DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 104 256 HE 006 378

AUTHOR Marsh, Harriet L.
TITLE Re-Entry/Transition Seminars. Report on the Wingspread Colloquium.
INSTITUTION National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 27p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1860 19th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009 ($0.25 handling plus postage)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Adjustment (to Environment); *College Students; Conference Reports; *Foreign Countries; *Foreign Students; *Higher Education; Seminars; Social Adjustment; Student Adjustment; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS *Wingspread Colloquium

ABSTRACT

A workshop designed to investigate the development of guidelines and recommendations for ways to assist foreign students in the United States to return and fulfill needed roles in their countries of origin was held in October 1974. This report discusses the deliberations and conclusions of discussion groups, combining these with relevant excerpts from papers presented as supplementary material. Emphasis is placed on the problem of reentry; an inventory of reentry problems; preparation for reentry; content of transition seminars; details of program planning; evaluation and follow-up; and recommendations for the future. Recommendations suggest: (1) Bring together representatives of some of the current transition-type programs to develop the content and format of transition-type programs to develop the lengths; (2) Establish a national clearinghouse for sharing information about on-going reentry transition programs, their impact, and innovative program ideas; (3) Add "reentry-transition" as a topic to the National Association for Foreign student Affairs Field Service Consultant's Manual; and (4) Provide field service training grants and workshop funds to stimulate interest in reentry-transition programs. (MJM)

RE-ENTRY/TRANSITION SEMINARS

REPORT ON THE WINGSPREAD COLLOQUIUM

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR FOREIGN STUDENT AFFAIRS

The National Association for Foreign Student Affairs gratefully acknowledges the generous support of the following agencies whose assistance made possible both the conference and the publication of this report: the Academic Affairs Conference of Midwestern Universities, the Agency for International Development and the AID/NAFSA Liaison Committee, the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State, and the Johnson Foundation. The Association also expresses particular appreciation to those persons preparing papers for the conference and those who served as discussion leaders.

RE-ENTRY/TRANSITION SEMINARS

REPORT ON THE WINGSPREAD COLLOQUIUM

by
Dr. Harriet L. Marsh

National Association for Foreign Student Affairs
1860 - 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Institutions of higher education in the United States have long been concerned for the adjustment of entrants into the life of these institutions. Extensive and sometimes involved "orientation programs" are arranged, more or less effectively introducing newcomers to university life. Recognizing the particular needs of students from other cultures, special efforts are made by some institutions to provide an introduction to American culture and education as well as to the institution itself. In order to aid schools in designing such programs, the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA) has one section of its Guidelines dealing with "Initial Orientation of Foreign Students." In the introduction, this publication notes two things: (1) "From the moment that the institution accepts a foreign student, it assumes... responsibility" for preparing the student to "function effectively, comfortably, and with reasonable success..." and (2) "the newly arrived foreign student should have...long-term, continuous orientation."[1]

But how "long-term, continuous" should this orientation be? How far does the institution's responsibility for the "effective functioning" of the student extend? Does it relate to what he does when he returns home, making the transition from his education in the United States to his professional responsibilities in his home country?

Only in comparatively recent years have there been expressions of concern about the product of American higher education when students return to their home countries to put into practice what they hopefully have learned during their heavy investments of time, money, and - what is more difficult to label or measure - "adjustment energy." Students and trainees sponsored by the United States government have undergone "debriefings" and a few institutions and organizations have sponsored what have been most commonly known as pre-departure activities (e.g., Michigan State University in cooperation with the Agency for International Development, the Institute of International Education, and the Mohonk Consultations). Little information about the existence and content of transition programs has been broadly organized and disseminated, however.

It was to find out about "where we are" and "where we ought to be going" that a re-entry - transition workshop was convened by The Academic Affairs Conference of Midwestern Universities in cooperation with the AID/NAFSA Liaison Committee and the Johnson Foundation at the Foundation's conference center, Wingspread, October 15-17, 1974. The conference had as its stated purpose the development of "guidelines and recommendations for ways to assist foreign students in the United States to return and fulfill needed roles in their countries of origin."

Because the workshop group was dealing with a concept still undergoing definition, a variety of terms was used, reviewed, revised, discarded and sometimes re-used to describe the re-entry - transition process. As noted earlier, such programs had often been described as "pre-departure", but such a term applied more to the timing of programs rather than to their content or purpose. The word "transition" seemed to emerge as perhaps most descriptive of the experience and least limiting in application to a variety of programs. Dr. El-Ayouty's opening address gave added dimension to the re-entry idea by referring to it as a process of resumption, a reintegration of giving and receiving on the part of the returnee.

