Kelman ed

Effects of Cross-National Contact on National and International Images

Ithiel de Sola Pool 1965

The subject of this chapter is travel and how it affects certain images: images of the foreigner and of the self; images held by the traveler and by his hosts. Thus the subject is the effects of travel on four sets of images: (1) The traveler's image of himself, his home country, and his own culture. (2) The host's image of himself, his country, and his culture. (3) The traveler's image of the outside world, particularly but not exclusively of the country he visits, its inhabitants and culture. (4) The host's image of the country from which the traveler comes, its inhabitants and culture.

Note what is omitted. First, we are not considering the two-step effect of the traveler on his compatriots back home and on their images of the world. For example, the ex-tourist at a picnic dressed in *Lederhosen* may somehow affect his neighbors' images of Europe. The ex-missionary to China or Africa may be an organizer of lectures and relief meetings in his home town. The Peace Corpsman's parents may acquire a deep interest in the Philippines or Tanganyika. Such effects we do not consider here.

Second, we will not be treating in a detailed way the diffused effect of foreign contacts via the traveler who is a writer. China had effects on Marco Polo; those are within the terms of reference of this chapter. But Marco Polo, and via him China, had a profound effect on millions of Europeans in the Renaissance; those effects are beyond this chapter's limits. This is a somewhat arbitrary limitation, for behind every mass media message that conveys images of foreign lands there lies an event of personal contact by a traveler. A story on sacred monkeys in India diffused through the wire services originates with a foreign correspondent. He expresses thereby what he as a traveler saw through his own prism of prejudices as he looked around him in

a foreign land. But the impact of his perceptions is multiplied manifold by the power of the pen. And so, as we draw the line of our attention at the effect of foreign travel on the traveler himself and on his immediate host, we cut the chain of causality almost at its start.

Yet somehow we must draw limits. So we shall deal here only with the effects of travel contacts on those individuals who participate in the contact event in person.

Thus, four sets of images—the traveler's image and his host's images of self and others—are our dependent variables, and travel is our independent variable. But travel is of many kinds. And so we start by considering the variety of types of travel.

KINDS OF TRAVEL

Let us consider some of the dimensions along which trips may vary. We list dimensions that can make a great deal of difference in the impact of a trip. One could certainly add to the list, yet even the combinations of only the noted variables would yield an astronomic number of kinds of trips, no two of which would affect a traveler alike.

1. Clearly, a first question to ask about any trip is its *purpose:* is it undertaken primarily for business, tourism, education, government service, news reporting, lecturing, attendance at meetings, health, family affairs, or for some other purpose? The effect of a trip is apt to differ depending upon the main purpose behind it.

Some trips involve responsibilities; many trips are undertaken for pleasure only. The vacation trip is a form of escape. It is a release from the pressures of normal duties. Not so the work trip, which engenders responsibilities of its own.

Some trips are undertaken in order to acquire information. Images are formed of those very objects about which information was sought. Such images are apt to be quite different from those acquired incidentally.

We might be interested, for example, in the images travelers to Germany acquire about the peaceful or warlike character of that country today. Consider first a trip by a newsman taken explicitly to investigate this question, in the course of which he interviews ex-Defense Minister Strauss, conducts a taxi-driver poll recording the replies, and engages in other purposive activities to get at relevant facts. Contrast that with a trip by a tourist visiting museums and beerhalls. The tourist, too, may acquire an image of Germany as peaceful or warlike. Asked after his return whether Germany can now be trusted, he may recall an evening of Schubert songs and an affable conversation on a train and report an image of Germany as a peaceful country. Or he may recall a rude ticket collector and a heel-clicking guide and may perceive it as warlike. Images come casually and all of the time from such adventitious experiences that have no logical relation to the object of the images. Clearly such effects must be distinguished from the effects of purposive information-seeking.

Yet in real life the distinction cannot always be sharply drawn. Foreign correspondents, whose professional job is to engage in purposive information-seeking, still gain many of their impressions from the casual events of their lives. Unfortunately, this is particularly true of their impressions of public opinion. Few reporters use the objective data available. Their assessment of the mood of a country is most often an interpretation of casual experiences and

suffers thereby from the biases that arise from their round of life. But even if such impressions are formed in events having other purposes than information-seeking, the interpretation of such casual events may be affected by the fact that the event occurs to a man whose mind is tuned to seeking answers to predetermined questions.

Up to now most social science studies of the effects of foreign travel have dealt with incidental effects of travel, not with its intended object. Thus, studies of student exchange programs have usually surveyed persons who came to the United States to acquire information on such matters as how to build bridges or how to irrigate deserts, but the studies have most often asked about the incidental images acquired of America as a country and of Americans as a people!

One particularly important kind of responsibility that a traveler may carry is the responsibility to report back his experiences to someone else. In studies of "debriefing" this responsibility has been found to have a particularly significant effect on the images acquired. The man who expects to write something, whether it is a progress report to the boss, a dispatch to his paper or foreign office, or even a piece of *belles lettres* for an unknown audience, carries on his shoulders all the time his imagined reader. The perception of every experience is colored by the expectation of telling it and by a fantasy of what the reaction to the story will be (Zimmerman & Bauer, 1956. See also Pool & Shulman, 1959; Bauer, 1958; and Bauer & Pool, 1960).

2. The effects of a trip are conditioned by a number of *temporal and spatial facts*. Is it the traveler's first, second, or *N*th trip abroad (Pool, Keller, & Bauer, 1956)? Is it a permanent migration or will there be a return? If not permanent, how long will the whole trip last—three days, two weeks, or five years? Within that total period, will one place be visited for the whole time, or will it be a series of short stops with little depth but opportunity for comparison between them, or some mixed combination of these patterns (Kelman, 1963)?

3. The nature of the *traveler's relations to the people he meets*, especially to members of the host society, also shape the effects of a trip.

What is the traveler's relation to fellow travelers? Is he traveling alone, in a pair, in a family group, in a travel group, or in large formations such as an army? If he is in a group, does it consist entirely of co-nationals, is it mixed with host-nationals, or is it multinational?

What is the traveler's residential relation to the host society? Is he part of a joint living group with his hosts—staying, for example, with a local family or in a university dormitory or a youth camp; does he live in a normal part of the community—for example, renting an apartment and shopping in local stores; is he in a traveler's milieu, staying in hotels and eating in restaurants; or is he in a foreign enclave such as an army camp, embassy, or compound?

What is the traveler's functional relation to host nationals? Is he engaged in a joint task effort with his hosts (if so, as superior, peer, or subordinate)? Is he trying to sell them something, be it a commodity or a policy? Is he seeking information or enlightenment from them? Does he have personal introductions to some of them (be it through friends, family, business, or profession)? Or does he have only the incidental contacts that arise with service personnel and in public places—contacts with hotel employees, taxi drivers and neighbors on a train? Moreover, does the traveler know the host's language, and how well (Deutsch & Won, 1963)?

The factors just mentioned have been frequently examined in social science studies of intercultural contact. For example, living arrangements of students have, not surprisingly, been found to affect significantly the amount and the quality of the interactions between foreign students and their American hosts. The Indian student, coming from a culture where living with a mother is not expected to end at eighteen, may often find in his landlady the key to how at home he feels. Selltiz *et al.* (1963) found that foreign undergraduates at small colleges interacted with Americans more than those at metropolitan universities. Further analysis revealed "that the difference between kinds of school in the interaction of foreign students with Americans can be accounted for largely on the basis of living arrangements provided at the different institutions" (p. 97). There can be no doubt that jointness of living arrangements is a very important factor (see also Lambert & Bressler, 1956, especially pp. 23–28). Even more important in shaping the total impact of the trip are the functional relations between the visitor and the host. These have been studied especially with reference to the varied professional roles involved when the visitor feels highly competent or feels inadequate, is allowed an opportunity for satisfactory professional development, or is subordinated (see Bailyn & Kelman, 1962; Mayntz, 1960).

