

The Effects of Participation in a Foreign Specialists Seminar on Images of the Host Country and the Professional Field¹

Herbert C. Kelman
Department of
Psychology
The University
of Michigan

A Multi-National Communications Seminar for broadcasting specialists was subjected to an intensive evaluation study, designed to assess the effectiveness of the Seminar in achieving its goals. This paper reports data based on one of the procedures used: a detailed questionnaire, completed by the 28 participants and an appropriate comparison group in their own countries before the beginning of the Seminar and some nine months after its completion. The major finding is a significant increase among the participants—relative to the comparison group—in the complexity and differentiation of their images of America and of American broadcasting. This increase seems clearly attributable to their American experience.

In the summer of 1962 the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs sponsored a Seminar at Brandeis University for broadcasting specialists from 16 countries. Built into the design was a plan for a thorough evaluation of the Seminar. A description of the Seminar and of the evaluation study can be found in an earlier report.²

Briefly, the Seminar included 28 participants from differ-

¹I should like to express my appreciation to the members of my research staff who participated in the development, administration, coding, and analysis of the questionnaire on which most of the data reported here are based: Reuben Baron, John M. Darley, Catherine Hoch, Rose Kelman, Allan Levett, and Victoria Steinitz; to the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs for their financial support and to Kenneth Cooper, the Bureau's former Chief of Research Programs, for his help and encouragement; to Louis G. Cowan, Director, and Henry Morgenthau, III, Associate Director of the Communication Research Center at Brandeis University, for their continuing interest and help; and to the Seminar participants and particularly to the members of the comparison group, who twice graciously consented to complete lengthy questionnaires.

²Kelman, H. C. (with the assistance of Victoria Steinitz). The reactions of participants in a foreign specialists seminar to their American experience. *J. Soc. Issues* 1963, 19, (3), 61-114.

ent parts of the world and variously involved in radio and television. The participants spent about two months at Brandeis University, taking part in professional and academic seminars, and about two months in travel.

The study was designed to obtain evidence on the effectiveness of the Seminar in achieving its goals. On the basis of these findings, it should be possible to come up with recommendations for improving future seminars and international educational and cultural exchanges. Four procedures were used: (1) Intensive interviews with participants; (2) Observations of the Seminar in progress; (3) Before- and after-questionnaires to participants and a comparison group; (4) Follow-up interviews (in the summer of 1963) with participants and the comparison group. The present report is based on the third of these procedures.

**Procedure of
the Questionnaire
Study**

A "Questionnaire for Specialists in Broadcasting" was developed, including several pre-coded questions (in which respondents selected one of a number of answer-choices). Most of the questions, however, required the respondent to reply in his own words. The questionnaire covered four substantive areas: (1) Views of American broadcasting; (2) Views of America and Americans in general; (3) Views of broadcasting in the respondent's own country; and (4) Views of the respondent's own professional role.

*Rationale and
Purpose of the
Questionnaire*

The Seminar's aim, among other things, was enhancing the participants' professional work and at providing firsthand knowledge of American mass media as well as of American life in general. One would expect some changes in images of and attitudes toward their professional field and their own professional roles. Similarly, one would expect some changes in images of and attitudes toward America, particularly American broadcasting media.

A large proportion of the questions dealt specifically with American broadcasting—its functions, contributions, and problems. Even those questions that focused on America and Americans in general were linked, insofar as possible, to the respondents' professional concerns with the mass media. For example, to tap the aspects of the United States that the respondent considered important, we asked: (a) Do

you think the mass media in your country provide adequate information about the United States?; (b) In what ways do you think the coverage might be extended?

It seemed reasonable to expect changes in this area of professional concern. It was also felt that questions clearly related to professional concerns would be more acceptable—less defense-arousing—than questions that focus directly on attitudes toward America.

Despite the emphasis on broadcasting, the questionnaire does provide information about the respondents' views of America in general. One pair of questions explores the respondent's perception of what impressions Americans have of his country—a highly salient dimension in a visitor's evaluation of his hosts.

