

PN-AAS-358 A 25
BN 39182

EVALUATION SUMMARY

of

1981 LONG-TERM PARTICIPANT TRAINING PROGRAMS

in

AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

coordinated by

INTERNATIONAL TRAINING DIVISION

Program Evaluation and Course Coordination Unit 002539
International Training Division
Office of International Cooperation and Development
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Washington, D.C. 20250

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Evaluation Process	2
1.2 Representativeness of Respondents	3
2. OVERVIEW	4
3. PROGRAM EVALUATION	8
3.1 Achievement of Training Program Objectives	9
3.2 Overall Program Satisfaction and Home Country Applicability of Training	10
3.3 Types of Training	11
3.4 English Language Training and Use	16
3.5 Factors with a Helpful Effect on Training Programs	17
3.6 Program Development	18
3.7 Professional Staff	19
3.8 Support Arrangements	20
3.9 Orientation	20
4. RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS	30
5. RESPONDENT SUBGROUPS	33
5.1 Region	33
5.2 Sponsor	35
5.3 Sex	36
5.4 Degree	36
6. EVALUATION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS	42
6.1 Exit Interview Questionnaire	42
6.2 Questionnaire Distribution System	43
Appendix A. COMPARISON OF RESPONDENT GROUP AND TOTAL 1981 DEPARTING POPULATION	45
Appendix B. COMPARISON OF 1981 AND 1980 RESPONDENTS	49
Appendix C. TABLES OF ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVES BY SUBGROUP	56
Appendix D. COUNTRIES REPRESENTED BY RESPONDENTS	58
Appendix E. UNIVERSITIES ATTENDED BY RESPONDENTS	59

TABLES

		Page
Table 3.1:	Achievement of Training Program Objectives	21
Table 3.2a:	Program Satisfaction	21
Table 3.2b:	Applicability of Training to Home Country Job Responsibilities	21
Table 3.3a:	Training Contribution to Achievement of Objectives	22
Table 3.3b:	Satisfaction with Types of Training	22
Table 3.3c:	Level of Presentation by Type of Training	23
Table 3.3d:	Time Devoted to Types of Training	23
Table 3.4a:	English Language Training	24
Table 3.4b:	Satisfaction with English Language Training	24
Table 3.4c:	Ease with English Language	24
Table 3.5:	Factors with a Helpful Effect on Training Programs	25
Table 3.6a:	Program Development Assistance	27
Table 3.6b:	Clarification of Objectives	27
Table 3.7:	Professional Staff Support	28
Table 3.8:	Support Arrangements	28
Table 3.9:	Orientation	29
Table 5.1:	Evaluation Responses by Region	39
Table 5.2:	Evaluation Responses by Sponsor	39
Table 5.3:	Evaluation Responses by Sex	40
Table 5.4a:	Evaluation Responses by Degree	40
Table 5.4b:	Satisfaction with Types of Training by Degree	41

TABLES

Page

APPENDIX

Table A:	Comparison of 1981 Respondents and Total Departing Population	47
Table B.1:	Respondent Characteristics in 1981 and 1980	52
Table B.2:	Participant Evaluation in 1981 and 1980	53
Table C.1:	Achievement of Objectives by Region	56
Table C.2:	Achievement of Objectives by Sponsor	56
Table C.3:	Achievement of Objectives by Sex	57
Table C.4:	Achievement of Objectives by Degree	57

1. INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes evaluation questionnaire data from long-term academic and nonacademic participants who completed training programs coordinated by the International Training Division (ITD) of the Office of International Cooperation and Development/USDA during calendar year 1981. Participants complete an exit questionnaire at the end of their United States training program and are asked to assess:

- 1) the degree to which they have achieved their individualized training objectives
- 2) their satisfaction with the training received
- 3) professional and support personnel
- 4) personal support arrangements
- 5) the transferability of their training to their home country situations.

This is ITD's second annual long-term participant evaluation report. The data gathered has been and will continue to be used to reinforce successful aspects of training programs and practices and to indicate areas requiring change in order to strengthen programs for future participants.

1.1 Evaluation Process

Exit Interview Questionnaires were mailed to participants or administered as part of an exit interview conducted by an ITD Program Specialist with those who came through Washington, D.C. en route to their home countries.

Participants were requested to express their satisfaction with various aspects of the training program through three types of written responses: (1) circling a number on a scale of one to five, e.g., where 1 = "not satisfied" and 5 = "very satisfied;" (2) checking an appropriate response, e.g., yes or no; and (3) providing personal comments.

For participants who completed the evaluation form as a part of an interview, it is possible that some withholding of information or biased responses occurred due to the face-to-face contact. However, the interviews do provide evaluation information beyond that available through the form. Participants can explain and discuss their successes or problems in detail. Program Specialists can gain awareness of reasons for problems or satisfaction with specific professional staff, university curriculum, or support arrangements, which is valuable in developing future training programs.

A new data collection system designed to improve the validity of responses and increase the questionnaire return rate will be implemented in June, 1982. This system is discussed in Section 6.

1.2 Representativeness of Respondents

It is important to note that the information presented in this report is based on a nonrandom sample of the total population of participants who completed long-term training programs during calendar year 1981. Twenty percent (109) of the 546 participants who completed programs in 1981 completed exit interview questionnaires. Because this is a nonrandom sample and is not constructed to be representative of the larger population, inferences cannot be made about the total 1981 group.

A comparison of characteristics of the respondent group and the total 1981 departing population was done using statistics obtained through the ITD Participant Training and Support Services Unit. These statistics, presented in Appendix A, demonstrate that, indeed, the respondent group is not very representative of the total 1981 population.

2. OVERVIEW

Overall, participant ratings of the training program were very high. For all questions which were rated on a five point scale, over one-third of the mean scores were 4.5 or higher. The lowest mean score was 3.8. Responses to questions asking if participants were or were not satisfied with a program aspect indicated that over 80% of the respondents were satisfied with all of the program aspects rated except English language training. Where respondents were asked to indicate if an aspect of training was or was not about right, the majority of respondents indicated the training was about right.

Program objectives were successfully met for most participants, receiving mean achievement ratings ranging from 4.2 to 4.4 on a five point scale with 1 = "not achieved" and 5 = "fully achieved."

Participants' satisfaction with the training program as a whole was high with a 4.3 mean rating. Participants felt that their training in the U.S. was highly applicable to their job responsibilities in their home countries; home country applicability received a 4.6 mean rating.