4. The *relation of the culture visited to the traveler's own culture* is a further factor conditioning the effects of a trip. The traveler may go to a land much like his own (for example, an American to Canada) or to one with a very different culture (an American to Japan). He may have been prepared for what he meets or he may not. He may have been informed about the conditions there or they may come as a shock.

It makes a profound difference whether the traveler goes from a homeland he regards as more advanced to a land he regards as more backward or whether he goes from a homeland he regards as more backward to a land he regards as more advanced. One may also ask if the host concurs in that rating.

Various studies have dealt with the problem of inferiority feelings by Asian and African students in Europe and America and the resulting forms of defensive behavior (see Isaacs, 1958; Bennett *et al.*, 1958; Morris, 1960; Selltiz *et al.*, 1963; Lambert & Bressler, 1956). A lot of attention has also been given to the problem of the foreign student who wishes never to return home because he finds in his host country the land of his professional and personal dreams (Mayntz, 1960, p. 736; Coelho, 1958).

5. The *ease or hardship* a traveler experiences is another factor affecting his reactions. Most generally, we may ask, does the trip turn out to be a pleasure or a pain? Obviously reactions to places enjoyed will be different from reactions to places suffered.

One can easily list a number of special factors that play a role in the enjoyment of voyages: Is the trip to a place where travel facilities are well organized, or to one where hotels are bad, information hard to obtain, transportation schedules unreliable, and so forth? Is the traveler well financed? Does he live as well as at home, better, or worse (Cleveland *et al.*, 1960)? Often this depends on whether the cost of living at prevailing exchange rates is higher or lower than at home. Is the traveler going at his own expense or on an expense account? Is life physically comfortable where he is abroad? Is the climate good or bad? Is the coun-

try clean or dirty (Isaacs, 1958), noisy or quiet, attractive or ugly? Is the food and drink palatable to the visitor (Isaacs, 1958)? Are the recreational facilities enjoyable? Is the traveler in good health or beset by illness? Is the trip made voluntarily, with some reluctance, or under compulsion? Examples of compulsory trips are the movements of armies or the flights of refugees; the images they acquire are quite different from those of the voluntary traveler.

6. Finally we may note that the changes experienced by the traveler are very much a function of *the person he was when he started.*

What were the expectations with which his trip was undertaken? Did the traveler have unrealistic hopes—of going to a utopia or finding a husband on the voyage? Or did the traveler expect the trip to be unpleasant and burdensome? Or did he have reasonable positive expectations?

What were the family status and other primary group attachments of the traveler? Did he leave behind family or a fiancée? Was he traveling alone and free from home ties? Or was his family with him? How old is the traveler: is he a child, an adolescent, or an adult?

One could further classify travelers on an endless list of other social variables including such standard categories as sex, occupation, level of education, ethnic origin, and place of residence. Among those demographic facts that are of great and obvious importance in conditioning response to travel experiences are sex and level of education.

Social research on the effects of international contact has been conducted on only a few of the many kinds of travel situations that could be defined by the parameters we have just reviewed. Often, reports of such research have failed to recognize the specificity of the results to the parametric peculiarities of the situation and have generalized about the effects of *travel,* when in fact all that was justified was generalization about the effects of *travel of some particular kind.* Thus, for example, the conclusion that travel produces a more sophisticated perception of the host country, which can be supported by studies of student travelers, may not hold up for soldiers serving in foreign theatres. The conclusion that travel abroad tends to strengthen identification of the traveler with his home culture can be supported by studies of Americans taking trips abroad, but probably does not always hold up for persons coming from less advanced to more advanced countries, nor does it hold up among immigrants.

Another conclusion widely accepted among specialists on exchange programs is that six-week trips are of very dubious value. The reason for this feeling is that the period is too short for the traveler to get over his initial culture shock. It is a period long enough for him to get homesick, disoriented, and puzzled, but not long enough for him to acquire any perspective on the host culture. But these conclusions tend to be based on first trips to the United States by persons from underdeveloped countries. A transatlantic trip by a European or American businessman or public official who has been abroad often before is a long trip if it lasts six weeks. He can seldom spare more time without disrupting his career role; and six weeks may be plenty of time for him to become thoroughly oriented to a situation much easier for him to adjust to than that of the Asian or African in the West for the first time.

So it is only with caution that we can generalize about foreign travel as such. What are the specific travel situations on which social research has shed some light?

One may distinguish six main travel situations on each of which a body of literature exists. There are studies of

a. foreign students, trainees, and others on trips to learn,
b. technical assistance personnel,
c. tourists and summer travel groups,
d. businessmen abroad,
e. armed forces overseas, and
f. immigrants.

Each of these is a peculiar situation readily characterizable in terms of the parameters listed above. The foreign student is a purposive traveler, usually responsible to someone at home for accomplishing certain objectives. Typically he is young and on his first trip, during most but not all of which he stays put. He tends to travel alone and must function in the language of the host country. Since his reason for studying abroad is that the foreign country can offer him something that his home country cannot, he concedes some partial superiority to the host country, though the concession may vary greatly in extent and avowedness. He is a willing if not an eager traveler, often but not always with unrealistic hopes. Usually intelligent and ambitious, he suffers some competitive handicaps in winning recognition in an unfamiliar environment, which is nevertheless one he prizes enough to have traveled abroad to partake in it.

Those are uniformities of travel for study. Such travel may vary, however, on other dimensions. The duration of the trip may vary between the three months' course for a specialized trainee and the ten-year leisurely pursuit of the Ph.D. by the acculturated or semi-refugee student reluctant to return home. The student may live in a solitary room, as a boarder, in a hostel or dormitory. He may be either in a country much like his own or in a very different culture. Typically, he enjoys his student years despite a stringent budget, mediocre food, and physical discomfort, partly because he has the irresponsible camaraderie of premarital life. Yet examples of rich students, unhappy students, married students, and so forth, are also numerous.

In the same way we can characterize the specific parameters of each travel situation that has been studied. For reasons of space and tedium we do so only incompletely.

The technical assistance situation is typically one characterized by an ambiguous superiority over subordinates in a joint task effort. While many advisors come on quick trips, the ones who have been studied are mostly ones who spend at least two years abroad, living at an unaccustomedly high standard of living in a backward, often hot and dirty, and otherwise uncomfortable environment. Variations in some of the other parameters, such as degree of residential isolation from the host culture or family status, and the ways in which these variations affect adjustment, have been main foci of many of the studies that have been made.

Tourists are the archetypes of the pleasure tripper without responsibilities. Off on one- to three-month trips, usually to pleasant places and in the lap of the travel industry, the tourist often, but by no means always, has only incidental contacts with his hosts. There are, of course, some tourists with personal friends in the host country and others who live, as in The Experiment in International Living, in host country homes; but they are the minority. The tourist more often goes from a rich country to a poorer country to take advantage of the buying power he can thus command. There is the reverse pattern of tourism too, of the visitor from

the poor country to the rich, though it has not been much studied. The tourist is most often a repeated traveler.

Business travelers are also often persistent travelers. With the heads of American corporations making an average of a trip abroad every other year, there are obviously many (perhaps one fifth or one sixth) who go abroad regularly, perhaps twice a year. Nowadays, men who make monthly business trips to Europe are by no means unknown. There are, of course, in addition executives stationed overseas. Typically, business travelers are trying to sell something and so they are anxious to please and understand their hosts. Typically also, they have close working relations with colleagues in the host country. Thus, contrary to the usual stereotype, the business traveler resembles the rich tourist in only a few respects, one of course being his comfortable travel budget. He is much more strongly motivated than the tourist needs to be to develop a sophisticated understanding of the country in which he operates.