In assessing images and attitudes, our primary interest is not at all in the degree to which these images and attitudes become more *favorable* as a result of the American experience. There is no particular reason to expect that a sojourn in a foreign country, even under the best of circumstances, will produce an increase in over-all favorableness toward that country, though attitudes may well become warmer and more personal. What is both realistic and desirable, as an outcome, are qualitative changes in the cognitive structure of images of the host country. Thus, the organizers and sponsors of the present Seminar were particularly interested in the extent to which participants would gain a fuller, richer, more detailed, and more refined picture of American mass media and American society in general. A global undifferentiated positive attitude would be as antithetical to this type of orientation as a global undifferentiated negative attitude.

We made special efforts to capture the *complexity* and *differentiation* of images and attitudes, both in the formulation of questions and in the coding of responses. We did not ignore the dimension of favorableness toward America and American broadcasting, but we regarded it as of secondary importance. This approach to attitude measurement also has some methodological advantages. At best, the favorable-unfavorable dimension gives only a limited picture of a per-

son's attitude toward an object, which must be supplemented by assessment of the cognitive dimensions.

The questionnaire also explored the respondents' images of and attitudes toward their professional field. Included were questions about the broadcasting media in the respondent's own country—their roles in society, their specific functions, their contributions, and their problems. It was assumed that participation in the Seminar, exposure to American mass media, and exchange of ideas with colleagues from around the world might produce changes as to images. The participant might, for example, become aware of certain new possibilities, approaches, and problems in the development of broadcasting in his country. He may become more or less satisfied with the status of the media. He may develop a more complex and differentiated view of the role of broadcasting media. These were the kinds of changes the questionnaire was designed to tap.

The questionnaire also included items designed to explore the respondent's definition of his professional role, his assessment of the importance of different aspects of his job, his satisfactions and dissatisfactions with his professional life, and his hopes and expectations.

It can be assumed that an effective seminar would probably produce some changes in the participants' professional images—of their field and of their own roles. It is very difficult, however, to specify what form these changes ought to take. They are likely to be quite different for different individuals—depending on the person's professional position, on the level of development of broadcasting in his own country, and so on. Perhaps the only general statement that can be made is that the person ought to come away with a richer and more differentiated view of his professional field.

*Administration
of the
Questionnaire
to Participants*

The questionnaire was administered to the participants before their arrival in the United States and approximately nine months to a year after their return home. Completion of the second questionnaire thus gave us some assurance that we would be dealing with relatively stable changes.

The before-questionnaire was mailed to the participants in the spring of 1962, shortly after they had been notified of

their participation in the Seminar. Most participants completed and returned the questionnaire before their departure for the United States, and the remainder did so immediately after their arrival.

The after-questionnaire was mailed to the participants in the spring of 1963. The covering letter explained that a member of the research team would interview the participant during the summer. All participants completed both questionnaires by the fall of 1963.

*The
Comparison
Group*

One cannot be certain that the visit to America accounts for whatever changes the questionnaire reveals. Attitude changes might result from other intervening events: for example, changes in the individual's professional activities or in the field of broadcasting in his country or in the world situation. Even the image of America might undergo changes quite independently of the trip. This is particularly true for broadcasters who are likely to be exposed to much new information in the course of their regular activities. Thus, it was necessary to question a comparison or control group.

The selection of an appropriate comparison group is a difficult task. In the ideal research design, one would ask each participating country to nominate twice the number of candidates who can actually be invited. One would then select, on a random basis, half of the candidates for participation and half for the comparison group. Such a procedure is usually impossible. In the present study, this procedure was approximated for about half of the participating countries where *alternate* participants were nominated. These were then asked to become members of the comparison group. In countries where no alternates were nominated, we invited broadcasters whom the director of the Seminar considered as meeting all the criteria for participation to become members of the comparison group.

