
Utilizing the Effects of the Fulbright Program in Contemporary China: Motivational Elements in Chinese Scholars' Post-Fulbright Life *

Meirong FU, Xin ZHAO

Beijing Foreign Studies University, China

Email: fmeirong@bfsu.edu.cn

Abstract:

The expansion of the Fulbright Program in China since 2004 represents a larger pool of Chinese intellectuals who have been enlightened in America and are expected to put their enhanced human capital to good use back home. While the Chinese scholars generally perceive the professional and personal effects of their Fulbright experience as tremendous, they have significantly underutilized these effects, largely due to the institutional and sociocultural constraints within China. The study concludes that given the institutional incompatibility between China and America, and laden with cultural baggage, the “enlightened” Chinese intellectuals could hardly live up to the U.S. government’s expectations.

Key Words: Chinese Scholars, Fulbright Program, Faculty life in China, Intrinsic motivation, Political and cultural constraints

* The preparation of this manuscript was partially supported by the Public Diplomacy Research Center of Beijing Foreign Studies University (Project No. 1120 040 831).

1. INTRODUCTION

Following the conclusion of World War II, the United States aspired to expand educational exchanges through government-sponsored programs aiming to create a more peaceful and productive world (Levin, 2005). Well illustrative of this is the Fulbright Program, which was founded in 1946 with the goal of “fostering leadership, learning, and empathy between cultures” (Fulbright, 1989). Acclaimed as “America’s premier vehicle for intellectual engagement with the rest of the world” (IAWG, 2013), the Fulbright Program boasts approximately 360,000 alumni from over 160 countries¹, including China. It should be noted that the first Fulbright agreement in the world was signed with China in 1947, but it was suspended due to the founding of the People’s Republic of China in 1949². After thirty years without contact between the Chinese and American academic communities, the Fulbright Program in China was resumed upon the normalization of China-U.S. relations in 1979. In 1983, the Program shifted its priority from providing English language teaching and teacher training to advancing American Studies, with the grantees’ areas embracing history, literature, law, journalism, management, economics, political science, sociology, philosophy, international relations, etc. From 1983 to 1989, about 24 Fulbright grantees had traveled in each direction, yet the numbers began to increase after 1991. More strikingly, the new millennium has witnessed faster growth of this bi-national enterprise. In 2004, the Chinese Ministry of Education (MOE) and the U.S. Department of State reached an agreement to “expand the program and share in the cost of funding individual Fulbright grants”. Thus, the Fulbright Program in China began to be jointly administered by the American Center for Education Exchange (ACEE) and the China Scholarship Council (CSC). In 2006, the number of Chinese higher learning institutions actively involved was increased from 41 to 125. Currently, about 100 grants are awarded each year to Chinese scholars and students.³ This represents a larger repository of first-hand knowledge about America and expertise as a result of professional and cultural learning, and a great potential of positively influencing millions of people (Bellamy and Weinberg, 2008). Indeed, Fulbright alumni are expected to put the effects of their Fulbright experience to good use. But did the Chinese grantees live up to the expectations?

Existing research on U.S. public diplomacy in communist countries gives much attention to its political and ideological influence, while the cultural and professional effects are inadequately discussed. As it is, the Fulbright Program also aims to enhance the participants’ cultural empathy and professional capacities, thus enabling them to transmit disciplinary insights, research and teaching techniques in their home institutions upon return. In particular, Fulbright alumni are encouraged to serve as a catalyst for creation of long-term scholarly relationships

¹ Statistics came from <http://eca.state.gov/fulbright/about-fulbright> (assessed July 31,2015).

² By August 1949, 27 American scholars and students and 24 Chinese students and scholars had participated in the exchange. http://beijing.usembassy-china.org.cn/fulbright_history.html (assessed November 4,2015)

³ Statistics came from *2012-2013 Fulbright China Directory* provided by Beijing American Center.

and establishment of institutional linkages between the institutions of the U.S. and of other countries. As a follow up of the authors' study⁴ which shows tremendous effects of the Fulbright experience on the Chinese scholars personally and professionally, this study focuses on their post-Fulbright lives. Specifically, it examines how these elite intellectuals have tapped their enhanced human capital for positive changes and analyzes the multiple factors in relation to utilizing the effects of their Fulbright experience.

The purpose of the paper is twofold. First, it offers a glimpse of what we might expect regarding the role of elite Chinese intellectuals in post-communist China. Second, it provides a better understanding of the impact of U.S. cultural diplomacy in different cultural contexts. Besides, the theoretical analysis of this study should shed light on future research so that motivational elements will be given due attention in utilizing a society's human capital.

This paper is structured as follows. Section 2 contains a review of literature on U.S. educational exchange programs. Section 3 provides the theoretical frame work of the study. Section 4 describes the methods and data in respect to this study. Section 5 presents the empirical results of the study. Section 6 gives a theoretical discussion of the findings. Finally, we propose conclusions, implications and suggestions regarding the impact of the Fulbright Program in China.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

In the vast literature of U.S. public diplomacy, the impact of educational exchange programs is viewed predominantly through the lens of international relations (e.g. Seabury et al, 1982; Stangor et al, 1996; Peterson, 2002; Atkinson, 2010; Ulrich, 2012). Many researchers highlight the great potential of U.S. educational exchange programs to eliminate misconceptions about America, support the development of liberal values and practices, and ultimately improve American image and foreign relations (e.g. Perry 2003; Schneider, 2004; Kruckeberg, 2005). Some empirical studies confirm that U.S exchange programs consolidate the alliance and transform its rivals during and after the Cold War (Wilder 1964; Richmond, 2003; Alzugaray, 2006; Medalis, 2009; Rugh, 2009). Conversely, some scholars argue that U.S. public diplomacy programs do not necessarily lead to an appreciative and sympathetic view (Hansel & Grove, 1986, Erb, 2002; Snow, 2004; Dutta-Bergman, 2006; El-Nawawy, 2006; De Lima Jr, 2007; Cull, 2009; Berger, 2009; Khatib, 2011) due to a plethora of cultural, political and institutional variants (Scott-Smith, 2008; Selltiz and Cook, 2010). Also noteworthy are a few works on U.S.-China educational exchange (Lampton et al, 1986, Kallgren and Simon, 1987; Xu 1999, Li, 2005). While this literature provides valuable first-hand information on exchange activities performed by participants from China and the U.S., it lacks timeliness and interpretation of the multiple factors of the outcomes.

⁴ This article, titled "Professional effects of the Fulbright experience on Chinese scholars (2001-2011)", finds that participating in the Fulbright Program has substantially uplifted the Chinese scholars' academic standard, work ethics and cross-cultural skills for a promising career.

Some studies did examine U.S. international exchange programs from other perspectives, notably the personal and professional effects on program participants and the ripple effects (Watkins, 1986; Dudden and Dynes, 1986; SRI International, 2005; ORC Macro, 2006; Scott-Smith, 2006; IAWG, 2013). Nevertheless, these studies largely make broad-based impressionistic evaluations with generalizations of the effects or document the positive outcomes. Occasionally, the effects of the Fulbright experience were found to be under expectation (Kraft, 1984; Sunal and Sunal, 1991; Aziz, 2004), but little is known about how the effects are utilized in post-communist countries. .

The impact of U.S. educational exchange programs is influenced by various factors. Among them are variables during the grant. Specifically, length of program affects participants' development of learning skills, such as cognitive complexity, liberal learning, personal philosophy and interpersonal self-confidence (Neppel, 2005). Besides, "intergroup contact produces different patterns of change on different types of group perceptions," and this change is likely to last after the contact ends (Stangor et al, 1996). Hence, Bellamy & Weinberg (2008) suggest that a well-designed program should include "professional training, local home stays, and community service". Pre- and post-conditions of exchange experiences are affective too. According to Warwick (1971), there are three "major sources of variation" in the impact of exchange experience: pre-departure conditions, transnational experience and post-return characteristics. Scott-Smith (2008) concludes that exchange does not change original attitudes from negative to positive; it only could strengthen the already positive attitudes. Atkinson (2010) emphasizes common identity of exchanges, arguing that the results will be more significant if the exchangees have "similar life experiences and knowledge" and if they are potential political leaders in their countries. Likewise, past experiences, identities and self-perceptions are considered important for exchange results (Gemignani, 2009; Hartman 2011). In terms of post-conditions, Erb (2002) notes that the applicability of exchange experience depends on the environment of the exchangee's home country, as well as continued contact and cooperation between the alumni. Notwithstanding the above mentioned factors, political and cultural factors in the home country are rarely examined.

