

**Su-chun Li**

.....  
National Cheng-chi University

# A Case Study of the Fulbright Program in Korea

## **Abstract**

*The U.S. Fulbright Program, the flagship of international educational exchange programs in the world, was established in 1946, after the devastation of World War II. It aimed for an innovative, peaceful world. The Republic of Korea was one of the first twenty signatory countries, where the US war surplus was used to fund the bilateral academic/cultural exchanges. This article reviews the history of the US-ROK agreement, including: funding, the Board, programs, and its evolvement over the past 60 years. This research discovered some unique aspects in Korean Fulbright which adapted to the local needs for national development.*

**Keywords:** *Fulbright Program, Republic of Korea, US-ROK relations*

## **1. Introduction**

The Fulbright Program was established in 1946, initiated by U.S. Senator J. William Fulbright, and aimed to promote educational and cultural exchange and mutual understanding in the wake of the devastation of World War II. By 2019, there were more than 160 countries participating in these binational exchange programs. Among them, there are 49 Fulbright Programs administrated by binational commissions and the rest of the programs are run by American Embassies in host countries.

Korea signed the agreement with the U.S. on April 28, 1950. Unfortunately, the Korean War broke out and suspended the establishment of the Commission. On June 30, 1960, an amendment, which added a new source of funding from agricultural surplus sales, reactivated the

binational Agreement and accordingly established the United States Educational Commission in Korea (USEC/K).

The USEC/K was ultimately established “in the midst of the revolutionary changes in Korean politics,” (Shim et al., 2010) and its 60 years of history witnessed South Korea’s development from an under-developed, totalitarian regime to a developed and democratic country; and also from an aid receiver to a giver in the global society. “Fulbright Program played an important role in South Korea’s spectacular rise from the ashes of the Korean War to become the great success story it is today” (Shim et al., 2010).

In 2015, Korea claimed the biggest Fulbright program in the East Asia and Pacific area. In early times, Fulbright Korea’s funding was mainly dependent on U.S. government support. But, in 2018, the U.S. allocation was less than 24%. More than two-thirds, about 69%, of funding is from Korean central and local governments. Presumably, this reversal of contribution reflected policy changes of the two Governments.

With the recent development of internationalization and globalization in education, there has been a rapid rise in the interest in educational and cultural diplomacy in world politics. The confluence of educational exchange and public diplomacy has received much attention, and become a new focus for collaborative research. This case study is part of the author’s dissertation research which aims to explore the development and practices of the Fulbright program and to analyze the impact of international educational exchange. The research purpose is to identify some successful/effective practices that might help the host country to find a better strategy to use international educational exchange as a tool of public diplomacy.

## **2. The Fulbright Commission in Korea and Its Development**

### *a. Legal Charter: Agreements and Diplomatic Notes*

The initial binational “Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Korea and the Government of the United States of America for Financing Certain Educational Exchange Programs” was signed in Seoul on April 28, 1950. It was signed by the representative of the Republic of Korea, Foreign Minister Ben C. Limb and the U.S. Ambassador Everett

F. Drumright, and entered into force on the same day. The preamble says, it is “[d]esiring to promote future mutual understanding between the peoples of the United States of America and the Republic of Korea through educational contacts” (Limb & Drumright, 1950).

The first funds were set to be made available from the sale of the war surplus property and it was agreed to be a portion of the \$24 million owed to the U.S. government by the Korean government for loan repayment (Shim et al., 2010). Unfortunately, North Korea launched a surprise attack on the South and the outbreak of the Korean War delayed the formation of the binational commission to execute the agreement of the exchange program.

Ten years later, on June 30, 1960, through an exchange of diplomatic notes between the U.S. Ambassador to Korea and Korea’s Minister of Foreign Affairs, an amendment reactivated the 1950 Fulbright Agreement with new funding coming from the sale of Surplus Agricultural Commodities, an Agreement the U.S. and Korea signed on May 31, 1955. This provided the program with access to \$900,000 (U.S. currency). An authorized commission, the United States Educational Commission in Korea (USEC/K), was finally “officially established” (Shim et al., 2010) on September 1, 1960, in Seoul.