The first questionnaire was sent out in the spring of 1962 to 46 broadcasters in the 16 participating countries. Questionnaires were returned by 23. In the spring of 1963 the second questionnaire was mailed to the comparison group. Again the covering letter explained that a member of the

research team would interview the respondent and asked him to have his questionnaire ready at that time. All comparison-group members completed the second questionnaire. Two members of the comparison group, however, had visited the United States in the period intervening between the two questionnaires and therefore had to be omitted from the group. For seven of the participants we did not have a matching control. It can be said that the comparison group consisted of individuals who fully met the qualifications for participation in the Seminar.

*Interpretation of
Questionnaire
Results*

In interpreting the results of the questionnaire study, we must be aware of the limitations of these data. First, the comparison group is not only incomplete but also provides much less than a perfect match for the Seminar participants. Second, there were many gaps in respondents' answers, particularly to questions about America or American broadcasting. Third, some responses were very rich, others quite sparse. Some respondents had obvious difficulties in the use of English; others were unaccustomed to questionnaires.

At the same time, the questionnaire data make a unique contribution to the over-all design of the study. This is the only part of the study in which identical questions were presented before and after the Seminar and both to the participants and to the comparison group. The interviews (particularly the follow-up interviews) do provide data about change; for example, they are a rich source of information about the participants' own introspections. However, if we want to know whether participants' responses *to the same stimuli* in 1963 differed from their responses in 1962, and if we want to have some reassurance that differences that are manifested are not due to extraneous factors, we must turn to the questionnaire data.

The results of the questionnaire study will be presented in two parts: first, changes on an index of differentiation of America, which constitute our major findings; and then a review of other changes.

Image Differentiation Between America and Its Mass Media

Our major interest was in exploring changes in the cognitive structure of respondents' images of American broadcasting and America in general. It seemed to us reasonable

to expect that participation in a four-month Seminar would produce more complex and differentiated images of the host country. Moreover, such changes represent a significant criterion for evaluation of international exchange programs.

A preliminary inspection of our data revealed that it was indeed on this dimension that the most consistent changes seemed to occur. We thus decided to construct an over-all *index of change in differentiation of the image of America*. To do this, we used *all* of the codes or rating scales that were designed to capture the complexity and differentiation of the respondents' images of American broadcasting as well as images of America and Americans more generally.³ Since the two sets of codes tended to produce similar results, and since it can be assumed that for our respondents American broadcasting is a highly salient feature of American life in general, it seemed reasonable to combine the two and thus provide a more stable measure. In all, 15 codes entered into the index of differentiations.

Six open-ended questions were concerned with American broadcasting and with America and Americans in general:

4. Can you mention some of the experiences in the United States that may be particularly instructive to broadcasters in your country? (This may include experiences that you would want to adapt to your own situation as well as experiences that you would want to avoid.)
6. In what ways (if any) should the functions of television be different in your country from those in the United States?
7. What would *you* say are the most important problems facing *American* television today?
11. What impressions of your country do you think Americans have? That is, if a typical American were asked to describe your country, what characteristics would he be likely to mention?
12. Can you think of any groups of Americans whose impressions of your country differ from the ones you just described? In what ways do their impressions differ?

³Details about the coding and rating procedures used and their reliability can be found in the author's "Second Report to the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, U. S. Department of State, on the Multi-National Communications Seminar held at Brandeis University in 1962" (March 1964, dittoed).

15b. In what ways do you think the coverage [about the United States] might be extended [by the mass media in your country]? For example, what information might be included in a feature program about the United States?

Responses to each question were rated on a three-point scale for *range of response*. Ratings depended on the number of distinct points a respondent made in response to a given question. For example, if a respondent to question 4 mentioned just one distinct area, he received a rating of 1 (narrow range); if he mentioned two distinct areas, he received a rating of 2 (moderate range); and if he mentioned three or more areas, a rating of 3 (broad range). It was assumed that the broader the range of responses, the more differentiated the images.