Foreign troops (with some exceptions, such as guerillas or military government officers) are at the opposite extreme in terms of need for understanding of the country in which they are stationed. Often, indeed, they are really at home away from home, living in camps isolated in every possible way from the host population. Responsibility is almost entirely to fellow nationals, not to citizens of the host country. The duration of the overseas assignment and its other characteristics are usually such as to make it undesirable in the soldiers' eyes and to make a return home eagerly sought. In addition, usually, though by no means invariably, the soldier has a certain contempt for the host country and its culture; he is young, without family present, and most of whatever contacts he has with the host occur in the course of pleasure seeking.

Finally, as we turn to immigrants we find a very different travel situation, or rather two situations which may be distinguished as immigration and colonialization. The difference lies in the migrant's attitudes toward the culture from which he comes and that to which he is going. Which carries the more prestige with him? The Frenchman going to Algeria had no intention of becoming an Arab, even if he settled there permanently. Nor does the typical American missionary going to Africa expect to give up his citizenship and adopt African ways, even if he too intends to stay for his whole career. On the other hand, the European immigrant who came to the United States quickly dropped his old country identity. He wanted to be an American. Sometimes in the first generation the transition was hard and he continued to live in a linguistic and cultural enclave, but there was never any doubt as to the direction of aspiration (see Handlin, 1951; Thomas & Znaniecki, 1918–1920). Only rare groups such as the Hutterites continued to evaluate their original culture above that of the host country. Perhaps the point can be emphasized by noting that early settlers of the American West from non-Anglo-Saxon origins were often mixed cases of colonizers and immigrants. With regard to the Indians, they were colonizers. It never occurred to them to become Indians, for they confidently felt superior in their culture. Simultaneously, they were dropping their German or Scandinavian or Slavic or other ways in favor of the English language and American practices.

In the above illustrations, the migrants and the hosts implicitly shared the evaluations of the two cultures, though those of inferior status would, of course, never admit it. But in practice the shared evaluation is evidenced by the fact that a Westerner settling in Africa would not assimilate, while an African settling in Europe would. A most interesting case arises when there is mutual condescension, when each group implicitly as well as verbally prefers its own culture to the other. That situation may be found where communities live side by side for generations, even centuries, without assimilation. The Hutterites and their American and Canadian neighbors are an example. Other examples are in the cities of Asia where side by side for centuries have lived communities with different dress, different customs, and different cultures. Ghettos of Arabs, Greeks, Kurds, Jews, Gypsies, and Indians may live next to each other indefinitely, without one trying to assimilate to another.

The situation that has been studied is that of the immigrant who does wish to acculturate, who moves from one country to another where he sees the promise of a more advanced and better life.

THE TRAVELER'S IMAGES OF THE HOST: FAVORABLE AND UNFAVORABLE

Travelers in the variety of situations noted above respond to their foreign experiences in different ways. Depending upon circumstances, their images of their hosts may be favorable or hostile, simple or complex, accurate or inaccurate.

Among the dimensions on which images may differ, favorability has been a major focus of past research. Does the traveler end up with a friendly or hostile feeling toward his host? Does he acquire sympathetic understanding of the country visited or become prejudiced against it? This, it should be emphasized, is a very limited way of looking at images. Does every image have to be friendly or hostile? We may have much more interest in the differences in cognitive content between, say, an image of Paris which is the Left Bank and an image of Paris which is the Right Bank than in whether one is more favorable than the other. Clearly, to characterize them only by which image is more favorable is to miss most of the interesting differences between them.

The evaluative dimension, while only one of those on which images can be located, still is an important one. The cross-cultural work of Osgood and associates (1957) using the semantic differential has demonstrated that the evaluative dimension is virtually always the first factor in the pragmatic definition of concepts. So it is not surprising that much of the work on travelers' reactions to the places they visit has focused on evaluative changes in their images.

Evaluations of many things may change as a result of travel, but most research has focused on the effect of the travel experience on favorableness or unfavorableness toward the host county—which in most studies was the United States. Financial support for exchange programs was wrested from the United States Congress in large part by the argument that seeing the U.S.A. would result in liking it and that the outcome of such favorableness would be political support. Experience has proved this assumption too simple.

Also too simple is the less ethnocentric "assumption that getting to know the people of another country will lead to liking them; this assumption underlies the expectation that exchange-of-persons programs will increase international good will. In its simplest form, this hypothesis would lead one to expect that, on the whole, visitors to

a country will leave with more favorable views than they held before their arrival, and that their views after the trip will be more favorable than those of their compatriots who have not visited the country in question. The entire body of research on cross-cultural education, however, suggests that this expectation is oversimplified and overly optimistic" (Selltiz & Cook, 1962, p. 10).

The findings on the effects of visiting on favorableness toward a country are actually contradictory. Most measures at most times show increased favorableness toward the host country by the visitor, but some studies do show decreased favorableness (Riegel, 1953; Watson & Lippitt, 1955; Langley & Basu, 1953; Selltiz & Cook, 1962). The differences between studies cannot be explained by the national origin of the students. True, there are great differences in favorableness toward the United States by students from different countries, but these differences do not follow a simple pattern, nor are the findings of different studies always the same for particular countries. Richard Morris' *The two-way mirror: National status in foreign students' adjustment* (1960) shows how complex are the variables involved. In his study it turned out that a foreign student's favorableness towards the United States was not significantly related to the average status actually accorded to the visitor's country by American students; that is, how the foreign student evaluated the United States was not related to how American students evaluated his country. On the other hand, the foreign student's evaluation of the United States was inversely related to how he himself ranked his own country. If he thought his own country backward he thought better of the United States. But the relationship of evaluation of the United States to any objective measure of development was too weak to be documented.[1] One cannot generalize that Caucasians are more favorable, nor is there any other easy generalization, not even that English speakers are more favorable.

Foreign policy does have something to do with how favorably a student views the United States. He is apt to reflect his government's policies. The way in which a visitor judges a country is often colored somewhat by the antagonisms and friendships manifested in international political alignments (Selltiz & Cook, 1962, p. 13; Buchanan & Cantril, 1953; Bauer, Pool, & Dexter, 1963). Accusations of colonialism or militarism or racism are not just high politics. They do get internalized by millions of people. But foreign relations account mostly for the basal attitude toward the United States with which the student starts his visit here, not for whether the experience leaves him more favorable or less favorable at the end than he was at the beginning.

More relevant to how the student's images change during his visit to the United States is the extent to which he has established close and friendly personal relations with Americans. Selltiz and Cook (1962) found "an association between having one or more close American friends and liking American life" (p. 18). But they point out that there is a problem in interpreting that result, having to do with time sequences and causal relationships. For example, in other studies (such as Morris, 1960), the data were gathered at only one point in time, when most of the students questioned had been in the United States a year or more. From a correlation, at a single point in time, between having friends and liking American life one

[1] Selltiz and Cook (1962, p. 17) indicate different results from different studies.

cannot tell which way the causality goes. To try to meet this difficulty, Selltiz *et al.* measured attitudes toward the United States both early in the student's stay and toward the end of his first academic year in this country. Their finding suggests that causality does go both ways. Students who reported at the end of the first academic year that they had at least one close American friend were more favorable in their attitudes toward the United States than those who said they had no close American friends. But they "found in addition that the former group had also been more favorable than the latter when they were first asked their attitudes, at the beginning of the year. Perhaps those who were initially most favorable were the most likely to make friends with Americans, rather than vice versa" (Selltiz & Cook, 1962, p. 19).