Participants undertook one or more of five types of training: academic study, field and observation tours, on-the-job training, technical short course study, and complementary training (such as mid-winter community seminars). Overall satisfaction with all five types of training provided was very good with scores ranging from 4.1 for complementary training to 4.5 for on-the-job training. When rating the contribution of these types of training in the achievement of program objectives, participants indicated that academic classroom training and on-the-job training were highly contributory with mean ratings of 4.6 each, followed by field and observation tours with a mean rating of 4.4, and technical short course study with a mean rating of 4.3. As might be expected, complementary training was felt to contribute the least toward achieving program objectives, but nonetheless was rated 3.8.

The majority of participants (ranging from 54%-87% depending on the type of training) rated the length and instructional level of all types of training as "about right."

Very high ratings were given for professional staff assistance. Participants rated the assistance provided by their University Contacts, Foreign Student Advisors, Faculty Advisors, Technical Leaders, Instructors, Trainers, and USDA Program Specialists with mean scores of 4.5 to 4.7.

Participants rated ITD Program Specialists, Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) Project Directors, and Agency for International Development (AID) Mission staff quite helpful in discussing their training plans with them, giving them mean scores of 4.5, 4.6, and 4.3, respectively. However, only 70% of respondents indicated that they were involved in clarifying their training objectives in their home countries, and only 63% clarified their objectives at ITD.

Orientations in the U.S. were generally considered useful by participants, with the Washington International Center (WIC) orientation receiving a mean rating of 4.2, and the USDA orientation a mean rating of 4.4. However, if response rates to these questions represent orientation attendance, attendance was low: 71% of the respondents rated the WIC orientation; 47% rated the USDA group orientation.

Almost all participants found the on-site support factors of financial arrangements, housing, meals, and personal acceptance to be satisfactory. In response to a "yes/no" question as to whether the above listed factors were satisfactory, acceptance by colleagues, faculty and staff received the largest proportion of "yes" ratings (94%); financial arrangements received the smallest proportion of "yes" ratings (82%).

3. PROGRAM EVALUATION

This section describes the responses of the 109 participants who completed the evaluation questionnaire upon completion of their long-term training program in 1981. All mean ratings are based on responses to five point scales. Means and percentages are calculated only for those who responded to a question. Not all totals add up to 100% due to rounding. Tables presenting these data follow at the end of this section.

Participants evaluated the following:

- 3.1 Achievement of training program objectives
- 3.2 Overall program satisfaction and home country applicability of training
- 3.3 Types of training
- 3.4 English language training
- 3.5 Factors with a helpful effect on training programs
- 3.6 Program development
- 3.7 Professional staff
- 3.8 Support arrangements
- 3.9 Orientation.

3.1 Achievement of Training Program Objectives (Table 3.1)

Individualized training programs with specific training objectives are developed for each long-term participant. Sample training objectives might be "observing range management practices" or "obtaining a master's degree in agronomy." These personalized objectives are listed on the evaluation questionnaire for each participant for rating on a five point scale with 1 = "not achieved" and 5 = "fully achieved." Although objectives vary in breadth and complexity, information on degree of achievement of participant objectives, regardless of their content, is a good indicator of whether the USDA training program is accomplishing its objectives. Although some participants did not fully achieve all of their objectives, mean ratings of objectives were very high (4.2 to 4.4). The grand mean achievement rating for all objectives for all participants is a very satisfactory 4.2.

Participants suggested that the following training experiences might have enabled them to better achieve their training objectives: more or different courses, different combinations of field and course work, more training time, and attainment of an advanced degree. Some participants commented that courses, experiences, or expertise needed to attain objectives weren't

provided. Many participants expressed the desire for more practical applications in training.

3.2 Overall Program Satisfaction and Home Country Applicability of Training (Tables 3.2 and 3.2b)

Participants were generally quite satisfied with their training programs as evidenced by a mean rating of 4.3. (This question had the very high response rate of 99%.) Participants also generally found their U.S. training highly applicable to their home country situations as evidenced by the high mean rating of 4.6.

Participant comments indicate that the perception of the training as appropriate or inappropriate to their jobs at home contributed to program satisfaction. Applicability of training to one's home country situation also was listed as a desirable aspect of training. Participants were satisfied to a greater or lesser degree depending on whether they had exposure to the type of training situations they desired.

3.3 Types of Training (Tables 3.3a-d)

Participants were asked to indicate whether a type of training was a part of their program in one section of the questionnaire, and to rate aspects of the types of training they undertook in a following section. However, some types of training checked as undertaken were not rated, and comments following ratings of different types of training indicate that the categories were open to respondent interpretation. Due to this lack of clarity of terms and difficulty with the questionnaire format, the number of responses does not accurately reflect the numbers of individuals who received these types of training. This section is revised in the redesign of the questionnaire discussed on Section 6.1.

The following table shows the number and percent of participants who indicated that they received one or more of five types of training as part of their programs. Many participants receive more than one type of training.

	<u>Part of Program</u>		<u>Not Part of Program</u>		<u>No Response</u>
	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>	
Academic classroom training	80%	(70)	20%	(18)	21
Field & observation training	88%	(76)	12%	(10)	23
On-the-job training	41%	(28)	59%	(40)	41
Technical short course training	51%	(39)	49%	(37)	33
Complementary training	62%	(44)	38%	(27)	38

Of those who responded to the question, most received field and observation training and/or academic classroom training (76 and 70 participants, respectively). The next most common training was complementary training (44), followed by technical short course training (39), and on-the-job training (28).

It should be noted that focus, amounts, and types of training differed for all participants. Additionally, to reduce questionnaire length, a participant who had academic training at more than one institution or multiple field or on-the-job experiences, or more than one technical short course, or more than one complementary course, rated his or her multiple experiences within a type of training in the aggregate.

Participants generally felt that all types of training contributed a great deal to achievement of their objectives. Academic classroom and on-the-job training both received the very high mean rating of 4.6. They were followed by field and observation training (4.4), technical short course training (4.3) and complementary training (3.8).

Overall satisfaction with all of the types of training was quite good. Participants were most satisfied with their on-the-job training (4.5), followed by academic classroom and technical short course training (both 4.4), then field and observation training (4.3), and complementary training (4.1).

Participants did comment on the types of training they undertook. Most participants were very supportive of field training. A number remarked that increased field trips would have been useful; however, some participants found their field experiences less relevant to their objectives than they desired. Participants remarked upon the benefits of the practical approach of the technical short courses. A few participants expressed displeasure over taking academic courses they felt would not be beneficial in their home countries. Complementary

training received mostly positive feedback. Some comments suggested it broadened the participants' understanding of Americans. This type of training was also referred to as a welcomed time to relax or as a holiday.

