is an orientation to this country. It has two emphases. The first is on American institutions, history, and culture, and the second is on the visitor's personal accommodation to his new physical, social, and cultural environment. The concept of orientation may be defined as either "immediate," establishing a bridge to life and work in the United States; or "long-range," establishing a current in the process of education which will underlie the visitor's stay in the United States, and perhaps

even accompany him to his homeland in the form of attitudes or knowledge.

Either one of the definitions--short-range or long-range--represents a formidable task for a 1-week program. Furthermore, the great heterogeneity of the visitors makes it extremely difficult for the staff to give an orientation which has equal validity for all participants.

It would seem reasonable to insist that the orientation should be much longer than one week if it is to accomplish its objectives. However, since some of the visitors to the United States will remain for only a brief period of time, one week in Washington already looms as a significant intrusion into their stay in the country. Other visitors who will remain for six months or longer--two or more years in some cases--will receive additional orientations to the United States. Under the prevailing conditions, then, one week seems to be a reasonable period of time for the orientation program.

However, accepting one week as the duration of the program does not negate the conclusion that the program is very ambitious and is unlikely to give a comprehensive and profound introduction to the American scene. The time, money, staff, and visitors' motivations are simply not equal to conducting the kind of instruction and to covering the topics which in other places and under different circumstances have yielded rich results. Since any program carried out will necessarily involve the selection of certain topics and activities from among other equally attractive alternatives, the resulting program is a balance among competing objectives, designs, and resources.

In the analysis of the Washington International Center program reported herein, the constraints of time, resources,

staff, and the general objectives of the existing program are accepted. Analysis of the program will be projected against a background of knowledge and techniques in the field of cross-cultural communication. The question which this report proposes to answer is as follows: "What contribution can the field of cross-cultural communication make to the orientation program of the Washington International Center?"

An analysis of the orientation program is made according to five critical issues, chosen for their capacity to highlight important aspects of cross-cultural communication. The five issues are: (1) Instruction and Accommodation, (2) Integration versus Fragmentation, (3) Persuasion and Learning, (4) Traditional versus Cross-Cultural Concepts, and (5) Receiving Roles and Giving Roles.

Adoption of a program based on an analysis of these five issues would provide advantages not found in the present program and, at the same time, it would incur disadvantages presently avoided. This is another way of saying that change proposals suggested in this report should be considered as alternative suggestions to the present program, and not as criticisms of it.

Analysis of the Program

Instruction and Accommodation: The Objectives

The orientation program may be depicted as accepting two objectives: first, to instruct the visitors about the United States, and second, to facilitate their personal accommodation to the country.

Instruction -- The objectives of instruction consist of imparting concepts and information about the United

States in the areas of customs and daily life, land and people, government and politics, family and community, religious life, education, the economy, and civil liberties and race relations. Most of these topics are treated by lectures of about one hour with, ideally, thirty minutes or so devoted to questions and comments from the visitors. The exceptions to the lecture and discussion approach are one movie shown in conjunction with the lecture on the economy of the United States, and a panel discussion on religion.

The lecture on customs and daily life, which is more informal than the others, is given by the Program Chairman a member of the Center's staff. This lecture is the only part of the substantive program presented by a certain staff member; all of the other lecturers are outside speakers.

The lecturers are given considerable freedom in both the content and style of their presentations. Given the range of differences in personalities, positions, and attitudes of the lecturers, it is inevitable that the treatment of the same topic can be vastly different from speaker to speaker. The overall program is difficult to characterize. It has an academic flavor, and an occasional lecturer attempts to condense a semester's course into a fifty-minute presentation.

The atmosphere of the program is academic; lectures are used in all of the eight topics. Academic subjects dominate the program, the scheduling and planning of sessions is precise, and the sessions seldom attain a personal, or even rhetorical, flourish. But the most important reason for the academic flavor is divorced from the topics covered, and from the nature of the program's speakers or administration. It is the role of the visitor, the traditional student's role, passive and receiving, which imbues the instructional aspect of the program with an academic tone.

The most important divergence from the academic mold is the Program Chairman's lecture on customs and daily life in the United States. It is a topical innovation which is not easily recognized as the offspring of any of the academic fields. Much of it has practical overtones. For example, sometimes the visitor is reminded of differences in the use of language between the United States and those persons educated by the British. One of the program chairmen gives a brief summary of attitudes and characteristics of people in the United States. The session blends demographic data and statistics, practical observations, and systematic attempts to present the cultural ways of people in the United States. As in the sessions led by outside speakers, there is considerable variance in the same session when led by different program chairmen of the Center. The author has heard three versions given by three different speakers, all of which varied in content and in attitudes projected by the speaker. All of the sessions, however, were characterized by a low-key approach, practical information, and cross-cultural comparisons.

The session by the Program Chairman is significant for several reasons. First, it is the initial session following the welcome and introduction by the Director of the Center and the AID representative. This session, therefore, has significance in establishing the mood and attitudes of the visitors for the week.

Secondly, as mentioned previously, it is the only lecture given by a member of the Center's staff. Thirdly, the format of the lecture provides a model for constructing the entire program according to the field of cross-cultural communication.

Finally, this is the first and the last session in which the two basic objectives of the program--instruction and accommodation--are joined in the same presentation. Some of the lecture material can be considered to impart concepts and information describing the culture--the customs, practices, and mores of the American people. Portions of the lecture can also be seen as giving hints and making observations which forestall possible misunderstandings between the visitors and Americans they will meet formally or informally, and which facilitate the accommodation of the visitors to the scene in the United States. Parts of the lecture provide material for both objectives simultaneously.