Responses to the above six questions were also rated on a three-point scale for *depth of response*. These ratings required somewhat more subjective judgments as to the elaborateness of the response and the importance of the points mentioned. Elaborateness might range from a mere mention of a given area to a detailed exposition of it. Similarly, the areas mentioned could vary in importance (e.g., from the sponsorship of TV or the use of TV as a means of creating national unity to the type of lighting effects used or the use of canned versus live programs). This obviously calls for subjective judgments, but the consensus among the coders was high. The combination of the two criteria—elaborateness and importance—yielded one of three judgments: a rating of 1 (superficial coverage of content areas); a rating of 2 (moderately detailed and elaborate coverage); and a rating of 3 (very detailed and elaborate discussion). It was assumed that more detailed and elaborate responses to these questions would reflect more highly differentiated images.⁴

Answers to question 12 (see above) were also scored on a four-point scale in terms of the extent to which they indicate specific knowledge and differentiation of American

⁴Precautions were taken to assure that the ratings of range and depth would be reliable and relatively unaffected by obvious sources of rater bias.

society. They were based not only on the number of separate groups a respondent mentioned but also on the *nature* of these groups. Lower scores were assigned if a respondent mentioned only groups that could be assumed to have different impressions on strictly logical grounds independent of knowledge of American society. Mention of groups representing bases for the stratification of American society was taken as an indication of a relatively high degree of differentiation.

Another code was an over-all rating, on a four-point scale, of the respondent's degree of knowledgeable about the American scene. This rating was based on responses to questions 4, 7, 11, and 15b (see above). A rating of 1 represented responses given in abstract, oversimplified, stereotyped terms, showing little or no knowledge of America; while a rating of 4 represented responses given in specific, concrete, factual terms.

Finally, each respondent received a score for the extent to which he perceived differences between the United States and his own country in the pattern of activities involved in television. The scores were based on a comparison of responses to two pre-coded questions: how much each of 13 activities was involved in television in his own country, and how much in American television. The assumption was that a greater awareness of differences between the two systems reflects a more highly differentiated image of American TV.

For each of these 15 codes, we noted direction of change from the before- to the after-questionnaire. The number of positive changes minus the number of negative changes constitutes the respondent's score.

The mean score on this over-all index for the 27 participants on whom data were available was 2.56 (2.9 for the 20 with matching controls). The mean score for the 20 members of the comparison group on whom data were available was -.60. Thus, the participants do show an increase in differentiation. The controls, on the other hand, actually show a slight decrease on the average. In order to test the significance of this finding, we first examined the scores of each group separately. Of the 27 participants, 17 had positive

Table 1 Scores on the Index of Change in Differentiation in the Image of America for Individual Participants and Their Matching Controls from the Comparison Group

	<i>Participants</i>	<i>Controls N=20</i>
	8	8
	8	-8
	6	-2
Africa	5	-3
	0	-1
	0	-3
	-1	8
	9	6
	8	0
Asia	5	3
	4	3
	4	1
	2	-5
	1	0
	1	-5
	-1	-1
	2	0
Europe	0	-2
	0	-9
	-2	-2
Mean Score	2.9	-.60

scores (indicating an over-all increase in differentiation from before to after), five had scores of zero, and five had negative scores. By the sign-test (which is a very conservative statistical test), this pattern is significant at the .01 level of confidence. Of the 20 controls, only six had positive scores, three had zero scores, and 11 had negative scores. The trend here is obviously in the direction of negative change, though not significantly so.

The most relevant basis for evaluating these results is comparison between the participants and the control group. To apply the sign-test, we used only those 20 participants for whom we had individual controls. Table 1 presents 20 pairs of scores on our index. In all cases, the comparison group member is from the same country as the participant and is matched in terms of nature and level of professional position. In 16 of the 20 pairs the participant has a higher

score than his control; in three pairs the scores are identical; and in only one pair is the participant's score lower. This pattern of scores is statistically significant, by the sign-test, at better than the .01 level of confidence.⁵

In sum, the results suggest very clearly that the participants in the Seminar developed more complex and differentiated images of America and of American broadcasting. Results from the comparison group permit us to conclude that these changes in the participants were indeed caused by their experience in America.

