Report on Fulbright Evaluation Research

1972-73 U.S. Student

Appendix I

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Preface 1

CHAPTER ONE HOW SUCCESSFUL IS THE FULBRIGHT PROGRAM? 2

A. Introduction 2
B. The Measurement of Success 6
1. Academic Success 6
2. Ambassadoriality 7
3. Receptivity 8
C. Age and Success 10
D. Marital Status and Success 12
E. Degree Status and Success 13
F. Academic Field and Success 14
G. Country of Study and Success 16
H. Language Ability and Success 18
I. Reasons for Studying Abroad 20

CHAPTER TWO DETERMINANTS OF SUCCESS 24

Part I Contacts with the Host Country 24

A. Professional Contact 24
B. Social Contact 28
C. Media Contact 30

Part II Problems During the Year Abroad 32

A. Academic Problems 32
B. Problems in Living 33
C. Personal Problems 36
D. Adjustment to Problems in Living 37

Part III Prior Contacts 38

A. Date of First Interest in Overseas Study 38
B. Circle of Influence 40

Part IV A Note on Motivation 42

Part V A Note on the Administration of the Fulbright Grants 44

Preface

This report represents an analysis of the 1972-73 American Fulbright students. It is largely based on questionnaires which they were sent before they left the United States and then again during their last month in the host country. Of the 239 who received a Fulbright award for 1972-1973 192 answered the first questionnaire, 164 answered the second questionnaire, and 112 answered both questionnaires.

We present this report with the reservation therefore, that the distribution of answers might have been different had everyone replied. This does not give us great concern, because for the most part we are interested in the analysis of different kinds of groups, for example those who had a lot of contact with fellow students compated with those who did not. In dealing with subgroups, the response rate is not as important as it is for presenting over-all results: we have less reason to be worried that non-respondents would have significantly altered the findings.

For the 1972-1973 American students who went abroad on a Fulbright, the year was a very successful one. If this year's group is typical, it can be said that most grantees work hard, they are productive, they discuss America and America's behavior with people in their host country, they learn a great deal about the country in which they are guests, and they consider their experience abroad outstanding.

This report details the nature of this success and attempts to find out what determines it. It discusses the various ways in which success might be measured and evaluates the importance of several determinants of success. We begin with a discussion of the various ways in which grantees might be successful during their year abroad (Chapter I); we then discuss some of the major determinants of success and of the kinds of grantees who achieve success and briefly review the administration of the grants (Chapter II).

CHAPTER I

HOW SUCCESSFUL IS THE FULBRIGHT PROGRAM?

A. Introduction

The goals of any long-term, well-established program that involves numberous agencies and interest groups are necessarily diffuse. The Fulbright Program is no exception. On the one hand, academic and scholarly achievement is stressed, particularly in the screening process. At the same time it is clear that academic success is not the only goal.

> Senator William J. Fulbright has been quoted as saying that
> High academic standards are important...but the purpose of the program is not the advancement of science nor the promotion of scholarship. These are by-products of a program whose primary aim is international understanding.[1]

Similarly, a recent release by the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (CU) of the U.S. State Department described the purpose of the Fulbright Program as follows:

> CU-sponsored programs are designed to strengthen patterns of informal two-way communication in ways which will favorably influence relations between the United States and other countries and help build the human foundations of the structure of peace.[2]

At the same time, the Fulbright award is not a political one. Applicants are not considered in terms of their expertise in U.S. foreign policy or other criteria that might especially qualify them to speak on behalf of their country.

---

[1]Cited in Robert Rosenzweig, "Foreign Policy and Education," Journal of Higher Education, 37 (May, 1966): 277-78

[2]CU Memorandum, March 22, 1974.

In considering the multiplicity of goals of the Fulbright Program according to which success can be measured, the present evaluation has therefore been faced with considering how these various criteria can best be distinguished. The outcome is a set of three goals, 1) academic success; 2) ambassadoriality; and 3) receptivity.

Academic success is the traditional goal of educational exchange programs. If it were the only goal, then the evaluation of this program would be a simple one. However, it is also the intention of the Program that the grantee represent the United States, that he or she be in the position of establishing and carrying out contacts with foreign nationals--perhaps fellow students, or newly-found friends and neighbors or other host country nationals--for whom, on the basis of personal contacts the grantee can provide, directly or indirectly, by words and by actions, some deeper insight into some aspect of the American way of life. This is the dimension of ambassadoriality.

A third cluster of goals has to do with the grantee's own reaction to the host country. It is intended by the Fulbright Program that the year abroad be one which is broadening, in which there is a furthering of the grantee's understanding of the host country and culture, in which the learning that takes place is not only academic but also in the more elusive area of culture. The learning is here called receptivity.

The three goals, academic success, ambassadoriality, and receptivity, are not complimentary, but can be independent of one another. Students might be academically successful, yet fail to be ambassadors or fail to learn very much about their host country.

On the final page of the second survey, grantees were asked for comments on their year abroad. Some of these comments can be used to illustrate what is meant by success in these three dimensions. One example of academic success comes from an archaelogy student who spent the year in Southeast Asia.

> I have gained experience here that few of my professional associates in the U.S. have had; I have worked in environments totally different from my own in every way and in so doing, I have found insights into my own as well as that of Nepal. I am working in an area where so little research has been done...It is both unnerving at times (there are no precedents) and exciting (I am making my own path.) .

A language student in Germany considered his year in Germany outstanding.

> I rated my year in Germany as outstanding because everything I set out to accomplish when I came has happened; my research has gone well. I have made valuable professional contacts, (my husband and I have made many friends) and we have the opportunity to stay for another year.

Ambassadoriality is well illustrated by the Fulbright student in Italy who wrote that he not only got a lot of work done but

> it was also a good opportunity for me to be able to have a show at the United States Information Service.

A different kind of ambassadorial function was reported by a student in Germany who found himself arguing with his fellow students.

> The German students are very active in politics and have strong opinions, I have found myself defending the U.S. against unfair accusations and confessing some of our weaknesses. The U.S. role in Europe, Watergate, and the Penn affair are very interesting, seen from a view never before possible.

Perhaps the most frequent comments were made by grantees in terms of receptivity, of experiencing a new civilization. A music student in Vienna wrote:

> A year's living experience within another culture cannot be measured in writing. It is something that imprints a lasting influence on the psychological thinking...

A literature student in Germany outlined three areas of receptivity in which he changed.