Accommodation -- The second basic objective of the Center is pursued separately from the formal objectives of instruction, once the presentation on customs and daily life has been given. The Center's effort to facilitate the visitors' adaptation to the United States and the Washington area begins with the reception of the visitors at the airport by Center volunteers. The visitors are met and greeted in the name of the U.S. Government and the Washington International Center. They are instructed how to find their hotels, where reservations have been made for them, and are given maps with specific directions for arriving at the Center at 9:00 A.M. Monday morning.

The visitors generally have a chance to visit the Center prior to Monday morning, depending on their arrival date, to receive a briefing. In this session, they receive a general orientation to the means of transportation in Washington and to other matters which will assist them during their stay in the city.

A second aspect of the program which contributes to the visitors' accommodation is its leisurely pace. Beginning

at 8:30 A.M. on Monday, and at nine o'clock on the other days, the program usually ends by three o'clock in the afternoon. Wednesday afternoon is completely open, and the Center is open each evening and informal activities are scheduled regularly for them. These evening activities are optional. Omitting the tours, the formal aspects of the program add to thirteen hours over a five day period.

Other contributions to visitor accommodation are the two tours offered during the week; one, a visit to an area high school. (During the summer months, this is replaced by a tour of the city.) These two excursions break the rhythm of the week, and perhaps more importantly, allow the visitors to assume the tourist's role, momentarily dispelling the one of student.

Perhaps the most significant contribution to the accommodation of the visitors is the climate of congeniality and gemütlichkeit generated by the Center--the mansion the staff, the volunteers. Those associated with the Center are always ready to answer questions or assist the visitor.

The Center may be typified then as presenting the proper resources--time, friendliness, leisure time activities, a leisurely program--which will enable the visitor to overcome the fatigue of his trip and the shock of a new environment and activities. Members of the staff arrange for hotel reservations for the visitors, but, beyond this step, the Center does not actively attempt to intrude too much in the visitors' personal lives.

Integration versus Fragmentation

It has been seen in the previous discussion that the two objectives of the program, instruction and accommodation,

are essentially separate. Unity is secured only with the session on customs and daily life, and, perhaps to a lesser extent with the presentation on government which precedes the tour of Capitol Hill. The remainder of the week can be considered to fall under either instruction or accommodation.

The program's fragmentation is further found within the instructional topics themselves. One topic of instruction is given without reference to the others. There is no development of a coherent theme throughout the week. Consequently, each session more or less stands by itself. This approach facilitates inviting speakers from different places and also contributes to the academic atmosphere of the program.

It, however, sometimes results in repetition. Frequently the speakers cover the same ground and the same statistics during a week's time; the visitors will surely learn that one out of five American families moved during the last year! The repetition is usually of a factual nature, or involves reiteration of a concept such as "mobility" or "pluralism." Neither the facts nor the concepts generate an underlying theme which integrates the week's program.

Persuasion and Learning

Both the W.I.C. program and the actions of the staff members lead this observer to believe that one of the outstanding concerns of the Center is to avoid any possibility that the program will be judged as attempting to influence the opinions, convictions, or attitudes of the visitors, thus leaving the staff open to charges of "indoctrination," "brainwashing," or "conditioning." The staff's intent to avoid influencing unilateral attitudes of the visitors towards the U.S. Government, the United States itself, or

unfavorable attitudes towards other countries is highly visible. Nevertheless, there is a threat that the program is not so perceived by all of the visitors as merely objective and informative. The reasons for this phenomenon are subtle and pervasive and shall be referred to as "persuasion" rather than by a stronger term, such as "indoctrination," which would be misleading.

The sources of persuasion perceived by the visitors might be associated with four different factors. The first two of these are overt and are considered in this section. The other two are covert and form the substance of issues four and five.

The first possible source of persuasion derives from instruction which presents political positions or policies of the United States having certain ideological implications for Americans, but at the same time, having unfavorable implications for other countries. A second source of persuasion would be overt ethnocentric instruction, i.e., imparting concepts and facts which provide either an invidious comparison between American and other cultures or rest on unexamined cultural premises which are explicitly deprecatory of cultures in other countries and favorable towards the United States.

The W.I.C. program carefully avoids political and social instruction, and it is apparent that valiant efforts are made to provide objective instruction. The staff and the speakers show an awareness and sensitivity to the commitments, beliefs, and cultures of the visitors. The persons giving presentations are sometimes selected to present a range of different convictions, and their affiliation is neither to the government, to the Washington International Center, nor so that they are not likely to present a systematic point of

view that could be interpreted as persuasion. The staff also encourages the visitors to ask questions and assures them that the speakers will not be embarrassed by them or by controversy.

The speakers are, apparently, either encouraged to or spontaneously stress the concepts of diversity and pluralism in the United States, a practice which also alleviates feelings of persuasion on the part of the visitors.

Throughout the week the volunteers of the Center are not only conspicuous but are often deliberately pointed out to the visitors. In addition, the activities of the evenings are optional, and, in a sense, the visitors "volunteer" their attendance in the evenings. The evocation of the "volunteer" or "volunteering" as a way of avoiding an image of persuading the visitors deserves extended comment.

The staff is obviously proud of the role played by the volunteers in the activities of the Center and justly so. They bring grace, congeniality, and helpfulness to the lives and activities of the visitors. They represent a tradition in the United States--that the individual assumes responsibility for himself and his community and discharges his responsibilities without appealing to, or waiting for, the government. Social activities of all kinds are carried out in a long tradition of private organizations manned by volunteers. The volunteer has a long and significant history, and, as understood in the United States, he represents a uniquely valued cultural development.