Three papers were prepared and sent in advance to conference participants: The Establishment of Re-entry/Transition Seminars for Overseas Sojourners by Richard Brislin, Research Associate, Culture Learning Institute of the East-West Center; Intercultural Adaptation: Resocialization versus Reacculturation? by Alfred Opubor, Associate Professor and Director of the African Studies Center for Michigan State University, and An Inventory of Transition Programs compiled by Frank Sehnert, formerly Foreign Student Adviser and currently a researcher in the area of transitional experiences, Southern Illinois University. All three writers attended the workshop. An opening address, "Re-entry and Reintegration," was given by Dr. Yassin El-Ayouty, Senior Political Affairs Officer of the United Nations and Adjunct Professor of African and Middle Eastern Studies at the State University of New York in Stony Brook. Following this, the remainder of the workshop consisted of discussion by six groups of about eight participants each, of three goals which had been set by the conference planning committee:

Goal I. Development of guidelines for the planning and implementation of national, regional, or institutional re-entry - transition conferences, seminars, or consultations for international students.

Goal II. Initiation of a coordinated national effort to stimulate, encourage and implement the development of re-entry - transition conferences in the United States.

Goal III. Identification of specific problems and needs within the transitional experiences of international students which warrant major attention (such as: transition curriculum, home country employment, post-transition relationships, institutional interest and support).

The report will discuss the deliberations and conclusions of these discussion groups, combining these with relevant excerpts from papers prepared for the conference as well as others presented as supplementary material. A summary of principal conference recommendations appears at the conclusion.

Re-entry: A Problem?

The concept of culture shock, which has been defined as personality maladjustment in reaction to temporarily unsuccessful attempts to adjust to new surroundings and people, has long been recognized. In an article written for Exchange, entitled "Can They Go Home Again?"[2], Dr. Brislin, with co-author H. Van Buren IV, points out that recent research suggests that a person who has been most successful in adjusting to a new culture may be the worst at readjusting to his old culture. Regardless of degree, many students returning home experience a sense of disorientation and strangeness - a kind of reverse culture shock. Dr. Opubor's conference paper referred to this as re-entry shock. Both works agree that such experiences have a two-fold cause: change in the home environment during the period of the individual's absence and change within the individual himself as a consequence of his stay abroad.

Some of the discussion groups expressed concern over using the term "problem" to refer to re-entry experiences, noting that some problems, so called, are normal for any move from role to role. The positive values of the adjustment process must be noted. Dr. El-Ayouty's address warned against regarding re-entry experiences as traumatic, pointing out that this attitude may be subtly paternalistic, based on both a false exaltation of foreign education and misconceptions of the resources of the "Third World."

With these precautions in mind, however, there was general agreement that some disorientation to home culture will very possibly take place and that there is therefore value in providing opportunity for what Janis has referred to as "the work of worrying,"[3] i.e., preparing for potentially stressful events. Whether or not students perceive the potential problems may be another question, however. Brislin's experience in conducting re-entry seminars at the East-West Center was that while many students feel a lack of need for a seminar before it occurs, they are convinced of its worth afterward. Previous participants have written letters following their return, indicating that content from the seminars have come back to them later when they have experienced problems.

An Inventory of Re-entry Problems

As a demonstration that students do indeed anticipate certain concerns about returning and to suggest the general nature of these, Dr. Nobleza Asuncion-Lande, one of the Wingspread participants, shared with the workshop an inventory originally developed by a group of foreign graduate students within six months of terminating their U.S. academic experience. [4]

Inventory of Re-entry Problems

1. Cultural adjustment
   a. Identity problem
   b. Insecurity
   c. Adjustment to changes in life style
   d. Adjustment to a pervasive quality of envy and distrust in interpersonal relations
   e. Adjustment to the localiteness (sic) of kin and friends
   f. Adjustment to a daily work routine
   g. Family or community pressure to conform
   h. No problem
   i. Other

2. Social adjustment
   a. Adjustments from individualism of U.S. life to familism (conformity and submission to the demands of family) in home country
   b. Colonial mentality
   c. Feelings of superiority due to international experience and travel
   d. Lack of amenities which were a part of U.S. existence
   e. Uncertainties in interpersonal relations
   f. Social alienation as a result of foreign sojourn
   g. Dissatisfaction with ritualized patterns of social interaction
   h. Frustration as a result of conflicting attitudes
   i. No problem
   j. Other

3. Linguistic barriers
   a. Adoption of verbal/non-verbal codes which are not familiar to countrymen
   b. Adoption of certain speech mannerism which may be misinterpreted by countrymen
   c. Absence of colleagues who speak the same code as returnee
   d. Unfamiliarity with new forms of communication or styles of expression
   e. No problem
   f. Other

4. National and political problems
   a. Changes in political conditions
   b. Shifts in national priorities/policies
   c. Shift in political views
   d. Political climate not conducive to professional activity
   e. Political climate not conducive to professional advancement
   f. Dissatisfaction with political situation
   g. Observed lack of national goals
   h. Politicization of office or colleagues
   i. Changes in bureaucratic leadership
   j. No problem
   k. Other