Later, on June 18, 1963, a new binational agreement based on the Fulbright-Hays Act of 1961 was signed by the two Governments. The “Agreement Between the Government of the Republic of the Korea and the Government of the United States of America for Financing Certain Educational Exchange Programs” was signed by Korean Foreign Minister Yong Shik Kim and American Ambassador Samuel D. Berger.

The 1963 Agreement superseded the 1950 Agreement, as amended. It regulated that the Commission’s annual budget shall “be approved” (in Article 3) and annual report “be accepted in form and content” (in Article 6) by the U.S. Secretary of State (Kim and Berger, 1963). Later on July 10, 1972, an amendment was made to “replace” the Commission with the name of “Korean-American Educational Commission,” a name more fairly reflecting the original idea of a binational scheme, and to enlarge the Board to ten members. This is the current legal charter that guides the KAEC, as there have been no further updated agreements or amendments. While the agreement is outdated, no one on the Board seem interested in trying to change it, commented Jai Ok Shim, former Executive Director of Fulbright Korea (Shim, 2019). Likewise, the legal charter of Fulbright Taiwan is dated 1964.

*b. Governance: The Board of Directors*

The first Board of USEC/K was made up of eight members, with four representatives from each country. The Commission was officially established on September 1, 1960, with space provided in the cultural affairs office of the U.S. Embassy. In contrast, the earlier reactivated program in Taiwan in 1957 initially and deliberately separated the Fulbright commission, the United States Educational Foundation in the Republic of China (USEF/C), from the U.S. Embassy, but subsequently an arrangement similar to Korea was made for the USEF/C's office quarters. This special arrangement signaled a high-profile connection with the U.S. Embassy/Government.

Ko Kwang Man was appointed as the first Executive Director of the Commission. The first American Fulbright scholar Belle Boone Beard, Professor of Sociology at Sweet Briar College, arrived in South Korea on April 14, 1961. The Fulbright Program had finally started in South Korea after a decade of delay.

Though the Korean Peninsula was divided into South and North at the time when the Commission was established in 1960, the two Governments agreed to keep the name of the Commission stated in the 1950 Agreement, USEC/K. In contrast, the reactivation of China's Fulbright Program in 1957 in Taipei "renamed" the Commission to the "U.S. Educational Foundation in the Republic of China." It took into special consideration that the R.O.C's jurisdiction did not reach mainland China, which was ruled under the People's Republic of China.

Basically, the format and architecture of the Board was set up in the 1950 Agreement, except later it was enlarged to ten members. The U.S. "Chief of Mission" shall be Honorary Chairman of the Commission, s/he has the deciding vote in the event of a tie vote, and shall appoint the Chairman of the Commission. It is the Chief of Mission who has the power to appoint and remove the citizens of the U.S. on the Commission, and at least two are from the U.S. Foreign Service in Korea. Board members serve without compensation, and this is the same for all the other worldwide Fulbright Commissions.

In terms of chairmanship, up to 2018, only once was a Korean from the Bureau of International Education Cooperation appointed as Chairman of the Board. However, he later resigned, mainly because the Board meetings proceeded in English and he could not handle the agenda properly and effectively (Shim, 2019). Besides that, only Public Affairs Officers of the American Embassy have served as the KAEC Board Chair.

The Fulbright Commission is formed in a binational format, but its decision-making body “the Board” conducts its business only in English at the Board meeting. To some degree, the language barrier may make the local Board members inferior to Americans. This is one of the mechanical design in favor of the U.S.; binational does not necessary means an equality of treatment/stance.

### *c. Funding*

As one of the early signatories, the U.S.–ROK binational agreement was based on the War Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended by the U.S. Public Law 79-584 which is known as the Fulbright Act. In the 1950 Agreement, the initial funding for the Fulbright Program in Korea was agreed up to an aggregate amount equivalent to \$2,000,000 (U.S. currency) provided for the purpose of financing certain educational exchanges, but it should not exceed \$400,000 (U.S. currency) in any single year. Hence, it seemed that funding would be exhausted in about five-years.

