

UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
Washington, D.C. 20548

094706

094706

For Release on Delivery
Expected at 10:00 a.m. EDT
July 25, 1978

STATEMENT OF
ELMER B. STAATS, COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
ON
[INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS]

H5E01303

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

A little over a year ago, when I testified at your hearings on "Public Diplomacy and the Future," the subject of most immediate concern to us, and I believe to you, was reorganization. As you then remarked, there had been since 1951 at least 32 reorganization studies, and the time had come "for the Congress and the Administration to stop talking about public diplomacy reform and to agree on specific steps...".

It is gratifying today to note that the basic decisions concerning reorganization have been taken and that they were the right ones. At any rate they were very much in line with the arrangements recommended

~~709678~~

094706

AGC00055
DL600613

at that time both by GAO and by your committee. The Administration's Reorganization Plan No. 2, which went into effect last April 1, will, we believe, make possible a better integrated and more effective Government role in international information, educational, and cultural affairs. The new arrangements thus should considerably advance the twin purposes of our public diplomacy--to see that American values, institutions, purposes, and policies are correctly understood by the rest of the world and to make sure that American policies take into account the legitimate concerns of others.

Since our appearance here last year, we have published two further reports in this field and are about to issue another. Those reports deal respectively with the East-West Center, interagency coordination of U.S. exchange and training programs, and Government support of language and area studies. We propose to confine our testimony today to those three reports and to our plans for further work in public diplomacy.

As to our future plans, we have recently initiated two additional reviews. One will examine the administration and impact of U.S. exchange programs, with emphasis on the selection and reception of, assistance to,

and followup with foreign and American exchangees. We shall be exploring these matters with foreign student advisers at American institutions and with U.S. officials and binational commissions in at least 12 selected countries.

The other review now getting under way is a comparative analysis of the public diplomacy programs of the United States and several foreign countries. We plan to include countries which conduct programs in public diplomacy that are comparable in size and sophistication to our own, including Britain, Canada, France, Germany, and Japan. We expect that our review will identify the principal differences and the reasons for them. We believe this review will also enable us to spot trends in the magnitude and directions of the various national efforts and to draw some conclusions as to whether or how foreign concepts and methods in public diplomacy might be constructively adapted to the improvement of U.S. programs. Finally, we hope to define through this review possibilities for meaningful coordination and cooperation in this field among the democratic industrial nations.

Beyond the published reports and current reviews just mentioned, we have tentative plans to examine the cultural

component of Department of Defense and Agency for International Development training programs for foreigners, and to evaluate the reception of and assistance to foreign tourists.

Our report on Government support to language and area studies in this country should be out next month.

Following the launching of Russia's Sputnik in 1957, the Congress passed the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to meet the then educational emergency by providing Federal financial assistance to local education "in order to insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States." Science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other critical subjects were to be supported.

Title VI of the act authorized grants to institutions of higher education for the teaching of any needed modern foreign language if adequate instruction in the language was not then readily available in the United States. Title VI also authorized grants in support of instruction in other fields needed for full understanding of the geographical areas in which the needed modern foreign language was used. Finally, Title VI also authorized research to promote improved instruction.

The Office of Education, within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, administers Title VI and has done so since its beginning. Fiscal year 1978 appropriations amounted to \$15 million. From inception through 1978, about \$228 million has been provided for Title VI.

Essentially, Title VI funds are used in support of teaching those foreign languages and areas not commonly taught in the United States.

The Office of Education also administers section 102(b)(6) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, as amended (Fulbright-Hays Act), which authorizes the President to provide for "promoting modern foreign language training and area studies in United States schools" by supporting visits to the United States by teachers from other countries. Fiscal year 1978 appropriations amounted to \$3 million.

We reviewed the Title VI and related Fulbright-Hays programs administered by the Office of Education as a part of our larger effort to review the programs of public diplomacy. In addition to a review of records and discussions at the Office of Education, we visited 17 universities and colleges with a total of 27 of the 80 centers receiving financial support from Title VI.

Most of those affected by these programs with whom we talked believed the Federal administrative efforts to be fair and effective. Lines of communication between the Office of Education and those applying for grants were open. The Office of Education is responsive to the community it serves.

While overall language enrollments in the United States have decreased since 1968, enrollments in the less commonly taught languages, those supported by Title VI, have increased.

Enrollments in the five most commonly taught languages, French, German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish, in institutions of higher education have fallen from a high of 1,040,284 in 1968 to 819,294 in 1977. During the same period enrollments in the less commonly taught languages have doubled from 31,517 to 63,928. Attached to this statement is a schedule showing language enrollment trends.