5. Educational problems
   a. Inability to reconcile aspects of U.S. education to education in home country
   b. Relevance of education to home situation
   c. Fulfillment of objectives in coming to U.S.
   d. Aspects of U.S. education which are least helpful to returnee
   e. Lack of facilities and resources for research
   f. Wrong expectations
   g. Failure to improve skills
   h. Absence of professional education programs to keep up with new developments or knowledge
   i. No problem
   j. Other

6. Professional problems
   a. Inability to work in chosen specialty
   b. Placement in inappropriate field
   c. Facing a glutted job market
   d. Scientific terminology in U.S. studies which are not subject to adequate translation into the native language
   e. Inability to communicate what was learned
   f. Resistance to change by co-workers
   g. Feeling of superiority due to U.S. training
   h. Non-recognition of U.S. degree
   i. Jealousy of colleagues
   j. Low compensation
   k. High expectations
   l. Isolation from academic and scientific developments in U.S. or in own field
   m. Perceived lack of enthusiasm and/or commitment among co-workers
   n. Concern with quick material success
   o. No problem
   p. Other

The workshop groups felt that Asuncion-Lande's inventory encompassed most of the academic, professional, social, and cultural areas of potential problems. Both El-Ayouty's address and Opubor's paper noted subtle aspects of both problems and their solutions relating to these specific problem areas. Both men called into question the assumption that foreign students would "automatically" serve as change agents upon their return. As Opubor noted, the student may have been specifically sent to acquire specific skills and therefore if he is "encouraged to perceive himself as an initiator of policy, then he is bound to be disappointed, he is bound to experience role shock, and the consequent re-entry shock" which such a discrepancy in perceptions will bring. El-Ayouty, in commenting on the false assumption of instant leadership, pointed out that the newly arrived individual, whether he is native or foreign, is looked upon by society as a "receiver" rather than a "donor."

Opabor's paper went so far as to suggest the inevitability that the foreign student will be "something of a deviant" in both host and home cultures. He concluded: "The most edifying choice for the individual, and the goal of all constructive strategy, is how to make the individual a responsible deviant."

Preparation for Re-entry: A Continuing Process

Perhaps no single idea was emphasized by the workshop groups more strongly than that re-entry transition cannot be thought of merely in terms of the termination of students' academic experiences. It is a continuing process. Dr. El-Ayouty suggested that it starts even so early as the application for admission to the institution. More than one of the discussion groups thought it should be considered as beginning with the choice of the school itself. The suggestion was made that an "itinerant seminar" of educational planners from the United States (host country) visit sending countries in order to explore bases for selection of students, to help train in methods of selection, and to establish contacts for continuing communication. Such a group might also help to clarify, for governments and counseling centers abroad, understanding of higher education in the United States. On the individual institutional level, it was thought to be vital that prospective students be given as detailed a picture as possible of what that institution offers in course work and training.

Once the student from overseas has been accepted and begins what should be a carefully chosen study program, two areas of his experience call for particular attention. One of these is outside his academic program; it is the ensuring of maximum contact with his home country through consulates, U.N. missions, trade or cultural groups, etc. It is obvious that the sending country, perhaps stimulated by either the individual or the host institution, must assume the responsibility for this area. In situations where students from a country are located in geographically far-flung institutions, this requires more deliberate planning than in major metropolitan centers. Such agents may serve the dual purposes of maintaining a sense of reality about the student's role upon his return and serving as a culture link for values which may be lost too easily in the process of so-called adjustment to U.S. society. That link with home may be enhanced, suggested El-Ayouty, if the student, early in his stay, is made to feel a sense of personal responsibility for contributions to his home country based on educational experience.

The second of these areas of special concern is the relevance of the program of studies to the role the student is expected to fill when he returns home. Clearly, tailor-making all programs to individual needs, particularly in large schools or departments, is not a realistic expectation. To the extent that faculty advisers or individual professors can gear aspects of course work or perhaps thesis topics or research projects to the anticipated vocational role, the

student may begin here to prepare for his responsibilities. Such a willingness on the part of faculty members is more likely in those who themselves have worked, studied or taught overseas, but their active involvement in programs dealing with re-entry - transition may also give them insight. Perhaps also through guidance regarding the practical training experience, the student may be aided in exploring manpower needs and the consequent job market at home. In any case, academic adviser, foreign student adviser, or both, must help the student extract principles of utility from the educational experience, or, in El-Ayouty's words, to transform knowledge into transmittable skills. After all, as one group noted and as was vividly illustrated by Dr. El-Ayouty in the case of a physician who did not have access to some of the complex and sophisticated equipment found in some urban U.S. hospitals, the returnee quite possibly will have to adapt what he has learned to whatever resources may be available locally.

The workshop groups discussed programs of varying length and content which might be held either on campuses or in regional centers, with the former preferred because local programs could be more specific and relevant. A later section of this report deals with some guidelines for such programs. It was emphasized by the discussion groups that preparation for such programs must of necessity identify both the "felt needs" of current students and the actual concerns experienced by those who had already returned home. Another important consideration before embarking on specific plans is the question of whether the potential participants are sponsored or non-sponsored. It was felt that the needs of the former group might be much more specific, while the latter might have a far broader spectrum of concerns, particularly in vocational areas.