Due to the Korean War, the Fulbright Commission in Korea was not started until 1960 after the two Governments agreed to modify the 1950 Agreement. A new paragraph for funding was added to the preamble as follows:

Considering that funds provided for under the present agreement have not been made available for such educational programs and that the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea desire to establish certain educational activities with funds in the currency of Korea that become available from additional sources for expenditure by the United States for such purposes (Chung & McCanughey, 1960).

The amendment gave the program access to \$900,000 (U.S. currency) made available as a result of the agreement of the Surplus Agricultural Commodities Agreements signed May 31, 1955, between the two Governments regarding funds and repayments related to the American Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, or the Food for Peace Act. It started in the first year with an amount equivalent to \$150,000 for 1961–62 and \$200,000 for 1962-63 (Shim et al., 2010).

Throughout the 1960s, Fulbright in Korea was almost exclusively funded by the U.S. government as part of its development assistance (Shim et al., 2010). While facing significant U.S. budget cuts in 1968 and 1969, the difficulty was solved by cost-sharing with local institutions

paying a regular salary to grantees and the Commission paying the difference. Later, a standing committee was appointed by the Board, on March 10, 1970, to look for new sources of money and to explore new ideas for generating funds for appropriate programs within the “Korean context” (Shim et al., 2010). Again, a “budget crisis of sorts at Fulbright” (Shim et al., 2010) occurred in the 1990s, which resulted in the creation of user fee charges for student counseling.

Fulbright Korea began on the basis of U.S. government funding, but over the years the Korean government’s contribution to the program has equaled, and in some cases exceeded, that of the American government. Non-governmental sources of funding, such as ETS (Educational Testing Service), played a key role in the growth of Fulbright Korea. The purchase of the Fulbright Building in 1999, dedicated in January 2000, involved one hundred percent Korean funding as the U.S. government opposed its Fulbright fund being used on a property purchase.

Once only a five-year financial plan for the U.S. government to support educational exchange between the U.S. and ROK, it has now been running for 60 years and keeps growing. There was a role shift between two Governments as funding sources changed. In the early years, “the U.S. government exerted a great deal of influence on the program. However, as time went on, the government of Korea came to play a more active role... [Since], the Fulbright agreement was amended to ‘balance the role of the Commission between the two countries’” (Shim et al., 2010). By its 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary in 2010, the Korean Government was contributing 40% of the budget to the Fulbright program in Korea. In 2018, the Korean Government contributed about 69% of the US\$9 million annual budget.

#### *d. Leadership*

Since its first establishment in 1960, the Fulbright Korea Commission had experienced 8 changes of leadership, and a total of 9 executive directors served from 1960 to 2018. Only two of them were Korean. The recently retired Korean Executive Director, Mrs. Shim, served the longest time, from 2004 till August 2019, and became the first woman and only the second Korean to hold the post of ED. She first joined Fulbright Korea as an administrative officer in 1977, serving in Fulbright Korea for 40+ years, from administrative officer, to deputy, to ED. She set an exceptional example in service to Fulbright Commissions worldwide.

### 3. Programs and Their Evolution

In the first decade, Fulbright Korea focused on development, military, and security. The next decade, the 1970s, the focus was moved from development to rapid industrialization, and devoted to “the study of man in a rapidly industrializing society” (Shim et al., 2010). Social sciences and humanities were two major focuses, followed by the arts, and among others, business administration was dropped. From 1984 to 2007, grants were given only in the humanities, fine arts, and social sciences (including business). Grants for natural sciences and engineering were available in earlier times and are again now.

American Studies in Korea was first encouraged in the 1960s, but failed (Shim et al., 2010). Later, in the 1980s, Korean Studies in the U.S. and American Studies in Korea became major focuses and made an exceptional advance among other subject fields. However, there is a “paucity” of American studies programs at Korean universities, and the applicant pool in American studies in Korea has declined over recent years. Thus, some flexibility or exceptions in selection have been taken into consideration (KAEC, 2018). This is an unusual measure for this merit-based program. However, KAEC noted that there has been a surprising development of the growth of Korean studies programs at U.S. universities in the past twenty years.