From many studies it is clear that adjustment correlates highly with the number and intensity of social contacts made by the foreign student in the United States (Selltiz & Cook, 1962, p. 18; Morris, 1960; Scott, 1956). Adjustment, in turn, is associated with giving vent to fewer angry remarks about the host. But the finding that satisfaction correlates with contact is of limited use, since the evidence is weak on the direction of causality. A priori it is just as possible that well-adjusted students make more contacts as that students who have more contacts become happier. It is not clear that a student temperamentally unsuited to making contacts will be happier if he is pushed into them. The Selltiz study coped with this issue by comparing students in institutions offering different degrees of opportunity for contact (and it is not likely that this was the basis on which students selected institutions), but the resulting data are still not conclusive. So we are still left unable to specify simply the degree to which contact through travel under any given circumstances will make the traveler more or less favorable toward the host. (For further discussion of these issues, see Chapter 15.)

Ultimately, many of the diverse data on favorableness of attitude toward the United States jelled in the observation of the now familiar U-shaped curve of changing attitudes. The general finding was that the visiting student typically started with very positive attitudes toward the United States; then, during the first year, he had problems of adjustment and tended to become disillusioned; but beyond a certain time he gained a deeper and more sophisticated insight and became increasingly favorable toward his host country. This was a finding replicated in many studies, highly general in its application to exchange and student programs, and of great practical importance for the design of such programs (Coelho, 1958; Lysgaard, 1955; Morris, 1960; Selltiz & Cook, 1962).

The general finding of the U-shaped curve revealed a norm around which cultural variation took place. The nadir was reached and more favorable attitudes began to be restored more quickly among students who came from cultures more like that of the United States and more slowly where the culture shock was greater.

Unrealistic expectations will intensify the disappointment manifested in the downward slope of the first half of the U-curve. The Indian student, for example, as described by George Coelho (1958) in an earlier period of intense political conflict, reached New York full of hopes and expectations. He anticipated opportunities for learning, new experiences, and human relationships. He knew that there were tensions in the situation arising from Indo-American frictions. He knew that many Amer-

icans regarded Nehru as a dupe of the Communists and Indian neutralism as evil. These attitudes, the student felt, could only arise from ignorance. Americans simply did not know much about India. He felt that he could easily explain that India was not anti-American or pro-Communist, and that her only aim was peace. He felt a mission to explain these clear and simple facts as he saw them. He was quickly disillusioned. He found that while Americans may indeed be ignorant of much about India, their political views had firmer roots and more tenacity than he had realized. He discovered people holding to their views with the same unquestioning intensity as he did to his. Each found opposite truths to be self-evident.

The would-be visiting corrector and teacher now found his own view of the world challenged and doubted. The welcome he had foreseen from people glad to have the "correct" facts given them had turned into annoyed criticism by obdurate people. And so the hopes of the first week turned into an increasingly unhappy first six months.

Not dissimilar is what happens to xenophiles (described by Howard Perlmutter, 1954 and 1956) when they actually go abroad. Xenophiles, as Perlmutter defined them, are people who score high on a test consisting of sentences comparing favorably foreign with domestic objects. They agree with such statements as "Most European girls make better wives than American girls" or "The British use the English language better than do most Americans." Among the high xenophiles will be found certain kinds who are apt to carry through their feelings by actually going to live abroad either in overseas jobs or as expatriates.[2] But these people, who had fantasies about a better world abroad while they lived complainingly at home, tended to isolate themselves in an American enclave once they actually got to live abroad. They literally became expatriates from America, but psychologically were equally expatriate from their fosterfatherland. It could not live up to their unrealistic expectations.

Unrealism of expectations, the individual's personality, the extent of culture shock, and the hard facts of reality all affect the detailed shape of the U-curve. It can go down slowly or steeply, reach its nadir early or late. And, along with other and perhaps more subtle causes, its shape is certainly affected by whether the visitor lives in comfort or squalor, and whether he is treated hospitably or not.

Finally, it should be noted that the favorableness of reaction to the foreign host is partly determined by what happens to the traveler when he returns home, for his permanent image of his overseas experience does not become crystallized until the completion of the process of readjustment (Useem and Useem, 1955; Scott, 1956; Bennett *et al.*, 1958; Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1963).

Thus the extent to which contact produces favorable images turns out to depend on a complex of several things. It depends on the traveler's initial psychological adjustment and his interpersonal relations. It depends on the moment in the cycle of his stay at which the measure of attitude is taken or his stay cut short. It depends upon how he views his experience in retrospect. And it depends, but as a second derivative, on the extent of cultural differences experienced (that is, cultural differences affect the rate at which the process determined by other factors takes place). The answer to the question as to how contact affects attitudes cannot be given in one sentence. Let us summarize, even if loosely and cryptically, what it is that we do know. We know that those individuals who are most favorable toward foreign countries from afar are not necessarily the ones whose reaction to a travel experience will be most favorable. We can predict that those individuals who have most and deepest contacts with the host will be most favorable, but we cannot be sure how far pushing people who avoid such contacts into having them will produce the same result. We also know that a deeply understanding favorable attitude takes some time to produce. A quick trip may leave shallow favorable attitudes, but these are likely to be stereotyped and to wear off, unless one has allowed time enough for understanding to develop. And finally we know that anything that can be done to make the return home easier and less traumatic is apt to let favorable attitudes to the host survive better.

THE TRAVELER'S IMAGES OF THE HOST: SIMPLE AND COMPLEX

Beyond the points considered in the last section, there are some further fundamental considerations that challenge not only the answer but even the relevance of the question as to whether closeness makes the heart grow fonder. Favorableness need not be a unitary trait; and if it is not, favorableness may not be of much political relevance. Study after study has indeed found no particular relationship between liking for Americans and support of American foreign policy positions (see DuBois, 1956). An outstanding study, that of John and Ruth Useem (1955), found that Indian students who had studied in the United States liked Americans but did not particularly respect them, whereas Indian students who had studied in England respected the English but did not particularly like them. Other studies have found that in many situations contact moved people toward neither more favorable nor less favorable attitudes, but from both the favorable and the unfavorable extremes toward the middle (Bauer, Pool, & Dexter, 1963; Cherrington, 1934). That result is related to another and very general finding: that the effect of first-hand experience is reduction of stereotyping—the shifting of the traveler's images from simple black and white perceptions to more qualified perceptions of the foreign reality.

Miscellaneous findings on such points were put into longitudinal perspective by George Coelho (1958) in his study of Indian students in the United States, in which he established a growing differentiation and specificity of images over time. The global like-dislike dimension, which can also be equated to support-oppose, is characteristic only of the most naive and inexperienced person, that is, the newly arrived foreign student. As time passes the visitor develops differentiated attitudes toward specific Americans, American domestic political practices, American foreign policy, American institutions of one sort or another (see also Selltiz *et al.*, 1963).

Insofar as there is a global positive-negative dimension, Coelho's study implies that it is nothing more than a symptom of the student's general state of adjustment to life. This is strongly suggested by his remarkable finding that attitudes toward India correlate

[2] These are apt to be high authoritarians among the xenophiles rather than low authoritarians if a small study of student tourists by this author and his wife, Jean MacKenzie Pool, can be trusted. Those who thought seriously about returning for a length of time were the high-xenophiles, high-authoritarians. It should be noted that Perlmutter has established the existence of a positive correlation between xenophilia and authoritarianism.

positively with attitudes toward the United States, that is, that during the initial phase of the student's stay, when he is becoming more and more disillusioned in regard to the United States, he is simultaneously becoming more and more unfavorable toward his own homeland. Later, when his attitude toward America improves, his attitude toward India simultaneously improves. This demonstrates to what extent evaluation of a country is a matter of projection and has little to do with the country itself.

Such global responses, when they occur, are thus of less interest as an international relations phenomenon than as a measure of holism in human behavior. They are an evidence of the power of what Abelson and Rosenberg (1958) call psycho-logic or the need to maintain balance. Fortunately, human cognitive processes are often subtle and allow for various modes of resolution of imbalance, including the conscious acceptance of affectively imbalanced beliefs and also including differentiation of entities into subentities.