The majority of participants were satisfied with the level of presentation for the various types of training, although variations did occur. The level of academic training was rated about right by 77% (52) of the respondents, but as too technical by 12% (8), too general by 7% (5) and too elementary by 4% (3). The level of field and observation training was rated about right by 64% (42) of the respondents, but received mixed feedback about what wasn't right: 18% (12) felt the information was too general, 15% (10) that it was too technical, 3% (2) that it was too elementary. The level of on-the-job training received an even more mixed response. Fifty-four percent (13) of the respondents felt the level of this training was about right; 21% (5) felt it was too general; 13% (3) felt it was too elementary and 13% (3) too technical. Most participants rated technical short courses as about right (67% or 22 participants) or too technical (27% or 9 participants).

Only one participant rated short courses either too general or too elementary. Sixty-five percent (24) of the participants rated complementary training as about right; 24% (9) rated it too general; 8% (3) rated it too elementary. Only one participant felt complementary training was too technical.

Close to three-quarters of all participants felt the amount of time devoted to the various types of training was about right. If participants didn't feel the amount of time was about right, they tended to think too little time was spent, with the exception of academic training. Of the participants who had academic training, 87% (60) felt the amount of time devoted to this training was about right. Those who felt otherwise were fairly evenly divided: 7% (5) felt this training received too much time; 6% (4) felt it received too little time. Of the participants who received field and observation training, 72% (48) felt the amount of time spent was about right, 22% (15) felt the amount of time was too little, and 6% (4) felt the amount of time spent was too much. Of those who indicated they had on-the-job training, 83% (20) felt the amount of time devoted to this training was about right and 17% (4) felt it received

too little time. Time devoted to technical short course training was rated as about right by 75% (24) of the respondents, as too little by 16% (5), and as too much by 9% (3). Time devoted to complementary training was rated as about right by 81% (30) and as too little by 19% (7).

3.4 English Language Training and Use (Tables 3.4a-c)

Twenty-four participants indicated they received English language training as a part of their training programs. At the completion of that training, 68% (13) felt they were adequately prepared, 32% (6) did not. (Five participants did not rate their preparation.) Thirteen students received their English training at American Language Institute of Georgetown University, three at New Mexico State University, and one each at the University of Colorado, Oklahoma State University and West Texas State University.

All participants were asked to rate their ease with English in performing various activities; approximately two-thirds responded. Overall, participants had the least difficulty reading English (a 4.5 mean score on a five point scale), followed by ease in understanding the instructors and transacting personal business (both 4.2 mean scores), and

participating in discussions (4.0 mean score).

Although some participants did experience problems, the high mean scores indicate that most participants were comfortable in English.

3.5 Factors with a Helpful Effect on Training Programs

(Table 3.5)

Participants were asked to indicate if any of nine factors had a positive or negative effect on their programs. The nine factors include:

- Orientation
- Language Training
- Program Specialist
- Secretary to Program Specialist
- University Faculty
- Technical Instructors
- Training Plan
- Community Where you Resided
- American Students or Colleagues

Program Specialists, training plans, university faculty, and American students or colleagues were noted as having an effect on training programs by over 80% of the participants; their effect was considered to be helpful by over 85% of these respondents. Although the other five factors did not have an impact on as large a number of participants, those participants they did affect primarily found them to be helpful.

3.6 Program Development (Tables 3.6 a & b)

Participants who discussed their training program plans with someone generally found that person to be very helpful. On a five point scale with 1 = "not helpful" and 5 = "very helpful" participants rated AID Mission staff with a mean score of 4.3, Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) Project Directors with a mean score of 4.6, and USDA Program Specialists at 4.5. Participants appreciated information provided; however, participant comments indicate that little discussion occurred. Most (93%) of the FAO-sponsored participants rated the helpfulness of the FAO Project Director; however, only 71% of the AID-sponsored participants rated the helpfulness of AID Mission staff. If the number of no responses to this question represents no contact with the above listed professionals, most FAO-sponsored participants (14 of 15 or 93%) discussed plans for their training programs in their home countries, but many AID-sponsored participants (24 of 84 or 29%) did not.

Participants were asked if they were involved in clarifying their program objectives in their home countries or at USDA. Of those who responded to these questions, 30% (28) indicated that they did not

clarify their objectives in their home countries, and 37% (31) did not clarify their objectives at USDA.

In their written comments, participants suggested that more information on what they would be doing and could expect in the U.S. would be useful. A few participants desired that a clearer indication of the purpose and details of their training programs be provided to organizations with whom they would be involved. Participants commented that they would have liked fewer deviations from their training programs and extended training.

3.7 Professional Staff (Table 3.7)

Participants gave the various professional staff with whom they had contact very high ratings for support in achieving their training objectives. International Training Program Specialists received the high mean rating of 4.7. Faculty Advisors and Technical Leaders both received the high rating of 4.6. University Contacts, Foreign Student Advisors, Instructors, and Trainers received the high mean rating of 4.5.

Participant comments on personnel responsible for the administration of their long-term training programs were very favorable. Most participants desire and much appreciate advice and involvement of these professionals.

3.8 Support Arrangements (Table 3.8)

Almost all participants found the on-site personal support factors of financial arrangements, housing, meals, and personal acceptance by colleagues, faculty, and staff to be satisfactory. Acceptance by colleagues, faculty, and staff was satisfactory to the greatest proportion of participants (94%), followed by meals (93%), and housing (89%). Financial arrangements, the most problematic of the support arrangements, were rated as satisfactory by 82% of the respondents.

3.9 Orientation (Table 3.9)

Orientations in the U.S. were considered useful by most participants who responded to the question. The Washington International Center (WIC) orientation received a mean rating of 4.2 and the USDA orientation a rating of 4.4. However, the response rate for this question was low: 71% for the WIC orientation and 47% for the USDA orientation. If the number of no responses to the questions on orientation represents lack of attendance, only half of the participants attended a USDA orientation, and not quite three-quarters attended a WIC orientation.