> 1. I learned more about Germany in 10 months than I could have hoped to absorb in 10 years from text books.
> 2. I experienced a "new" set of cultural mores; i.e., different goals, priorities, basic principles, etc.
> 3. I became a "foreigner". A very healthy experience which has helped me to better understand the frustrations in being "different". This experience alone makes this year outstanding.

Academic success, ambassadoriality, and receptivity are three terms used here to describe a variety of specific goals. Their realization was far from complete, but the Fulbright Program achieves sufficient success in each of them to suggest that the Program is well justified in terms of moneys expended for it. In the pages that follow, the three goals are examined in quantitative terms.

B. The Measurement of Success:

1. Academic Success

The extent of scholarly activities of American Fulbright students during their year abroad is one good indicator of success. Three questions in the time-2 survey provide us with a measure of such scholarly activities. As Table 1-1 shows, the grantees score well on each of them.

TABLE 1-1

THREE MEASURES OF SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

Question 19. On the whole, how hard did you work during the past year?

Very hard	46%
Moderately hard	46
Not very hard	8
Total	100% (N=164)

Question 20. How much work did you get done during your year abroad?

A great deal	59%
Some	36
A little	5
None	--
Total	100% (N=163)

Question 21. Did you already, or will you publish, perform, or show anything you worked on during your year abroad?

	Yes	No	Total	N=
Publish	55%	45	100%	(143)
Perform	19%	81	100%	(111)
Exhibit	21%	79	100%	(114)

Most of the grantees worked hard (46% very hard, 46% moderately so), most report that they got a great deal of work done (50%), and most said that they expect to publish, perform, or exhibit some of the work they did during the year.

For purposes of analysis, these three questions were combined into an Index of Academic Success. On the basis of their combined scores the grantees were divided into three more or less equal groups, High, Medium, and Low.

2. Ambassadoriality

Because the Fulbright Program is intended to enhance mutual understanding a successful year abroad goes beyond academic success. Another dimension considered in this study the extent to which the grantees are able to represent America abroad, that might be called their ambassadoriality. Table 1-2 suggests that along this dimension too the 1972-1973 grantees did well.

TABLE 1-2

TWO MEASURES OF AMBASSADORIALITY

Question 13. At any time in your stay, did you see yourself as "representing" America abroad?

Yes	75%
No	25
Total	100% (N=160)

Question 14. Were you called upon to explain America's actions and behavior?

Often	29%
Sometimes	46
Rarely	16
Never	6
Total	97% (N=162)

Most of the grantees said that they represented America abroad (75%) and were at least sometimes called upon to explain America's action and behavior (75%). In other words ,the majority of grantees did not spend the year as lone scholars, but at least from time to time were cast in the role of ambassador. The two measures were combined into an Index of Ambassadoriality and grantees assigned a score of High, Medium, or Low.

3. Receptivity

A second dimension of mutual understanding is the extent of learning about the host culture that took place during the year. The degree to which grantes became immersed in the host society is considered an important indicator of the success of the year abroad. Tables 1-3 and 1-4 report the findings of these measures.

TABLE 1-3

MEASURE OF RECEPTIVITY: I. KNOWLEDGE ABOUT HOST COUNTRY

Question 22. Below are listed various aspects of a society. For your host country please indicate how much you know.

	1	2	3	4	5	1+2
	A great deal			Little or none		
A. Culture or way of life	57%	37	6	1	--	94%
B. Educational opportunities	33%	42	20	5	--	75%
C. Treatment of minorities	21%	40	30	8	1	61%
D. Distribution of income	12%	36	38	14	--	48%
E. Balance of payment	9%	15	28	26	23	24%
F. Migration from rural to urban areas	19%	35	28	15	3	54%
G. Internal politics	19%	35	28	15	3	54%
H. Political relations with the U.S.	33%	35	22	9	1	68%
I. Political relations with other countries	19%	29	36	14	3	48%

Grantees were asked about nine aspects of society, ranging very widely. For all but three of them (political relations with other countries, distribution of income, and balance of payment), the majority said that they knew a great deal. (In future surveys, it will be possible to measure the amount of learning that took place during the year, since this question will be repeated both before grantees go abroad and when they have finished their stay).

Another indication of receptivity was provided by asking grantees whether they ever felt that they were "native".

TABLE 1-4

MEASURE OF RECEPTIVITY: II. GOING NATIVE

Question 12. At any point in your stay abroad, did you ever think of yourself as a "native".

Yes	38%
No	62
Total	100% (N=161)

Over a third of the grantees reported yes even to this question. The two receptivity measures were combined to form a Receptivity Index.

To obtain a picture of the kinds of grantees who tended to be successful, this part of the report compares the success measures in terms of some of the characteristics of the grantees, such as age, marital status, language ability, academic level and field of study. It also presents an effort to determine the countries or geographic areas in which students were most likely to be successful.

C. Age and Success

Our measure of academic success consists of questions asking grantees to indicate how hard they worked, how much they got done during the year abroad, and whether they are publishing, performing, or exhibiting anything that they worked on during the year. A very striking relationship was found between the age of the grantees and their likelihood to be successful according to these criteria. Only eighteen percent of those under 25 compared with fifty-six percent of those over 30 were highly successful in our composite measure of of academic success. (See Table 1-5, row A). The older students, more likely to be working for a Ph.D. or artists not working for any degree, were probably in a position where their work was more clearly defined, in which they could accomplish more concrete objectives; further, by virtue of their age, they were more mature and presumably as a result of maturity alone more likely to "settle down" and do their work.

It might be expected that older students, while more successful academically, would make less effort to encounter host country natives on a social basis and have less opportunity to play the role of "ambassador", as we have defined it.

This is true, but only to a relatively small extent. Whereas among those under 25, twenty-five percent scored high on ambassadoriality, only nineteen percent of those over 30 achieved this score. (See Table 1-5, row R.) A six-percent difference cannot be taken very seriously, if it appears only for this one generation of grantees. It will be important to examine this finding over the coming years; if it remains consistently lower for the older student, then even this small percentage difference will establish itself as meaningful.

The extent to which grantees were receptive to the host country and culture is not affected by the age of the grantee in any clear-cut way. Both the youngest and the oldest groups of grantees obtained similar scores, with the middle group--those between 25 and 30--scoring slightly lower. (See Table 1-5, row O.) In other words, the grantees' ability to take away from the host country an increased understanding of its way of life does not appear to depend on the age of the grantee, and all that age implies.