Consideration was given to transition seminars which would be held during the semester prior to departure and given course credit. Apart from noting that an outstanding advantage to this approach would be the motivational factor (as well as adding an element of academic respectability), the workshop participants felt that this could not be considered in any detail since it was so clearly a question of local institutional policy. Brislin's paper commented on the advantages of formal credit: "Students can easily adopt the view that since the seminar is not listed as an established entity in the college catalogue, then it should be considered as a second-class opportunity." He suggested that such a seminar might be offered through a given department, such as psychology, sociology, education or anthropology, in the form of directed readings, research or independent study. In order to gain administrative approval and support, seminars would have to be "designed around solid, academic content."

Content of Transition Seminars

What of content for seminars, beyond the obvious necessity of making certain that they are related to actual and felt needs of returnees and the attempt to build them around relevant and legitimate

academic content in order to offer credit? Although it was generally agreed by the discussion groups that broadly applicable specific content is difficult to recommend, some general areas may be suggested, which could then be modified on the basis of the expressed needs and specific characteristics of the participants (e.g. level and field of study, sponsorship). Brislin's article in Exchange [5] suggests some general areas of concern. These are (1) family and personal relationships in returning home; (2) issues which would be problematic over a short, rather than a long, period of time, such as readjustment to certain customs; (3) problems involved in returning to, or beginning, a job and relationships with professional colleagues; (4) difficulties arising out of return to non-western perspectives on life. The East-West Center seminar about which Brislin was writing makes use of role-playing techniques. Both he and one of the workshop groups recommended the use, in transition seminars, of case studies from actual experiences of returnees.

A guiding principle for content, as well as reason for establishment, of transition seminars is, according to Brislin, the "work of worry" concept noted earlier. His pre-conference paper posits that "when people prepare for unpleasant, aversive events that could occur in the future, the impact of those aversive events is much less severe than if the people did not prepare. The preparation can take the form of thinking through (or role-playing) what might happen in the future. Such a procedure forces the individual to gather new information, to plan for different courses of action contingent upon various aspects of the future event..."

Another discussion group suggested some rather specific content which would be of universal concern - the process of job application. This would involve information about national needs, how to apply what has been learned to those needs, and how to communicate his capacities to the returnee's potential employers.

One of the suggestions made by a group regarding possible content was that seminars might be arranged either by, or in cooperation with, a professional organization, along the lines of a specific field of study. This obviously would not be a local program but might draw together from various parts of the United States graduate students near the end of their study program. Such a group could discuss topics of common professional interest together with implications for transition. One workshop participant - a faculty member in the field - cited international economics as a possible topic in this category.

A way of determining content for transition is to look at the objective in terms of desired results in the characteristics of returnees. In an article appearing in Topics of Culture Learning,[6] Stephen Bochner theorized that overseas sojourners become more open and broad-minded as a result of their experience. He suggested the concept of "mediating men", referring to people who are able to provide a link between cultures since they understand their own and the one in which they have lived. In an area in which "globality"

on the part of at least some in our population seems highly desirable, if not indeed essential, this might well be a goal in transition seminar planning.

In 1957, the late Donald Tewksbury, who was Professor of International Education at Teachers College, Columbia University, listed what he saw as the "Characteristics of a Mature International Person." Despite the obvious alteration in the circumstances surrounding certain items (e.g. number 14) and the somewhat dated nature of some of the terminology, much of his description seemed currently relevant to many of the workshop participants. Dr. Tewksbury's list of characteristics describe the mature international person as one who:

1. Has deep, active, and successful roots in one's own culture
2. Has examined objectively the strengths and weaknesses of his own culture
3. Is eager to consider seriously what other peoples think of his culture
4. Is not too sensitive about criticism of his own culture
5. Is able, in traveling, to identify with other peoples and to listen and learn from them
6. Is not afflicted with a "plumbing complex" toward people in technologically underdeveloped countries
7. Has experienced and passed beyond the stage of "culture shock" in relation to cultures that differ sharply from his own
8. Has personal and friendly relations with a number of persons from other countries on a long-term basis
9. Has international friends in one's own specialized profession or occupation
10. One with whom persons from other countries can be frank and in whom they may have confidence
11. Can discuss other cultures without bringing in name-calling, stereotyping, and extreme categorization
12. Has found "multiple securities" in many countries as well as a primary security in one's own country
13. Is actively concerned with promoting the exchange of contributions between one's own and other countries

14. Is able to discuss the Soviet Union and Communist China calmly

15. Is thoroughly familiar with and actively supports the United Nations and its specialized agencies

16. Is an active member of at least one of the thousand private international organizations at work in the world

17. Has examined his own motivations for being international-minded, and also the nature of his internationalism

18. Has an elementary familiarity with the family of languages and sees his own language as one member of this family

19. Does not wish to make over other people and cultures in his own image

20. Can for the moment become another person and enter empathetically into the thoughts and feelings of other people

21. Finds it natural and satisfying to live as a member of the "family of man" because he has experienced the common bonds that unite people of different cultures.