Table 3.1: Achievement of Training Program Objectives

Q: To what degree do you feel that each of these objectives was achieved?
(1 = "Not achieved," 5 = "Fully achieved")

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>No Response</u>
Objective #1	4.4	(103)	6
Objective #2	4.2	(84)	25
Objective #3	4.4	(67)	42
Objective #4	4.2	(46)	63
Objective #5	4.3	(30)	79
Grand Mean of Objectives	4.2		

Table 3.2a: Program Satisfaction

Q: How satisfied are you with the training program as a whole?
(1 = "Not at all satisfied,"
5 = "Very satisfied")

<u>Mean</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>No Response</u>
4.3	(108)	1

Table 3.2b: Applicability of Training to Home Country Job Responsibilities

Q: How applicable is your training to your job responsibilities in your home country?
(1 = "Not applicable," 5 = "Highly applicable")

<u>Mean</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>No Response</u>
4.6	(103)	6

Table 3.3a: Training Contribution to Achievement of Objectives

Q: To what extent did the training contribute to the achievement of your program objectives? (1 = "Not at all," 5 = "A great deal")

<u>Type of Training</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>
Academic classroom training	4.6	68
Field and observation training	4.4	70
On-the-job training	4.6	27
Technical short course training	4.3	34
Complementary training <u>1/</u>	3.8	39

1/ Mid Winter Community Seminars, Communications Seminars

Table 3.3b: Satisfaction with Types of Training

Q: Please indicate your overall satisfaction with the training. (1 = "Not at all satisfied," 5 = "Very satisfied")

<u>Type of Training</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>
Academic classroom training	4.4	69
Field and observation training	4.3	69
On-the-job training	4.5	24
Technical short course	4.4	31
Complementary training	4.1	37

Table 3.3c: Level of Presentation by Type of Training

Q: The information presented was:

<u>Type of Training</u>	<u>Too Technical</u>		<u>Too General</u>		<u>Too Elementary</u>		<u>About Right</u>		<u>No Response</u>
	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>	
Academic classroom training	12%	(8)	7%	(5)	4%	(3)	77%	(52)	41
Field and observation training	15%	(10)	18%	(12)	3%	(2)	64%	(42)	43
On-the-job training	13%	(3)	21%	(5)	13%	(3)	54%	(13)	85
Technical short course	27%	(9)	3%	(1)	3%	(1)	67%	(22)	76
Complementary training	3%	(1)	24%	(9)	8%	(3)	65%	(24)	72

Table 3.3d: Time Devoted to Types of Training

Q: The amount of time devoted to this type of training was:

<u>Type of Training</u>	<u>Too Much</u>		<u>About Right</u>		<u>Too Little</u>		<u>No Response</u>
	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>	
Academic classroom training	7%	(5)	87%	(60)	6%	(4)	40
Field & observation training	6%	(4)	72%	(48)	22%	(15)	42
On-the-job training	-----		83%	(20)	17%	(4)	85
Technical short course	9%	(3)	75%	(24)	16%	(5)	77
Complementary training	-----		81%	(30)	19%	(7)	72

Table 3.4a: English Language Training

Q: Was English language training a part of your program in the United States?

<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>		<u>No Response</u>
<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>	
27%	(24)	73%	(66)	19

Table 3.4b: Satisfaction with English Language Training

Q: At the completion of your English training, did you feel adequately prepared?

<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>		<u>No Response</u>
<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>	
68%	(13)	32%	(6)	90

Table 3.4c: Ease with English Language

Q: Please indicate the ease with which you were able to:
(1 = "Not Easy," 5 = "Very Easy")

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>No Response</u>
Understand the instructors	4.2	(78)	31
Read written materials	4.5	(79)	30
Participate in discussions	4.0	(78)	31
Transact personal business	4.2	(71)	38

Table 3.5: Factors with a Helpful Effect on Training Programs (1 of 2)

Q: Which of the factors listed below had a positive or negative effect on your program? If a factor did have an effect on your program, please check whether it was helpful or not helpful.

Part I of the following table shows whether participants felt a certain factor had an effect on their training programs. Part II shows, for those affected, whether the impact was helpful or not helpful.

Table 3.5 (2 of 2)

<u>Factor</u>	<u>PART I</u>					<u>PART II</u>			
	<u>Impact</u>		<u>Minimal Contact</u>		<u>Response Rate</u>	<u>Helpful</u>		<u>Not Helpful</u>	
	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>		<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>
Program Specialist	97%	(93)	3%	(3)	88%	97%	(90)	3%	(3)
Training Plan	93%	(90)	7%	(7)	89%	91%	(81)	9%	(8)
University Faculty	89%	(87)	11%	(11)	90%	95%	(83)	5%	(4)
American students or colleagues	83%	(72)	17%	(15)	80%	86%	(62)	14%	(10)
Technical Instructors	80%	(74)	20%	(18)	84%	99%	(73)	1%	(1)
Orientation	80%	(73)	20%	(18)	83%	93%	(68)	7%	(5)
Secretary to Program Specialist	76%	(66)	24%	(21)	80%	98%	(65)	2%	(1)
Language Training	30%	(24)	70%	(56)	73%	83%	(20)	17%	(4)

Table 3.6a: Program Development Assistance

Q: With which of the following personnel did you discuss the plans for your training program? Please indicate how helpful each was to you.
(1 = "Not helpful", 5 = "Very helpful")

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>No Response</u>
Aid Mission Staff	4.3	(60)	49
FAO Project Director	4.6	(14)	95
ITD Program Specialist	4.5	(79)	30

Table 3.6b: Clarification of Objectives

Q: Were you involved in clarifying your program objectives?

	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>		<u>No Response</u>
	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>	
In your home country?	70%	(64)	30%	(28)	17
At International Training, USDA?	63%	(52)	37%	(31)	26

Table 3.7: Professional Staff Support

Q: Please rate the following individuals in terms of the support provided to you in achieving the objectives of your training programs.
(1 = "Not helpful," 5 = "Very helpful")

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>No Response</u>
University Contact or Foreign Student Advisor	4.5	(85)	24
Faculty Advisor	4.6	(82)	27
Technical Leader	4.6	(47)	62
Instructors or Trainers	4.5	(96)	13
International Training Program Specialist at USDA	4.7	(98)	11

Table 3.8: Support Arrangements

Q: Were the following personal support factors satisfactory at the training site?

Support Services

	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>		<u>No Response</u>
	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>	
Financial arrangements	82%	(84)	18%	(18)	7
Housing	89%	(88)	11%	(11)	10
Meals	93%	(84)	7%	(6)	19
Acceptance by colleagues, faculty, and staff	94%	(94)	6%	(6)	9

Table 3.9: Orientation

Q: Please rate the usefulness of the following orientation programs provided by: (1 = "Not useful," 5 = "Very useful")

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>No Response</u>
Washington International Center	4.2	(77)	32
USDA Group Orientation	4.4	(51)	58

4. RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Most questionnaire respondents were AID-sponsored (78%) African (61%) males (85%) enrolled in academic programs (59%). Most did not receive English language training (73%) or have difficulty with English. The two major fields of study undertaken were Agronomics/Engineering (41%) and Animal Science/Natural Resources (36%).