The newly created English Teaching Assistant (ETA) program started in 1992 when “KAEC and the Republic of Korea’s Ministry of Education (MOE) agreed to collaborate in providing a new type of opportunity in Korea...” (Shim et al., 2010). That memo specifies that up to 12 American students would spend one or more years in Korea as English language teaching assistants in Korean primary and middle schools. With a focus on cultural exchange, a maximum of 12 hours co-teaching was expected per week, and they were encouraged to learn Korean language, take up independent study, etc. In 2008, Korea claimed the largest ETA program in the world (Shim et al., 2010). There are some special/unique features of Korea’s ETA program that differ from the practice in other Commissions, such as: 1) about one-third are 2<sup>nd</sup> year, and even 3<sup>rd</sup> year; 2) the placements are from elementary school to secondary and tertiary; and 3) more placements in secondary than elementary schools. For example, in 2018, there were 116 ETAs of whom 80 are newcomers, 36 are renewals for a second or third year, and 87 serve in secondary schools compared with 25 in elementary school and 4 in universities.

In 2015, Fulbright Korea became the largest program in the East Asia and Pacific area, with a total two-way-flow of 264 grantees, followed by Indonesia's 248. On aggregate, between 1949 and 2016, there have been a total of 5797 Korean Fulbrighters with 2842 Americans and 2955 Koreans that have benefited from this program (FFSB, 2018).

In terms of direction of flow of people, in the early days it was more from Korea to the U.S., not U.S. to Korea. Senator Fulbright once suggested that the purpose of the program was "less to educate outsiders than to educate Americans about the outside world" (Shim et al., 2010), and one way to accomplish this purpose was to have foreign students come to the U.S. for study. Nevertheless, from Korea's perspective, the Fulbright Program early on was directed more toward educating Koreans about America than educating Americans about Korea, since more Koreans went to the U.S. rather than the other way around (Shim et al., 2010). However, in 2018 there were 96 Korean grantees compared to 156 Americans. Considering a big portion of the American grantees are ETAs, 117 in total, the direction of people flow in higher educational interchange has changed. But, in the core programs, it is still true: more Koreans go to the U.S. than Americans to Korea.

## 4. Research Findings

In its 60 years of operation, the Fulbright Program in Korea has grown from 21 grantees a year in 1960 to 261 grantees in 2018. Up to now, about 6000 grantees have benefited from this two-way exchange program. If their families and contacts were included, one can envision the compound impact that was initiated by this cultural and educational exchange. As the KAEC's 2018 Report highlighted in Fulbright Korea's history, Korea was an undeveloped country ravaged by war when it first began to send and receive Fulbright grantees in 1960. The universities were weak, few professors held doctorates, and graduate education was almost nonexistent. Thus, one major part of Fulbright's purpose was to help rebuild Korea's intellectual human resources. American lecturers were needed in every field (KAEC, 2018).

Fulbright was there for all the years of Korea's modernization. It became an integral part of modern Korean history, "a direct reflection of the history of modern Korea..." (Shim et al., 2010). In the early years, the mission was seen as that of developing Korea's system of higher educa-

tion. An especially intertwined situation in Korea, returned grantees filled position after position in important offices in the Korean government, in the educational system, in the press, and in the professions of law and medicine. While the same might be said for several other countries, the relative effect of these newly-trained men and women on the somewhat inchoate world of Korean society was far greater than it could possibly have been in the more settled and trained societies of, for example, Japan or Germany (Shim et al., 2010).

This research finds continuity and change during KAEC's 60 years of operation; in particular, it has proved to be adaptive to Korean's local culture and government policies. Its purposes first served to help improve the quality of Korean's higher education system, then to cope with national development policy, to focus on long-term impact from cultural exchange, and finally the ETAs helped in Korea's English education at elementary and secondary schools.