The role of the volunteer, then, symbolizes both the apparent objectives of the Center and the separation from the government and private enterprise. Despite the repeated references to the volunteers and their visibility, their significance and purposes in the Center may not be appreciated by the foreign visitors. Their presence conveys a

message that is too culturally specific to be received as intended by persons from all countries. Their role is dismissed by at least some of the visitors, and their significance may well be neutralized for many others. One visitor from the Middle East remarked that they may be volunteers, but they still have their duties to perform, and that they are guided by those requirements. He apparently had little conception of the significance and the role of the volunteer in the United States. He, and other visitors as well, may discount the quality contributed by the volunteers, and seek explanations more compatible with their own cultures to explain the volunteers' presence.

There is no evidence that the volunteers are detrimental to the work of the Washington International Center; indeed, all of the evidence indicates personal warmth and appreciation of them by the visitors. Nevertheless, the significance of the "volunteer" is equivocal in the context of the Washington International Center and probably does not mitigate against the perception of persuasion. Many visitors are probably, to a great extent, not willing or able to accept that they are served by volunteers when their visit to the United States is financed by the government. It should be noted that in some parts of the world a volunteer refers to a person who acts for the government, but who finds it convenient or necessary to conceal the connection.

The volunteers of the Washington International Center may be said to be effective and to contribute to the activities of the Center by the strength of their personal qualities, whereas their role of volunteer is perhaps more neutral than is usually recognized.

Traditional versus Cross-Cultural Concepts

Despite the best intentions, when the instruction involves persons from different cultures, misunderstandings are probable. It is sometimes nearly impossible to predict precisely how a person from another culture will react to the best intentioned practices and instruction. For example, the great care which the Washington International Center devotes to not offending any of the visitors and the concern that it not be perceived as attempting persuasion give grounds for suspicion that there are hidden purposes behind the care and concern. Excessive caution with respect to the visitors gives rise to conclusions opposite to those intended. Some of the visitors begin to question the role of the volunteers, question the objectivity of the presentations, and generally attribute to the program a degree of persuasion not intended.

More specific sources of the perception of persuasion may be traced to implicitly ethnocentric presentations of concepts. Styles of presentation and operations of the Center which deviate from the cultural expectations of the visitors or which are associated with expressions of excessive concern are suspect. Through various concepts and practices at the Center, undesired reactions by at least some of the participants are highly probable. Some of these are given below.

Repetition --It has been previously mentioned that the staff of the Washington International Center encourages the visitors to ask questions and make comments. This point is repeatedly made to the visitors who, sometimes, are given the following explanation as a reason for asking questions: "If you do not ask questions, the lecturer has two possible interpretations available. Either he was so

comprehensible that no questions were necessary, or he was so confusing that questions are inappropriate."

In principle the admonition to ask questions and make comments is good, but after the point has been made two or three times, one begins to wonder if the staff is attempting to convey a hidden message or intent. Undoubtedly the staff repeats the request because of the difficulty which it has experienced in the past with many of the foreign visitors, who seem to prefer to take a receptive role with respect to the instructors. Their reason for doing so involves deep-seated psychological and behavioral predispositions in their cultures. Nevertheless, their cultures also are likely to attach a different meaning to the sheer repetition of an admonition, and perhaps, as did even this observer, begin a silent enquiry into the reasons and intents behind the repetition. Furthermore, the reasons given for asking questions and making comments, which, from the American point of view, reflect the lecturers' need for feedback, action and achievement from students, may be disconcerting for some foreign visitors.

Depersonalization --There is a tendency in some of the interactions between the visitors and both staff and volunteers for the visitors to be treated somewhat impersonally, which may seem deflating to their status. Some of the practices in mind are subtle and are probably barely noticed, if at all, by the staff and some of the visitors. For instance, mention of the number of groups and visitors that one particular chairman has led through the program over the years is somewhat depersonalizing to the visitors given the information. They now appear as the latest contribution to an ongoing statistical count.

The very explicit instructions given orally, or requested by means of cards and questionnaires, in which the

visitor and his activities are objectively and impersonally treated may elicit a reaction of being a pawn and perhaps of being manipulated. The explicit instructions and demands laid upon the visitors who accept invitations from host families may antagonize those visitors for whom entertaining is more customary than it is for Americans and also antagonize those who assign more prerogatives and privileges to the guest than to the host, contrary to the American custom.

It is quite likely that the feeling of depersonalization from the visitor's point of view often refers to the failure of the Washington International Center to observe the visitor's status. In a group of visitors in which, for example, a ranch worker in his early twenties is seated next to a mature and well-placed government official from an Asian country, and all group members are extended the same welcome, given similar courtesies, and treated with equality, these practices will rankle the status of some of the visitors. This source of depersonalization may be one which the Center will choose to preserve. On the other hand, the American effort to be sociable and friendly is not uniformly perceived as personalized treatment. Nor is it always given credit for sincerity, and it generally does not take into account the needs and predispositions of the visitors. It is a friendliness impersonally given, since it disregards the status of the visitors.

Receiving Roles and Giving Roles

The role which the visitor assumes as a participant in the orientation program is the most subtle and perhaps the most important of the five issues.

The Active Role -- Most of the time during the week at the Washington International Center, the visitor assumes a receiving and passive role. There are two major exceptions to this. One occasion which requires a more active role is the Friday evening session, the International Circle, where three visitors representing different parts of the world are invited to give presentations on their own countries. The session is designed to give representation to the visitors and to elicit their participation in the program. Unfortunately, the session follows the end of the formal program on Friday afternoon. Attendance is optional and when this observer saw it, poor. Hence few persons are affected by it; thus the session cannot be considered an integral part of the program.