The following section presents participant information regarding type of training program, training objectives, field of study, participant sponsor, home country region, and sex.

Type of Training: A majority, 59% (63 participants), of the respondents were involved in academic training; 41% (43) were involved in nonacademic training. Three participants didn't indicate type of training.

Training Objective: The major training objective of the largest proportion (64%) of the respondents was to obtain a degree: 30% (28) were obtaining a bachelor's degree; 31% (29) a master's degree, and 3% (3) a Ph.D. degree. The major training objective of 36% (34) of the respondents fell into the nondegree category. These nondegree participants were involved in research, on-the-job training, or study tours. Fifteen participants did not indicate their training objectives.

Field of Study: Most respondents studied Agronomics/Engineering (41%, 42 participants) or Animal Science/Natural Resources (36%, 37 participants). Management/Education/Human Resource Development was studied by 15% (15 participants) of the respondents; Economics/Policy by 8% (8 participants). Seven participants did not indicate their field of study.

Sponsor: The majority, 78% (84 participants) of the respondents were sponsored by AID; 14% (15) were sponsored by FAO; 8% (9) were sponsored by country governments. One participant did not respond to this question.

Home Country: The majority of participants were from Africa, 61% (66 participants), followed by representation from East Asia at 16% (17). Participants from Latin America and Near East/South Asia each comprised 11% (12) of the respondent group. Representation from Europe was very low, 2% (2).

Countries with the highest number of respondents were:

Botswana	10
Tanzania	10
Burma	8
Kenya	6
Mali	5

All other countries had under five participants each. A list of these countries is presented in Appendix D.

Sex: Most of the respondents were male, 85% (80 participants); 15% (14 participants) were female. Fifteen participants did not respond to this question.

5. RESPONDENT SUBGROUPS

This year information is available on participants grouped by region, sex, sponsor, and degree. The subgroup mean ratings discussed below are mostly high with little variation. Tables displaying the mean ratings for the various subgroups for overall program satisfaction, achievement of training objectives, and applicability of training to home country situations appear at the end of this section.

As stated earlier, since this group of respondents is not random, these observations cannot appropriately be generalized to the whole population. Additionally, because the number of respondents in each category is small, significant differences cannot be identified between the subgroups.

5.1 Region (Table 5.1)

Regional representation varies widely: Africans (66 participants) comprise 61% of the sample population; East Asians (17) comprise 16%; Latin Americans (12) and Near East and South Asians (12) each comprise 11%; Europeans (2) comprise 2%. Because the number of participants in the different subgroups does vary, those with small numbers should be noted when considering the strength of mean ratings.

All of the regional groups' mean ratings for program satisfaction were very good, ranging from the very high rating of 4.7 from the East Asian subgroup (17 participants) to 4.3 from the Near East and South Asian group (12 participants), to 4.2 from both the African (65 participants) and Latin American (12 participants) groups, and 4.0 from the two participants from Europe.

The applicability of training to participants' home country situations was rated extremely high by all groups except the Europeans. Both the East Asian (17) and Latin American (12) groups rated it 4.7, followed by the Near East and South Asian group (11) at 4.6, the African group (61) at 4.5, and the European group 4.0 (2).

Since this program is designed to meet needs of participants from developing countries, it is understandable that the European participants' scores would be lowest; however, it is noteworthy that they were still more than satisfied with the training program.

Respondents' evaluations of achievement of their training objectives were also very acceptable. On a five point scale where 1 = "not achieved", 3 = "moderately achieved", and 5 = "fully achieved" the subgroup's grand mean ratings for the achievement of training objectives ranged from 3.7 to 4.3. The African and East Asian groups each had a grand mean rating of 4.3, followed by the Near East and South Asian group's rating of 4.2, the European pair's rating of 4.0, and the Latin American group's rating of 3.7.

5.2 Sponsor (Table 5.2)

The majority of the respondents, 78% (84 participants) were sponsored by the Agency for International Development (AID), 14% (15 participants) were sponsored by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), and 8% (9 participants) were sponsored by individual countries.

Because the number of responses from FAO- and country-sponsored participants is small, comparisons based on the sponsor subgroup data are tenuous. However, the information available shows that the FAO-sponsored respondents rated the achievement of their training objectives at 4.5, slightly higher than the other two groups which both gave grand mean ratings of 4.2.

Country-sponsored participants (only 9) generally were most satisfied with their programs (4.7), followed by FAO-sponsored (4.5) and AID-sponsored (4.2) participants. All three groups rated applicability of training to their home country situations highly: country-sponsored at 4.7, FAO-sponsored at 4.6, and AID-sponsored at 4.5.

5.3 Sex (Table 5.3)

Women, who comprise 15% of the sample*, generally rated training factors slightly higher than their male colleagues; less variability occurred in their scores. Females (13 participants) rated their overall program satisfaction higher than males (80 participants), 4.5 compared to 4.2. Females' mean rating of applicability of training to their home country situations was slightly higher than males': 4.6 compared to 4.5. Both groups had the same mean score for achievement of objectives, 4.2.

5.4 Degree (Tables 5.4a & b)

Bachelor's, master's, and nondegree participants were almost equally represented in the sample (30%, 31%, and 36%, respectively). Very few Ph.D. program participants (3 or 3%) are in the sample; however, Ph.D. participants comprised only 4% of the total population.

*Fifteen participants did not indicate their sex on the questionnaire.

Nondegree and Ph.D. participants generally rated achievement of objectives higher than B.S. and M.S. participants: both nondegree and Ph.D. groups gave grand mean ratings of 4.4, compared to ratings of 4.1 and 4.0 by bachelor's and master's degree groups, respectively. Nondegree and Ph.D. participants were also somewhat more satisfied with their programs (4.5 and 4.3 mean scores, respectively), although B.S. and M.S. participants' mean scores of 4.0 and 4.2, respectively, indicate a high degree of satisfaction.

Nondegree participants, followed by M.S. degree participants, felt that their training would be most applicable in their home countries, rating applicability at 4.8 and 4.6, respectively. Both B.S. and Ph.D. degree participants gave mean applicability ratings of 4.3.

The one Ph.D. participant who rated satisfaction with academic training gave an excellent score (5.0). Participants in nondegree programs rated satisfaction with academic training next highest (4.7), followed by those in M.S. programs (4.4), and by those in B.S. programs (4.2).