#### *a. A Shift of Funding Resources*

The initial idea of the Fulbright Program was to make use of the local currency from War Surplus sales. Where there was no war surplus available, the Smith-Mundt Act of 1948 later authorized the U.S. State Department appropriations to carry out reciprocal interchanges of persons, knowledge, and skill with other countries. In Korea's case, while Fulbright was suspended between 1950 and 1960, there was about 500 "Smith-Mundt Grantees." After the reactivation of Fulbright in 1960, a new fund from the sale of agricultural surplus was made available for the Fulbright Program in South Korea. Later, based on the Fulbright-Hays Act of 1961, a new Agreement was signed between U.S. and ROK in 1963, and U.S. Government appropriations were promised to support this educational exchange program. But, matching funding from foreign countries was highly encouraged by the U.S. government, for it aimed toward a more legitimate "binational" level in this educational exchange program.

A turning point came at the time of a huge budget cut in the U.S. Government Fulbright Program in 1968 and 1969. According to a report in *The Korea Times*, the Fulbright Program was "in financial havoc," (quoted from Shim et al., 2010) and had reached extinction. While facing the first financial threat, the USEC/K Board "appointed a standing committee to look for new sources of money and to explore new ideas for generating

funds for appropriate programs within the Korean context” (Shim et al., 2010). As a result, the Korean Government’s contributions to the KAEC grew from the first year of US\$7951 in 1971 to US\$39,369 in 1977, and later in 1983 reached US\$340,000, about 42% of annual budget.

But, the KAEC believed that if it only relied on governmental funds, the Program would have to be cut back. They found the local institutions’ participation, such as paying a salary to grantees, kept the program alive. Finally, the acquisition of the Fulbright Building/House marked a new era for the KAEC. As the U.S. Government budget for Fulbright Program was not allowed to spend on property purchases, the Fulbright building was 100% Korean funded. Thus, the KAEC moved “from a fully funded development program of the U.S. government to a widely supported and substantially mature program of international educational exchange” (Shim et al., 2010).

As to the KAEC 2018 budget, it shows the Korean government contributed about 69% of funds for the core programs. However, the architecture of the Board, which is in favor of the U.S. side, has not changed since 1963. The Fulbright program worldwide, with 49 binational Commissions in operation, is seen as an American program/brand. This was understandable in the early times, when Korea and other Asian countries are under developed. A link with the more advanced U.S. was desirable for it received higher respect and privilege.

As to 2018, most of the EDs in the East Asia and Pacific were Americans, 4–5 out of 9, and the recruitment of EDs is mainly dominated by the U.S. mission. The mechanism of the Fulbright Program is designed to be operated by a binational agreement. Based on a spoke-hub paradigm, this might suggest giving weighting power to the U.S. and increasing its influence in policy making. In particular, the Obama U.S. government highlighted the importance of public diplomacy, and created a new Section of Study Abroad in the State Department. The performance of the Fulbright Program became a higher priority of the U.S. foreign service. It is in their interests to get involved in the operation and direction of its implementation; especially since the performance of the Fulbright Program is listed among the items of the performance evaluations of U.S. foreign service Public Affairs officers. This trend may also reflect pre-2016 U.S. foreign policy promoting soft power and public diplomacy.

In contrast, the Korean Government has been increasing its financial contributions to the KAEC, but it seems to enjoy being an invisible

supporter, hiding behind the scenes. Similarly, this seems to happen in the case of Fulbright Taiwan in the operation of the Commission and the Board. It will be interesting to find out if a Commission is operated differently in a place where the chairmanship is rotated between the two countries.

### *b. A Strong Support from Korean Alumni*

The idea of organizing Korean alumni “for financial support purposes” was first raised in 1983 at the Commission’s Board meeting. It was not until May 1987 that the Korea Fulbright Alumni Association (KFAA) was inaugurated, with a commemoration of the worldwide 40th anniversary of the Fulbright Program. More importantly, the KFAA not only plays a significant financial support role in the Program when it is in need, but also supports the program in other non-financial channels. Among many supports from Korean alumni, two significant events were the arrangement of Senator Fulbright’s first and only visit to the Korean Peninsula in September 1990 and the purchase of the Korea Building.