A second exception to the visitor's passive role is found in the relatively full freedom he is allowed in his personal affairs. No one escorts him around or helps him to accommodate to life in Washington. The Center provides the essential orientation to the specifics of daily life and makes available the service of its staff members and volunteers. The visitors confront a responsive and responsible organization but are not pressed to accept its services.

The Guest Role -- The most salient aspects of the visitor's role are those of guest, student, and tourist. The visitor is a guest in the United States, and, specifically, he is a guest at the Washington International Center. He is given an orientation program which is intended to assist him in becoming a guest in some other location after his stay in Washington. In many subtle ways the guest-host relationship is established between the visitor and the Washington International Center, whether it is staff, volunteer or host family. In accordance with American

culture, the visitor is expected to accommodate to the host rather than the reverse, which is the acceptable relationship in some other countries. It may well be that some of the visitors are placed on the defensive and chafe at constantly assuming the role of the guest.

There is a second aspect to the role of guest, or the recipient of a favor, which overlaps with the role of becoming a student. The majority of the visitors at the Washington International Center are financed by the United States Government; they receive a benefice. It is clear that among some of the visitors there are doubts about the reasons why they were given support. Psychologically, they show uncertainty about accepting support and demonstrate hesitancy in how they ought to act with respect to it.

The visitor who is puzzled by his presence in the United States at no expense to himself probably comes from a culture in which there exist clear precedents for how one reciprocates a favor or gift. The rules governing social reciprocity are probably more binding and demanding than the ones which appear to be in effect in the United States. Although AID or the sponsor of a visitor may regard it as desirable not to place demands on him, it is quite likely that the loose arrangement may cause the visitor to search for reasons why he has been selected, and how he is expected to reciprocate. He may begin to fret at his role of recipient and guest and begin to seek in the day's events for some ulterior motives. Visitors with this frame of mind may transform essentially neutral comments and actions into efforts of persuasion.

The Student Role -- When the visitor becomes a participant in the orientation program, he assumes the role of student. It is a passive role which requires only

attendance and attention at the presentations. Although the visitors are encouraged to ask questions, in actual practice many of them may sit through the entire week without verbally participating. Even note-taking is a rare occurrence, although some will occasionally write out a question to ask the speaker. The passivity of the role or, perhaps, just the role of the student, may be uncomfortable for the visitors from countries where there is little tradition of adult education or where knowledge perhaps does not have the same practical significance that it does in American culture. Undoubtedly some of the visitors question their roles as students as well as the objectives of the program. Some probably believe that only experience will attain the goals aspired to by the program, while others probably subscribe to the opinion that they do not need any preparation or orientation to the country.

It is possible that in retrospect the visitors remember more clearly those moments in which they were visitors in Washington--tourists on Capitol Hill, in the Library of Congress, and at Mount Vernon. The demands of becoming a participant in the orientation program never successfully competed with the other demands of the tourist and the visitor. Therefore, the role which the visitor assumes, passive and receiving, compels him to search for explanations for his experiences during the program. Not all the visitors will question the orientation. On the other hand, some may but will not betray their own feelings.

Some Effects of the Receiving Role --In many respects the visitors feel themselves to be in a disadvantageous position, since they have come to the United States to secure an advantage in work or in education which is not available

in their own country. Their reasons for coming to the United States are likely to involve the areas of methods, technology, and science.¹ In some way, the majority of the foreign visitors are likely to exhibit attitudes that attribute superiority to some aspect of American life.

In contrast to the superiority imputed to American technological culture, most foreign visitors are likely to reserve for their own cultures a superiority in social, personal or even political aspects of life, and, in these areas, hold American culture in disdain. They are quick to judge American life, or an American speaker in the orientation program, against their own system of values. They tend to project, show selective perception, and seem concerned to validate their preconceptions regardless of the evidence presented against them. It is not suggested that these reactions are unique to the visitors nor even characteristic of all of them. Nevertheless, in comparison to American groups, the impression emerges at the Washington International Center that those who speak out frequently are aggressive in their questions and comments following a lecture. They attempt to challenge the speaker and maintain an aggressive stance² in areas which they consider to encroach upon their own cultural values.

¹Unquestionably there are visitors who come to this country for specific reasons which have no connection with either their work or their education. Even these visitors, however, are likely to share in the attitude ascribing to American society a superiority in the areas of methods, technology, and science, or--to put it differently--American efficiency and materialism.

²What is called "aggressive" by American standards may not be aggressive in other cultures. Persons from the Middle East in particular may seem much more "aggressive" to Americans than to their own countrymen.

A typical example of the foreign visitors' aggressiveness is found in their questioning of the side effects of industrialization, technology, and mass production. Their questions are designed to elicit answers showing the neglect of humanistic values in American society and, sometimes by implication, to show how they are observed in other countries. The technical superiority of the United States is juxtaposed with the moral superiority of other cultures.

It is neither the validity nor the appropriateness of these positions which are under discussion but rather the deftness and quickness with which American problems such as the ghetto, political assassinations, divorce, Viet Nam, and violence are picked up by the foreign visitor and unilaterally developed as examples of American shortcomings. The projection, selective perception, and commitment to a predisposing system of values exhibited by the visitors seem to exceed in vigor and frequency similar phenomena with American groups.³

There is evidence in the literature to support at least some of the assertions made above, but of greater interest is the possibility that these reactions are a response to the passive student's role, to the role of the guest, and, finally, to the role of the recipient of a favor or a gift. The evidence for these tentative conclusions is slim. It is based on the behavior and comments of a few participants in each group observed and corroborated by talks with foreign graduate students at the University of Pittsburgh. Despite.