It is the latter process that increasingly takes place during at least the first few years of a foreign contact experience. Coelho's (1958) results suggest that after a while (three or four years with his sample) a reversal sets in. The newly arrived student had a number of simple preconceptions about America and Americans. He soon began to discover that there were Americans and Americans. There were whites and Negroes; rich and poor; friendly and unfriendly; informed and ignorant. And he found that individuals had complex views on even those items on which the foreign stereotype of Americans assumes a completely simple image: Communism, materialism, race.

Not only does experience enable the visitor to say that Americans are *both* friendly and obsessed with Communism, but it even allows him sometimes to recognize that many Americans have highly complex views as to the significance of the existence of Communist movements in the world and what to do about them. True, most foreign student surveys have found that even returning students at the end of their stay are highly critical of American attitudes on Communism and race, but even if critical, they are apt to have somewhat less simple notions of what these views are.

Discovering these complexities is an exciting experience. It is the heart of the exploratory process of discovering America. The process goes on for at least a couple of years. The student is intensely attentive to all the differences and nuances he finds in the culture and will talk about them endlessly. But if he stays much longer (Coelho says more than four years) he begins to take America for granted. It is no longer an object of study; it is simply the environment in which he lives. His becomes the fish's attitude toward water rather than, as before, that of the land animal thrown into it. He thinks of his life in relation to his neighbor, not his life as a foreigner in relation to Americans. His interests become personalized. He may, as a result, become less attuned to subtleties in national characteristics. In that sense he may revert to a small degree to simpler national images.

It would be interesting to study this process in immigrants. There is no reason to assume that the sequence of complexity and simplicity of images is the same for immigrants as for sojourners. It might be the same or it might be different. Unfortunately, the process of image development we have been describing here as observed in studies of foreign students has been almost entirely overlooked in the large literature on immigrants. There are hundreds of studies of the acculturation

of different ethnic groups. Almost none has documented the changing images that the migrants held of their new country. Passing remarks in memoirs and diaries are numerous, but the job remains open for someone to compile these and to document what happened to the image of the migrant's new homeland as he experienced the transition from stranger to native (see Hansen, 1940a, 1940b; Handlin, 1951; and Thomas & Znaniecki, 1918–1920).

THE HOST'S IMAGES OF THE TRAVELER

In the last two sections we have followed the existing literature where it has led us. Wherever that has been one-sided, our treatment has also been one-sided. We have considered how the traveler changes in his perceptions of the country he visits. But earlier we defined our subject more broadly. We said that we were interested in the effects of contact upon the images of host and of traveler held by host and by traveler. This gives us four possible topics, of which only one—the traveler's image of his host—has been extensively studied. There remains a panoply of fascinating questions about the rest of the relationships. With two of these—the host's image of the traveler and the traveler's image of himself—we shall deal in the present section and the next.

How does the host's image of the traveler change? In what ways do contacts with tourists and foreign students shape their hosts' images of the visitors' homelands? Harold Isaacs, whose pioneer work on images stands almost alone in its focus on this aspect of image formation, documents the extent of such impact of travelers on the host. Isaacs, whose work appropriately to its hypothesis-forming role in an unexplored field is partly anecdotal, tells us in *Scratches on our minds* (1958) of various ways in which Indian and Chinese travelers have shaped the images of their countries that are held by influential Americans. He describes the Indian student in a rooming house who, by failing to clean his hairs out of the bathtub, left an indelible scratch on the mind of an American fellow student destined to an ultimate role of international importance. He notes the impact of Vivekenanda and other writing swamis; of Lin Yu Tang, of Nehru and Mme. Chiang in their visits to the United States, of Krishna Menon in New York. And then there is the repeated and oft documented experience of Americans with Indian visiting students, wherein the host finds the visitor arrogant, opinionated, hypercritical.

Writers comment on such transmissions of images through a traveler, usually, when the results are bad. They note the problem case among foreign students. They write about obnoxious American tourists, who are noisy, boastful, and indifferent to the sensitivity of their hosts (Garraty & Adams, 1959). They analyze relations of troops overseas to the local population, usually when incidents of sex and violence have acerbated tensions. They comment on difficulties of absorbing refugee or immigrant populations.

It is these atypical situations that have been studied and observed. And they are probably very atypical. In the absence of systematic research there is no solid evidence, but there is good reason to suspect that the net impact of the ordinary traveler on his host, like the impact of his host on the traveler, is primarily to increase the complexity and differentiation of the images held. The consequence is undoubtedly sometimes favorable, sometimes regressive toward the middle, as well as sometimes unfavorable. The patterns that

determine which outcome occurs are unknown and may perhaps differ from those bearing on the images of the host received by the visitor.

In one respect the image of his country conveyed by a traveler is most often inaccurate. Travelers are not a representative cross-section of their home populations. That type of Indian student whose querulousness has entered into the American image of India is in the first place an educated Indian. His education is essentially British in content, at the hands of British-educated scholars. He is of high or medium-high caste, from a prosperous family, used to commanding service in all menial activities. Expectations of respect and unwillingness to give it, reluctance to do normal chores, and condescension to American culture, when they do occur, reflect the kind of person he is in his home country rather than global characteristics of his country itself, but they get communicated as part of the national image.

While the foreign student is an abnormally high-status sample of his society, the immigrant is often an abnormally low-status one, and either distortion creates problems. The turn of the century American image of the Irish or the current New York image of Puerto Ricans arises from observing a population of men who did not make a go of it in their homelands. The old Yankee image of crude and ignorant Irish bumpkins could hardly encompass a milieu that could produce a Noyes, an O'Flaherty, and a Joyce. Nor does the prejudiced New York image of Puerto Ricans encompass the facts of Operation Bootstrap, of a country developing to a modern society faster than any other in Latin America.

The traveler may be unrepresentative for other reasons too. Travelers act differently when abroad than they do at home. The problem here is the weakening of control by relevant reference groups. Good conduct, if not internalized, is often enforced by awareness of the ways in which important "others" will react. Travel is a way of escaping these censors. The traveler puts his usual reference persons at a distance. The foreigners close at hand do become new reference persons for travelers with sharp sensitivity, a broad sense of humanity, or high need for affiliation; but foreigners do not serve this role for everyone. For some types of persons the only "others" who count are those in his own in-group; the feelings of outsiders do not matter even when they are physically present. By confining the scope of his sensitivity to censors at home, whom he has temporarily escaped, the tourist permits himself the indulgence of misconduct abroad. The man on a spree at a resort, the one who shouts at waiters and clerks, the woman who wears shorts into a cathedral, the traveler who talks disparagingly about the country he is visiting, might never at home so contravene the demands of etiquette.

Such kicking over of the traces may not always be negative. For a few individuals the foreign environment provides a freedom from censorship which opens up their initiative and creativity. Missionaries and colonizers have often felt a readiness to take command of "little brothers" toward whom they felt superior, in a way they were incapable of at home. Asian students abroad have often felt free to disregard traditional taboos when away from their families.

Release from authoritative controls can have many consequences and take many forms. Whatever the form, however, it makes the traveler an unrepresentative sample of his society. Yet he is read most often not as an individual, not as a sample of his class or social group, but as a sample of his nation. Experiments by Perlmutter have shown

that observers code the behavior of foreigners primarily in national categories and only secondarily in terms of other available categories (Perlmutter, 1957; Bruner & Perlmutter, 1957). Subjects in these experiments were asked to predict characteristics of men described on a series of dimensions. One man might be described by occupation (a businessman), by personal attributes (intelligent), by nationality (a Frenchman). The most variance in the predictions was accounted for by nationality, if the nationality was foreign. Telling Americans that a man was an American did not help them at all to predict what he would do or be like. That was treated as irrelevant information and other items, such as his occupation or intelligence, were used as indicators. In predicting the behavior or traits of foreigners, on the other hand, nationality was used as the dominant clue.