From all of the above comments, it is clear that whether content is general or specific and whatever may be the outcome of the seminars, the process of planning for them must be the work of more than one individual, department or agency. Input regarding content must come from many sources. The workshop emphasized, as has been noted, the importance of students themselves in identifying needs. Case histories, as stated, would be drawn from the reported experiences of returnees. In an earlier section, the vital role both students and the home government play in maintaining contact was also emphasized. To highlight and reinforce the importance of alumni, one group recommended the development of systematic programs among returnees which would specifically assist transition program planners in learning about needs which have been experienced. The recommendation further encouraged continuing contact with the university and with university personnel traveling abroad. Faculty and staff working or traveling overseas might be able to interview returnees regarding their adjustment at home.

Another source for adding to program content may be the newly-arrived foreign student. Brislin's paper suggested that "if there is overlap between the time periods" when seminars for both the new and the departing students are held, "there can be joint sessions. The incoming students can explain to the returnees how things are back home, what changes have taken place, what the political situation is like, and so forth... On the other hand, the returnees can provide the incoming students with valuable information, lessons learned from 'war stories,' places to frequent and places to avoid, names of helpful people, advice on academic coursework, and so forth." The East-West Center, the University of Texas and the University of Kansas have planned initial orientation

and transition programs to overlap in such a way as to provide for this sharing opportunity.

Several groups reiterated the importance of involving sponsors of students in both the planning of transition programs and their evaluative follow-up. Sponsoring agencies may, for their own purposes, maintain contact with returnees who have been under their auspices. These contacts could be used in cooperation with regional or campus planners to feed in program suggestions based on the returnees' experiences after some period of time at home.

To know what is needed and to evaluate what has been done are perhaps most critical in planning content in transition seminars. In order to accomplish these ends, two further specific - and probably inter-related - recommendations were made by discussion groups. One was that an information network for re-entry/transition programs be formed in order to share processes of program development, innovations, evaluations, and sample programs.

A second recommendation, which perhaps formalizes or structures the first, is that a national clearinghouse be established for the purpose of sharing information on ongoing re-entry/transition programs and their impact. It was felt that this latter project might be most effectively carried out through the organizational connections of NAFSA.

Some Details of Program Planning

Although content is central to any transition program, the effective conveying of that content is critically affected by numerous details which require attention. Brislin's conference paper dealt with many of these, based on his East-West Center experience, and the workshop groups discussed both these and others which seemed important.

The very planning group itself should receive careful attention. Brislin suggested that it be composed of no more than five people for the obvious reason that more will only multiply the potential disagreements on procedure. While keeping this possible result in mind, it is, however, important that several elements of the population be involved in the planning, if only by solicitation of ideas through questionnaires or consultation. Some examples of these may be: student participants, faculty, administration, home and host governments, sponsoring agencies, service groups (e.g. Rotary), multinational corporations (who represent potential employers), and other possible funding sources such as professional organizations or U.S. government agencies. Those who actually serve on the committee may derive a particular benefit from their process of planning together, so they may wish to go off the campus (if this involves a single institution's program) for a day or two in order to develop themselves as a group.

Brislin's paper commented on the implications of the fact that a seminar has to compete with many other activities in which students might

engage before going home. The timing of transition seminars is critical, since the motivation of a sense of need is lacking if the program is held too early and minds are distracted by immediate necessities if the seminar is too close to actual departure time. For maximum impact, Brislin continued, a one-to three-day seminar should probably be held within three months of departure time. The East-West Center has found it worth the cost, in order to achieve optimal attendance, to budget three extra days for its grantees to attend a seminar right after final examinations. Thus the pressure of academic responsibilities is off and the final flurry of activity has not yet begun. The workshop discussion groups, in their considerations, reinforced this idea regarding timing.

How long should a seminar be? There was general consensus that length would vary according to content, timing, location, and the nature of the participants. A general rule-of-thumb might be the one-to three-day period suggested above. Some, however, thought a three to five-day period would be better suited to the "work-of-worry" process, in order to allow for the dynamics of the group to develop.

In answer to the question of where seminars might best be held, there was again general agreement that, in the case of individual institutional programs, they should be held at some off-campus location. Brislin pointed out that without such a removal from campus, "the situational pressures of invitations from non-returnee friends, need to go to the drugstore for a tube of toothpaste, and competition from television take their toll on session attendance." Such defections not only detract from the seminar itself but the entire group is affected.

Another possibility relating both to location and timing was suggested by one of the groups. It would have the additional advantage of lowering the cost factor. This was the idea that already existent transition programs be strengthened and used as stopovers en route home by carefully screened returnees from institutions throughout the country. For example, the East-West Center would accept students returning to Asia and the University of Texas program might be expanded to include those headed for Central and South America. There would need to be considerable planning for and coordination of such efforts but this would call again for a "national clearinghouse" or network referred to on page 11.