From the point of view of the Fulbright Program, it appears that if academic success is an important objective, then the selection of more mature students might be an important criterion. If receptivity and ambassadoriality are to be considered important, then the selection of student fresh out of college would be as desirable as older students. Exposure to a foreign environment is at least as enriching for the young as for the older grantees.

TABLE 1-5

AGE AND SUCCESS
(Percent High on Success Measures)

Age	Academic Success	Ambassadoriality	Receptivity	N=
Under 25	18	25	38	(56)
25 - 30	34	23	31	(66)
Over 30	56	19	36	(36)

D. Marital Status and Success

One important question for an international exchange program is whether to send students who have no ties and are therefore able to experience the environment fully, or whether to send students who are married, and hence experience the year as a couple. One can argue both ways. The single students are able to experience the environment without "strings attached," yet the married students constitute a couple and hence can represent a year abroad for two persons rather than one--at little additional cost to the Program.

In terms of success, married students were far more successful academically, single students more successful as ambassadors. In terms of receptivity the differences were slight. (See Table 1-6.)

TABLE 1-6

MARITAL STATUS AND SUCCESS
(Percent High on Success Measures)

Marital Status	Academic Success	Ambassadoriality	Receptivity	N=
Single	21	28	37	(83)
Married	48	14	33	(71)

D. Degree Status and Success

From the material we have examined so far we are gaining the impression that academic success is related to maturiety, both in terms of age and in terms of marital status. (Whether being married is a valid sign of maturity is of course debatable!)

Yet another indication of this maturity is found in the academic level of the grantee and in his or her degree objectives. Those grantees who hold an M.A. degree are more likely than those who hold a B.A. degree to be academically successful (42% vs. 20%), as can be seen in Table 1-8. Using a somewhat different measure we find, likewise, that those grantees who are working for a Ph.D. degree are more likely to achieve academic success than those who are only working for an M.A., with those not working for a degree somewhere inbetween. (It should be recalled that this group is composed in part at least of persons in the creative arts.)

Perhaps these findings are less surprising than the relationship between degree status and plans with ambassadoriality and receptivity. Here we see that the degrees held seem to matter little in the success scores. But when we separate out the students who are working for an M.A. from the others we find that they exceed **them both in ambassadoriality and receptivity.**

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that if academic demands are less severe or are likely to be made in a more organized setting--M.A. candidates take courses, Ph.D. candidates are likely to be doing independent work, less confined to a particular institutional setting--the opportunities for ambassadorial activities are greater and the possibility of exposing oneself to the host country and culture more ready-made.

Grantees not working for a degree are a group rather different from the academic grantees. From the data it appears that they are least receptive to the host country and culture but are more likely to be ambassadors than Ph.D. candidates.

TABLE 1-8

PERCENTAGE OF SUCCESS BY DEGREE STATUS AND DEGREE PLANS

	Percent Successful Academically				
Degree Plans			Degree Held		
Not working for Degree	27	(45)	B.A. or equivalent	20	(64)
Working for M.A. or equiv.	21	(24)	M.A. or equivalent	42	(92)
Working for Ph.D. or equivalent	40	(90)			

	Percent High on Ambassadoriality		
Not working for degree	28	B.A.	26
Working for M.A.	33	M.A.	22
Working for Ph.D.	18		

	Percent High on Receptivity		
Not working for degree	18	B.A.	34
Working for M.A.	46	M.A.	35
Working for Ph.D.	39		

F. Academic Field and Success

Every Fulbright grantee works in a specified area of field of study. Table 1-9 illustrates the relationship between the student's field of study and the chances for success:

TABLE 1-9

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ACADEMIC FIELD AND SUCCESS
(Percent High on Success Measures)

Field of Study	Academic Success	Ambassadoriality	Receptivity	
Humanities	23	21	19	(57)
Social Sciences	36	20	40	(45)
Natural Physical Sciences	50	50	25	(8)

Although the number of persons in the physical sciences is too small for stable percentages, we can examine differences between the students of humanities and the social sciences in terms of the success measures. We find no difference between these two areas as far as ambassadoriality is concerned, but on both academic success and receptivity the social science students are by far more likely to be successful than the humanities students. Possibly social science students are more interested in the culture and society of the host country, and are hence naturally more inclined to be receptive to the society. Yet foreign language and culture students, classified under the humanities, might also be expected to have high receptivity, so that the great percentage difference is not easy to explain.

This finding, as the others, permits no definitive explanation. For one thing, we must wait to see whether the relationship will hold up in future years; only then can we be confident that it is not an artifact of the particular survey or cohort but has something to do with the nature of the areas of study and the kinds of students selecting them. It will also be useful to examine the background characteristics of social science students; perhaps these were older or more advanced and like other older students, as we saw above, were more inclined to be academically serious.

(Time did not permit an examination of this possible relationship.) The fact that humanities students fared relatively poorly not only in academic success but also in receptivity would argue against "maturity" as an explanation, since as we already saw, it was not related to receptivity for the grantees as a whole.

As is true of all survey findings, we raise more questions than we can answer. For the moment we must remain content with reporting the finding that social science students in the 1972-73 American Fulbright student group were more successful both academically and in terms of receptivity, and no less successful in terms of ambassadoriality.

G. Country of Study and Success

The Fulbright Program scatters grantees throughout the world. In most countries there are very few Fulbrighters in any one year, and any reporting of the success or failure would be highly misleading, since the results are dependent of the idiosyncracies of the few who happen to be there. Quantitative analysis presumes a large enough number of cases to prevent the likelihood of chance as an explanation of the variations that are found.

The only area of the world in which Fulbrighters were present in large enough numbers to permit quantitative analysis, at least for the 1972-73 cohort, was Western Europe, with 43 respondents in Germany and 41 in the remaining countries of Western Europe. We therefore present the findings only for these two. (See Table 1-10.)