In line with these findings one may suspect that the traveler is most often read not as a sample of the generic stranger; nor as a sample of his sex, or age group, or social class; nor as a sample of his profession, or his personality type, or skill group; but as a sample of his nation. The things he does become part of the observer's image of the country from which the traveler comes. The new information may add only a small part to the image; it may only complicate the image and make it less black and white. But whatever the perception does, it is to the national image that it does it.

There is a good reason for this dominance of the coding by nationality in the interpretation of the behavior of foreigners. It is not just chauvinism. It is because typically the person doing the coding has less prior information on that category than on other likely ones. Let me illustrate the point by an anecdote. I once took a charming, petite, Japanese woman schoolteacher to a restaurant. She ate two forkfuls of a large steak and then set it aside, protesting it was very good but too much. My image of the eating habits of women was not changed. I was already familiar with enough examples to have a stable image of that distribution. Nor was my image of the eating habits of small women, or of schoolteachers, or of small schoolteachers or even small women schoolteachers changed. For all these categories I had more than adequate information to dismiss this case as an exception. The only obvious category on which I was ignorant (and in fact remain ignorant to this day) is the nationality one. For several years there has been a question in the back of my mind about the facts on eating habits in Japan (or more likely of some possible subcategory of these, such as habits of educated Japanese women in eating meat). This is something less than a fixed or well-formed image, but it is at least the ghost of an image. It is a large part of my stock of knowledge on this subject.

Nationality plays such a key role in the coding of images about foreigners precisely because of the widespread initial ignorance of them. If that is so, then the growth of travel and of all forms of international communication may have a profound effect. The peculiarities we have been describing in the way in which people handle foreign information are in large part the peculiarities of information processing in the presence of ignorance. But the incorporation of information gradually erodes ignorance. The very information processed reduces ignorance and changes thereby the special peculiarities of the information-processing situation we have been describing. With more information the foreign becomes less foreign. We described this sequence before when we noted the increasing complexity of images that

comes with experience. These more complex images are also more stable. And in a sense they are less psychologically powerful; they are less apt to provide the illusion of all-encompassing and adequate explanations. The more we really know about foreign nationalities the less clear-cut our images become.

THE TRAVELER'S IMAGES OF HIMSELF AND HIS OWN COUNTRY

Profound as the impact of travel may be on people's images of foreigners, it is even more profound on the traveler's image of himself. Contact with people of another culture is a way to discover one's own identity.

A number of studies have been made of youthful American tourist groups—groups such as The Experiment in International Living and Crossroads Africa. Uniformly they find that the student has returned with a greater appreciation of America and an intensified identification with America (Smith, 1954; Thanas; Pool, 1958; Isaacs, 1961). The same type of finding has emerged in studies of foreign students in the United States. In many cases the most profound effect of their stay in a strange land is a better appreciation and understanding of their home country—a firmer attachment to its values.[3]

This reidentification with his homeland by the traveler abroad takes many forms. It shows up, for example, in increased support of his government's foreign policies. Thus John and Ruth Useem (1955) found that Indian students who went to England and America returned closer to the basic Nehru foreign-policy viewpoint. Those leftists who started out more critical of American policy than Nehru became less anti-American while in the United States. But those individuals who started out more pro-American than Nehru became less pro-American while in the United States. Being abroad solidified them with their own national policy.

The same thing was found in a study of American businessmen who traveled abroad (Bauer, Pool, & Dexter, 1963). The foreign trade policies supported by businessmen who had not traveled much were largely determined by their companies' special interests. But the highly traveled respondents—those who had made five or more trips abroad and at least one in the previous five years—arrived at their views in quite a different way. They were not in general more liberal on trade matters than their less-traveled colleagues, nor were they more protectionist. However, their views on tariff policy were less predictable from knowing the industry in which they were engaged than were those of their more provincial colleagues. For those businessmen who had not traveled much, if we knew what their firms produced, we could make a reasonable prediction of where they as individuals would stand on tariff policy. For those who had traveled, however, better predictions could be made, not by knowing what they manufactured, but by knowing the nation's foreign policy. From either atypical extreme, the travelers moved to support that norm.

[3] Kelman and Bailyn (1962) distinguish two patterns of behavior of Scandinavians who spent a year in the United States. Both these patterns involve increased identification with their home countries, but in one pattern this identification appears to take a defensive form, while in the other it takes the form of greater differentiation of images and understanding of the country.

Summarized in a sentence, the political effect of travel on tariff attitudes was to counteract the force of self-interest. It made a man see the trade issue in national terms, rather than in the parochial terms of his own industry.

Foreign travel made the businessman increasingly aware of international political problems and America's relationship to them. As he traveled, he found himself being role-cast, not as the representative of a particular industry, but as an American. He found himself playing at being Secretary of State and talking for his country, not for his firm.

The influence of travel was not primarily to bring European or other foreign ideas to the traveler, leading him to diverge from his national norm. On the contrary, it moved him toward that norm. There was a shift in center of gravity away from narrow parochial interests toward international interests, but with views quite close to the national standard. Thus, foreign travel broadened the frame of reference in which the businessman considered the foreign-trade issue to one which took account of world political and economic circumstances. But the responses he gave to the facts that he learned abroad were ones that his own domestic reference group would approve. The reference group perceived as relevant changed from a parochial to a national one, but it remained a *domestic* one.

Thus the very partial and often irrelevant experiences of foreign travel, either on the Lido or in an office, did affect the broad foreign-policy conclusions reached by businessmen. Whether the traveler acquired his sense of responsibility to an American role in an argument with a perverse waiter or in a study of foreign production costs perhaps made little difference. Whatever the stimulus, its effect was to shake established convictions and to make the traveler think about himself in a national, and often more statesmanlike role—defined, it is true, as the American business community sees that role.

The way in which foreign travel related to public-affairs attitudes was illustrated in a most striking way by data on political party affiliation of our respondents. The theory we have just stated about the way in which new information affects old attitudes postulates that, if any shift of opinion on matters of substance occurs as a result of a challenge to previous views, its direction should be toward the standard position of the individual's reference group, not toward the view expressed in the stimulus. Insofar as businessmen's travel fits that theory, the effect of travel should be to push deviant businessmen to the standard business view—in this case, toward the Republican Party. Though this prediction follows from the theory we were using, we cannot claim advance wisdom. Like most of our colleagues, we expected that travel would liberalize and that liberals would be less often Republicans. We were wrong. We found, as our theory should have led us to expect, that the most traveled businessmen are most uniformly Republican (Bauer, Pool, & Dexter, 1963, pp. 168–170).[4]

These findings also help us to understand that minority of cases in which travel alienates the traveler from his homeland; of course such cases do exist. What usually distinguishes the immigrant or defector or other person whose identity is shaken is a transfer of reference groups. Before travel can undermine his attachment to his home-

[4] The authors consider and give data for rejecting the most obvious noncausal explanations of the correlation.

land he normally has to find a sense of belonging in a group in the host country that can partially replace his original reference persons. For a student this new reference group often consists of his scientific and professional colleagues in the host country, especially in those instances where his profession has no significant cadre in his home (Bennett *et al.*, 1958; Watson & Lippitt, 1955; Coelho, 1958; Lambert & Bressler, 1956). But these conditions of disaffection are far less often realized for the traveler than are the conditions of patriotic reinforcement. Renewed attachment to the homeland is the normal effect of travel.

Such a process of growing support for their own country and its policies by travelers overseas has been studied most closely by Harold Isaacs (1961 and 1963). It is dramatically illustrated by the case of American Negroes who have gone to Africa.