To conclude, prior research on U.S. government-sponsored educational exchange programs, the Fulbright program in particular, is narrow in perspective and general in conclusion. Notably, there is a dearth of empirical research regarding the multi-faceted impact of U.S. cultural diplomacy in the post-communist context, and the multiple factors in relation to the impact. And the case of China is notably understudied.

3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Humanistic theories of motivation support the idea that people have strong cognitive reasons to perform various actions (Maslow, 1954; Deci, 1975). Specifically, the Cognitive Evaluation Theory (CET) is used to interpret the motivational elements in the Chinese scholars' post-Fulbright lives. As part of the Self-Determination Theory, CET maintains that people are

intrinsically motivated to learn and curious to try new things” (Deci & Ryan, 1982), but social contextual factors cause variability in intrinsic motivation (Deci and Ryan, 1985). According to Dev (1997), intrinsic motivation refers to (a) the desire to participate in an activity purely out of curiosity, i.e. a need to know more about something; (b) the desire to engage in an activity purely for the sake of participating in and completing a task; and (c) the desire to contribute. When people are intrinsically motivated, they will perform their jobs with more interest, excitement and creativity. And extrinsic motivation refers to doing something because it leads to a separable outcome, typically the rewards for showing the desired behavior, and the threat of punishment following misbehavior. Hence, certain supportive conditions are required for the maintenance and enhancement of people’s inherent propensity to learn, as it is often disrupted by various non-supportive conditions (Ryan and Deci, 2000).

Moreover, CET identifies three psychological needs as determinants of people’s intrinsic motivation (Lochne et al, 2012). When these needs are satisfied, there will be positive consequences, such as well-being, growth and happiness; when they are thwarted, people’s motivation, productivity and happiness plummet (Deci and Ryan, 1985). The first need is competence, i.e. feeling efficacious and having a sense of accomplishment, like positive feedback, optimal challenges, freedom from demeaning evaluations, effective communications, etc (Oudejans, 2007). The second need is autonomy, i.e. self-determination in one’s behavior. Deci and Ryan (1987) find that individuals are more satisfied and more intrinsically motivated in an environment that is based on autonomy rather than control. Accordingly, acknowledgment of feelings, opportunities for self-direction and choice will improve intrinsic motivation because they allow individuals a greater feeling of autonomy (Deci and Ryan, 1985). The third need is relatedness, i.e. a sense of belonging with other individuals, work groups or culture. Although intrinsic motivation can stand in isolation in some cases, a secure relational support is conducive to the expression of intrinsic motivation (Anderson et al, 1976). When people feel comfortable and appreciated by others, they will portray a higher degree of intrinsic motivation (Oudejans, 2007). In sum, compared with externally controlled behaviors, intrinsically motivated behaviors are associated with “higher satisfaction and more effective performance” (Lochner et al, 2012), and therefore lead to “enhanced performance, persistence, and creativity” (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

4. METHODS AND DATA

This study adopts a qualitative approach, drawing on data from in-depth interviews. The population for the study is 521 Chinese Fulbright grantees of the year 2001 through 2011, who were sponsored by six specialized programs: Visiting Research Scholar (VRS), Graduate Student (GS), Dissertation Research (PhD), Scholar-in-Residence (SIR), American Political Science Association Congressional Fellowship (APSACF), and Foreign Language Teaching Assistant Program (FLTA) (see Table 1). Their contact information came from *Fulbright China Directory* via ACEE. We invited all prospective participants via email for an interview to be conducted in four cities -- Beijing, Tianjin, Xiamen and Guangzhou – during the six months

from 1 June through 30 December of 2013. In all, 111 recipients responded, 35 scholars accepted our invitation, and eventually 32 of them made it.

Table 1. Number of Chinese Fulbright Scholars (2001-2012)

	VRS	SIR	FLTA	APSACF	GS	PHD
2001-2002	18	4	--	--	N/A	--
2002-2003	22	1	--	--	N/A	--
2003-2004	19	0	--	--	N/A	--
2004-2005	38	2	--	1	6	--
2005-2006	38	2	11	1	2	--
2006-2007	40	3	17	--	2	--
2007-2008	40	4	40	--	--	8
2008-2009	40	7	40	--	--	20
2009-2010	40	5	39	--	--	17
2010-2011	38	0	40	--	--	20
2011-2012	37	6	39	--	--	14
Total	370	34	226	2	10	79

Source: Fulbright scholar directories, http://www.cies.org/schlr_directories (assessed on October 31, 2013).

As shown in Table 2, the 32 participants⁵ consist of 10 men and 22 women. At the time of interview, all of them held a faculty position at a leading university in China, except one who was affiliated with a research institute. Among this group are 10 full professors, 1 researcher, 10 associate professors and 11 assistant professors, and their areas include history, linguistics, literature, law, journalism, business administration, economics, political science, sociology, philosophy, international relations, etc. 25 of them had worked for more than ten years work in high-learning institutions, while 7 had less than 5 years of such experience. In terms of grant type, this group well represents the range of the Fulbright Program.

Table 2. Profile of Interview Participants

Name	Sex	Type	Year	Discipline	Prof'l Rank	Title/position
Chang	F	VRS	2004-5	American Literature	ASSOP	None
Jian	M	VRS	2007-8	Business Administration	FP	Associate Dean

⁵ Their pseudonyms are used for the sake of confidentiality.

Feng	M	VRS	2007-8	Film Studies	ASSOP	None
Ying	M	VRS	2007-8	Environmental Economics	FP	None
Xin	F	VRS	2007-8	American Literature	ASSOP	Office Director
Ai	F	VRS	2007-8	Law	FP	None
Hong	F	VRS	2008-9	Applied Linguistics	FP	None
Cui	F	VRS	2008-9	American History	FP	Program Director
Qing	M	VRS	2009-10	American Literature	ASSOP	None
Kui	F	VRS	2009-10	Asian American Literature	ASSOP	Program Director
Min	F	VRS	2009-10	Linguistics	FP	None
Cai	F	VRS	2009-10	International Business	FP	Program Director
Fei	M	VRS	2010-11	International Relations	ASSOP	Division Director
Xia	F	VRS	2010-11	Chinese Philosophy	Researcher	None
Tao	F	VRS	2010-11	Political Science	FP	None
Ya	F	SIR	2001-2	Linguistics	ASSOP	None
Qi	M	SIR	2006-7	American Studies	ASSOP	None
Zhong	M	SIR	2006-7	Education	ASSOP	Vice Dean
Rong	F	SIR	2007-8	American Studies	FP	Program Director
Mei	F	SIR	2007-8	Economics	ASSOP	None
Si	M	APSA	2004-5	International Relations	FP	Assistant Dean
Zheng	M	FLTA	2005-6	American studies	ASSISP	None
Yan	F	FLTA	2005-6	Linguistics	ASSISP	None
Rui	F	FLTA	2005-6	Linguistics	ASSISP	None
Xi	F	FLTA	2007-8	English Education	ASSISP	Vice Director
Shu	F	FLTA	2007-8	Linguistics	ASSISP	None
Qiang	M	FLTA	2010-11	International Relations	ASSISP	None
Lei	F	FLTA	2011-12	Translation Studies	ASSISP	Vice Director
La	F	GS	2002-4	Linguistics	ASSISP	None
Yue	F	GS	2006-8	Linguistics/American S	ASSISP	None
Li	F	PHD	2011-12	International Relations	ASSISP	Assistant Director
Mo	F	PHD	2011-12	Linguistics	ASSISP	None