TABLE 1-10

SUCCESS IN GERMANY AND OTHER WESTERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES*
(Percent High on Success Measures)

	Academic Success	Ambassadoriality	Receptivity	
Germany	16	33	30	(43)
Other Western European Countries	44	12	29	(41)

*The success rates in the rest of the world is presented below, for the record

	Academic Success	Ambassadoriality	Receptivity	N=
Latin America	36	9	55	(11)
Eastern Europe	--	43	29	(7)
East Asia	50	17	33	(6)
Near East	50	50	--	(2)

The relatively poor showing of grantees in Germany as compared with other European countries is perhaps due to the fact that the Germany Bi-national Commission cooperates in the final selection of candidates with the DAAD, with Fulbrights given in general to younger,less advanced students and DAAD grants to those more advanced academically. Futhermore, the other European countries, particularly Great Britain and France, are the most highly sought after countries for Americans students, England in fact because there is no foreign language requirement, France because it has for many Americans been the country most closely associated with a Fulbright year abroad. (For a fictional account of this experience, see for example, some of the work of Ann Burstyn.) Similarly, Italy has had a very strong attraction for American students. In all these countries,the competition is likely to be very stiff.

The German grantees however appear to make up for this deficiency by their higher ambassadorial success. It is not possible to assess the meaning of this finding with any great confidence. One can speculate that ever since World War II, Americans have played a very distinct role in Germany, that of introducing Germans to the "American way of Life".

By now, twenty-five years after the destruction of the Nazi dictatorship, it is difficult to believe that the Americans students can provide much teaching in the "lessons of democracy", but possibly there are still some residues. Perhaps too in Germany, the comparatively vulnerable situation that Americans abroad have been placed in ever since the War in Vietnam has been less striking than in the rest of Western Europe, where any ambassadorial activity on the part of Americans has, for the past few years, been likely to be rather minor one. Whether in the face of an embarrassing foreign policy, which included carpet bombings over Christmas, American students would eschew discussion of difficult areas, or the hosts would avoid raising the subject, it is certainly remarkable that only 12 percent of the grantees in Western European countries would be active ambassadors. It will be interesting to see whether in subsequent years, in which the U.S. foreign policy is regarded as less hostile and aggressive by people in such areas of the world as Western Europe, which are close to the U.S. in terms of economic and social development as well as political processes, ambassadoriality will be a more frequent activity.

The extent of receptivity remains the same for students in Germany and students in the rest of Western Europe. Cultural learning does not appear to be affected by the area visited, at least judging by these two areas. (The adventurous reader will note that receptivity is greatest in Latin America.)

H. Language Ability and Success

Grantees were asked to rate their language ability. By the time of the second survey, most thought that they could speak fluently--clearly one of the outcomes of their year abroad. (See Table 1-11.)

TABLE 1-11
LANGUAGE ABILITY BEFORE THE YEAR ABROAD AND AT ITS END

Time-1Question 17, Time-2 Question 4.

How well are you able to speak in the local language?

	Time-1*	Time-2
Like a native	12%	16%
Fluently	27	53
Adequately	35	24
With some difficulty	18	5
With much difficulty	9	3
Total	101%	101%
N=	(188)	(164)

* In the first interview, the question was worded slightly differently: "How well do you communicate in the local language?" This might account for some of the differences in the findings.

It is important to know how seriously language ability affects a successful outcome of the year abroad. It is therefore particularly interesting to find, as we do in Table 1-12, that language fluency is not directly related to academic success, although it is very strongly related to ambassadoriality and even more to receptivity. (See Table 1-12.)

TABLE 1-12

LANGUAGE FLUENCY AND SUCCESS

(Percent High on Success Measure)

	Academic Success	Ambassadoriality	Receptivity	N=
Like a native or fluently	25	26	43	(110)
Less than native less than fluently	51	13	17	(35)

In all thirty-five grantees in our sample reported not being fluent in the local language. Yet half of these were successful academically, compared with only 25 percent of those who reported themselves to be fluent. Clearly it is not the absence of language ability itself that accounts for such a difference, but rather the finding is the result of other factors, which were not examined here.

One likely explanation is that the grantees in countries where language fluency is not likely to be achieved, such as Asia and perhaps Eastern Europe, were probably more advanced students, and as such more likely to succeed academically.

Ambassadoriality is understandably related to language ability, simply in terms of the possibility of communicating with host country nationals; likewise receptivity, the ability to learn about culture and customs, is greatly enhanced by the ability to understand the language.

For the Fulbright Program it is clearly important that ability in the host country language be part of the grantee's "equipment"; but before making this an universal requirement it would be important to understand better the conditions under which poorer language ability is adequate, at least for academic success.

I. Reasons for Studying Abroad

Academic success is related to a variety of factors; we have examined some of these, in terms of the characteristics of the grantees, such as their age and marital status; in terms of their field and country of study; and in terms of their ability to master the host country language. One set of factors which we have not touched upon so far has to do with the grantee's own reasons for studying abroad. Did they seek to achieve academic success? Such a question is asked in our study, once before the grantees went abroad, and then again after they spent their year overseas. Inasmuch as the wording is somewhat different and the categories of choice differed in the two time periods, a direct comparison is not possible. Beginning in the coming year it will be possible to use both time periods to assess the relationship between what grantees expect to consider important, what they actually considered most important and how these expectations were related to academic and other kinds of success. In the current analysis only the Time-2 question could be used for this relationship.

Table 1-12 reports the results for both time periods.

TABLE 1-13

REASONS FOR STUDYING ABROAD*

	Time-1	Time-2
Learning in my professional area	66%	44%
Meeting new people	8	***
Experiencing a new environment	26	***
Experiencing a new culture and way of life	**	56
Total	100%	100%
N=	(190)	(160)

* In Time-1, grantees were asked: "Below are listed three kinds of explanations given for study abroad. Please rank them in order of their importance to you." The results are given in terms of the percent giving the first choice of each of the first three categories.

In Time-2 grantees were asked: "Two reasons often given for study abroad are listed below. Check the one that is more important to you." This question has now been incorporated for both Time-1 and Time-2 surveys given in subsequent years.

** Not asked in Time-1.

*** Not asked in Time-2.

Table 1-13 was not intended to show that different questions produce different answers, even though that is one of its conclusions. Rather it is intended to show that academic goals are not the only important reason for studying abroad, and that this is true not only from the point of view of the administration of the Fulbright Program but from the point of view of the grantees themselves.

In Time-1, in answer to the somewhat vague other alternatives given, two-thirds of the grantees chose "learning", as the most important reason for studying abroad. In Time-2, where the choice was made clearer, the percentage dropped to under fifty, and indeed, experiencing a new culture and way of life was considered important by slightly (56%) more grantees than was learning (44%.)