Nondegree participants were most satisfied with field and observation training (4.5 mean score) and B.S. degree participants the least satisfied (3.9 mean score). M.S. degree participants gave a 4.3 mean rating; the one Ph.D. candidate who had this training rated it 4.0.

Only 19 respondents rated satisfaction with on-the-job training. The one Ph.D. and four M.S. degree participants who responded were very satisfied, 5.0 and 4.8 mean ratings, respectively. Ten nondegree respondents gave a mean rating of 4.5. The four B.S. degree participants mean rating of this training was 4.0.

Technical short course training satisfaction ratings were very close, from B.S. degree participants most satisfied (4.4), followed by nondegree participants (4.3) and M.S. degree participants (4.2). None of the Ph.D. degree participants indicated they had had technical short course training.

Participant satisfaction with complementary training varied. The mean rating from the three Ph.D. respondents was very high (4.7). B.S. degree participants' mean rating of this training was 4.1, followed by M.S. degree participants' mean rating of 4.0, and the one Ph.D. student who rated satisfaction at 3.0.

Table 5.1: Evaluation Responses by Region

<u>Region</u>	<u>Respondents</u>		<u>Overall Program Satisfaction</u>		<u>Applicability to Home Country</u>		<u>Grand Mean of Objectives*</u>	
	<u>Percent</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>#</u>
Africa	61%	(66)	4.2	(65)	4.5	(61)	4.3	(61)
East Asia	16%	(17)	4.7	(17)	4.7	(17)	4.3	(16)
Europe	2%	(2)	4.0	(2)	4.0	(2)	4.0	(2)
Latin America	11%	(12)	4.2	(12)	4.7	(12)	3.7	(12)
Near East and South Asia	11%	(12)	4.3	(12)	4.6	(11)	4.2	(12)
No Response	-	-	-	(1)	-	(6)	-	(6)

*See Appendix Table C.1 for more detail.

Table 5.2: Evaluation Responses by Sponsor

<u>Sponsor</u>	<u>Respondents</u>		<u>Overall Program Satisfaction</u>		<u>Applicability to Home Country</u>		<u>Grand Mean of Objectives*</u>	
	<u>Percent</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>#</u>
AID	78%	(84)	4.2	(84)	4.5	(79)	4.2	(79)
FAO	14%	(15)	4.5	(14)	4.6	(14)	4.5	(15)
Other	8%	(9)	4.7	(9)	4.7	(9)	4.2	(8)
No Response	---	(1)	---	(2)	---	(7)	---	(7)

*See Appendix Table C.2 for more detail

Table 5.3: Evaluation Responses by Sex

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Respondents</u>		<u>Overall Program Satisfaction</u>		<u>Applicability to Home Country</u>		<u>Grand Mean of Objectives*</u>	
	<u>Percent</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>#</u>
Male	85%	(80)	4.2	(80)	4.5	(78)	4.2	(77)
Female	15%	(14)	4.5	(13)	4.6	(13)	4.2	(13)
No Response	--	(15)	---	(16)	---	(18)	---	(19)

*See Appendix Table C.3 for more detail.

Table 5.4a: Evaluation Responses by Degree

<u>Degree</u>	<u>Respondents</u>		<u>Overall Program Satisfaction</u>		<u>Applicability to Home Country</u>		<u>Grand Mean of Objectives*</u>	
	<u>Percent</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>#</u>
Bachelor's	30%	(28)	4.0	(27)	4.3	(27)	4.1	(26)
Master's	31%	(29)	4.2	(29)	4.6	(27)	4.0	(27)
Ph.D.	3%	(3)	4.3	(3)	4.3	(3)	4.4	(3)
Nondegree	36%	(34)	4.5	(34)	4.8	(32)	4.4	(32)
No Response	---	(15)	---	(16)	---	(20)	---	(21)

*See Appendix Table C.4 for more detail.

Table 5.4b: Satisfaction with Type of Training by Degree

<u>Degree</u>	<u>Academic Training</u>		<u>Observation Training</u>		<u>On-the-job Training</u>		<u>Short Courses</u>		<u>Complementar Training</u>	
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>#</u>
Bachelors	4.2	(27)	3.9	(17)	4.0	(4)	4.4	(14)	4.1	(17)
Master's	4.4	(28)	4.3	(17)	4.8	(4)	4.2	(10)	4.0	(15)
Ph.D.	5.0	(1)	4.0	(1)	5.0	(1)	---	--	3.0	(1)
Nondegree	4.7	(7)	4.5	(22)	4.5	(10)	4.3	(3)	4.7	(3)
No Response	---	(46)	---	(52)	---	(90)	---	(82)	---	(73)

6. EVALUATION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS

Both the Exit Interview Questionnaire and the evaluation system have been redesigned.

6.1 Exit Interview Questionnaire

For 1982, the Exit Interview Questionnaire has been shortened from 11 to 6 pages, visually enhanced, and prepared for easier coding of responses, yet it collects almost all of the same data as the previous version. Ambiguous terms and questions and confusing question formats have been modified.

In the 1982 questionnaire revision, the question: "To what extent did the training contribute to the achievement of your program objectives?" has been replaced by, "How would you rate the quality of your training?" Hopefully, this substitution will result in more useful information.

Because a number of written comments suggested more practical training was desired, an additional question has been added to the 1982 revised questionnaire for those who had academic training: "Did you have an appropriate balance of academic and practical training?"

The questions on helpfulness of home country and U.S. orientations have been changed to gain information on numbers of participants who attended orientations.

To reduce participant confusion, on the redesigned form, Program Specialists will indicate types of training to be rated by a participant before the participant receives his or her questionnaire.

Additionally, the questionnaire format of questions referring to types of training has been simplified.

6.2 Questionnaire Distribution System

In light of the current low questionnaire return rate and recommendations from last year's exit summary report, a new distribution system has been designed.

In the future, each departing participant will be mailed a questionnaire with a cover letter requesting participation in the evaluation effort. An addressed return envelope will be included. The evaluation materials will be mailed to participants two months prior to their program completion dates in an attempt to increase the response rate by avoiding the last minute time demands participants face. The Evaluation Unit will provide Program Specialists with the evaluation form, cover letter, return envelope and lists of

the upcoming departing participants. The Program Specialists will fill in a description of the individual's training program and forward the materials to them. When completed forms are received by the Evaluation Unit, they will be given to the appropriate Program Specialist for review and the addition of his or her comments and returned to the Evaluation Unit. At the end of 1982, the return rate for evaluation questionnaires under the new distribution system will be reviewed.