**Additional Changes
in Attitude in
Various Areas**

A number of other findings also emerge. These must be viewed cautiously since they represent a relatively small number of systematic differences out of a large number of comparisons. Nevertheless, an examination of these findings can give us at least suggestive evidence about the nature of the changes produced.

*Views of
American
Broadcasting*

There are several indications that Seminar participants show a greater degree of reorganization in the content of their views of American broadcasting than do the members of the comparison group. First, responses as to types of activities reveal a tendency to conclude (on the after-questionnaire) that most potential TV activities do not receive so much emphasis in America as participants had thought and that these activities should receive more emphasis than they do. Second, participants show more over-all change in their views of American experiences which broadcasters in their own countries might either emulate or avoid. For example, on the question of commercial versus public ownership of stations and sponsorship of programs, 11 out of the 16 participants showed some change, as compared to two out of the 13 controls. More than half of these changes, incidentally, take the form of a *decreased* emphasis on need to avoid American experiences in ownership and control. It is unlikely that the observed change reflects a newly acquired

⁵ Results obtained with each of the 15 individual codes also point in the same direction. The mean change score of the participants is higher than that of the controls (i.e., indicative of a greater increase in differentiation of the image of America) in 12 cases, identical in one, and lower in two. This pattern is statistically significant by the sign-test at better than the .01 level of confidence.

preference for commercial broadcasting, but it probably does reflect the development of a less stereotyped image. Finally, in responding to a question about the most important problems facing American television, participants show an increase both in number of problem areas mentioned and of causes identified.

As to causes, we find the largest increase in the tendency by participants (in contrast to controls) to mention inadequate financial resources. This finding is interesting since it represents a change in a stereotype. Many participants had assumed that American television operates with unlimited financial resources.

These findings on abandoned stereotypes are consistent with the observed increase in complexity and differentiation of the image of America and American broadcasting. They may be related to the fact that the Seminar encouraged a more analytical approach to broadcasting, which may have led participants to rethink some general issues in the field.

Let us turn now to data bearing on *evaluation* of American broadcasting. Two indices were developed. The first is an index of change in the *respondent's evaluation of potential American contributions to his own broadcasting system*. To construct this index, a value of +1 was added to a respondent's score for each of the following: an increase in the number of areas in which he feels his own broadcasting system could benefit from American experiences; a decrease in the number of areas in which he feels American experiences should be avoided; and an increase in a rating by the coder of the over-all extent to which the respondent indicates that American experiences have a potential contribution to make to broadcasting in his own country. A value of -1 was added for a change in the opposite direction on each of these three codes. When participants are compared with controls on this index, we find a small but consistent difference: There is a definite trend for participants (as compared with controls) to become more positive (or less negative) in their evaluation of the potential contributions of American experiences.

The second index is essentially an index of change in the *respondent's satisfaction with American broadcasting*. This index is based on three items: (1) An over-all rating, by the coders, of the degree of favorableness of each respondent's general attitude toward American TV; (2) A rating by the respondent of how extensively American mass media cover information about his own country; and (3) A rating by the respondent of how accurately American mass media cover information about his own country. The last two codes call for an evaluation of how well American broadcasting (along with the other mass media) handles a specific task: coverage of information about each respondent's home country. This kind of evaluation represents not merely a professional judgment, but also a highly personal one. On each of the three satisfaction codes, the participants show greater change in the negative direction than do the controls, with the difference falling just short of statistical significance.

The findings, though not strong, suggest that the participants' evaluation of American broadcasting does not change along a single dimension. They tend to become somewhat less satisfied but, on the other hand, to become somewhat more inclined to see American broadcasting as a potential source of contributions to their own systems. There is no necessary contradiction between these two findings. As a visitor becomes more familiar with American broadcasting, he may find features with which he is not particularly satisfied, and his reactions may contain more critical comments than his earlier reactions. This would be particularly likely to happen with respect to matters about which he himself is very knowledgeable and in which he is personally involved. The decline in satisfaction may simply reflect a greater willingness to be critical now that he has had the opportunity to make personal observations. At the same time, increased familiarity may increase awareness of relevant procedures and approaches that might prove useful. In the evaluation of international exchange programs, one can easily draw the wrong conclusion about the effects of a program if one relies on a single measure of "favorableness."