As might be expected, the reason for studying abroad and academic success were strongly related. Among the grantees who scored high on academic success almost two-thirds chose learning as the more important reason for studying abroad. (See Table 1-14.) But what about ambassadoriality? We find very clear indications that those who scored high on this measure of success were likely to select experiencing a new culture and way of life (65%) as more important than learning as such. At the same time, receptivity, which is a measure of the success achieved in experiencing the new culture, those who scored high on receptivity, that is, those who succeeded in experiencing a new life and culture, were as likely to mention learning as the main reason for studying abroad as they were to mention experiencing a new culture and way of life.

TABLE 1-14

REASONS FOR STUDYING ABROAD AMONG SUCCESSFUL GRANTEES

Success Measure	Grantee scored High in .. Learning in Profession	Experiencing new Culture	Total	N=
Academic Success	65%	35%	100%	(46)
Ambassadoriality	35%	65%	100%	(34)
Receptivity	48%	52%	100%	(50)

These findings suggest that the measure of success that has the clearest link to what grantees themselves consider important is academic success. At the same time it also suggests that where academic work is related to the culture and people of the host country--as for example in the study of foreign language and literature, or in area studies--the distinction between academic learning, or learning in one's professional area and academic success and receptivity becomes obscured.

Those who are high on receptivity, that is who succeed in learning about the host country culture were as likely to give as their main reason for studying abroad one that has to do with learning in their professional area as one that deals with experiencing a new culture.

In other words, while it is important to keep academic learning separate from receptivity, there is a convergence when the purpose of the academic work is itself cultural and directly related to the host country. In those cases--and they are many in any international educational exchange program--such a fine distinction between what is pure academic learning and what is cultural learning becomes moot.

CHAPTER II

DETERMINANTS OF SUCCESS

In the first chapter some of the background characteristics and attributes of the grantees were discussed and their relationship to success in the Program examined. This chapter considers some of the determinants of success. These are seen in three different aspects. First we examine the importance of contacts in the host country; that is, the extent to which grantees had contact with fellow students and professors (or other professionals), as well as with the mass media. How important is it for grantees to establish and maintain such contacts?

The second area of interest has to do with the smoothness of the year abroad. If it was one in which there were serious problems or problems to which the grantee reported difficulty in adjusting, how gravely did this affect the grantee's chances of success?

The third area has to do with prior contacts, and how important these were to the grantee's success.

Part I. Contacts with the Host Country

A. Professional Contact

Were the grantees in touch with their counterparts in the Host country? Four questions addressed themselves to this question: 1) did they speak to local audiences? 2) did they participate in cultural or professional meetings? 3) how much contact did they have with students or young colleagues? and 4) how much contact did they have with professors or other experts in the field? Table 2-1 gives the distribution to each of these questions.

TABLE 2-1

PROFESSIONAL CONTACT

Question 11. While you were abroad did you:

	Yes	No	Total
A. Speak to any local audiences?	24%	76%	100%
B. Participate in cultural or professional meetings?	59%	41%	100%

Question 15. How much contact did you have with students or young colleagues in your host country?

A great deal	54%
Some	33
A little	12
None	1
Total	100%

Question 16. How much contact did you have with professors or authorities in your field while in your host country?

A great deal	34%
Some	46
A little	19
None	1
Total	100%

The majority of grantees had participated in meetings, had a great deal of contact with students or young colleagues, and had at least some contact with professionals; about one-third spoke to local audiences.

How important is professional contact in terms of academic success? A composite measure of these four indicators divides the grantees into three groups according to their degree of professional contact. Using this measure we can show the relationship between professional contact and the three measures of success.

Table 2-2 shows the relationship between professional contact and success.

TABLE 2-2

SUCCESS AND PROFESSIONAL CONTACT
(Percent High on Success Measures)

Professional Contact	Academic Success	Ambassadoriality	Receptivity	N=
High	47	23	42	(43)
Medium	30	35	30	(70)
Low	23	2	34	(47)

Table 2-2 shows clearly that grantees who had contact with fellow students or professors as well as those who participated in local professional activities were more likely to be successful in all three reasures. Among those who were high in professional contact 47 percent had academic success, among those who were low, only 23 percent had high academic success. Similarly, those who were high or had a "medium" amount of professional contact were far more likely to be successful ambassadors than those who were low in professional contact. It is interesting to note that the middle group in professional contact did even better in ambassadoriality than did the high group.

In the receptivity measure, professional contact was less important although the high exceeded the low in the percent successful in this measure as well.

Professional contact is an important aspect of the Fulbright Program. Its importance is perhaps greater in academic success and in ambassadoriality than in the extent to which grantees were receptive to the local culture.

It should be noted that there is no indication of what makes for successful professional contact as such. On occasion it depends on the circumstances and on luck. But it also could depend on the initiative of the grantee.

One science student in Western Europe reported that he started out unsuccessful but then changed his location.

> Although my initial experiences were not very good--that had nothing to do with the grant; rather, personal differences with a professor. I transferred to one of the finest institutes in the world for research in my field (air pollution effects on vegetation). The opportunity to work with these people is one of the greatest and best experiences of my academic career.

Not all grantees who were academically successful had succeeded in establishing professional contacts as well. Some indicated that they made it on their own, so to speak. A social science student in Belgium complained.

> I accomplished a great deal of work and polished up my French. But we found it very difficult to meet people (other than Americans). Also, my intellectual contacts were extremely limited--this lack of discussion with Belgian scholars was my greatest disappointment.

A music student in Germany complained more particularly about his fellow students.

> I was disappointed with the lack of warmth among students. There was a great deal of professional jealousy in my music school, directed towards the foreign students sometimes. This feeling also prevailed in my dormitory, where most students were German musicians. Foreigners tended to stick together as a result of this. Professionally it was a fantastic year, however, and I consider the training and experience invaluable.

In other words, professional contact could enhance academic success; those who enjoyed it were more likely than the others to achieve academic success. But it was not an absolute requirement; some students succeeded academically inspite of its absence.

Ambassadoriality appeared to be more difficult to achieve in the absence of professional contact. Table 2-2 showed that virtually no grantees who lacked professional contact achieved a high score in ambassadoriality.

B. Social Contact

It is not surprising that a high degree of professional contact is related to academic success. What about other kinds of experiences that grantees might encounter in the host country? We considered these in terms of social contacts and media contacts. Social contacts were rather extensive for the 1972-73 grantees as can be seen in Table 2-3.

TABLE 2-3

SOCIAL CONTACT

Question 6. How much social contact did you have with local persons?

A great deal	61%
Some	34
A little	5
None	--
Total	100%

Question 7. Were you invited into the homes of local persons?