As in many countries, in Korea, Fulbright scholars have typically been represented prominently both in government and in academia. This matches Korea’s traditional *yangban* (“scholar official”) class, which explicitly linked scholarly achievement with public service. This may explain some of the successful initiatives in Fulbright Korea. An exceptional, unprecedented case in the worldwide Fulbright program is the purchase of the Fulbright Building.

Financially, it is openly recognized that Korea Fulbright Alumni Association played a significant role with their continued financial support (KAEC, 2018). Such as, a funding drive from Korean alumni for the purchase of the Fulbright Building. In recent years, an ETA Alumni Fund Grant was made possible by the donations from previous ETAs who created the Fulbright Korea Alumni Fund. It seems a spirit of generosity in giving and/or paying forward has spread among Korean alumni, and from Korean to American grantees. The new culture of an alumni society is created.

Furthermore, it is also the Korean alumni lobby that again and again successfully reinstated the Hubert H. Humphrey Fellowship program, administered by KAEC, after the program was first discontinued in 1995; since Korea graduated from underdeveloped country. This resumed program is to be ‘completely funded’ by the Korean government (KAEC, 2018).

This deserves special attention as the Humphrey program is for developing countries only.

The Fulbright Program in Korea is one of the biggest programs in the East Asia and Pacific. Some programs, such as North Korean Defectors English Educational Program and ETA Alumni Fund Grant, are financed by the donations of alumni. This is quite an unusual case in Fulbright Programs. Some other Commissions, such as Fulbright Austria, just recently have focused on alumni and hired a development officer. For Fulbright Taiwan, the alumni donations are almost zero.

### *c. A Stable Income Generated from ETS*

In the early days, KAEC generated its own income by providing an Educational Testing Service to cover its administrative costs. Recently, the ETS was discontinued and a new service of ACT was started in September 2018. This testing service has been administered since the establishment of USEC/K, and this service has generated income to support the Commission's administrative costs. In 2018, the ETS brought about US\$700,000 income a year, about 7% of annual revenue. This is unique since all the other Fulbright Commissions in the East Asia and Pacific area ended this service a long time ago. This reliable revenue also helped contribute to the fund for purchasing the Fulbright Building, which was dedicated in 2000 (Shim et al., 2010).

### *d. A Pioneer in ETA Programs*

In the region of Asia-Pacific, the ETA program was first started in Korea in 1992, based on an agreement between the KAEC and the ROK Ministry of Education (MOE) to collaborate in providing a new type of opportunity in Korea for younger American students who are either graduating seniors or recent college graduates. The ideas are: the KAEC will "manage" this program on behalf of the MOE, and the KAEC will create a new category of "Fulbright Graduate Intern" for ETA grantees, since this is not a study award *per se*.

This was initiated by the MOE representative member of the Board and approved by the Board meeting on February 1, 1991. The initial arrangement of the ETA program was: co-teaching with local Korean teachers in elementary and middle schools, focus on conversation, encourage

ETAs to learn Korean language, and live in a boarding house or with their host family. The ETA candidates must be unmarried, not over 30 years of age, and native English speakers.

The KAEC stated its long-term objectives: “the program, over a period of several years, would help to foster the development of a ‘critical mass’ of young Americans who would have a firsthand knowledge of Korea and at least some basic Korean language skills. With such qualifications, KAEC believed that these young Americans would be prepared to make more meaningful contributions to the development of U.S.-Korea relations throughout their future academic and professional careers.” As to the young Koreans, those “exposed to an American at an early age were likely to form a more objective impression of the U.S. than might be the case otherwise” (Shim et al., 2010).

This ETA program was later adopted by Fulbright Taiwan in 1995 and Indonesia in 2004. By 2018, the ETA program was active in 72 countries, and it is now the biggest and fastest growing Fulbright program in non-English speaking countries. Most importantly, it is mostly locally funded.