³The extent to which these reactions of the visitors can be associated with fatigue and cultural shock presents an important question. Cultural shock and temporal disjunction are certainly present, and, in at least one case observed, were severe.

the fact that the observations and conclusions of this section lack a sound empirical basis, it is suggested that a consideration of the foreign visitor's role expectations and behavior while at the Center and in the United States represents a valid and neglected subject.

Reformulation of the Orientation Program
According to Cross-Cultural Communication

Objectives

Culture in the field of cross-cultural communication is defined as the cognitive or subjective characteristics which an individual shares with members of his group or society. Misunderstandings among persons of different cultural backgrounds or breakdowns in communication can be attributed, in part, to the failure to recognize the cultural basis of behavior.

In reformulating the program according to cross-cultural communication, the first objective should be to instruct visitors about American culture in such a manner that they would be able to employ their knowledge and information to describe and interpret everyday events. The visitors would not only be instructed in understanding American culture but, as a second objective, would be assisted in accommodating to life and work in the United States. Both objectives, instruction and accommodation, would be achieved if the visitor could be given the knowledge and understanding necessary to assume an effective social, professional, and cultural role in the United States.

Perspective of the Program

It has often been observed that exposure to another culture enhances the understanding of one's own culture rather than of the other culture. This observation finds support in research and provides the basis for the assumption that understanding of the other culture is based on understanding of one's own culture. Instruction on American culture should therefore be carried out in a manner that allows the foreign visitor to make immediate connections with his own culture. Technically speaking, the necessary requirement is a description of life in the United States according to principles that are conceptually equivalent from culture to culture, thus enabling the visitor to come to grips with American culture and, at the same time, enhance his appreciation of his own culture.

The principles for describing culture should be conceived as dimensions which are necessary for the description of any culture. The dimensions should serve as conceptual bridges. For example, the concept of democracy is not equivalent in all cultures; its denotations differ. Concepts such as democracy have to be analyzed and reduced to component ideas which can have transcultural application. Thus, one idea that can be associated with democracy is that of decision-making, and this can, in some form, be applied to governmental processes in any country. Aspects of decision-making, in turn, can be considered as dimensions; consequently these dimensions would have conceptual equivalence from culture to culture.

The visitors should be given a careful explanation of what to expect and what not to expect from the program. They should then be told that the program would consist of a presentation of some principles which would assist them in

coming to grips with life in the United States and facilitate reflection upon their own culture.

The use of conceptually equivalent terms may also help to alleviate the need which the visitor frequently has for being around his own countrymen. Part of the reason for this need is associated with the familiarity and facility of interacting with fellow countrymen. Another reason may be an expectation that whatever Americans say will be biased. In such a situation, it is understandable that some may feel that one's own countryman is likely to be more trustworthy than an American. If the program is designed to contrast systematically American with other cultures, and if this other culture is always one of the factors in the equation, then the distrust that the visitor may feel might be lessened, and he might be less likely to reach the impression of persuasion, rather than instruction or information.

Implementation of the Program: Practices and Styles

The subjective and cognitive culture of an individual may be considered as predispositions to behavior. Culture acts as the rules or principles which govern the behavior of the person. Cultural predispositions may be analyzed as (1) values, (2) assumptions, and (3) patterns of thinking. This three-fold differentiation of culture calls attention to the fact that the predispositions which govern the individual's behavior lie largely outside his field of awareness. Most persons are not fully aware of the assumptions and patterns of thinking derived from their culture. Values are at the level of awareness. Cultural differences in values, assumptions, and patterns of thinking are associated with the roles persons assume and with the events defined by the culture as demanding certain roles and

behavior. These three concepts--cognitive predispositions, roles, and events--are important for both understanding the visitor's reactions to the orientation program and reformulating the program itself.

It has been observed that the visitor is more likely than his American counterparts to become skeptical and suspicious of what happens to him and what he is exposed to during the orientation program. He will give greater attention to and be more influenced by the position and status of others and of himself than will American counterparts. A good proportion of the visitors are likely to assume a close connection between the words and actions of the individual and his role and position. As a consequence, they are more likely to give greater attention to the roles of others and to events at the Washington International Center, while tending to neglect specific words and actions for their own implications. In other words, all words and actions are likely to be judged more or less automatically against a backdrop of role and event. It is this characteristic which partly contributes to the perception by Americans that the visitors project, perceive selectively, and act so as to validate their preconceptions.⁴

A number of practices and styles associated with the Washington International Center program impinge upon the assumptions, values, and patterns of thinking of some of the foreign visitors. These practices and styles contribute to the skepticism and suspiciousness witnessed in some of the visitors. Several specific practices and styles which deserve attention are mentioned in the sections a to c below.

⁴See page V-20 for this constellation of attitudes.

Operational Activities-- Repetition of directions and stress on procedures should be avoided such as, the repeated emphasis on asking questions. Although intended to elicit certain patterns of behavior, the visitors will interpret these repetitions as characteristics of the staff rather than as suggestions for their own actions. The significance of the admonitions is thus lost. To accomplish the purposes of repeated suggestions, such as asking questions, the staff should create the conditions which will produce the results desired. The visitors, for instance, initially should be encouraged to ask questions and make comments because, as visitors from abroad, they possess knowledge, insights, and perspectives which are unfamiliar to the American speakers. They can be told that the Washington International Center is concerned with conducting a dialogue rather than a monologue, and this can be attained if the visitors will express their views by means of questions and comments. When a group does ask questions and make comments, then the group should be thanked for shedding light on an issue or for bringing a new perspective to bear on some aspect of American society.