Often	53%
Occasionally	39
Rarely or never	8
Total	100%

Question 8. In what kind of an environment did you live?

Predominantly American	2%
Mixed	41
Predominantly local	57
Total	100%

Question 9. During your year abroad did you:

A. Make close friends with any local persons?	Yes	91%
B. Spend holidays with local persons?	Yes	71
C. Travel with local persons?	Yes	66

Grantees were likely to have a great deal of social contact (61%), were invited into homes of local persons (53% said "often"), lived in a predominantly local environment, (57%), made close friends with local persons (91%), spent their holidays with local persons (71%) and even traveled with somebody they met in the host country (66%).

These questions, on the basis of which the responses were divided into three categories, high, medium, and low. Table 2-4 shows the relationship of social contact with our three success measures.

TABLE 2-4

SOCIAL CONTACT RELATED TO ACADEMIC SUCCESS, AMBASSADORIALITY RECEPTIVITY
(Percent High on Success Measures)

Social Contact	Academic Success	Ambassadoriality	Receptivity	N=
High	25	31	41	(75)
Medium	44	19	27	(48)
Low	34	10	29	(38)

The social contacts that grantees established were particularly important for ambassadoriality and somewhat important for receptivity. Its effect on academic success is not so clear. Those with a medium amount of social contact were more likely than either the high or the low to do well academically.

Some grantees reported that even if their academic experience was not successful, their social horizons were enormously broadened. A literature student in Turkey wrote:

> While my academic experience was quite unsatisfactory, I did spend a lot of time with Turks, speaking Turkish and sharing ideas.

An anthropology student in Western Europe wrote of his entry into the local civilization.

> I was able to "get into" the local culture about as much as possible, having come as a stranger who was shy and could only express myself minimally in the language. I found out as much generally as I could have expected to, but also experienced problems with my research design which prevents my feeling that the experience was "outstanding".

Another student, a language student in Western Europe was succinct in his distinction between academic and social success.

> As far as my research was concerned, it was a bust. However, I made friends with people I would like to see again.

What is clear from considering the relationship between personal contacts and success is that the social penetration achieved by grantees during their year abroad might not help them get their work done, but it does help with respect to the other important goals to the Fulbright Program, that of the enhancement of mutual understanding.

C. Media Contact

The third kind of penetration of the host culture is media contact. It is impersonal, to be sure, but it provides a useful introduction into the quotidian life of the society in which grantees find themselves. Table 2-5 suggests that the majority of grantees read local newspapers and listen to the local radio, while only a minority watch local television. (This latter is of course in part due to the non-availability of television services in some countries and of television sets in the grantees' homes.)

TABLE 2-5

MEDIA CONTACTS

Question 10. During your year abroad did you: (please circle your choice).

	Regularly		Occasionally		Rarely or never		Total
A. Read any local newspaper?	1	66%	2	30	3	4	100%
B. Listen to any local radio station?	1	54%	2	38	3	8	100%
C. Watch any local television	1	27%	2	40	3	33	100%

The three measures were combined into a measure of media contacts. In Table 2-6 this is related to our three success measures.

TABLE 2-6

MEDIA CONTACTS RELATED TO ACADEMIC SUCCESS, AMBASSADORIALITY, RECEPTIVITY
(Percent High on Success Measures)

Media Contacts	Academic Success	Ambassadoriality	Receptivity	N=
High	31	27	47	(62)
Medium	41	15	[illegible]	([illegible])
Low	[illegible]	23	19	([illegible])

Media contacts were important only in the degree of receptivity which grantees achieved. Among those with high media contacts, 47 percent scored high in receptivity, among those with low media contacts, only 19 percent scored high. This suggests that in terms of learning about the culture and pure knowledge (as was measured in the Receptivity Index) media contact is more important than any other kind of contact.

Summarizing the relationship between the different measures of contact and the different measures of success it can be said, as an approximation that:

1. Professional contact helps achieve academic success.
2. Social contact helps achieve a high degree of ambassadoriality.
3. Media contact helps achieve a high degree of receptivity.

Part II. Problems During the Year Abroad

One of the purposes of this evaluation has been to determine the extent to which grantees had problems, and also to indicate whether these affected their success. For this reason a number of questions were addressed to this area of concern both before they left for their year abroad and at the end of their stay.

The problems asked about are considered in several dimensions, and include academic problems, problems in living abroad, and personal problems. We also asked about the grantee's ability to adjust to the various problems.

A. Academic Problems

Most grantees appeared to have few academic problems. When asked whether they adjusted well to the local professional and academic environment 75 percent said that they did. 79 percent said that they had adequate supervision--whatever amount they required. Somewhat fewer grantees but over 50 percent found it easy to obtain the materials they needed for their work; only 8 percent complained that it was difficult.

Did the presence or absence of academic problems affect success? The three questions were used to build an index of academic problems, and the respondents were divided into three approximately equal groups on the basis of the extent to which they mentioned any academic problems.

TABLE 2-7

ACADEMIC PROBLEMS AND SUCCESS
(Percent High on Success Measures)

Score on Academic Problems Index	Academic Success	Ambassadoriality	Receptivity	N=
Low (few problems)	53	21	32	(56)
Medium	29	26	42	(53)
High (many problems)	16	20	31	(51)

The most pronounced effect of academic problems was, as might be expected, on academic success. Those who had few problems with their professional environment, who received the supervision they considered adequate, and found it easy to obtain their research materials also were more likely to do well academically (53% scored high); those who found frustrations were likely to do poorly (only 16% scored high on academic success). For ambassadoriality and receptivity there appeared to be little impact of the extent of academic problems, on the other hand.

In other words, academic problems, relating to the work that grantees were attempting to carry out were important determinants for academic success. But those respondents who suffered from insufficient supervision or who had difficulty obtaining their research materials were as likely to do well as ambassadors and were as ready to be receptive to the host country and culture as the rest.

B. Problems in Living

A scored set of questions was asked about the extent to which grantees had what might be called "problems in living". Could they easily find an adequate place to live, obtain living essentials (food furnishings, clothing, etc.), obtain proper medical care, and live on the allowance of their grant?

For the large majority of grantees (77%), obtaining proper medical care and living essentials constituted no problem. Finding an adequate place to live was more difficult; less than half the respondents said that it was easy for them to find a place to live. (See Table 2-9.) Yet grantees had not expected it to be easy to find a place to live, and indeed 42 percent of the grantees found it less of a problem than they had expected it to be when they were asked the same question in Time-1. Whereas only a quarter of the grantees expected it to be easy to find a place to live, 46 percent said that it was easy to find housing after all.