*FP – Full Professor; ASSOP – associate professor; ASSISP - assistant professor;

We interviewed the participants face to face -- 19 in an office, six in a meeting room, four in a coffee shop, two in a tea house and one in a garden. The interviews were conducted in Chinese, each lasting 60 to 90 minutes. We first restated the purpose of our research and then asked the

participant to sign the letter of consent. The interview questions concern the participants' background, their perceptions of the Fulbright experience, and how they have utilized their enhanced human capital. While a list of questions was prepared, specific questions varied and additional inquiries were proposed as per the interviewee's response. We took care to ensure that participants did not feel judged or evaluated. The interviews were transcribed verbatim and translated closely from Chinese into English by the authors. For data analysis, we employed qualitative analysis techniques. The first two transcripts were inductively coded to establish a coding system for the remaining transcripts; statements from similar or different transcripts were compared in order to identify the themes and subthemes of the findings. Recurring themes and subthemes were identified, which serve as categories to structure the findings.

5. EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

Drawing on data from the interview, this section presents the Chinese scholars' professional pursuits, socially contributory actions, and internationally-oriented commitments in their post-Fulbright lives. It also reveals the key factors that affected the amount and direction of activity they carried out.

5.1 Progress in academic career

A starting question concerns **changes in professional specialization and credentials** as a result of the Fulbright experience. 21 alumni stated that their scholarly engagement in the U.S. confirmed or strengthened their areas of research already chosen. As Chang concluded, "After returning from the states, I am more confident professionally, and the most important change is to be critical in my intellectual production in African American literature." Xi viewed her Fulbright teaching experience as "an enjoyable mission," which prompted her long-term plan of "teaching Chinese in various cultures", and her forthcoming assignment at the Confucius Institute in the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago.

In addition, 13 scholars noted that the Fulbright experience broadened their specialization or sparked new research interests, thus enabling them to "carve a niche" in academic career. As Ying described, "my interest in green accounting and expertise in quantitative skills in forestry economics were enhanced by my collaborative research at Yale." Similarly, Kui reported having shifted her area from Chinese American literature to Asian American literature, largely because of her scholarly engagement at UC Berkeley.

Another trend is that some young scholars were inspired to pursue an advanced degree in international studies. For example, Qiang mentioned his ongoing doctoral research in International Relations at China Academy of Social Sciences (CASS). Shu expressed the desire to "go for PhD in multicultural education through the lens of sociology", because the year in the U.S. deepened her insight in social issues. Yue noted that she went into American studies because the systematic training at Georgetown put her on the track of American politics. She

added, “To strike the iron when it is hot, I began to do my Ph.D. at the American Studies Institute of CASS in 2009.”

Asked about post-Fulbright changes in professional credentials, nearly all participants said without hesitation that their standing was not raised at all, largely due to the lack of value placed in the Fulbright Program by their home institution. As Lei illustrated, “When I applied for the Fulbright grant, I knew little about it. Today, it is still short of recognition in China. The Fulbright experience has never added merit to my career advancement.” Five scholars noted that the Fulbright Program cannot compare with the Chinese government-sponsored talent programs. As Feng remarked, “In China, many administrators know little about the Fulbright Program, let alone give respect for Fulbright scholars. But they attach importance to Cheung Kong scholars.”

In terms of **scholarly research and publications**, the great majority of the group indicated changes in amount of research performed in the post-Fulbright period. These changes included new grant-funded project development, more research activities and increased publications. Specific aspects of their output point to three trends.

First, among the increased publications are much more articles and monographs than textbooks and translated works. The participants indicated considerable endeavor to produce scholarly works by incorporating information, materials or data obtained in the U.S., but the most common type of their works were articles in Chinese language journals and monographs published in China. By contrast, fewer text books and translated works were produced mainly because they are not considered “serious” publications. Well illustrative is the case of Xia, a professor of Chinese philosophy. Interactions with American scholars at Brown University sparked Xia’s interest to “translate four classic works into Chinese and publish them through the Press of China Social Sciences,” but this plan was postponed again and again, because she had to produce articles first – to meet the requirement of her institute.

Second, older scholars have published a greater number of journal articles than younger scholars overall. An explanation stated is that the older group includes more full professors and administrators whose works stood a better chance of being accepted or solicited by journals and newspapers in China. For example, Jian admitted having submitted two articles by request of *People’s Daily*. By contrast, seven younger scholars indicated lower rate of publication in recent three years. With fewer chances of having their articles published in “recognized” journals, some of them would put less effort in research or did not conduct scholarly research at all. Thus, Zheng lamented, “It is increasingly difficult to publish in CSSCI or Core journals. My manuscripts were often rejected without any explanation or suggestions. My drive to produce for publication is diminishing.”

Third, the scholars are dissatisfied with the quality of their published works overall. These works even include a large percentage of articles published in CSSCI journals and monographs coming out through a prominent press. A major shortcoming stated is the lack of rigor and

originality. Asked whether or not they applied the sophisticated methods they acquired in the U.S., only four scholars said yes, while 15 others gave somewhat negative responses, noting that it was time-consuming to carry out projects using quantitative instruments. The instances of three scholars are illustrative. Xi spent much time scrambling to publish whatever she could get into print, rather than concentrating on developing significant research projects. Ying produced “quick works” due to time constraints of an MOE-funded project. Citing the book based on her doctoral dissertation, Yue explained, “When designing my doctoral research project at CASS, I intended to employ some mathematical models I grasped at Georgetown. But my advisor cautioned that these models were too sophisticated to be appreciated in China. And the strenuous process of data collection and analysis would prolong the whole thing.”

Clearly, to a large extent, the Chinese scholars have underutilized the research skills and academic standard they came to absorb in the United States. There are three main reasons for the sorry state of the alumni’ scholarly research in China, particularly since 2006.

The first reason is the pressure to publish. Nearly all participants noted that their professional competence is predominantly measured by numbers of published works, particularly articles published in designated “top” journals. According to Ying, his home university requires every full professor to publish two SCI papers each year; failure to meet the criteria for three years will result in being “degraded or even eliminated from faculty posts”. Min said sorrowfully, “In recent years, the pressure to publish has increased immensely. So I was often sleepless when the evaluation was approaching.” Thus, anxiety for quick results forced the alumni into quick action by sacrificing quality and standard of academic research. This also accounts for the limited effort among the group to publish in international journals. As Rong illustrated with her case, “As a professor of English and American Studies, I prefer to publish in English language journals. But considering the lengthy cycle and strict rules, I have to count on Chinese language journals.” 11 alumni pointed out that the evaluation for faculty placed much value on research grants of the central and provincial governments, which directed a great deal of efforts in writing proposals and conducting the project. As Si described, “It is time consuming to use substantial empirical evidence or sophisticated analytic instruments. In order to complete an MOE-funded project in two years, I rushed to publish three papers in Chinese journals.”

The second reason manifests the “squeezing out” effect. Hefty teaching responsibilities and other commitments squeezed much time out of the alumni. Some of them would devote 30 hours a week to preparing classes, lecturing, and counseling students. As Hong illustrated, “Currently I have four MA students, three PhDs and two undergrads. I spend a lot of time reading their papers.” Ying complained that he taught 4-5 classes each semester because his colleagues didn’t want to take over his courses. Administrative work also squeezed much time. For example, as an associate dean, Jian had substantial commitments to political, administrative and non-academic duties. Citing the CPC mass line education campaign, he remarked, “I’ve got to make arrangements and notify all party members of the school. An occasion like this is burdensome and meaningless. I can hardly concentrate on what I’m really interested in doing.”

As Director of International Affairs, Xin described her life this way, “Numerous meetings and business trips are part of my life. Meanwhile, I teach American literature in the English Department. The hefty workload squeezes out much time of my scholarly research.”