An alternative to individual institutional programs which would again affect cost would be the use of current colloquial arrangements among several institutions in a metropolitan center. Such a regionally-based program might, in addition to conserving money and personnel, allow for greater flexibility of groupings in the seminar (along the lines of, e.g. originating country or area of the world, professional field, sponsorship, etc.).

The question of structured (i.e. pre-planned) vs. non-structured programs was raised. There seemed to be agreement that some combination of approach would be most ideal. Brislin's experience suggested that it is important not to tell participants about what problems they will have (which would be presumptuous, anyhow), but instead to present material examining the range of possibilities that people moving between cultures might encounter. The East-West Center also has added a session, which is designed for each seminar by the participants themselves, which has little structure. Such a session has multiple advantages. It actively involves the participants and thus enhances their commitment to the seminar. It should help to ensure current relevance. Planning a session can be a useful experience and may help the planners to consider some of the transition issues while going through the planning process. Finally, it can give an air of "relaxation" in the midst of whatever structure may have been given to the seminar.

There are some physical details which need to be taken into consideration in planning. Brislin illustrated some of these and rightfully pointed out that failure in any one could be a "deterrent to successful completion of otherwise well thought out programs." Transportation, housing, and food all need to be carefully planned and constantly monitored if participants are to be as free as possible to get maximum value from the "higher things" of the seminar.

Evaluation and Follow-up

The report has repeatedly commented on the need for making certain that in the establishment of re-entry/transition programs we are being realistic and not setting up "strawman" problems. There is the immediate task of evaluating individual transition programs, in which the participants provide the major "feedback." This must be done with some delicacy, since it is too easy for those asked to evaluate to feel they are somehow the subjects for an experiment. This feeling may be largely dissipated by explaining that the comments made will be used to make improvements in future seminars and that, indeed, the present program is in part the result of earlier cirticism. It may be well to provide opportunity for both specific evaluation (e.g. the request to rate individual sessions or the whole seminar along scales of usefulness or importance) and open-ended comment.

The role that returnees play in this evaluative process has already been noted. Not only may alumni be sent questionnaires or be interviewed by university personnel traveling overseas, but they might be called together in a follow-up conference, in situations where it might be economically and geographically practical. Local government officials, especially those responsible for education and manpower needs, could participate and, by so doing, not only contribute useful information and guidance but in the process receive some subtle training for future selection of students to study in the United States.

The whole subject of evaluative follow-up could be undertaken as a research project, especially by a returnee trained in social science fields. One of the discussion groups called for some major research efforts to determine what happens to individuals in inter-cultural movement in roles and in organizational settings. Research should deal not only with the experiences on first re-entering the home country but longitudinally to see what happens over a period of time. Opubor's paper made the observation that in reaching judgements about his American experience, the student needs to see how the "particular historical circumstances of the United States have led to the creation of the American way of life and American successes and failures." It is likewise vital that the returnee use a similar historical framework for making the inevitable comparisons with his own society. This is a process which takes time and may not allow an early evaluation of his study experience in the United States. Asuncion-Lande, in recognition of this fact, sent her problem inventory to participants in one of her seminars six months later for their comments, indicating the changes in their perspectives which had taken place after being home for some time.

AID, in its follow-up of grantees, takes cognizance of a basic educational principle, that learning is demonstrated by behavior change. Thus AID, through its overseas personnel, looks at productive, observable, change or what we might call "on-the-job performance." While this type of observation would be impracticable for most institutions or agencies, it does point up the importance of some objective data on the returnee's experience. This could perhaps be obtained from employer or colleague by either correspondence or interview carried out by university/agency personnel who may be in the area.

SUMMARY: Where Do We Go from Here?

It was obvious to the workshop participants that they were dealing with a subject of major concern that was, except for some of the transition activities referred to in this report, new territory to be explored. The need should be obvious and the possibilities for doing something about the need seem limitless. The recommendations of the workshop groups offer some beginning directions, but hopefully the report will spur the reader to creative thinking about still further possibilities. If a national clearinghouse, referred to earlier, is established, such new ideas might be shared with all who are interested. Attention to the relevance of students' academic experience and preparation for the application of that experience is vital if we are concerned about the value of U.S. education to foreign students.

Although it would be neat and helpful to conclude this report with a recommended model of re-entry - transition programs, it would be premature at this stage of our communication and understanding. Thus a first step in providing specific guidelines for the establishment of transition programs was recommended at the workshop.

Representatives of some of the principal ongoing transition programs should be brought together for the specific purpose of developing the content and format, including teaching suggestions, for a three-day, five-day, or week-end seminar dealing with the phenomenon of transition from the role of student in the United States to that of professional in his home country. In addition to all the thoughts and suggestions of the Wingspread discussion groups, this planning group should take into consideration the following: (1) seminars should be held at on-campus locations; (2) the plans should include recommendations for implementation and evaluation. It was further recommended that the work of this planning group be made widely available.