English education in Korea has a long history of more than a century; but it was not until 1995 that the Sixth National Curriculum declared English as the primary foreign language to learn in school, and focused on communicative competence and integrative ability to use the language in everyday communicative contexts. The time was right and the idea had matured. Since the 1990s, the Korean government has been committed to a nationwide globalization policy, and aimed to move Korea into the center of politics, economy, culture, and the like. Korea’s Globalization Steering Committee emphasized the importance of English education in effectively carrying out its globalization policies (Chung & Choi, 2016; Chang, 2009).

Over the decades, the Korean ETA program has been modified and expanded its operation. A great success should be attributed to the leadership of KAEC with creative arrangements and the flexibility to overcome different obstacles.

## 5. Future Research and Suggestions

The Fulbright Program was first started and was in Asia mainly because of its original idea of making use of the sale of U.S. War Surplus Property from WWII. The idea was to turn “hard” money into the “soft”

dollars of educational and cultural exchange. The hope was that through exchange this would result in a change of thinking, thus leading to a more peaceful world with American values of democracy.

As existing literature suggests “people’s experiences while they are abroad, rather than the simple fact of being in a foreign country, are likely to shape their attitudes.” Scholarship programs were set up to “nurture sympathetic opinion leaders” (Wilson, 2014), which was highlighted in the long-term purpose of Korea’s ETA program. However, winning hearts and minds is hard to measure; as is evidence of direct causality between exchange programs and political influence. It is suggested that elite networking and education are two possible routes that international mobility could influence international relations (Wilson, 2014).

Likewise, Nye’s third face of soft power refers to establishing a long-term unconscious preference. The author would like to echo a limits approach of public diplomacy on educational exchange, or educational diplomacy. This approach focuses not on changing the policies of the target country, but on setting limits to policy options for the other country, following universal values of freedom, democracy, peace, and self-determination.

## References

- Chang, B.-M. (2009). Korea’s English Education Policy Innovations to Lead the Nation into the Globalized World. *Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), pp. 83–97.
- Chung, J. & Choi, T. (2016). English Education Policies in South Korea: Planned and Enacted. In: R. Kirkpatrick, ed., *English Language Education Policy in Asia*. Springer: Springer International Publishing, pp. 281–299.
- Druett, J. (1989). *Fulbright in New Zealand*. Wellington: Fulbright New Zealand.
- Fairbank, W. (1976). *America’s Cultural Experiment in China 1942–1949*. Washington, DC: Department of State Publication.
- Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board (2016). *Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board 2015 Annual Report*. Washington, DC: FFSB.
- Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board (2018). *Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board 2017 Annual Report*. Washington, DC: FFSB.
- Koeran American Exchange Commission (2018). *Annual Program Report: FY/PY 2018 (October 1, 2017 – September 30, 2018)*. Seoul: Korean-American Educational Commission.
- Kim, Y. S. & Berger, S. D. (1963). *Agreement Between the Government of the Republic of the Korea and the Government of the United States of America for Financing Certain Educational Exchange Programs*. Seoul: s.n.
- Li, S.-C. (2018). *A Comparative Study of the Fulbright Program in Asia-Pacific: Case 1, a Historical Review of the Development of Fulbright Program in Taiwan*. Taipei: IDAS.

- Nye, J. J. S. (2011). *The Future of Power*. New York: PublicAffairs.
- Shim, J. O. (2019). *Research Project*. s.l.: [email].
- Shim, J. O., Larson, J. F., Carriere, F. F. & Underwood, H. H. (2010). *Fulbright in Korea's Future – A 60th Anniversary Commemorative History*. Seoul: The Korean-American Educational Commission.
- Wilson, I. (2014). *International Education Programs and Political Influence: Manufacturing Sympathy?* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wilson, I. (2017). Exchanges and Peacemaking: Counterfactuals and Unexplored Possibilities. In: J. Mathews-Aydinli, ed., *International Education Exchanges and Intercultural Understanding: Promoting Peace and Global Relations*. Ankara: Springer Nature, pp. 21–39.