The third reason is the stiff and limiting intellectual environment. 19 scholars indicated great difficulty in adjusting to home environment compared to the autonomy, peacefulness and comfort they enjoyed while living in the United States. In respect to intellectual freedom, 9 professors pointed out that many publishers in China reject “sensitive topics”, such as Academia Sinica, democratic movement, North Korea and Tibet. Citing her manuscripts on national identity and Chinese legislative discourse, Min described, “The editors would ask me to shun ‘politically sensitive’ texts regarding ‘Taiwan’, ‘Iran’ and ‘Iraq’ if I wished to publish in their journal. In making revisions again and again, I was losing my intellectual dignity.” Besides, seven professors complained about the working conditions and staff support at their institution. Cui noted that professors in the U.S. often delegated some workload to teaching assistants and supporting staff; sadly, in China, many professors had to cope with everything by themselves. Ying stated that apart from 12 hours’ teaching every week he spent considerable time “replying to emails and handling all kinds of paper work.” Min described her working conditions at Renmin University, “The office building looks magnificent, but the ‘software’ is disappointing. For example, there are no soap, no tissues in the restrooms. Worst of all, we three professors share a small office”.

The interview also addressed post-Fulbright efforts in **course development**. 15 alumni reported having developed at least one new course by incorporating knowledge and materials they acquired in the U.S. Citing his undergraduate course *China on the Screen*, Feng observed that examining the image of China from a comparative perspective and within the western theoretical frame “greatly broadened students’ world views.” Yue noted that her graduate course on American government was the first of its kind at her home institution and her course readings followed that of Georgetown University. By contrast, 17 other scholars indicated little effort in course development. One reason was that already heavy workload left them little time to teach news courses. As Qing said, “The Fulbright experience at Yale inspired me to teach holocaust literature, but I had to postpone the plan due to my administrative duties to the MTI program.” Moreover, the pressure to publish detracted much attention. As Ai articulated, “It makes little sense to make strenuous efforts in preparing new courses and pursuing excellence in teaching. I have to put every iron in the fire to produce publications.” Besides, centralized control discouraged initiatives in course development. As Mei illustrated, “I designed a course based on my lectures in the U.S., but I could not teach it back home. As the MOE controls the curricular structure of institutions with international trade majors, my university has limited autonomy in course offering.” Similarly, Xi mentioned that her new course *Chinese Culture* in support of the international education at her university was rejected by the Provost because “it too costly for a small group of undergrads mostly from Korea and Mongolia.” Notwithstanding their differing experiences in course development, the participants indicated substantial efforts

to modify existing courses by enriching their lectures with materials and knowledge they acquired in the U.S.

Another key question concerns changes in **teaching approach**. Most of the alumni indicated attempts to improve teaching methods, which involved reading requirement, instructional approach and style of interaction. Seven scholars mentioned the student centered approach characterized by interactional participation and intellectual stimulation. Cai said that she advocated seminar courses at her school, because many Chinese professors had followed the “chalk and talk way” of teaching, and dominated classes, leaving students little room of thinking independently. Xia stated that American professors’ strength in stimulating different voices reassured her consciousness of engaging students in class. Besides, 11 scholars emphasized that the academic standard prevailing in American universities stimulated them to reform their course design aiming to tap students’ intellectual potential. As Kui illustrated, “I updated the readings of *Asian American Literature* with several books donated by my American advisor, thus making the course “comparable to that of UC Berkeley.” Qing reported having revised his syllabus of *Comparing Contemporary Chinese and American Fictions* by increasing required readings, hoping to push the students to learn through reading.

Nevertheless, some alumni noted that their initiatives encountered institutional and cultural obstacles. Notably, the university did not appreciate their initiatives, or did not allow them to make changes to the existing pattern. For example, Cai proposed bilingual teaching at her school as an effort to promote internationalization of its professional degree programs, but the high-level leadership disapproved her proposal because “the aim was too high to be achieved.” Jian attempted to introduce some practices of American business schools to his school, but could hardly push the initiative because “the university only wants tangible benefits and quick results.” In respects to sociocultural constraints, seven scholars highlighted students’ performance in class. Kui observed that American style seminars could hardly bear fruit back home because “most Chinese students are shy of expressing themselves openly.”

5.2 Ripple Effects

To begin with, participants indicated considerable endeavor in **sharing knowledge and insights** about the U.S. with their family, colleagues, students or friends. The most common ways of sharing was talking informally face to face or through social media such as *weibo*, *wechat* and the State Alumni Website. Eight scholars claimed to have become “cultural interpreters” about U.S. society, conditions, and practices. As Cui articulated, “Many Chinese have stereotypes and misconceptions about American culture and society, and American values. I feel obliged to pass on my first-hand knowledge” In comparison, the participants’ actions of sharing via formal channels were limited. Specifically, only seven scholars contributed articles about their Fulbright experience to *State Newsletter of Exchange Alumni* or other media, and six scholars gave presentations on alumni-related occasions. More often than not, they did it by request. As Xia described, “Upon return from the U.S., I contributed two essays about “Americans’ Family Values”, and a commencement at Brown, at the request of *New Century*

and *State Alumni Newsletter*. Asked about their low engagement in this respect, 13 scholars explained that few people seemed to be interested in their Fulbright experience or exchange-related insight. 9 alumni attributed it to “time constraint” or “schedule conflicts”. As Tao remarked, “Life is about tradeoffs. Since my time and energy are limited, I have to be very selective in terms of commitments.”

In terms of **advising people on U.S. sojourns**, most alumni reported having become a source of information among their colleagues intending to apply for a Fulbright grant, meanwhile they used examples from personal experiences to encourage their students to study in the United States. Specifically, 21 participants recounted instances of advising their colleagues on pursuing academic endeavor through the Fulbright Program. As Hong said, “My precedent significantly influenced my colleagues. I used to expect very few chances of success for researchers of linguistics compared to applicants from sociology, law, economics etc. So I promoted the Fulbright grant in my way.”

Strikingly, the alumni indicated much commitment to facilitating their students for further study in the U.S. As Feng illustrated, “Some of his students desired to go for film studies because of his new course *English Films: Theories and Practice*, as part of his Fulbright project. I took pleasure in recommending them to graduate programs in the U.S., and a number of them were admitted into top universities.” Interestingly, the role of referees was more notable among grantees who reported close interactions with their American host professors. As Jian described, “My host professor at the University Florida was affirmative of my intellectual ability. Due to our close interactions, he accepted two Chinese students to do PhD with him.”

Nevertheless, ten participants reported little engagement in this regard. In particular, five grantees of SIR and FLTA attributed it to the “inferior” status of their host institution, while others raised the issue of popular majors among students. According to Ya, her students never wanted to study in her host institution, a non-prominent liberal art college. Qing lamented that few students bothered him for a reference for an American literature program in the U.S., because “they favor accounting, sociology, law, MBA, finance, etc.”

The alumni indicated some **socially contributory actions** in their communities. These actions were closely related to their professional specialization, such as teaching English at elementary schools, compiling translated articles for the *Friends of Nature*, creating a forum on the internet. The instance of Tao is well illustrative. As a professor of Feminism in international relations, she created a blog “Women’s Voice” aiming to spread awareness of women’s problems. It is worth noting that the Fulbright Program has created an engaging community and network for the alumni, and enabled them to influence other people. Accordingly, the ACEE has strived to keep members of the International Exchange Alumni connected and work together to act upon common values they developed during the grant. For example, the Alumni Small Grants Competition and the Alumni Engagement Innovation Fund were established by the State Department to support team-based alumni initiatives that promote shared values and innovative

solutions to global challenges.⁶ Nevertheless, asked about their involvement in these causes, only two scholars reported having initiated a project, and 7 scholars indicated involvement in a project proposed by others. As an explanation, six scholars said that they hoped to “kill two birds with one stone” but often found the proposed initiatives did not match their area.