APPENDIX A

COMPARISON OF RESPONDENT GROUP AND TOTAL 1981 DEPARTING POPULATION

As stated in the report introduction, the respondent group is not very representative of the total 1981 departing long-term participant population. An overview of the major differences is presented below. The table on page 47 presents more complete information.

AID-sponsored participants are overrepresented in the sample (by 28%) as are those in academic programs (by 21%). Of those in degree programs, participants who obtained B.S. and M.S. degrees are overrepresented in the respondent group (by 18% and 11%, respectively). Participants in nondegree programs are very underrepresented (29%). Ph.D. degree participants are represented similarly (3% in the sample, 4% in the total population).

Latin American, East Asian, and European participants are represented similarly in the respondent group and the total 1981 departing population. African participants are overrepresented (by 19%), while Near East and South Asian participants are somewhat underrepresented (by 10%).

Fields of study are disproportionately represented as well. Two areas, Animal Science/Natural Resources and Management/Education/Human Resource Development, have 12% and 4% too much representation. The other two areas, Economics/Policy and Agronomics/Engineering, have 7% and 9% too little representation.

Universities were fairly well represented in the sample. Of the sixty-four universities attended by 1981 departing participants, 34 were attended by questionnaire respondents. A list of universities attended is presented in Appendix E.

Table A: Comparison of 1981 Respondents and Total Departing Population

	<u>1981 Sample</u>		<u>1981 Total Population</u>	
<u>Sponsor</u>	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>
AID	78%	(84)	50%	(275)
FAO	14%	(15)	30%	(163)
Other	8%	(9)	20%	(108)
No Response	-	(1)	-	--
<u>Type of Training</u>	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>
Academic	59%	(63)	38%	(202)
Nonacademic	41%	(43)	62%	(327)
No Response	-	(3)	-	(17)
<u>Training Objective</u>	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>
BS	30%	(28)	12%	(63)
MS	31%	(29)	20%	(107)
PhD	3%	(3)	4%	(20)
Nondegree (comprised of research, study tour, on-the-job training)	36%	(34)	65%	(356)
No Response	-	(15)	-	-

Table A cont.

	<u>1981 Sample</u>		<u>1981 Total Population</u>	
<u>Region</u>	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>
Africa	61%	(66)	42%	(225)
East Asia	16%	(17)	19%	(101)
Europe	2%	(2)	5%	(27)
Latin America	11%	(12)	13%	(72)
North East & South Asia	11%	(12)	21%	(113)
Other	--	--	1%	(3)
No Response	--	--	--	(5)
<u>Field of Study</u>	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>
Agronomics & Engineering	41%	(42)	48%	(184)
Animal Science & Nat. Res.	36%	(37)	24%	(91)
Economics & Policy	8%	(8)	17%	(67)
Management, Educ., & Human Resource Development	15%	(15)	11%	(42)
No Response	--	(7)	--	(162)

APPENDIX B

COMPARISON OF 1981 AND 1980 RESPONDENTS

This section compares the evaluation responses of the 70 participants who completed their long-term programs in 1980 with the evaluation responses of the 109 respondents who completed their programs in 1981. The two samples have similarities and differences.

B.1 Respondent Characteristics (Table B.1)

Distribution of AID sponsorship is similar: 77% in 1980; 78% in 1981. FAO representation decreased 9% from 1980 to 1981. No country-sponsored participants completed questionnaires in 1980. Fewer FAO- and country-sponsored participants were part of the USDA training program in 1980.

The proportional representation from Africa is the same for both years: 61%. Comparable data are not available for other regions. More participants (8%) received academic training in 1981 than in 1980. More participants (11%) were in degree programs in 1981 than in 1980.

B.2 Participant Evaluation (Table B.2)

Overall, mean ratings of program aspects were similar, but generally slightly lower in 1981 than in 1980. These ratings discussed below are detailed in tables on pages 53-55. Although both received very satisfactory ratings in 1981, neither applicability of training to one's home country nor satisfaction with the training program as a whole received the extremely high ratings of 1980 (down from 4.8 to 4.6 and from 4.7 to 4.3, respectively). Ratings of achievement of objectives were the same or up to .3 lower in 1981 from 1980. More participants were involved in different types of training in 1981: the least change occurred in the percent of participants in academic training.

The 1981 group felt that the technical short courses contributed a little less to achievement of their program objectives: 4.7 in 1980 vs. 4.3 in 1981.

The overall level of satisfaction with the types of training was similar, with up to .2 differences. Fewer 1981 participants felt that the level of presentation of all types of training was about right (with the exception of an increase for complementary training). Some participants (8 or 34% of those responding) felt that their on-the-job training was too general or too

elementary in 1981 while no 1980 participants felt their on-the-job training was too general or too elementary. Ratings of the amount of time devoted to training types were similar with the exception of technical short courses for which fewer participants rated the amount of time spent as about right in 1981. More participants felt the short courses were too short and too long in 1981.

In 1981 11% fewer participants were satisfied with financial support arrangements than in 1980. Orientations were rated slightly lower in 1981 as was helpfulness of professionals in discussing training programs with participants. Ten percent fewer participants clarified their objectives at USDA in 1981. Ten percent more of the participants were not satisfied with their English language training in 1981.

Table B.1: Respondent Characteristics in 1981 and 1980

<u>Sponsor</u>	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>
AID	78%	(84)	77%	(53)
FAO	14%	(15)	23%	(16)
Other	8%	(9)	-	
No Response		(1)		(1)

<u>Type of Training</u>	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>
Academic	59%	(63)	51%	(35)
Nonacademic	41%	(43)	49%	(33)
No Response		(3)		(2)

<u>Training Objective</u>	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>	<u>% of Resp.</u>	<u># of Resp.</u>
B.S.	30%	(28)	23%	(15)
M.S.	31%	(29)	29%	(19)
Ph.D.	3%	(3)	1%	(1)
Nondegree	36%	(34)	47%	(31)
No Response		(15)		(4)

Table B.2: Participant Evaluation in 1981 and 1980*

	<u>1981</u>	<u>1980</u>
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Applicability of training to home country:	4.6	4.8
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Satisfaction with training program as a whole:	4.3	4.7
Achievement of Training objectives:	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Objective 1	4.4	4.6
Objective 2	4.2	4.4
Objective 3	4.4	4.4
Objective 4	4.2	4.5
Objective 5	4.3	4.4
Contribution to achievement of objective by type of training:	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Academic training	4.6	4.6
Observation training	4.4	4.6
On-the-job training	4.6	4.7
Technical short courses	4.3	4.7
Complementary training	3.8	3.9

*Mean ratings are based on five point scales.