There were fewer happy surprises when it came to living on the allowance of the grant. Almost half the grantees (47%) expected it to be easy, only 14% expected it to be difficult. But after the year abroad, almost twice as many in Time-1 said that it was difficult to live on the Fulbright grant. It should be noted that over half the respondents did have realistic expectations; 56 percent did not change their estimate of whether it is easy or hard to live on the grant; of those that did change, however, most found it more difficult than expected. The world-wide inflation no doubt had some part in this unrealistic expectation.

TABLE 2-8

PROBLEMS OF LIVING IN A FOREIGN COUNTRY:
EXPECTATION AND OUTCOME

Time-1-Question 16. Do you expect it will be easy or difficult to:	Time-1	Time-2-Question 24. During your year abroad was it easy or difficult to: Time-2
Find an adequate place to live?		
Easy	25%	46%
Somewhat of problem	48	32
Difficult	28	22
Total	101%	100%
N=	(189)	(160)
No change from Time-1 to Time-2		40%
Time-2 easier than Time-1		42
Time-2 harder than Time-1		17
Live on allowance of grant?		
Easy	47%	39%
Somewhat of a problem	39	34
Difficult	14	27
Total	100%	100%
N=	(181)	(160)
No change from Time-1 to Time-2		56%
Time-2 easier than Time-1		18
Time-2 harder than Time-1		26

How seriously was success in the Program affected by such problems in living. The four questions were combined into a single measure, called the "problems in living index". Table 2-9 presents the relationship of the index to measures of success.

TABLE 2-9

PROBLEMS IN LIVING AND SUCCESS
(Percent High on Success Measures)

Score on Problems in Living Index	Academic Success	Ambassadoriality	Receptivity	N=
Low (few problems)	38	16	32	(56)
Medium	23	26	38	(48)
High (many problems)	39	29	37	(54)

The various difficulties grantees might experience seemed to affect ambassadoriality only (for academic success and receptivity the results are either minimal or ambiguous) but in a reverse way: the greater the problems experienced, the greater the likelihood of being successful ambassadors.

C. Personal Problems

In addition to asking about academic and living problems, the survey included questions on personal problems. Grantees were asked whether they (or their dependents) experienced any particular problems and they were asked whether loneliness was a factor that they faced.

For the most part, grantees had very few personal problems. Only 5 percent reported major problems, with an additional 13 percent reporting them for their spouse and/or children.
As for loneliness, almost three-quarters of the grantees said they experienced it rarely or never, only 4 percent said "often".

These two questions combined into an index of personal problems. This index is related to success in Table 2-10.

TABLE 2-10

PERSONAL PROBLEMS AND SUCCESS
(Percent High on Success Measures)

Score on Personal Problems	Academic Success	Ambassadoriality	Receptivity	
Low (few problems)	30	27	40	(45)
Medium	26	25	18	(39)
High (many problems)	39	19	40	(78)

Although one might think that personal problems would keep the grantee from carrying out his academic work successfully, the findings in Table 2-10 do not show this; instead, no clear relationship is detectable. Those with few problems are better able to succeed in ambassadoriality, however. As for receptivity to the host country and its culture, those with few problems do well, and those with many do too; it is the middle group that appear to have the smallest proportion of persons scoring high in receptivity.

D. Adjustment to Problems in Living

It is one thing to have problems, another to adjust to them. Grantees were asked how well they adjusted to local customs and way of life, to local bureaucratic routines, and to the local political climate. Whereas most said that they adjusted to the local customs (87% said they adjusted well), only 36 percent said that they adjusted to local bureaucratic routines. The local political climate was in between, in terms of adjustment. (49% said "well"). These three questions were combined to form an index of "adjustment to problems in living". Table 2-11 reports the relationship between adjustment and our success measures.

TABLE 2-11

ADJUSTMENT TO PROBLEMS IN LIVING AND SUCCESS
(Percent High on Success Measures)

Score on Adjustment Index	Academic Success	Ambassadoriality	Receptivity	
Low (adjusted well)	34	15	49	(41)
Medium	34	25	32	(88)
High (adjusted poorly)	24	29	23	(29-31)

The strongest relationship was found to be between receptivity and adjustment. Those who adjusted well were far more likely to score high on the receptivity measure than those who did not adjust well, suggesting that those grantees who got along with the local customs and ways of life were also better able to respond to the civilization and culture of the host country (or the other way around). Ambassadoriality worked in the reverse direction: those who scored poorest on the measure turned out to be the most successful ambassadors. The implications here are not at all clear. Possibly the effort to represent the United States was most keenly felt by those to whom the host country presented greater obstacles. As for academic success, the difference in success scores for those who adjusted well was greater (34% scored high) than those who adjusted poorly (24% scored high), but the difference is not so strong as was found in the receptivity measure; furthermore, the middle category showed no difference compared with the high category (in both groups 34% scored high on academic success).

PART III. Prior Contacts

A. Date of First Interest in Overseas Study

The ways in which American students come to apply for a Fulbright are many. How much difference does it turn out to make whether a grantee had wanted to study abroad before he or she ever went to college or was inspired only shortly prior to his application? Does it matter whether he is in a network of peers who are also "internationally-minded?"

How important is it for a successful year abroad whether the grantee had contact with the host country before-hand? Such questions are taken up in this section.

About a quarter of the grantees had first seriously considered the possibility of studying abroad even prior to going to college. But in terms of academic success, at least, such early motivation had little impact. Table 2-12 presents the results.

TABLE 2-12

DATE OF FIRST INTEREST IN STUDY ABROAD AND SUCCESS
(Percent High on Success Measures)

Question 4. When did you first seriously consider the possibility of studying abroad?

	Academic Success	Ambassadoriality	Receptivity	N=
Prior to college	28	15	36	(33)
During college	31	30	28	(39)
After college	30	22	30	(37)

Those who had early plans did not differ in any clear-cut way in terms of success from those who had planned study abroad only later. This might seem surprising since one might have expected the early overseas planners to have higher motivation; yet there are so many other factors that come to play a role in being successful that this single dimension might have to be more carefully screened than was possible for this report. The granting of longstanding wishes often carries with it a burden--of having to live through the fulfillment of one's wish, of avoiding the danger of disappointment, of catching up to the reality of a complex life in a foreign culture that might have little bearing to the childhood dreams of spending a year in an exotic land. Such dimensions were not tapped in our study, and we are now faced with interpretation of non-findings, which can be the result of many unknown factors. It is clear that Table 2-12 show no clear patterns.