5.3 Internationally-oriented Commitment

The Fulbright experience imparted considerable **personal ties and professional contacts**. Specifically, 28 scholars indicated contacts via email with the individuals they met in the United States in the year following the sojourn, while 15 scholars reported contacts with more than three US colleagues and social friends three years after the sojourn. In addition, 11 scholars had someone from their Fulbright experience visit them in China, and 6 scholars had continuing contact by attending conferences or other events.

It is noteworthy that the participants who rated their host professor or advisor more positively regarding professional support were more likely than others to maintain continuing contacts after the sojourn. As Xi said, “Close interactions with my American host professor made my Fulbright teaching experience very rewarding. Therefore, I strongly desire to invite him to visit Beijing for further interactions.” Seven alumni, including Xi, reported having actually invited their former host professor or advisor to give lectures or short courses at their home institution. As Hong recounted, I made arrangements for my American host professor to give four lectures at *Renmin* University. Over 200 Chinese professors and graduates from Beiwai, BNU and Tsinghua joined us. And it enabled an American professor to better understand China through interactions with Chinese academics.” Two professors, Jian and Si, indicated continuing contacts with their former host professors or colleagues through collaborative research. As Ying stated, “I have stayed in touch with my advisor at Yale, and conducted collaborative research with him for several years. Later he introduced his colleagues to continue our collaboration.” Besides, five scholars maintained contacts by helping organize conferences, workshops and other activities aiming to foster academic exchanges. For example, Kui initiated a conference on Asian American Literature in collaboration with her former colleagues at UC Berkeley. Si facilitated a U.S. Senator’s visit to his university, which was “an unprecedented event at the school.”

By contrast, 15 participants indicated few ensuing contacts with their American host professors, advisors, colleagues, etc. Typically, they maintained the contacts as a gesture of courtesy, by sending greetings on Christmas or Thanksgiving. As an explanation for their low engagement, seven participants expressed their feelings of inferiority. As Chang said, “As an obscure person, I don’t feel good to initiate academic exchanges with American professors.”

The personal ties provided an on-going channel of communication and the potential for **increasing institutional linkages and cooperation**. Nine professors reported having strived to

⁶ To participate, the alumni must team up with at least five current or former exchange participants.

foster exchanges and collaborations between their home institution and an American institution. For example, Shu served as a bridge between her university and an American university to investigate the possibility of establishing Christian schools in China. Mei facilitated her home university to establish a joint degree program with TSU in 2012.” Ya pushed a Study Chinese Program which brought about 10 American students to Beijing for three months each year. There are also some unsuccessful instances in this respect. Five participants described their endeavor as futile largely due to obstacles within their home institution. In particular, old-fashioned academic systems posed constraints to international collaboration. As Cai remarked, “with our curricular structure being far cry from international standards, how can we expect our American counterparts to trust us?” Xin echoed this view, “Without a compatible curriculum, my host institution can hardly accommodate foreign students wishing to study here.” Citing her efforts to promote an exchange program between her home institution and UC Berkeley, Kui revealed that the two parties reached no agreement due to divergence over its long term goal and administration.

It is more noteworthy that 19 alumni indicated little commitment to institutional exchange due to personal, organizational and cultural factors. Above all, they considered it a daunting task, especially when they were already burdened with hefty workload. Citing a student exchange program, Fei listed the complicated procedures regarding expense, safety, curricular compatibility, etc, and concluded, “Considering the immense work, and lack of administrative and financial support, I gave up.” This view was echoed by Min, “As an ordinary professor, I have no power, no influence, and no resources to make things happen. Without institutional support, the proposed programs could hardly come into fruition.” Besides, four professors stated that their American host institution was “not prominent enough” to lure the attention of their home institution in respect to collaboration. As Hong illustrated “The university leadership favors world class universities like Harvard, UCLA, Oxford, etc, rather than second-tier institutions like the University of Minnesota. So I didn’t bother.” Citing his host institution in Montana, Zheng said, “I intended to bring American students here, and send Chinese students there. But I did not follow up, considering BFSU students desired top universities.”

Another key aspect of international commitments concerned **participation in alumni activities**. The U.S. Embassy in China, through ACEE, has persistently strived to create an engaging community by organizing various alumni-related activities. Given that the vast majority of the alumni were affirmative and nostalgic about the Fulbright experience, it would seem logical to expect their enthusiastic involvement in these activities. Nonetheless, the interview reveals modest involvement overall, and the level of involvement varies with the type of activity. Specifically, there is a relatively high level involvement with social gatherings such as receptions, banquets and performances, U.S. presidential election party, which were usually relaxing and entertaining. 21 participants reported having attended at least one of such events during the past three years, as a way of socializing with other alumni and the organizers. Citing

the Birthday Party in commemoration of Senator Fulbright, Xia emphasized that this event allowed her to interact with the Embassy staff and fellow scholars, and to better understand the Fulbright program. Rui said that she attended several movies, operas, and musicals, but missed many other events, including the reception of Ambassador Gary Lock. Regarding the “difficult” events such as lectures, workshops, online debates, 21 participants expressed appreciation to the US Embassy’s strenuous efforts in engaging the Fulbright alumni, but indicated limited involvement since the sojourn. A major explanation is time constraint. As Feng said, “I did want to share my observations with other alumni through events organized by the Embassy. But I was too busy to spare two hours to get there.” Besides, three grantees of FLTA expressed a sense of inferiority. As Yan said, with the lowest status among Fulbright scholars, I don’t want to show up, though I appreciate the Embassy people in organizing events.”

The interview also addressed the activities organized by the Association of Chinese Fulbright Alumni (ACFA)⁷. 18 alumni reported having participated at least one of the annual conferences, hoping to interact with fellow Fulbrighters from different disciplines. However, they generally described the event as “poorly organized”, “uninteresting”, “more political than academic”. Citing the second conference in Nanjing, Ai remarked, “The conference was more political than academic. They invited some officials to give long winded speeches. It is a waste of my time.”

The limited involvement in alumni activities organized by the ACFA reflects the unpopularity of the Fulbright Program administration on the part of China. A major grievance concerns the pre-program deposit of 40,000 RMB and documentation of guarantee. Nearly all participants viewed the formalities as “burdensome”, “restrictive”, “hurtful”, and “humiliating”. As Min remarked, “the whole thing conveys a message of distrust to Fulbright scholars.” In addition, the participants generally disfavored the MOE’s interference with their post-Fulbright activities. As the secretariat of ACFA, Si described his painful experience this way, “In obtaining financial and administrative support from the MOE, we submitted a long proposal and waited long for their approval. The agenda of the first annual alumni conference was changed several times.”

6. DISCUSSION

While participating in the Fulbright Program successfully uplifted the Chinese scholars’ academic standard, work ethics and cross-cultural skills overall, the study presents a mixed success in respect of utilizing their enhanced human capital. In terms of career advancement, the alumni indicated considerable effort to pursue further study, adjust professional specialization, broaden areas of research, enrich course contents, modify approaches to teaching and counseling, develop courses or curricula, and conduct scholarly research. However, the direction, standard and amount of their effort was under expectation overall,

⁷ This organization was established in 2009 aiming to promote China-U.S. human and educational exchange.

particularly in respects to scholarly research and course development. In terms of ripple effects, most of the alumni served as ongoing cultural interpreters among their friends, students and colleagues by spreading knowledge about the U.S. or advising on their sojourns to the US, but much fewer scholars followed through socially desirable actions, such as giving presentations or contributing articles about their Fulbright experience at the request of a civic organization, or doing interviews with media. As regards fostering personal ties, institutional linkages and cultural exchanges, most of the alumni reported continuing contacts with people they met during the program, but their endeavor to establish ties with American host institutions was somehow disappointing. Similarly, although the scholars expressed great interest in organized alumni activities, most of them reported limited engagement in networking with fellow Fulbrighters and working together upon shared values. In sum, the alumni generally desired to bring positive change by utilizing the fruits of the Fulbright experience, but their performance and contribution were far from satisfactory, compared to what the Fulbright Program seeks to achieve.