Table B.2 cont.

	<u>1981</u>	<u>1980</u>
Satisfaction with types of training:	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Academic training	4.4	4.6
Observation training	4.3	4.5
On-the-job training	4.5	4.5
Technical short courses	4.4	4.5
Complementary training	4.1	3.9

Support factors at the training site:	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Financial arrangements	82%	18%	93%	7%
Housing	89%	11%	90%	10%
Meals	93%	7%	94%	6%
Acceptance by colleagues faculty, and staff	94%	6%	100%	---

Clarify objectives:	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
in home country?	70%	30%	72%	28%
at ITD/USDA?	63%	37%	73%	27%

Usefulness of orientations at:	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Washington International Center	4.2	4.4
USDA	4.4	4.6

Table B.2 cont.

	<u>1981</u>	<u>1980</u>
Helpfulness of people in discussing training program plans:	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Aid Mission Staff	4.3	4.7
FAO Project Director	4.6	4.4
ITD Program Specialist	4.5	4.8

Helpfulness of professional staff in achieving program objectives?	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mean</u>
University Contact or Foreign Student Advisor	4.5	4.5
Faculty Advisor	4.6	4.8
Technical Leader	4.6	4.6
Instructors or Trainer	4.5	4.6
USDA Program Specialist	4.7	4.8

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
English language training taken as part of program	27%	73%	26%	74%
Satisfaction with English language training:	68%	32%	78%	22%

APPENDIX C

Table C.1: Achievement of Objectives by Region

Region	Objective #1		Objective #2		Objective #3		Objective #4		Objective #5		Grand Mean of Objectives	
	Mean	#	Mean	#								
Africa	4.4	(61)	4.2	(53)	4.5	(45)	4.4	(31)	4.5	(22)	4.3	(61)
East Asia	4.5	(16)	4.5	(15)	4.4	(12)	4.6	(7)	4.6	(5)	4.3	(16)
Europe	4.0	(2)	4.0	(1)	---	---	---	---	---	---	4.0	(2)
Latin America	4.2	(12)	3.6	(9)	4.2	(5)	2.4	(5)	3.0	(2)	3.7	(12)
Near East & South Asia	4.3	(12)	4.3	(6)	4.2	(5)	3.7	(3)	3.0	(1)	4.2	(12)

Table C.2: Achievement of Objectives by Sponsor

Sponsor	Objective #1		Objective #2		Objective #3		Objective #4		Objective #5		Grand Mean of Objectives	
	Mean	#	Mean	#								
AID	4.3	(79)	4.1	(66)	4.4	(51)	4.1	(34)	4.3	(25)	4.2	(79)
FAO	4.5	(15)	4.8	(10)	4.8	(10)	4.6	(8)	4.3	(3)	4.5	(15)
Other-Country	4.4	(8)	4.7	(7)	4.8	(5)	4.3	(3)	5.0	(1)	4.2	(8)

Table C.3: Achievement of Objectives by Sex

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Objective #1</u>		<u>Objective #2</u>		<u>Objective #3</u>		<u>Objective #4</u>		<u>Objective #5</u>		<u>Grand Mean of Objectives</u>	
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>#</u>								
Male	4.3	(77)	4.1	(61)	4.3	(49)	4.3	(34)	4.6	(25)	4.2	(77)
Female	4.3	(13)	4.5	(10)	5.0	(7)	4.3	(7)	4.0	(2)	4.2	(13)

Table C.4: Achievement of Objectives by Degree

<u>Degree</u>	<u>Objective #1</u>		<u>Objective #2</u>		<u>Objective #3</u>		<u>Objective #4</u>		<u>Objective #5</u>		<u>Grand Mean of Objectives</u>	
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>#</u>								
Bachelor's	4.3	(26)	4.0	(24)	4.4	(20)	4.1	(14)	4.4	(10)	4.1	(26)
Master's	4.3	(27)	4.1	(21)	4.5	(18)	3.8	(13)	4.0	(7)	4.0	(27)
Ph.D.	4.7	(3)	4.3	(3)	4.3	(3)	4.3	(3)	5.0	(1)	4.4	(3)
Nondegree	4.5	(32)	4.5	(28)	4.5	(24)	4.6	(14)	4.4	(11)	4.4	(32)

APPENDIX D

COUNTRIES REPRESENTED BY RESPONDENTS

<u>Country</u>	<u># of Respondents</u>
Barbados	1
Bolivia	1
Botswana	10
Burma	8
Cameroon	2
Chad	2
China	1
Dominican Republic	1
Egypt	4
Gambia	1
Ghana	3
Greece	1
Guatemala	2
Guinea	1
Guyana	1
Indonesia	4
Iraq	1
Jamaica	4
Kenya	6
Lesotho	1
Liberia	2
Malawi	3
Malaysia	1
Mali	5
Mauritania	1
Nepal	1
Niger	3
Nigeria	2
Pakistan	2
Panama	1
Philippines	2
Portugal	2
Senegal	4
Sierra Leone	1
Somalia	2
Sri Lanka	2
St. Vincent	1
Sudan	4
Swaziland	1
Syria	1
Tanzania	0
Thailand	1
Togo	2

APPENDIX E

UNIVERSITIES ATTENDED BY RESPONDENTS*

<u>University</u>	<u># of Respondents</u>
Auburn University	1
California Polytechnic, Pomona	2
California Polytechnic, San Luis Obispo	1
California State, Fresno	3
California State, Chico	2
Colorado State University	5
Cornell University	1
Florida Agric. & Mech. University	2
Indiana University	1
Louisiana State University	2
Michigan State University	5
New Mexico State University	8
North Carolina Agric. & Tech State University	1
North Carolina State University	5
Ohio State University	1
Oklahoma State University	3
Portland State University	1
Sam Houston State University	1
Seattle University	1
Texas A & M University	2
Texas Tech University	3
University of Arizona	6
University of Arkansas	1
University of California, Davis	2
University of Colorado	1
University of Florida	7
University of Georgia	4
University of Houston	1
University of Idaho	1
University of Illinois	1
University of Massachusetts	1
University of Michigan	1
University of Minnesota	5
University of Missouri	6
University of North Dakota	1
University of Oklahoma	1
University of Wisconsin	10
Utah State University	2
Washington State University	2
Western Illinois University	8
Western Michigan University	1
West Texas State University	2
West Virginia University	1
Other	5

*Some participants attend more than one university.