Other conference recommendations related to publishing and distributing efforts, too. It was felt that the Wingspread conference report itself should receive wide distribution to academic and professional organizations and to the publications of these groups. The work of the planning group referred to above might lead to its inclusion in the NAFSA Field Service's Consultant's Manual, to aid and encourage Field Service consultants in obtaining information on presently existing programs and perhaps to stimulate thinking about establishing new ones.

Because there are comparatively few university and agency personnel with expertise in the area of re-entry/transition programs, the NAFSA Field Service might be asked to make use of some who have had experience to serve as consultants to institutions interested in establishing transition programs. In another approach to sharing what wisdom there is in the field, representatives of interested institutions would be enabled to secure in-service training grants from the Field Service in order to visit one or more of the ongoing programs.

Conferences have long been a means of sharing professional information and several of the discussion groups recommended that a topic on transition be included in national conferences of relevant professional organizations. NAFSA or the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO) might include the subject in their programs. After further development, this subject could serve as the theme or central work project of NAFSA regional conferences.

To be effective, the Wingspread conferees agreed, the efforts of this workshop could be only a beginning, a stimulation to further exploration and planning and, as this section has outlined, some very specific action. To know where we are in the field of transition programming, to give careful consideration to some of the vital planning factors as outlined in this report, and to take active steps to inform and plan - these will be the proof of the value of the workshop.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Bring together representatives of some of the current transition-type programs to develop the content and format of transition seminars of varying lengths. Distribute the results of the work of this group as widely as possible.

2. Establish a national clearinghouse for sharing information about ongoing re-entry - transition programs, their impact, and innovative program ideas.

3. Add "re-entry - transition" as a topic to NAFSA Field Service Consultant's Manual. The Field Service should make use of some of the few current transition program specialists as consultants.

4. Provide Field Service training grants and workshop funds to stimulate interest in re-entry - transition programs.

5. Encourage professional organizations to establish re-entry - transition programs bringing together students of similar disciplines toward the end of their study period.

6. Develop contacts among alumni to assist transition program planners in learning needs of returnees, perhaps in part through university personnel traveling overseas.

7. Accumulate series of case histories of the re-entry process and problems for use in planning and workshop sessions.

8. Create an "Itinerant Seminar" of educational planners to visit sending countries in order to visit regional educational centers, establish contacts between sending and receiving nations and help to train in methods of selection of students.

9. Use the topic of re-entry - transition programs in regional and national conferences of NAFSA and other organizations in the field of higher education.

APPENDIX A

FOOTNOTES

1. "Initial Orientation of Foreign Students," Guidelines, National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (Washington, D.C., 1966) p. 1.

2. Richard W. Brislin and H. Van Buren IV, "Can they Go Home Again?", Exchange, IX (Spring, 1974), p. 20.

3. I. Janis, Psychological Stress, John Wiley (New York, 1958).

4. The original inventory was compiled by a group of Mutual Educational Exchange Program grantees participating in a week-end workshop at the University of Texas-Austin in August, 1973. That workshop was called the Janus Project. Dr. Asuncion-Lande amplified the inventory for a similar program held at the University of Kansas in August, 1974. Both activities were conducted as a part of the orientation program for incoming Mutual Educational Exchange grantees which was arranged by I.I.E.

5. Brislin and Van Buren, loc. cit.

6. Stephen Bochner, "The Mediating Man and Cultural Diversity," Topics in Culture Learning, East-West Culture Institute (Honolulu, 1973), pp. 23-37.

APPENDIX B

BIBLIOGRAPHY*

Bochner, Stephen — "The Mediating Man and Cultural Diversity," Topics in Culture Learning, East-West Culture Institute (Honolulu, 1973), pp. 23 - 37.

Brislin, Richard W. — "The Establishment of Re-entry/Transition Seminars for Overseas Sojourners." Paper prepared for the Re-entry/Transition Workshop at Wingspread, October 15 - 17, 1974.

Brislin, Richard W. and Van Buren, H. IV. — "Can They Go Home Again?", Exchange, IX (Spring 1974), pp. 19 - 24.

"Initial Orientation of Foreign Students," Guidelines, National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (Washington, D.C., 1966).

Janis, I. — Psychological Stress. New York: John Wiley, 1958.

Opubor, Alfred E. — "Intercultural Adaptation: Resocialization versus Reacculturation?" Paper prepared for the Re-entry/Transition Workshop at Wingspread, October 15 - 17, 1974.

Sehnert, Frank H. — "An Inventory of Transition Programs." Paper prepared for the Re-entry/Transition Workshop at Wingspread, October 15 - 17, 1974.

*This bibliography includes only those references used in the report. A more extensive list of references dealing with the re-entry-transition process is planned for the future.