Close examination of the findings reveals that institutional and social-cultural factors within China have posed major constraints to the Chinese scholars' intrinsic motivation to maximize the effects of their Fulbright experience and fulfill the Fulbright Program's goals.

6.1. Bureaucratization in University Governance

Studies of faculty motivation show that professors find their positions intrinsically satisfying in terms of complexity, responsibility, autonomy and interpersonal relationships (McKeachie, 1982). Sadly, in contemporary China, the government has continued to exercise tight control over higher-education institutions, particularly the leading universities. As a key characteristic, the central government or local governments appoint the President and the Secretary of the Communist Party for each institution. This often directs the appointed officials to pursue short-term and utilitarian objectives of institution development. Moreover, university governance is bureaucratized, resulting in increased administrative control and interference in academic affairs, rather than support and assistance. Accordingly, for example, the curricula proposed by departments or schools are subject to approval of the provost's office or the graduate school; academic committees at department or university levels are usually headed and dominated by chief administrators.

With persistent bureaucratization in China's higher education institutions, administrators are the "shakers and movers" while professors without any administrative title rarely have a say. This not only restricts faculty's freedom, independence and discretion in career development, but also causes faculty-administrator conflicts in some cases. As this study shows, the alumni had to limit their academic research inside the boundary of freedom, and their initiatives in course development were subject to centralized control. In fostering institutional exchanges, the scholars would find their efforts were not supported or appreciated by the leadership. This substantiates the proposition of Freedman (1973), faculty are motivated intrinsically to perform their duties when the institution allows them to expand interests through creation of a

supportive academic culture and assists their initiatives by providing mechanisms for personal, professional, and organizational development.

Despite its international prestige, the Fulbright Program has been under-recognized in China in comparison with the talent programs sponsored by the Chinese government. As a result, the alumni found their credentials were not raised back home, and the value of their Fulbright experience was belittled, if not ignored. This somewhat discouraged them to bring positive change through professional activities and socially contributory actions. To a large extent, the status of Fulbright scholars in China results from inadequate promotion of the Program. Worse of all, the reputation of the Fulbright Program has been tarnished by the program administration on the part of China. Hence, former Fulbrighters mostly take up an indifferent attitude towards alumni activities monitored by the CSC. Deci and Ryan (1985) observed that human beings inherently long for recognition and trust by others, so satisfaction in this regard will stimulate their intrinsic motivation to perform. This suggests that lack of respect inhibits individuals' desire to fulfill their duties.

6.2 Demeaning Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

Aiming to build 100 top-rated universities and a group of world-class universities for the 21st century, the MOE launched the 211 Program in 1995 and the 985 Project in 1998, giving the targeted universities extra funding and thereby expecting extra research output from them. As a reaction, these universities have imposed demeaning criteria for evaluating faculty: progress of their scholarly engagement is checked annually and/or every three years predominantly based on the number and type of research grants and published works; the number of papers a faculty member has published in SSCI or CSSCI-ranked journals over a 5-year period is often the decisive factor in promotion. By comparison, low value is placed on faculty's other responsibilities, especially teaching and service. Such evaluations may bring immediate benefits on an institutional level, but the negative outcomes are disastrous.

Above all, overemphasis of research output has resulted in quick publications displaying superficial methods of learning and inquiry. As McKeachie (1982) pointed, "Individuals who become anxious under the threat of evaluation are likely to be less creative, less effective in solving problems." With immense pressure to publish and the likelihood of demotion or dismissal, the Chinese scholars' need of security overrode all other concerns, which directed them to play safe by producing half-baked ideas and mediocre works for publication. Despite the academic standard they came to absorb as a result of the Fulbright experience, they would turn from time-consuming empirical studies to inquiries that achieve immediate results, at the expense of creativity and rigor. To quote Min in the interview, "you won't care about nutrition when you are starving."

Moreover, emphasis on the number and type of publications and research grants distorts the scholars' intrinsic motivation for academic research. According to CET, a major source of faculty satisfaction is the feeling of autonomy, a sense of being able to exert a good deal of

personal control over their time and energy. In the words of McKeachie (1982), “The work is fun because it is chosen; the same work carried out in response to orders from others becomes burdensome and unpleasant.” With C-ranked journal papers⁸ becoming the yardstick in faculty evaluation and promotion, the alumni’s scholarly activities are misguided to meet external standards, thus stifling their motivation to conduct research for its own sake. Hence, the majority of the alumni put much effort into government-funded research projects and would publish prodigiously, forgoing the intrinsic rewards of the activity. Eventually, their passion for scholarly research diminished; some of them even didn’t care to have a look at their published papers.

Furthermore, simply looking at scholarly productivity erodes the alumni’s feeling of professional competence. With the demeaning evaluation system prevailing in China’s leading universities, teaching was often given secondary consideration and treated as a non-scholarly activity. Consequently, professors would not consider teaching a realm for their mastery attempts, thus decreasing efforts in devising new courses or the best methods of teaching. As Deci and Ryan (1982) pointed out, “Faculty are likely to teach less well and to feel less competent as teachers”. Meanwhile, the formidable task of publishing a number of articles in “recognized” journals within a time limit often made the alumni feel incompetent as a researcher, and repeated frustration caused them to give up scholarly research activity eventually. According to Ryan and Deci (2000), social-contextual events causing feelings of incompetence during action will “forestall the natural process of self-motivation” for that action.

Besides, with the evaluation downplaying faculty service, the alumni’ sense of relatedness diminished. As a result, most of them conveniently neglected or failed to perform responsibilities in respect to university service, special administrative assignments and community service. Understandably, it makes little sense to take additional work when one’s endeavor is not recognized. As Niemiec and Ryan (2009) said, a person would portray a high degree of intrinsic motivation when his needs for relatedness were satisfied. For the alumni, a secure relational base rests on their colleagues and associates valuing and appreciating their efforts to initiate changes for good causes, but the immense pressure to produce publications tarnished their mood for other engagement.

6.3 Ingrained Chinese Cultural Values

Traditional Chinese culture, with its unique values, has strong impact on the behavior of all Chinese. These values can be summarized as face, harmony, moderation and hierarchy (Bond and Hwang 1986). To be specific, face is a sense of favorable social self-worth that a person expects from others (Goffman, 1967). Harmony refers to “one’s inner peace of mind, contentment, as well as interpersonal harmony” (Cheung et al, 1998). The doctrine of

⁸ This refers to Social Science Citation Index, and Arts and Humanities Citation Index, or the Chinese equivalents.

moderation emphasizes following the golden rule of being in the middle and avoiding going to extremes. Hierarchy reflects how an individual endorses the hierarchical role and relationships prescribed by social norms (Leung & Chan, 2003). This study shows that deep-rooted Chinese cultural values undermined the alumni's "secure relational base", i.e. the psychological need of relatedness in terms of utilizing the effects of the Fulbright experience.

First, face is very important to the Chinese, especially in their dealings with others. Hence, some alumni made little effort to foster institutional linkages largely because their American host institution was not prominent enough to lure the attention of their home institution. Being conscious of "face", Chinese higher education administrators prefer to engage in international exchange with top-tier universities, in order to look good in the eyes of their associates and competitors. Likewise, considering themselves "not distinguished enough", some alumni with "low ranks" were shy of contacting their American peers on personal and professional levels.

Second, the Chinese are inclined to seek inner harmony by avoiding changes in the status quo. Notably, high-level administrators of Chinese universities disfavor changes in the existing system. Therefore, the alumni's proposals of bilingual teaching of content courses and internationally oriented curricula were rejected on the grounds that they "aim too high", or "not fit in the curricular structure". Such behavior demonstrates the conservative attitude of many Chinese in compliance with the principle of playing safe, which urges people to achieve inner and interpersonal harmony by avoiding confusion, risks and conflicts in life (Kirkbride et al, 1991). In advising students and colleagues on U.S. sojourns, the alumni generally played a very active role, to seek harmony with people around them.