In their search for identity, many American Negroes have gone to what they felt to be a homeland. Some had called themselves Afro-Americans before going to see. Many had felt themselves rejected children of the United States and in turn rejected those who rejected them. But in Africa they discovered that, oppressed or not, they were more American than they knew. They were eaters of hamburgers, not of fufu. They were not even dark enough in most cases to pass as African. They talked English like Americans not like Englishmen. Many discovered that if Africa was home they could not go home again.[5]

It should be no surprise to discover that foreign travel is a profound psychological experience. The travel industry is able to sell tours to millions of people who spend on these trips amounts of money comparable to what they spend on cars, homes, and education, even though vacation travel is a sheer luxury. Clearly it must be a deeply meaningful luxury.

Testing one's identity against alternative ways of life, and in that way rediscovering one's identity, is a deeply meaningful experience. But anything as personally significant as travel seems to be must mean different things to different people. It must be a shell into which can be poured whatever is most salient in the particular individual's resolution of his psychic conflicts. It must provide a variety of very different people an opportunity to act so as to produce very different desired images of themselves.

Travel does that. It creates all sorts of opportunities for people to act out their self-images and, in so doing, to confirm or modify them.

Let me illustrate that point by closing with a report of a small study done by my wife, Jean MacKenzie Pool, and myself on a Council for Student Travel ship to Europe and back.

The study explored how each of forty-two students used his summer abroad to work out his own identity problems. The students, who were members of The Experiment in International Living, each filled out a battery of questionnaires on the way over and the identical battery on the way back. In addition, we had a two-hour interview with each on the way back. The battery included authoritarianism items, Perlmutter xenophilia items, sentence completions, and (on the way back only) projective stories (comparable to the

[5] What makes this experience and that of summer tourists different from that of immigrants who do change their identity is a subject well worth studying. Could it be that we are in the presence of a dissonance phenomenon in which the old identification has to become all the stronger the more it is challenged until there is a quantum jump and the individual reverses sides?

Thematic Apperception Test) with a verbal stimulus.

The population we studied was far from a typical one. It was liberal and xenophilic and our cutting points on the appropriate scales were certainly all at one end of the general population distribution.

It was a youthful population, with its mode in the years eighteen to twenty. Their problems were problems of adolescence. If need for affiliation burst through many protocols (and it did), if identity conflicts were salient (and they were), it is partly because these are above all the problems of youth. What can be problems for older travelers too, burst forth in undisguised magnitude among these adolescents.

The group was in many ways homogeneous; but the point of interest is not the ways in which they were alike, but the ways in which they differed. They all were delighted with their summer. All used the summer's experience in the search for identity, but since they were different persons and personalities, they did it in different ways. Indeed, as we tried to explore the range of meanings and uses that a summer in Europe could have even for a homogeneous population engaged in a common program, we had no difficulty in differentiating a number of different patterns among these forty-two students.

We can differentiate four patterns in terms of the dominant motivation or need served by the trip. First, there were those for whom the trip was an escape. Second, there were those for whom it was a chance to test their adulthood, their ability to cope. Third, there were those for whom the gratification of a trip to Europe was status enhancement. Finally, there were those for whom the trip was an opportunity to satisfy various instinctual impulses.

Consider those for whom the trip was an escape. They told us that they felt freer, more relaxed, less anxious abroad than they do at home. Sometimes they told us on the return trip that their anxiety levels were building up as they were coming closer to the realities of life.

This pattern contrasts sharply with the reactions of youngsters for whom the trip was a way of proving that they could cope all alone in a strange foreign place. To these timid souls it would be inconceivable to think of abroad as a place to relax. They reported greater anxiety abroad. They were often consciously breathing a sigh of relief as the ship was taking them closer to home. They were proud of themselves for having successfully pulled the summer off. They regaled the interviewer with stories of how they had found their destination in cities where they could not speak a word. They were pleased and happy that they had done it all, but several of them said explicitly that they had had their traveling now. Having proved that they were now adults and no longer children needing a parent's knee, they were done with traveling for at least several years.

That was not so for the other two groups. They, especially those for whom the trip was a chance for status enhancement, contemplated with pleasure the prospect of further trips abroad.

Those for whom the trip was an escape were intermediate in their inclination to contemplate another trip soon. It was not that they enjoyed the trip less. On the contrary: they were the most successful Experimenters. They are the people whom the selectors should be looking for. Yet they are less apt to return soon than some of the others. To understand why, we must consider those persons rather more

closely. What is it that they are trying to escape from?

These are people who are trying to escape from a driving sense of duty, and they never really do escape. They are people who at home are constant doers. They work very hard. They have high ideals. At their universities they are activities men and joiners. (In our own small sample almost every one of the "escapers" came from a home in which there had been a disruption of their parental identification and they narcotized their personal problems in work.) For these people the trip was an escape from the pressures of over-commitment and of group relations. But the escape was only a partial one, for they soon made the same life for themselves on the Experiment, though with lesser responsibility since the Experiment was only temporary. On the trip they did everything, talked to everybody wherever they went, enjoyed it enormously. They were full of reports of the wonderful people they had met. They were group-oriented in their own Experimenter groups. They cared primarily for the human contacts they made with foreigners. They were often contemptuous of cathedrals and museums, for they were heavily socially conscious thanks to their grinding consciences.

The reason these people could not indulge too often or too much in the escapist pleasure of travel was precisely that they recognized it as escapist. They were returning to purposeful careers in "the real world" and while that made them anxious, they knew they had to do it. Most of them had well-laid plans for some years ahead. In principle they would be all in favor of engaging in overseas work as a contructive kind of activity, but in practice they were committed in one way or another for some time to come.

It was the young men and women who saw travel as enhancing their status who were seriously discussing the idea of going abroad for a year or two soon. They were the ones most likely to take overseas jobs or to marry abroad. (The Peace Corps with its hair-shirt ideology had not yet appeared on the horizon and would presumably not have appealed to them.) This group included a number of high-xenophile, high-authoritarians.

The ways in which these thirteen individuals saw European travel as conferring status on them were varied. For some this occurred in the most obvious ways; travel to the high spots of Europe is after all a well-recognized symbol. For others the mechanisms were more subtle. They might appreciate the formality of European manners as a drama in which they liked to participate. They might aspire to the great tradition of culture. They might look down on the backward Europeans. Some of them filled their interviews with reports of their contacts with great persons. But however they managed it, the events they reported somehow demonstrated their status.

Such travelers can indulge in the xenophilic fantasy of expatriation because they are not kept to their lasts by conscience. They dream of enhancing themselves by becoming part of the great life of Europe or by enjoying the good life of the American in Europe. They have actually traveled more often than any of the other types. They correspond more with European friends. It is from this group that a disproportionate share of our professional international communicators will tend to come, whether for the State Department or for other public or private agencies.

Finally we mentioned the group for whom the great gratification of the foreign is release of instinctual impulses.

That statement may give a misleading picture of our respondents, for they were, after all, youngsters from good middle-class homes. So we must distinguish between those few who got this satisfaction directly and overtly in their own behavior and those inhibited ones who obtained it only in the fantasy of liberation. Those who are inhibited might merely observe with admiration what they consider to be the great warmth and emotional freedom of Europeans. They may talk of women kissing each other or of boy chums. A few who were less inhibited had gone on a minor spree in taverns and brothels, somehow feeling that that is Europe in contrast to the United States. But whatever they do the symbolic significance of Europe to them is an assuaging of guilt and a testing of dependency.

They are at one with all our respondents, and indeed with all adolescents, in that central to their behavior is the question of acceptance. Proof that one is accepted takes a variety of forms. Whether the form was finding a lover, group activity, or social life, all these young people were looking in Europe for evidence that, cut off as they now were from their parents' apron strings, they were nonetheless welcomed and loved, even by foreign strangers. The interviews are loaded with tedious pathos about wonderful ways in which their foster families accepted them (or occasionally failed to), the way in which they found friends in strange places, the kindness shown them by complete strangers on the street. With all due deference to the validity of the sentiments, they began to verge on an obsession.