*Views of
America and
Americans
in General*

A global increase in favorableness is not necessarily the most desirable outcome.

Analysis of the data on changes in the *content* of respondents' views of America did not produce any clear-cut results. On the other hand, data bearing on the *evaluative* dimension are very consistent in showing changes in the positive direction.

Attitudes toward Americans were inferred from responses to question 11 (see above), in which respondents were asked to guess how the typical American would describe their respective countries. Each respondent's views of Americans were rated on three five-point scales: the degree to which he sees Americans as well-informed and knowledgeable about his own country, as sympathetic to his own country, and as prepared to accept his country on equal terms. An index of change combining these three ratings was constructed by adding +1 to a respondent's score for each positive change (from before- to after-questionnaire) and -1 for each negative change. Participants show significantly more positive change on this index than do controls. We are justified in concluding, then, that on the whole the participants' evaluation of Americans (at least within the context presented by question 11) becomes relatively more favorable as a consequence of their American experience.

Coders were also asked to rate, on a five-point scale, the degree to which each respondent's general attitude toward the United States appeared to be favorable. When ratings based on the before-questionnaires are compared with ratings based on the after-questionnaires, we find that participants tend to change in the direction of a more favorable evaluation, while controls tend to change in the opposite direction. The difference between the two groups is not quite significant, but it does represent a strong trend.

Finally, there is also a nonsignificant tendency for participants to become relatively less satisfied with the adequacy of information about the United States provided by their own mass media. If we assume that, other things being equal, a respondent who is more favorably inclined toward America will be more critical of the information about

America presented by the mass media, then this finding lends further support to the conclusion that participants become relatively more favorable in their evaluation of America as a consequence of their participation in the Seminar.

In sum, our information seems to suggest that the participants' experience in America leads not only to more complex and differentiated images but also to a generally more favorable evaluation.

*Views of
Broadcasting
in the
Respondent's
Own Country*

As might be expected, the content of participants' views of broadcasting in their own countries undergoes less change than the content of their views of American broadcasting. There is, however, some indication that participants are more likely than controls to reexamine their own television systems and to conclude (on the after-questionnaires) that some of the potential TV activities do not receive so much emphasis in their own countries as they had thought. There is also a great tendency for participants to show an increase in the number of problem areas mentioned when they discuss the difficulties confronting their own television systems. Neither of these findings is statistically significant, though they suggest that participation in the Seminar may have stimulated a broader process of examination and analysis of *general* professional issues.

In their discussions of possible solutions to the problems faced by television in their own countries, participants show some interesting changes. They become more inclined to seek solutions in the wider social context (e.g., through national development in general and through an increase in capital) and less inclined to seek solutions in the internal operations of their broadcasting systems (e.g., through improving the quality of programs).

Data that have some bearing on respondents' evaluation of broadcasting in their own countries can be obtained from answers to question 3: "Can you mention some of the experiences in your country that may be particularly instructive to broadcasters in other countries?" Participants (as compared with controls) show a small decrease in the number of areas in which they feel other broadcasting systems would benefit from the experiences of their own coun-

tries. Similarly, participants (as compared with controls) show a decline on coder ratings of the over-all extent to which each respondent indicates that his own country has a potential contribution to make. Both of these findings fall short of statistical significance, but there does seem to be a consistent if small tendency for participants to lower their evaluation of the contributions that their own broadcasting systems might make to others.