Third, influenced by the doctrine of moderation, the Chinese scholars usually conform to social norms of the majority and restraint from larruping conduct. Hence, viewing keeping low-key as a most important principle in social interactions, a large percentage of the alumni simply shunned "high-profile publicity" such as giving presentations at civic organizations and doing interviews with media. Moreover, they generally chose to "go with the flow" and yielded to the authority by conforming to the demeaning criteria for faculty evaluation.

Furthermore, the Chinese are very sensitive to their positions in the hierarchical structures (Leung and Chan 2003). Thus, the alumni holding administrative positions generally played a more active role in tapping their resources regarding curricular development and institutional exchanges. By comparison, the alumni without any administrative positions reported limited commitment to education reforms, communities and institutional collaboration. Claiming themselves as "a small potato", these "powerless" scholars had no intention to assume additional responsibilities.

7. CONCLUSION

Notwithstanding the Fulbright experience has resulted in substantial positive effects, the Chinese scholars have largely underutilized these effects mainly because the institutional and

sociocultural constraints within China undermined their intrinsic motivation to perform dutifully for positive change. This conclusion brings up two implications. First, given the persistent institutional incompatibility between China and the U.S., the enhanced human capital from the Fulbright experience can hardly be transferred effectively. As Erb (2002) noted, the applicability of exchange experience depends on the environment of the exchangee's home country. With bureaucratization persisting in Chinese higher-learning institutions, the alumni lack a sense of autonomy, peacefulness and comfort fit for scholarly engagement and socially contributory actions. As emphasized by CET, academics are intrinsically motivated to perform when they feel competent, self-determined and supported. Second, Chinese cultural values may negatively influence the mind and behavior of Chinese. Strikingly, this has also occurred to the highly educated individuals who were selected through a merit-based competition and enlightened by a cross-cultural experience. With a "cultural baggage that has been nurtured based on the individual's own cultural orientation" (Tahir et al, 2007), the alumni generally adopted an acculturation strategy within their comfort zone. As powerless elite, the Chinese intellectuals would yield to the power elite, or become part of the unhealthy culture.

The Fulbright experience has resulted in meaningful effects on the Chinese scholars personally and professionally, but it will be meaningless if these effects cannot be consciously utilized to improve the societies and "to create a more peaceful and productive world." To achieve greater effects, it is important that contradictory elements relating to motivation in the participants' post-Fulbright career life are reduced and their psychological are nurtured. The following are recommendations in these regards.

First, increase awareness of Fulbrighters' expertise and potential and give them proper support to promise more positive change. Most of the alumni found their institutions did not value them, thus the Fulbright experience never served as a booster in terms of advancing their careers. This situation can be alleviated when administrators of Chinese universities respond professionally and competently to the alumni's needs of relatedness. Meanwhile, the CSC should make greater efforts to promote the Fulbright Program among higher education institutions involved in the program, and push them to tap the alumni's experience and expertise.

Second, strengthen expectation for Fulbright alumni to produce ripple effects, as partial fulfillment of the Program's goals. The Fulbright experience by itself does not necessarily engender voluntary attributes (Bachner and Zeuschel, 1994). Alumni often require explicit requests to perform their duties and to support team-based contributory initiatives. This is particularly true with Chinese scholars, who are generally ingrained with moderation and modesty. Therefore, Program administration ought to be more proactive to ensure that the Fulbright alumni are committed to their communities and society. In particular, this entails the CSC's conscious efforts to engage the grantees professionally and respectfully.

Third, stimulate participation of alumni activities through systematic supervision. While the ACEE has strived to create an engaging Fulbright community by organizing various events to bring the alumni together, the alumni's involvement is too limited. Hence, the Program's

administrators must articulate and implement a standard of post-program evaluation. Systematic supervision of alumni will reinforce the value of their Fulbright experience and increase their participation in contributory activities in light of the program's goals.

Fourth, prompt American host institutions to play active roles in fostering linkages and collaboration. Follow-up activities need to be reinforced by deepening communication and interactions between alumni and their American peers. As the most essential, irreducible feature of the Fulbright experience (Bachner and Zeuschel, 1994), the host institutions should make due contribution. In this regard, the Program administration needs to stimulate the efforts of American institutions involved in the program.

REFERENCES

- [1]Alzugaray, C., "Academic Exchanges and Transnational Relations: Cuba and the United States", *Latin American Perspectives*, 33-5 (2006), 43-57.
- [2]Anderson, R., Manoogian, S. T., Reznick, J. S., "The Undermining and Enhancing of Intrinsic Motivation in Preschool Children", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34 (1976), 915-922.
- [3]Atkinson, C., "Does Soft Power Matter? A Comparative Analysis of Student Exchange Programs 1980-2006", *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 6 (2010), 1-22.
- [4]Aziz, L., "International Scholar Exchange Programs: the Impact of Incomplete Images of Arabs and Americans -- A Case Study of the Fulbright Exchange Program", unpublished doctoral dissertation (University of Pittsburgh, 2004).
- [5]Bachner, D., Zeuschel, U., "Utilizing the Effects of Youth Exchange: A Study of the Subsequent Lives of German and American High School Exchange Participants", report by Council on International Educational Exchange (New York, 1994), <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ed410819.pdf> last assessed 4 November 2012.
- [6]Bellamy, C., Weinberg, A., "Educational and Cultural Exchanges to Restore America's Image", *Washington Quarterly*, 31-3 (2008) , 55-68.
- [7]Berger, E., "Selling America: U.S. Public Diplomacy Programs in the Middle East and South Asia in a Post 9/11 Environment", <http://dukespace.lib.duke.edu/dspace/handle/10161/1671> last assessed 1 October 2011.
- [8]Bond, M., Hwang, K., "The Social Psychology of Chinese People", in Bond, M. H. (ed.), *The Psychology of the Chinese People* (Hong Kong, 1986), pp.213-266.
- [9]Cheung, F., Leung, K., Fan, R., Song, W. Z., Zhang, J. X., Zhang, J. P., "Development of the Chinese Personality Assessment Inventory", *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 27 (1996), 181-199.
- [10]Cull, N. J., *Public Diplomacy: Lessons from the Past* (Los Angeles, 2009).
- [11]De Lima Jr., A. F., "Students' Corner: The Role of International Educational Exchanges in Public Diplomacy", *Place Branding And Public Diplomacy*, 3-3 (2007), 234-251.