In this connection, we can distinguish a fifth group, consisting of shy souls who could not bring themselves to seek evidence of their acceptability directly. These painfully timid youngsters, while no less preoccupied with being loved, did not dare press the issue directly. They retreated into watching—a very legitimate occupation for tourists. Some of these people were brilliant observers. They did not take pictures. To face a camera toward a person is an aggressive act, much more common among those whose primary gratifications were status enhancement and instinct release than among shy observers or for that matter among those escaping an over-ruling conscience.[6] But they could describe a cathedral rose window in detail. These people walked, often alone, and looked at the physical glories of Europe. Yet for all their escapism they were just as concerned as anyone with how far people accepted them.

At this point we can summarize what it means when we say that the travel experience enables the traveler to see *himself* in a new image. Each one of the five groups we have just examined acted out a different drama in their trip abroad, but some things they all had in common. In each instance the circumstances of travel unshackled the traveler from the routines of normal life and enabled him to experiment with who he is. His images of himself and the world were expressed in these experiments. In that process the traveler (incidentally for him but of great interest to us) distorted his image of the host to make it fit his needs. The image of Europe became that of the distinguished, or the passionate, or the dangerous, or the beautiful, as needed.

[6] What people photograph is a very suggestive indicator. There are travelers who take people only, buildings only, or mixed scenes only. And there are those who take few pictures and those who take many.

At the same time the traveler acquired a deeper conviction of his image of himself as a person and as an American. In his contacts with foreigners he could establish a sense of his identity more clearly than he might have seen it before. And, of course, the images with which he experimented in perceiving his identity were those with which his psyche was most preoccupied.

REFERENCES

Abelson, R. P., & Rosenberg, M. J. Symbolic psycho-logic: A model of attitudinal cognition. *Behav. Sci.*, 1958, *3*, 1–13.

Bailyn, Lotte, & Kelman, H. C. The effects of a year's experience in America on the self-image of Scandinavians. *J. soc. Issues*, 1962, *18* (1), 30–40.

Bauer, R. A. The communicator and his audience. *J. Confl. Resol.*, 1958, *2*, 66–77.

Bauer, R. A., & Pool, I. de S. *The effects of audiences on communicators.* Cambridge: Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration and Center for International Studies, M.I.T., 1960.

Bauer, R. A., Pool, I. de S., & Dexter, L. A. *American business and public policy: The politics of foreign trade.* New York: Atherton Press, 1963.

Bennett, J. W., Passin, H., & McKnight, R. K. *In search of identity: The Japanese overseas scholar in America and Japan.* Minneapolis: Univer. Minnesota Press, 1958.

Bruner, J. S., & Perlmutter, H. V. Compatriot and foreigner: A study of impression formation in three countries. *J. abnorm. soc. Psychol.*, 1957, *55*, 253–260.

Buchanan, W., & Cantril, H. *How nations see each other.* Urbana: Univer. Illinois Press, 1953.

Cherrington, B. M. *Methods of education in international attitudes.* (Teachers College Contributions to Education, No. 5.) New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1934.

Cleveland, H., Magone, G. J., & Adams, J. C. *The overseas Americans.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Coelho, G. V. *Changing images of America: A study of Indian students' perceptions.* New York: Free Press, 1958.

Deutsch, S. E., & Won, G. Y. M. Some factors in the adjustment of foreign nationals in the United States. *J. soc. Issues*, 1963, *19* (3), 115–122.

DuBois, Cora A. *Foreign students and higher education in the United States.* Washington: American Council on Education, 1956.

Garraty, J. A., & Adams, W. *From Main Street to the Left Bank.* East Lansing: Michigan State Univer. Press, 1959.

Gullahorn, J. T., & Gullahorn, Jeanne E. An extension of the U-curve hypothesis. *J. soc. Issues*, 1963, *19* (3), 33–47.

Handlin, O. *The uprooted.* Boston: Little, Brown, 1951.

Hansen, M. L. *The immigrant in American history.* Cambridge: Harvard Univer. Press, 1940. (a)

Hansen, M. L. *The Atlantic immigration, 1607–1860.* Cambridge: Harvard Univer. Press, 1940. (b)

Isaacs, H. R. *Scratches on our minds.* New York: John Day, 1958.

Isaacs, H. R. *Emergent Americans: A report on "Crossroads Africa."* New York: John Day, 1961.

Isaacs, H. R. *The new world of Negro Americans.* New York: John Day, 1963.

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

Kelman, H. C., & Bailyn, Lotte Effects of cross-cultural experience on national images: A study of Scandinavian students in America. *J. Confl. Resol.*, 1962, *6*, 319–334.

Lambert, R. D., & Bressler, N. *Indian students on an American campus.* Minneapolis: Univer. Minnesota Press, 1956.

Langley, Grace, & Basu, Sita Exchange of persons: An evaluation of the experience and training of Indian grantees under Fulbright and TCM programs. A study prepared for the Evaluation Section of USIA, India, 1953. (Mimeographed)

Lysgaard, S. Adjustment in a foreign society: Norwegian Fulbright grantees visiting the United States. *Int. soc. Sci. Bull.*, 1955, *7*, 45–51.

Mayntz, Renate The visiting fellow: An analysis of an academic role. *Amer. sociol. Rev.*, 1960, *15*, 735–741.

Morris, R. T. *The two-way mirror.* Minneapolis: Univer. Minnesota Press, 1960.

Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. *The measurement of meaning.* Urbana: Univer. Illinois Press, 1957.

Perlmutter, H. V. Some characteristics of the xenophilic personality. *J. Psychol.*, 1954, *38*, 291–300.

Perlmutter, H. V. Correlates of two types of xenophilic orientation. *J. abnorm. soc. Psychol.*, 1956, *52*, 130–135.

Perlmutter, H. V. Stereotypes about Americans and Europeans who make specific statements. *Psychol. Reports*, 1957, *3*, 131–137.

Pool, I. de S. What American travellers learn. *Antioch Rev.*, 1958, *18*, 431–446.

Pool, I. de S., Keller, Suzanne, & Bauer, R. A. The influence of foreign travel on political attitudes of American businessmen. *Publ. Opin. Quart.*, 1956, *20*, 161–175.

Pool, I. de S., & Shulman, I. Newsmen's fantasies, audiences and newswriting. *Publ. Opin. Quart.*, 1959, *23*, 145–158.

Riegel, O. W. Residual effects of exchange of persons. *Publ. Opin. Quart.*, 1953, *17*, 319–327.

Scott, F. *The American experience of Swedish students.* Minneapolis: Univer. Minnesota Press, 1956.

Selltiz, Claire, Christ, June R., Havel, Joan, & Cook, S. W. *Attitudes and social relations of foreign students in the United States.* Minneapolis: Univer. Minnesota Press, 1963.

Selltiz, Claire, & Cook, S. W. Factors influencing attitudes of foreign students toward the host country. *J. soc. Issues*, 1962, *18* (1), 7–23.

Smith, H. P. *Changes in attitudes resulting from experiences in foreign countries.* Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Harvard University, 1954.

Thanas, Katherine Significance of social context for short term cross-cultural travel. Unpublished manuscript.

Thomas, W. I., & Znaniecki, F. *The Polish peasant in Poland and America.* (5 vols.) Boston: Gorham, 1918–1920.

Useem, J. & Useem, Ruth *The Western educated man in India.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1955.

Watson, Jeanne D., & Lippitt, R. *Learning across cultures: A study of Germans visiting America.* Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1955.

Zimmerman, Claire, & Bauer, R. A. The effect of an audience upon what is remembered. *Publ. Opin. Quart.*, 1956, *20*, 238–248.