The American practice in this respect is different and should be avoided. The American will generally thank the group for having asked questions and for being a good group. The point of reference is some action of the group: the giving of feedback without considering the quality of the group's intervention. It is the quality of the questions and/or dialogue that should be reacted to rather than the success of eliciting a reaction from the visitors.

Another area in which stress and repetition should be avoided is in operational and administrative activities. (Note that the emphasis on asking questions can be considered

as an operational matter with respect to the process of instructing.) Examples of other such activities whose emphasis should be minimized to the greatest extent possible are found on pages V-15-16--request cards to fill out for home hospitality, etc. Emphasis on these will increase an awareness of activities behind the scenes and contribute to an impression of persuasion. At the same time, the stress will detract from the orientation program itself.

Style of Presentation -- The instruction should be deductive and concise. The visitors should be given a few principles which are conceptually equivalent in their own cultures. The presentations should avoid either expressive or analytical subtleties which might contribute to misunderstanding or to an impression of persuasion. For example, one of the speakers noted that the United States had been drawn into the First World War, again drawn into the Second World War, and, if there were to be a Third World War, the United States would also be drawn into it. He was asked why the United States wanted a Third World War. He repeated his earlier observation; he received the same question again.

The exchange may be analyzed according to different patterns of thinking or perhaps according to styles of rhetoric. Since the United States and World War III are mentioned in the same context, the two were interpreted to exist in either a conative or causative relation. The inference may be genuine, it may represent sharp-shooting of the speaker, or it may represent a general reaction to a topic suggested by the remark but not central to it. Whatever the explanation, the exchange was a subtlety in the American speaker which was misunderstood or deliberately

misinterpreted. In either case, the exchange was not useful from the program's point of view.

The implication of this example is that greater attention should be given to the style of presentation with the recommendation that it be deductive, stress principles and values, avoid action patterns and operationalism, treat facts and statistics with care, and finally, avoid subtleties of thought and rhetoric which lend themselves to misinterpretations.

Reserves of Meaning --Two different reserves of meaning may be tapped to elucidate an idea or an event--a contemporary explanation or a historical one. One may attempt to explain the significance of American civil liberties, for example, as a conflict among competing interest groups. The explanation rests on sociological factors considered in the contemporary situation. An alternative explanation would entail a traditional or historical description of civil liberties. Past events, issues, and ideas would serve as a reserve of meaning--the historical approach used to illuminate the current situation and problems.

Americans are predisposed to turn to analytical, contemporary, and comparative explanations for reserve of meaning, whereas most visitors are likely to derive a greater understanding from historical or traditional treatments of an idea or event. Many of the visitors are resistant to the contemporary and comparative analyses favored by American social scientists as well as to the American tendency of basing explanations on facts and statistics. Although some speakers do provide a historical approach to their topics, the Washington International Center might find it useful to exploit the historical reserve of meaning further.

Pedagogies -- Experience has shown that instruction in the area of cross-cultural communication has been most successful in employing methodologies that require the students' participation and involvement. The teaching methods available may be listed in order of their greatest to least involvement:

- (1) Sensitivity Training - The examination of interpersonal relations and of cross-cultural differences in leaderless and roleless groups.
- (2) Behavioral Exercises - The performance of loosely structured tasks which elucidate interpersonal relations and the participants' cross-cultural differences.
- (3) Simulations and Role Playing
- (4) Seminars and Discussion Groups
- (5) Panel Discussions
- (6) Lectures
- (7) Films

Given the special conditions of the orientation program and the nature of the participants, the best type of instruction from a cross-cultural point of view is the seminar and discussion group type with panels and lectures providing variety. Role playing and simulation should also be considered as potentially useful pedagogies requiring more complex development.

A cross-cultural-communication approach to learning invites the participant to accept certain principles and employ them to understand his own behavior and that of others. This approach is, therefore, reinforced when the pedagogy used involves the participants and produces behavior during the process of instruction which they can

examine. The greater the degree to which the visitor's experiences are tapped and his own culture made salient, the less passive and receiving his role of student will be.

Themes of the Program

As stated previously, ideally, an instructional program based on cross-cultural communication would integrate the objectives of imparting knowledge to, and facilitating personal accommodation for, persons of different cultures. Objective unity is derived from the fact that cross-cultural concepts are individualistic and thus refer to personal pre-dispositions. Approaches now found in the orientation program, for example, a demographic treatment of the American family or the organization of American education, would not be very useful since they tend to be remote from the visitors' personal experiences of daily life.

The employment of cross-cultural dimensions as principles which could be used to describe and analyze cultures would provide themes for an orientation program. These principles could be arranged to form an orderly and valid progression extending over a week's time. Those selected should encompass the substantive areas now present in the orientation program, and, in addition, establish a connection between an introduction to American culture and the visitors' daily experiences in the United States.

Customs and Habits of the American People -- The first day of the program, Monday, is a period of hardship for the visitors who are likely to be physically tired and psychologically upset. The day's instruction could concentrate on the concrete aspects of daily life in the United States. Many of the points covered by the program chairmen in their

session on customs and daily life are appropriate for the opening day. The areas of language, greetings, food, dress, and event structure in American life should be treated as providing dependable cues for behavior and the structuring of behavioral patterns for Americans, a function which the visitors' cultures usually provide for them but which, due to the dislocation, fatigue and cultural shock they are probably experiencing, do not.