- [12]Deci, E. L., *Intrinsic Motivation* (New York, 1975).
- [13]Deci, E. L., Ryan, R. M., *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior* (New York, 1985).
- [14]Deci, E. L., Ryan, R. M., "Intrinsic Motivation to Teach: Possibilities and Obstacles in Our Colleges and Universities", *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 10 (1982), 27-35.
- [15]Deci, E. L., Ryan, R. M., "The Support of Autonomy and the Control of Behavior", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53 (1987), 1024-1037.
- [16]Dev, P. C., "Intrinsic Motivation and Academic Achievement: What Does their Relationship Imply for the Classroom Teacher?" *Remedial and Special Education*, 18-1 (1997), 12-19.
- [17]Dudden, A., Dynes, R., *The Fulbright Experience 1946-1986: Encounters And Transformations* (New Brunswick, 1987).
- [18]Dutta-Bergman, M. J., "U.S. Public Diplomacy in the Middle East: A Critical Cultural Approach", *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 30 (2006), 102-124.
- [19]El-Nawawy, M., "US Public Diplomacy in the Arab World: The News Credibility of Radio Sawa and Television Alhurra in Five Countries", *Global Media and Communication*, 2 (2006), 185-205.
- [20]Erb, G. M. V., "Does Democratic Aid Make the Grade? The Impact of the US Sponsored University Level Academic Exchange with Post-Soviet States",
http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/libcat_pubs last assessed 3 February 2013.
- [21]Freedman, M., *Facilitating Faculty Development* (San Francisco, 1973).
- [22]Fulbright, J. W., *The Price of Empire* (New York, 1989) .
- [23]Gemignani, C. L., "Understanding the Study Abroad Experience of University Students", unpublished doctoral dissertation (The University of Iowa, 2009).
- [24]Goffman, E., *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face to Face Behavior* (Garden City, 1967).
- [25]Hansel, B., Grove, N., "International Student Exchange Programs: Are the Educational Benefits Real?" *NASSP Bulletin*, 70 (1986), 84-90.
- [26]Interagency Working Group (IAWG), *Fy 2012 Annual Report: U.S. Government-Sponsored International Exchanges And Training* (Washington, DC, 2013) ,
<http://www.iawg.gov>. last assessed 17 May 2014.
- [27]Kallgren, J. K., Simon, D. F., *Educational Exchanges: Essays on the Sino-American Experience* (Berkeley, 1987).
- [28]Khatib, L., "Public Diplomacy in the Middle East: Dynamics of Success and Failure", in Fisher, A., Lucas, S. (eds.), *Trials of Engagement: The Future of US Public Diplomacy* (Boston, 2011), pp. 133-147.
- [29]Kirkbride, P., Tang, S., Westwood, R., "Chinese Conflict Preferences and Negotiating Behaviour: Cultural and Psychological Influence", *Organization Studies*, 12 (1991), 365-386.

- [30]Kraft, B., "Scholars Hail Rewards of Teaching Overseas but Warn that Planning Ahead Is Essential", *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 4-4 (1984), 21-24.
- [31]Kruckeberg, D. & Vujnovic, M., "Public Relations, Not Propaganda, for US Public Diplomacy in a Post-9/11 World: Challenges and Opportunities", *Journal of Communication Management*, 9 (2005), 296-304.
- [32]Leung, T., Chan, R., "Face, Favour and Positioning — A Chinese Power Game", *European Journal of Marketing*, 37 (2003), 1575-1598.
- [33]Levin, R. C., "Foreword", in Li Cheng Li (ed), *Bridging Minds Across the Pacific: U.S.-China Educational Exchanges, 1978-2003*, (Lanham, 2005), pp.xi-xiii.
- [34]Li, C., "Introduction: Open Doors and Open Minds", in Cheng Li, (ed.), *Bridging Minds across the Pacific: U.S.-China Educational Exchanges, 1978-2003* (Lanham 2005), pp.1-24.
- [35]Lampton, D. M., Madancy, J. A., William, K. M., *A Relationship Restored: Trends in US-China Educational Exchanges, 1978-1984* (Washington D.C., 1986).
- [36]Lochner, L., Wieser, H, Mischo-Kelling, M, "A Qualitative Study of the Intrinsic Motivation of Physicians and Other Health Professionals to Teach", *International Journal of Medical Education*, 3 (2012), 209-215.
- [37]Mckeachie, W. J., "The Rewards of Teaching", *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 10 (1982), 7-13.
- [38]Maslow, A. H., *Motivation and Personality* (New York, 1954) .
- [39]Medalis, C., "American Cultural Diplomacy, the Fulbright Program, and U.S.-Hungarian Higher Education Relations in the Twentieth Century",
<http://gradworks.umi.com/33/73/3373715.html> last assessed 9 January 2013.
- [40]Niemiec, C. P., Ryan R. M., "Autonomy, Competence, and Relatedness in the Classroom: Applying Self-Determination Theory to Educational Practice", *Theory and Research in Education*, 7 (2009), 133-144.
- [41]Neppel, J. M., "Study Abroad as A Passport to Student Learning: Does the Duration of the Study Abroad Program Matter?", unpublished doctoral dissertation (Maryland University, 2005).
- [42]ORC Macro, "International Visitor Leadership Program Outcome Assessment",
http://eca.state.gov/files/bureau/ivlp-eurasia-study-executive-summary_january-2006.pdf last assessed 4 April 2013.
- [43]Oudejans, R., "Linking Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation to Job Satisfaction and To Motivational Theories", working Paper (University of Maastricht, 2007).
- [44]Perry, W. J., "In America's Interest: Welcoming International Students",
http://www.nafsa.org/uploadedfiles/nafsa_home/resource_library_assets/public_policy/in_america_s_interest.pdf last assessed 2 February 2012.

- [45]Peterson, P. G., "Public Diplomacy and the War on Terrorism", *Foreign Affairs*, 81(2002), 74-94.
- [46]Richmond, Y., *Cultural Exchange and the Cold War: Raising the Iron Curtain* (Boston, 2003)
- [47]Rugh, W. A., "The Case for Soft Power. Toward a New Public Diplomacy", in Philip Seib (ed.), *Redirecting U.S. Foreign Policy* (New York, 2009), p.321.
- [48]Ryan, R. M., Deci, E. L., "Self-Determination Theory and the Facilitation of Intrinsic Motivation, Social Development, and Well-Being", *American Psychologist*, 55-1(2000), 68-78.
- [49]Schneider, C. P., *Culture Communicates: US Diplomacy that Works* (Netherlands Institute of International Relations, 2004), <http://www.peacepalacelibrary.nl/ebooks/files.pdf> last assessed 11 February 2013.
- [50]Scott-Smith, G., "Mapping the Undefinable: Some Thoughts on the Relevance of Exchange Programs within International Relations Theory", *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616 (2008), 173-195.
- [51]Scott-Smith, G., "Searching for the Successor Generation: Public Diplomacy, the US Embassy's International Visitor Program and the Labour Party in the 1980s", *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 8-2 (2006), 214-237.
- [52]Seabury, P. P., A. K., Blitz, Billington, J. H., "A Symposium: What Future Directions for Academic Exchange?" *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 491 (1987), 154-163.
- [53]Selltiz, C, Cook, S. W., "Factors Influencing Attitudes of Foreign Students toward the Host Country", *Journal of Social Issues* 18-1 (2010), 7-23.
- [54]Snow, N., "From Bombs and Bullets to Hearts and Minds: The U.S. Public Diplomacy in an Age of Propaganda", in Y. R. Kamalipour & N. Snow (eds.), *War, Media And Propaganda: A Global Perspective* (Lanham, 2004), pp.17-24.
- [55]SRI International, "Outcome Assessment of the Visiting Fulbright Scholar Program", <http://csted.sri.com/sites/default/files/reports/vscholarfinal6-30-05-complete.pdf> assessed 24 December 2013.
- [56]Stangor, C., Jonas, K., Stroebe, W., Hewstone, M., "Influence of Student Exchange on National Stereotypes, Attitudes and Perceived Group Variability", *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26 (1996), 663-675.
- [57]Sunal, D. W., Sunal, C. C., "Professional and Personal Effects of the American Fulbright Experience in Africa", *African Studies Review*, 34-2 (1991), 97-123.
- [58]Tahir, A. H. M., Ismail, M., "Cross-Cultural Challenges and Adjustments of Expatriates: A Case Study in Malaysia", *Turkish Journal of International Relations*, 6 (2007), 72-99.
- [59]Ulrich, M. P., "Retooling U.S. Public Diplomacy as A Strategic Instrument of Foreign Policy", working paper (Strategic Studies Institute of the US Army War College, 2012),

<http://www.isn.ethz.ch/digital-library/publications/detail/?id=152134> assessed 20 January 2013.

- [60]Watkins, B. T., "Exchange Program Gives Professors A Breather from Academic Routine", *Chronicle Of Higher Education*, 32-10 (1986), 27-28.
- [61]Wilder, E., "America as Seen by Polish Exchange Scholars", *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 28-2 (1964), 243-56.
- [62]Xu, Q., "The Ideological and Political Impact of U.S. Fulbrighters on Chinese Students: 1979-1989", *Asian Affairs*, 3 (1999), 139-157.