A significant problem for the programming officials in the Office of Education is determining the national need for and priorities among the many language and area studies in the United States. This is an intractable problem because a way has yet to be devised where benefits would outweigh costs for developing a system to keep up with changes to the pool of those with a foreign language

and area competence in the United States. Correspondingly, there is no method known to us to permit a determination as to how many Americans are needed with language and area competencies by language and discipline.

Since the beginning of the Title VI program, the Office of Education has sought to determine priorities among languages and area studies in the context of the "national need."

During the first two to three years of the program, languages to be supported were identified. During that time and thereafter up until about 1972, attention was focused on developing and managing the program. The national needs were believed to be generally known. And, too, it was believed that the needs were so great that the Federal support of any language and area study outside those few Western countries whose languages were commonly taught would contribute to satisfying the national need.

In 1972, data from an Office of Education initiated study then in progress became available to provide a basis for awarding grants in 1972 and following years.

The study, begun in 1969, was published by the American Academy of Political and Social Science in October 1973 under the title "Language and Area Studies Review." It was prepared under the direction of Dr. Richard D. Lambert,

University of Pennsylvania, under the auspices of the Social Science Research Council with funding provided by the Office of Education, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the W. Clement and Jessie V. Stone Foundation.

The study presented the results of a review and evaluation of American college and university programs for Latin American, East European, Middle Eastern, African, and Asian studies. It also presented information on the number of Americans with language and area competence.

The Office of Education presently programs its funds on the basis of the data in the Lambert study, the number of graduates from institutions receiving center grants, the Title VI foreign language fellowships, and such other information as it may acquire.

There are limitations on what Federal program managers can do to influence the programs supported by Title VI funds. Title I of the original National Defense Education Act of 1958 contained the provision that:

"Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system."

While that provision is no longer found in the authorizing legislation, the following is:

"The Congress reaffirms the principle and declares that the States and local communities have and must retain control over and primary responsibility for public education. The national interest requires, however, that the Federal Government give assistance to education for programs which are important to our defense."

Thus, by design, Federal officials managing the Title VI programs have no responsibility for managing the education programs supported by Title VI funds, although they are able to influence them in certain ways.

In addition, Title VI financial support to centers amounts to about 11 percent of the total costs of centers. And center costs are only a small part of the total costs of a university. Thus, even if the legislation did not prohibit Federal intrusion, the amount of Federal funding involved for any one center is too small to permit any meaningful intrusion.

It is difficult to comment on the appropriate level of Federal funding for Title VI.

Those with whom we spoke who received Title VI grants identified many benefits of the program. We were told that prestige stemming from Title VI center status attracts funding from other sources which means that the

financial value of the grant is larger than the amount of the grant alone would suggest. Other benefits include:

--Library acquisitions that would not otherwise be made.

--Otherwise uneconomic instruction in "limited demand" foreign languages to small numbers of students.

--Outreach programs designed to provide services to those beyond the institutions of which the centers are a part.

--Fellowships.

Many arguments can be advanced for and against continued Title VI funding. The "educational emergency" to which this program was addressed 20 years ago, i.e., the concerns felt in the wake of Sputnik, are less apparent today than they were then. On the other hand, the knowledge Americans gain from these programs today can be viewed as contributing to the national needs relating to such matters as interdependence, trade relations, and our leadership in a world community of nations.

For the fiscal year 1973, the Executive requested only \$1 million for Title VI which had been funded at almost \$14 million in fiscal year 1972. The Congress provided \$12.5 million for fiscal year 1973. For fiscal year 1974, the Executive did not request any funds for Title VI, but the Congress provided \$11.3 million. It is clear that the Congress has provided strong support for the Title VI program.

During the last several years the Congress has provided a stable level of federal funding with increases to offset the effects of inflation. No convincing case has been made known to us for increasing or decreasing the funding level for this program provided by the Congress.

The other current GAO report in public diplomacy, entitled "Coordination of International Exchange and Training Programs--Opportunities and Limitations," was published yesterday.

That review had its origins, in part, in a symposium of practitioners and students of public diplomacy convened by GAO a year and a half ago. A number of plausible observations were made at that time about the need for more effective data sharing and coordination among the numerous Federal agencies--and perhaps private groups as well--that conduct international exchange and training programs. President Carter's Reorganization Plan No. 2, which was submitted to the Congress in October 1977 and took effect six months later, gave additional point and timeliness to our review. Under that plan, as you know, the new International Communication Agency (ICA) absorbed the functions of the U.S. Information Agency and the State Department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs and was given the mandate to "coordinate the international

information, educational, cultural and exchange programs conducted by the U.S. Government...."

Our report identifies a number of unrealized opportunities to improve U.S. exchange and training programs through closer interagency coordination and makes several recommendations as to how ICA might fulfill its coordination mandate.