Presentation of the day's program should make full use of visual techniques and other methods that will put the subject across concretely. The topics of the program should contain intellectual content and systematic contrasts with practices in other countries. Examples of this procedure might be as follows:

- (1) The English language could be used to illustrate how behavior is regulated by principles which often lie outside the field of individual awareness. An effective illustration from English is the rule for the sequence of adjectives modifying a noun, such as the large, red, brick house or the long, black, silk dress, in which the adjective referring to substance must precede the noun. The rule is observed, even though it is rare that the native English speaker is aware that his linguistic behavior is governed by such a rule.
- (2) The brevity and stereotyped form of American greetings will not only warn the foreigner about American practices but provide insights into American informality and depersonalization as well. The question, "How are you?" is not an inquiry; it is a ritual requiring a specific answer, "Fine."

- (3) A number of American food habits are of importance for the foreigner but, as with all of the customs and habits, some more profound cultural implications should be extracted from the concrete examples to avoid the impression of "talking down" to the visitors. Thus, practical information is given in the suggestion of cultural differences.

American food might be discussed from the culturally relative points of view of its informality (there is little custom or ritual associated with its serving), its lack of individuality (blandness), and conservatism (most Americans do not accept as edible many of the foods of, say, the Chinese or the French).

- (4) American dress should be considered as being less important than in some cultures and more important than in others. In the United States there are degrees of latitude in how one dresses, and a great deal of informality. Propriety of dress can be used as an effective introduction to the principle of event structure: what is proper depends largely on the occasion or event, and only partly on how much of the body is covered and in what manner. Having given an example of behavioral event structuring, American culture and other cultures can be placed in this context to suggest answers to the question of what kinds of behavior patterns are expected in certain

events, such as a classroom, cocktail party, informal party, reception, athletic event, office interview, etc.

Customs and habits of Americans as events is a topic which should be conducted in a climate suitable for discussion, and one which will, hopefully, elicit contrasting examples and inferences from the visitors. Since the subject is concrete, it could be developed entirely around films, slides, and video systems.

The lecture on the land and people, now given on Monday afternoon, is not so important as some of the other subjects presented during the week. The subject of the lecture is usually a general, brief treatment of the geography and history of the United States. It could be better presented by means of a movie. Such a film would be a good activity for Monday night; it would not consume prime time and would give pedagogical variety to the program.

Values and Attitudes of the American People -- On Tuesday, the program would focus upon values and attitudes of the people of the United States. These cultural predispositions would be presented according to concepts and in a manner that would encourage the visitors to draw contrasts with their own cultures. Having covered the impact of events on behavior on Monday, Tuesday's sessions would begin to emphasize the importance of values, assumptions, and patterns of thinking in governing behavior. For the remaining days of the week, American culture could be presented by means of the themes of individualism versus individuality, equality versus inequality, achievement versus ascription,

and inductive operationalism versus deductive valuation.⁵ Each one of these contrasts could be systematically pursued in American culture as well as in cultures which provide contrasts for American precedents. Within the limits of time, the contrasts should be presented in a historical context and their composition should be flexible.

Role of the Visitor

Much of the visitor's perceived impression of persuasion has been associated with his passive role. An emphasis on the visitor, providing contrasts and integration of program objectives, would help to allviate the image of persuasion, since the origin of the impression is gained more from the general situation than from specific aspects of instruction.

The ambiguity and passivity of the visitor's role requires administrative action for correction. Reconstructing the role will have to commence when the visitor is first selected to come to the United States. The visitor should be clearly informed of the reasons for his selection, and what is expected of him. Finally, the visitor should be reached by the Washington International Center and informed of his one-week orientation program.

It would be desirable at the earliest point possible after the visitor's selection to begin structuring for him a role in which he will give as well as receive. The visitor should be encouraged to perceive himself, as a

⁵It is not suggested that this language be employed in sessions. There are simpler, although less precise, ways of stating these ideas. For example, many Americans think of inductive operationalism as "getting on with the job." Spelling out this approach, however, goes beyond the scope of this report; the direction suggested requires a developmental effort.

resource, and he should be treated as such. Part of his assignment in the United States is to bring to Americans his own point of view and to informally represent his own country. (Visitors at the Washington International Center occasionally assume this role on their own initiative.)

Structuring an active and giving role for the visitor is a difficult and delicate matter. Specifically, the visitor could be given assignments, and, during the program's first day, the welcome and introduction given by the AID officer could be designed to structure a role for the visitors. Attitudes are important determinants of role definition. The climate at the Center and attitudes of the staff, volunteers, and AID officials would be very important. These persons would have to genuinely see in the foreign visitor a resource: a person with a valid point of view who deserves a hearing. If these attitudes are not present, an effort to restructure the role of the visitor would only contribute to the impression of persuasion rather than detract from it.

Feasibility

Reformulation of the orientation program according to cross-cultural communication presents a difficult task. First, the kind of program objectives and concepts suggested is not common currency in either the academic world or in the world of training for organizations such as AID or the Peace Corps. It would be difficult to locate persons who could carry it out, and it would be even more difficult to generate a pool of persons who can be brought in to deliver a given lecture. Another difficulty is that the suggestions call for persons who are not only familiar with

a particular approach in cross-cultural communication, but who also possess the ability to translate cultural abstractions into concrete, everyday examples.

A second consideration to program reformulation is that the foregoing suggestions incur a higher risk than the rather formal presentations now given, which are relatively safe whether effective or ineffective. The suggestions, if implemented, would generate more participation and personal involvement from the visitors. Although such an objective is desirable pedagogically, it runs administrative risks. The results are not nearly as easy to control as the practices now pursued.

Despite the difficulties of the reformulated program, some of the suggestions could be implemented. Developments in both the academic and the training worlds point to the utility of cross-cultural instruction in the general directions outlined.