B. Circle of Influence

Another set of questions relating to prior contact with overseas study was designed to establish a "circle of influence".

Whether grantees knew anybody else who had ever studied abroad or who had received a Fulbright helps us determine the kind of "social network" in which they operate in the United States. Presumably it would be a sign of a certain kind of success for the Fulbright Program if it could attract students to become grantees who have had no prior connection with anybody who had ever been abroad. Such a person would become a kind of envoy and who upon his return would bring back new information, and help achieve mutual understanding not so much in the host country as at home.

In order to determine such information, grantees were asked three questions at Time-1:

Question 8: At the time you applied did you know others who

a. Had ever studied abroad?

b. Had ever received a Fulbright?

c. Applied for a Fulbright grant at the same time you did?

Not surprisingly most persons knew at least some persons who had been abroad. This is seen in Table 2-13:

TABLE 2-13

DID YOU KNOW OTHERS WHO HAD STUDIED ABROAD? RECEIVED A FULBRIGHT? APPLIED WHEN YOU DID?

	Studied Abroad	Received a Fulbright	Applied Same Time
Many	46%	8%	Yes: 59%
Few	50	62	No: 41
None	5	31	
Total	101%	101%	100%
N=	(192)	(192)	(192)

Should we say that fully 40 percent of the grantees did not know anyone else who applied for a Fulbright when they did, in other words, that the Program manages to reach applicants who are not otherwise well connected to a network of internationally minded persons? Or should we say that only 40 percent of the grantees did not know anyone else, that the majority was indeed well established and with a number of links to other persons and places? Once we can compare the 1973 grantee with later generations, we will be able to see what the trend is.

An index was constructed based on these three questions. The index is related to success in Table 2-14.

TABLE 2-14

CIRCLE OF INFLUENCE AND SUCCESS
(Percent High on Success Measures)

Index of Circle of Influence	Academic Success	Ambassadoriality	Receptivity	N=
High (knew many others)	28	30	62	(26)
Medium	30	17	28	(40)
Low (knew few others)	31	23	18	(45)

While academic success is little affected by the density of the grantee's social network, ambassadoriality and especially receptivity are affected. Among those who knew others who had studied abroad, received a grant or applied for a grant to study abroad, a far greater proportion scored high on receptivity (62% vs. 18%) and slightly more on ambassadoriality grantees (30% vs. 23%). This suggests the kind of impact the social network has on work abroad. The scholarly part is little changed by it, but the way in which the culture is absorbed is enormously affected. Whether this is so because of the differences in the kinds of students who know others who are involved with international study, and who are in that sense oriented toward international work, or whether the persons whom they know are personally helpful in providing keys toward the understanding of the culture we don't know.

But the world which the grantee faces when he or she lives in a foreign country is apparently made more legible by one's own social contacts at home.

PART IV. A Note on Motivation

Grantees were asked what they would do if they did not receive a Fulbright award, would they go anyway or would they stay home. This question is seen as a measure of the motivation to go abroad. In all, 45 percent of the respondents said that they would go abroad anyway.

Answers to this question are related to the extent to which the grantees know others who have studied abroad, as seen in Table 2-15.

TABLE 2-15

MOTIVATION BY CONNECTIONS TO OTHERS WHO HAD STUDIED ABROAD

Question 8.

At the time you applied did you know others who had ever studied abroad?

	Motivation: plans for coming year without Fulbright			
	Would you go abroad anyway?	Would stay at home?	Total	
Many	51%	49	100%	(84)
Few or none	40	60	100%	(97)

Table 2-15 suggests that persons who were more connected with the overseas study were also more likely to go abroad even without a Fulbright.

Dissertation students were more likely to go abroad than were students who were less advanced in their study; likewise social science and science students were more likely to go abroad than was true for humanities students. The same appears to be true for science students, though the sample is too small to make very clear statements. (See Table 2-16.)

TABLE 2-16

MOTIVATION BY ACADEMIC LEVEL AND FIELD OF STUDY

	Percent who would go abroad anyway	
Field of Study	Percent	Number
Humanities	33%	(106)
Social Sciences	62%	(74)
Sciences	[55%]	(12)
Academic Level		
B.A. only	46%	(36)
Graduate Student	32%	(56)
Writing Dissertation	56%	(67)
Other	45%	(31)

In Table 2-17 we examine the relationship between motivation and success.

TABLE 2-17

MOTIVATION AND SUCCESS
(Percent High on Success Measures)

Question 10. What plans had you made for the coming year in the event you were not awarded a grant?

	Academic Success	Ambassadoriality	Receptivity	N=
Would you go abroad anyway?	39	25	46	(52)
Would you stay at home?	21	21	19	(53)

Those who would go abroad anyway were much likely to score high on academic success and even greater differences were seen in receptivity. Clearly motivation as measured by this question has much to do with the extent to which grantees were effective both in their academic work and the degree to which they could absorb the foreign culture. The only success measure which was not affected by their determination to go overseas was ambassadoriality.

PART V. A Note on the Administration of the Fulbright Grant

Grantees were asked how much contact they had with anyone at the Binational or Fulbright Commission, how useful and adequate they found that contact, and how they would rate the administration of the grant. They were also asked to rate their total experience abroad. It is clear from the results (See Table 2-18) that whatever contacts grantees had with Binational Commission persons (slightly more than half had at least some contact), this contact was very useful, and it was sufficient for their purposes.

It is equally clear that the administration of the grant was, for the majority of the respondents considered to be good if not excellent. There were few complaints, and these appeared to be for very specific reasons. For example, one grantee complained about the Portuguese Program which according to him was suffering from problems at the level of the directorship. But such complaints were very few. For the most part, at least in their open-ended comments about the year abroad, grantees did not mention the Commission one way or another. Judging from the answers to the fixed choice questions, the Commissions appear to be considered as handling their problems well.

Perhaps the best indication that the administration of the grant, as well as the program as a whole, is working well can be seen from the overall rating that the grantees gave their year abroad. Half considered it outstanding, and almost all the rest thought it was very good.

This rating is made despite the disappointments and difficulties that some grantees experienced, many the result of unexpected problems, some the result of unduly high expectations.