We recommend that the Director of ICA:

- (1) Evaluate the possibility of expanding the data base of the Exchange Visitor Information System (EVIS), which ICA inherited from State's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, to include at least all unsponsored foreign students in the United States and possibly other categories of visitors as well. This expanded data system, whose potential uses and users were never established by State, could facilitate more effective followup of former exchangees, make possible a more comprehensive and versatile census of exchange activity than is now available, and provide an additional tool for evaluating and coordinating U.S. efforts in this field.

- (2) Arrange with the State Department to issue instructions to overseas missions that would re-emphasize and clarify requirements for interagency data sharing and coordination.
- (3) Determine with the Chairman of the new Advisory Commission on International Communication, Cultural and Educational Affairs whether ICA or the Commission should sponsor a series of annual or occasional conferences designed to permit Government agencies engaged in exchange and training to share experiences, air common problems, and develop possible joint planning and programing.
- (4) Resume, with certain improvements, publication of the periodic "Directory of Contacts for International Educational, Cultural and Scientific Exchange Programs" heretofore published by the State Department. GAO also recommeded that the Advisory Commission continue publication of "Exchange" magazine but adapt it to the expanded responsibilities of the Commission and ICA.
- (5) Arrange to obtain periodic rosters of foreign exchangees from the Defense Department, Agency for International Development, and the Department

of Health, Education, and Welfare and instruct overseas missions to use them in appropriate followup activities.

We have attempted in our recommendations to reflect a view of the potential for coordination in this field that is pragmatic rather than dogmatic and to build on the successes, while profiting from the errors, of past coordination efforts. A review of the past 30 years experience makes clear an important and often overlooked fact. Coordination and data sharing in this field cannot properly be characterized in the abstract as either good or bad. Some coordination efforts can be productive and significant, but others can be futile and even detrimental.

For example, over the past 30 years a series of data-sharing and coordination efforts produced a succession of interagency mechanisms in Washington that generated a plentitude of reports but little in the way of coordination. One might conclude from that observation that the need for coordination was either ineffectually addressed or mistakenly perceived. Primarily, it appears to have been the latter.

Possibilities for meaningful coordination in this field are circumscribed by the nature of the programs. Most of them have specialized objectives--to impart the knowledge and skills needed for economic development or military self

reliance, to share artistic or cultural achievements, to expand areas of scientific and humanistic knowledge. The criteria to be applied and the judgments to be made in conducting such programs must flow essentially from their established purposes. The intrusion of extraneous interagency criteria could undermine the integrity and credibility of such programs.

What seems needed to perfect meaningful data sharing and coordination in the field of exchange and training is more modest and more manageable than some of the efforts and proposals of recent years. What seems needed is, not a new layer of bureaucracy, but a series of specific arrangements to identify real interagency problems as they emerge and a predisposition on the part of the agencies concerned to deal with them case by case. The measures we are recommending to ICA should facilitate that process.

Thus, in this field as in others, an examination of past experience leads one to a more sophisticated and more useful perception of reality. So far as interagency coordination of exchange and training is concerned, the national interest in greater efficiency and effectiveness will best be served if the agencies concerned take due account not only of the apparent opportunities but also of the inherent limitations.

On this basis we have made a number of recommendations to the Director of ICA that I understand the Agency is actively

pursuing. By taking steps to expand and utilize the Exchange Visitor Information System, to restate the coordination responsibilities of the country teams, and to arrange for the periodic sharing of program information among the public and private agencies involved, the International Communication Agency can, we believe, begin to implement to good effect its mandate as coordinator of U.S. exchange and training activities.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would welcome your questions or comments.

STATISTICS ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE ENROLLMENTS

<u>Year</u>	<u>Total Modern Foreign Language Enrollments</u> <u>As a Percent</u> <u>of total</u> <u>Enrollments</u>	<u>Number of</u> <u>Enrollments in</u> <u>The Five</u> <u>Commonly Taught</u> <u>Languages</u>	<u>Number of</u> <u>Enrollments in</u> <u>The Less</u> <u>Commonly Taught</u> <u>Languages</u>
<u>Postsecondary Institutions (Colleges and Universities)</u>			
1960	608,749 17.0	595,324	12,099
1963	801,781 17.8	781,920	19,642
1965	975,777 17.6	929,215	23,690
1968	1,073,097 15.5	1,040,284	31,517
1970	1,067,217 13.5	1,021,465	45,710
1972	963,930 11.6	904,398	59,425
1974	897,077 9.9	832,945	64,071
1977	883,222 Not Available	819,294	63,928
<u>Public Secondary School (Grades 7 through 12)</u>			
1968	4,357,786 24.8	4,336,422	21,282
1970	4,286,570 23.3	4,269,520	16,903
1974	3,853,265 18.4	3,828,317	24,483