APPENDIX C

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Marja Lee Backes
Administrative Assistant
Academic Affairs Conference of
Midwestern Universities
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, Indiana 47809

DeWitt Baldwin
International Director
The Lisle Fellowship, Inc.
511 Meadow Call Drive
Rockville, Maryland 20851

Marvin Baron
Associate Foreign Student Adviser
International House
University of California
Berkeley, California 94702

Diane Beitz
Department of Speech
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Karen Bove
Institute of International Education
65 East Water Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601

Cameron F. Bremseth
Assistant Director for Program
Office of International Training
Agency for International Development
(SA-5) Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20523

William J. Brisk
Latin American Scholarship Program
for American Universities
25 Mount Auburn Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Richard Brislin
Research Associate
The East-West Center
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

Mary O. Chance
Associate Director
National Association for Foreign
Student Affairs
1860 - 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009

Clifford Clarke
Bechtel International Center
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

Eugene L. Clubine
Coordinator
Office of International Education
Services
E.O. Building
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa 50010

Mrs. John W. Colby
Spokane International Exchange
Council
South 1724 Lincoln Street
Spokane, Washington 99203

Stephen L. Duffy
Foreign Student Adviser
St. Louis University
St. Louis, Missouri 63103

Stephen Dunnett
Director, Intensive English Language
Institute
State University of New York
212 Townsend Hall
Buffalo, New York 14214

Yassin El-Ayouty
Senior Political Affairs Officer
United Nations - New York
Adjunct Professor
African and Middle Eastern Studies
State University of New York
Stony Brook, New York 11790

Maxwell Epstein
Dean of International Students
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

Homer Higbee
Assistant Dean
International Studies and Programs
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

David S. Hoopes
Executive Director
Intercultural Communication Network
4401 Fifth Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Leonard P. Iaquinta
Associate Director
World Studies Data Bank
Academy of Educational Development
680 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10019

John K. Johnson
Director
Graduate Admissions
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky 40506

Bryant E. Kearl
Executive Director
Asia Office
Agricultural Development Council, Inc.
Tanglin, P.O. Box 84
Singapore, 10

Joan Kertis
Head
Division of Special Courses
Institute of International Education
809 United Nations Plaza
New York, New York 10017

Robert G. Knudsen
International Studies
California State University at Fresno
Fresno, California 93700

Nobleza Asuncion-Lande
Department of Speech and Drama
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas 66044

Josephine Leo
Director
Office of International Educational Services
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20742

Harriet Marsh
Director of Resident Affairs
International House
500 Riverside Drive
New York, New York 10027

Helen McNaulty
Director
Latin American Studies
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Robert T. Moran
Assistant Professor
International Student Adviser
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Joe Neal
Director of International Office
University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712

Alfred Opubor
Director
African Studies Center
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

Wyn Owen
Director
Economics Institute
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado 80302

James H. Ringer
Associate Dean and Foreign Student Adviser
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, Indiana 47809

Kenneth A. Rogers
Director
International Office
Washington University
St. Louis, Missouri 63130

Frank H. Sehnert
Adviser, International Student Services Division
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois 62901

Ernst M. Sinauer
Director
International Training Institute
1356 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

A. Keith Smiley
The Mohonk Trust
New Paltz, New York 10017

Philip I. Sperling
University Relations
Agency for International Development
Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20523

Mary Ann Spreckelmeyer
Chief, Foreign Student Programs
Office of Youth, Student and Special Programs
Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs
Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20520

John B. Stabler
Chairman
Indiana Consortium of International Education
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, Indiana 47809

George Stebbins
Director
International Student Services
The Catholic University of America
Washington, D.C. 20017

Richard M. Thomas
Director
Community Development
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois 62901

Jose E. Vinas
GPO Box 1755
San Juan, Puerto Rico 00936

Harold E. Walker
Executive Director
Academic Affairs Conference of Midwestern Universities
Professor
Department of Philosophy
California State University at Fresno
Fresno, California 93700

Jerry Wilcox
Assistant Director
International Student Office
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York 14850

James S. Worley
Director
Graduate Program in Economic Development
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, Tennessee 37203

Foreign Students

Ugur Aker
681 Merrick, #303
Detroit, Michigan 48202

Jan R. Dircks
International Student Office
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois 60115

Esko Kervinen
5867 Wilkins Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15217

Arvind Khilnani
E40-25
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Davy Perera
Department of Food Nutrition
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Mohammed Razi
1275 Elgenman Hall
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

Soenyunt Swe
Center for Aerial Photographic Studies
Civil Engineering Department
Holister Hall
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York 14850

Joseph Nana-Baa Wirdeu
185 Claremont Avenue
Apartment 2-C
New York, New York 10027

The Johnson Foundation Staff

Leslie Paffrath
President

Henry Halsted
Vice President - Program

Rita Goodman
Vice President - Area Programs

Eunice Moss
Program Associate

Kay Mauer
Conference Coordinator