It may be of interest to note that the greatest contrast between participants and controls is in the area of ownership and control of the broadcasting system. Controls tend to become somewhat more likely than participants to see this as an area in which other broadcasters can benefit from the experiences of their own countries. Participants become more likely than controls—in response to another question—to point to “too much government intervention or political interference” as a cause of problems faced by television in their own countries. There is no indication here of any major shift in attitude, but simply an indication that participants now see more pros and cons.

There is no evidence that they become generally more dissatisfied with their own broadcasting systems. Change scores on a coder rating of degree of favorableness of each respondent's general attitude toward his own TV system, for example, show no differences between participants and controls. Rather, it would seem, the participants become somewhat less *certain* of the advantages of their own systems. In particular, they may come to see that, while their own procedures may be ideally suited to their own circumstances, they may not be equally suited to the circumstances in other countries.

In sum, the pattern of changes in participants' views of broadcasting in their own countries suggests that the Seminar has stimulated a certain amount of new thinking. In part, this probably reflects a process of examination and analysis of *general* issues in broadcasting. In part, changes in participants' views probably resulted from the opportunity to compare their own systems with those of other countries, including the United States. There is no indication that par-

*Views of the
Respondent's
Own
Professional
Role*

ticipants become generally less satisfied with their own systems, but there is a definite indication that they become less certain of the contributions that their own systems can make to other countries. It would seem that they become more aware of the possibility of the relative advantages and disadvantages of different approaches.

There is no indication of any major redefinition of professional roles. There is some tendency, however, for participants to show more change than controls in their assessment of the importance of various activities that might be involved in their jobs. Respondents were asked to rate each of ten activities as very important, somewhat important, slightly important, or not important to their jobs. By comparing the ratings on the before-questionnaire with those on the after-questionnaire, we obtained a measure of change (regardless of direction) for each activity. These were then summed to yield a total change-score for each individual. The mean change-score on this index is 5.18 for participants and 4.43 for the comparison group. The difference between the two groups is not significant by the sign-test, but there does seem to be a trend for the participants to change more in their perception of activities associated with their jobs.

The specific activities for which the participants show the greatest amount of change (in either direction)—relative to the controls—are “public relations” and “the commercial side of communication.” Future analyses will reveal whether these changes reflect actual changes in activities. If not, it can be presumed that comparison of their own activities with those of their American counterparts has led to a change in their definitions or evaluations of “public relations” and “the commercial side of communication,” which in turn accounts for the change in their assessment of how much these activities are involved in their own work.

There is one other activity in which participants show a considerable amount of change, relative to the controls—and here it is change in a single direction: Participants tend to attach increasing importance to “contact with international developments in communications” as an aspect of their jobs; while controls show no consistent change in this direction.

As for changes on the more personal, affective level, answers to questions about respondents' satisfaction with their work reveal no consistent differences between participants and controls. An interesting difference does emerge, however, in responses to the following two questions:

18. If there were no obstacles in your path, what would you *hope* to be doing in five years? Please be as optimistic as you can in your description.
19. Now, taking into account the circumstances that are likely to prevail, describe what you *expect* to be doing in five years.

Answers to question 18 (on the before- and after-questionnaires) were rated on a three-point scale for level of aspiration; answers to question 19 were rated on a similar scale for level of expectation; and the congruity of hopes and expectations was also rated on a three-point scale. The three ratings were combined into an index of *change in positive orientation toward the professional future*. Participants show greater change on this index than do controls. The difference between the two groups barely misses statistical significance at the .05 level by the sign-test. Indications are that participants (relative to the comparison group) increase their level of aspiration as well as their confidence that they will be able to achieve this higher level of professional position.

It must be stressed that this effect, like most other effects presented in this paper, is of relatively small proportions. When we state, on the basis of a comparison between participants and controls, that there is a statistically significant or near-significant difference, we are only saying that the participants as a group have shown a noticeable change on the dimension in question, which is most probably attributable to participation in the Seminar rather than to chance fluctuation. What such a finding tells us, essentially, is that experiences of the type that were provided by participation in the Seminar are *capable* of producing this type of change. And this, it seems to us, is precisely what we need to know for purposes of evaluation.