The reformulation of the program lends itself to implementation by stages. It is suggested that the Washington International Center change the Monday presentation, incorporating the ideas of concrete customs, habits, and preferences, and, secondly, key events in American life. The topics suggested for the other days are connected with the subjects as they are now taught, so the program for these days could also be reformulated in stages. In view of the fact that the current program contains a few topics chosen from a much greater number of possible topics, and that the sessions now do not hang together as a meaningful unit, a change in the program by stages would not disrupt its coherence.

A gradual reformulation is suggested to permit the Washington International Center to find appropriate persons

to make presentations, to develop materials, and to establish an internal competence with the concepts and methods involved. It is assumed that the program chairmen would assume a more active role in a changed program since there would be a greater use of seminars, films, and participative methods. Demands upon the staff would be primarily for coordination and resources. These functions could be fulfilled by the chairmen without incurring the risks of presenting a "party line."

A reformulation of the program along the lines suggested would help to alleviate some of the difficulties associated with the role of the visitor. This is a matter, however, which largely depends on administrative actions and on the attitudes of the staff and speakers who come in contact with the visitors.

Summary

In the orientation program with the Washington International Center staff attempts to facilitate the visitor's accommodation to Washington, D.C. and to instruct him about life and work in the United States. The objectives are ambitious for a one-week program, which represents an option selected from a number of equally attractive alternatives.

The staff of the Center is concerned that their program be perceived as giving instruction and information. Nevertheless, several factors are present which contribute to a perception of persuasion. The staff's caution and concern with non-persuasion gives grounds for suspicion. Practices such as the repetition of requests, the depersonalized treatment of visitors, and the use of certain concepts

which lack conceptual equivalence in many cultures all contribute to the same impression. Finally, the passive, guest role of the visitor leads him at times to become aggressive, to search for ulterior motives in the program, and perhaps to conclude that its objective is to persuade.

A reformulation of the program according to cross-cultural communication would facilitate integration between the objectives of instruction and accommodation, establish more unity of themes and concepts, invite more participation from the visitors, and endow the visitor with a more active role. In conducting the program, the staff should avoid undue emphasis on operational and administrative matters, the instruction should be deductive, the style of presentation should avoid subtleties of rhetoric and of thought, and the significance of a concept or event should be given a historical or traditional analysis rather than a comparative one. The best pedagogy for the program would be seminars and discussion groups, with other pedagogies used to provide variety.

The themes of the program should begin with a description and a cultural analysis of concrete customs and habits: language, food, greetings, and dress. The focus would then shift to values and attitudes of the American people. Themes suggested are the contrasts of individualism, equality versus inequality, achievement versus ascription, and inductive operationalism versus deductive valuation.

An issue which goes beyond the scope of the program, but also constitutes a factor in it, is the role of the visitor. It is urged that administrative attention be given to this issue. If the visitor can be guided into becoming a resource person and representative of his country, the assumed role of the visitor would dispel some of the undesirable reactions to the orientation program.

A reformulation of the orientation program according to the suggestions made would present several difficulties. The proposals could be implemented by stages without disrupting the current program.

PART VI

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bales, Robert F. Interaction Process Analysis: A Method for the Study of Small Groups. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Press, 1950.
- Cantril, Hadley. The Pattern of Human Concerns. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1965.
- Cantril, Hadley and Kilpatrick, F.P. "Self-Anchoring Scaling, A Measure of Individual's Unique Reality Worlds," Journal of Individual Psychology. Burlington, University of Vermont, 1960.
- Cronbach, Lee J. Essentials of Psychological Testing. New York: Harper, 1949.
- Kimmel, Paul. Participant Assessment of AID Training Programs A Descriptive Statistical Report to the Agency for International Development. Washington, D.C.: Dept. of State, 1968.
- Knapp, Robert B. (ed.). "Report of a Conference Held under the Auspices of the American Council of Education," Orientation to America for Foreign Exchangees. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1952.
- Lybrand, W.A. AID Participant Training Exit-Interview Development Study. Washington, D.C.: Dept. of State, 1967.
- McGeoch, John A. and Irion, Arthur I. The Psychology of Human Learning. Longmans, Green, 1952.
- Merrifield, Charles W. The Washington International Center as an Experiment in International Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1957.
- Ryans, David G. Characteristic of Teachers, Their Description, Comparison, and Appraisal; A Research Study. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960.
- Selltiz, Claire, et al. Attitudes and Social Relations of Foreign Students in the United States. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1963.

- Shattuck, Gerald M. Trans-Cultural Adaptation: A Study of Foreign Graduate Students at Cornell University. PhD Thesis. New York: Cornell University Press, 1964.
- Shiro, Eugene L. An Evaluation of a Two-Week University Orientation Program for Foreign Students in its First Three Years of Operation. Washington, D.C.: The American University Press, 1965.
- Stone, Donald C. and Flack, Michael J. The Reorganization of the Washington International Center as an Instrument for Building International Understanding. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1957
- Thorndike, E.L. and Lorge, Irving. The Teachers Word Book of 30,000 Words. New York: Columbia University Press, 1944.
- U.S. Advisory Commission on International Education and Cultural Affairs. Foreign Students in the United States: A National Survey. Washington, D.C., 1966.

Some references have been made in the text to Appendices A, B, and C. These contain data of a detailed, specific nature of more interest to individual specialists than to general readers. For this reason they have not been published as part of the report but are accessible for "in office" consultation.

Appendix A contains the WIC Program Outline.

Appendix B contains the research instrument used.

Appendix C contains observation data with illustrative tables.