PNAAS-366

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

memorandum

Ref No: 0526-09
Action: St/IT
as approp.
Due Date
Copies To:

DATE: May 10, 1983

REPLY TO ATTN OF: HRDC/ET: Elmer G. Fales

SUBJECT: Participant Evaluation and Follow Up

TO: See Distribution

THRU: HRDC/OD/ET:AYWilburn

Attached is the third in a series of reports evaluating USAID's participant training program. As in the two prior reports, it is based on data collected from 650 participants, constituting 50% of all participants returning between 1975 and 1980.

Earlier reports pointed out inter alia how deficiencies in English language abilities, inadequate participation of participants in program planning, and shortcomings in pre-departure orientation tended to affect training program success adversely.

I am pleased to advise we have been moving ahead to address these concerns:

- Enrollments at our AUC English language programs have been risen from 133 in 1976/77 to over 1300 in 1982/83.

- Qualifying ALIGU scores for call forwards have been raised.

- "Shadow sheets" for use by participant nominees at various GOE ministries have been designed and are being tried out. These will require much greater participant involvement than heretofore in the planning of his/her program.

- We are field testing two video tapes produced by AID/W and designed to give future participants a more up-to-date look at the United States and the experience of being a participant.

We solicit your comments to improve our training services.

Buy U.S. Savings Bonds Regularly on the Payroll Savings Plan

DISTRIBUTION

DIR:MPWStone
DD:OCylke
IT/CMT:WGill
IT/IR:RSeifman
IT/FI:JSuma
DRPS/IDPS:WFraser
DRPS/LAD:JRoberts
DRPS/UAD:DO'Riordan
AGR/PAD:FMoore
AGR/A:ARadi
AGR/ILD:RFulton
AD/HRDC:HLusk
HRDC/H:WOldham
HRDC/P:TReese
HRDC/ST:JRiley
DPPE/PO:RBurke
DPPE/PAAD:JLaPittus
AD/IT:VDMcCutcheon
AD/DRPS:GZarr
AD/AGR:RFort
AD/DPPE:NSweet
DPPE/DIC:NCylke (2)
AA/NE:AID/W
NE/TECH :AID/W (2)
S&T:AID/W (2)
NE/E:AID/W

Attachment: as noted.

PN-AAS-366
ISN 39196

EVALUATION AND FOLLOW-UP PROJECT FOR USAID PARTICIPANT TRAINING PROGRAMS IN EGYPT

REPORT NUMBER 3

FACTORS RELATED TO THE EVALUATION OF UNITED STATES TRAINING FOR EGYPTIANS

263-0005-C-00-1007

BY:

Farag El-Kamel, Ph.D.

March 1983

America-Mideast Educational and Training Services, Inc.

Cairo, Egypt

00059

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
INTRODUCTION		1
SECTION I	DIFFERENTIAL EVALUATION OF TECHNICAL ASPECTS	2
	A. Evaluation of Program Aspects and Predeparture Knowledge and Orientation	4
	B. Evaluation of Program Aspects and Index of Accommodation Problems	7
	C. Program Evaluation and Desire for Recreational Activities	8
	D. English Proficiency and Evaluation of Program Aspects	9
SECTION II	FACTORS INFLUENCING MEETING THE PARTICIPANT'S OBJECTIVES	12
SECTION III	GENERAL EVALUATION OF THE TRAINING EXPERIENCE	17
	A. Enjoying the Training Experience	17
	B. Participants who Made Friends in the United States	20
	C. Overall Impression of the United States	22
SECTION IV	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	25

iv

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	The Relationship Between Evaluation of Program Aspects and Predeparture Orientations and Knowledge	5
2	The Relationship Between Evaluation of Program Aspects and the Index of Accommodation Problems	7
3	The Relationship Between Wanting Recreational Activities and Evaluation of Program Aspects	8
4	The Relationship Between English Proficiency and the Evaluation of Program Aspects	9
5	Meeting of Participants' Objectives	13
6	The Relationship Between Evaluation of Program Aspects and Achieving Participants' Goals	15
7	Factors Related to Enjoying the United States Training Experience	19
8	Differences in Participants' Abilities to Make Friends with Americans	21
9	Factors Related to Participants' Liking the United States	23

This is the third in a series of four reports on the preliminary findings of the evaluation of returned USAID Egyptian participants. The emphasis in this report will be on how aspects of the training programs were evaluated by different types of participants. Also included in this report is a discussion of factors related to the extent to which participants succeeded in meeting their training objectives, as well as the overall evaluations of the program and of the participants' U.S. experiences.

SECTION I

DIFFERENTIAL EVALUATION OF TECHNICAL ASPECTS

A descriptive evaluation of technical aspects of training programs for Egyptian participants was presented in Report Number One. The present report, however, investigates differences that may exist among sub-samples of participants classified according to their predeparture (including socio-demographic) characteristics and according to characteristics of their training programs. The technical program aspects considered here include: (1) relevance and focus of training programs; (2) sophistication of programs; (3) level; (4) length; (5) pace; (6) amount of material covered; and (7) variety of training material.

An index summarizing the participants' evaluations of the abovementioned technical program aspects was constructed and is used in this analysis to substitute for the specific program aspects. This is how the index of program evaluation is constructed of seven specific variables evaluating the program aspects mentioned above. Participants were given a score of two if their evaluation of a specific program aspect was very positive, and a score of one if their evaluation was not very positive. The participants' scores in all of the seven variables were then added up and averaged to arrive at the present index, which classifies participants, according to their average score, into three groups that had an overall low, medium, or high evaluation of their program aspects.

It should be pointed out that while this index is a good measure of evaluation of program aspects, it may not be sensitive to specific reasons participants had for negative evaluations, since in theory, participants giving negative or critical responses to program aspects may do so for more than one reason.

For example, those who did not evaluate program sophistication very positively may have thought that the program was too sophisticated or that it was not sophisticated enough.

Having said that, it appears that the vast majority of the critical respondents shared the same reason for making a negative evaluation of each program aspect. From this we conclude that the index is fairly representative for negative evaluations. The pattern of reasons for negative evaluation does not show enough polarization to make the possibility of conflicting negative reasons in important weakness. Thus 86 percent who did not think that their program sophistication was very good were of the common opinion that those programs were not sophisticated enough. Likewise, 94 percent of participants critical of program durations believed that their programs were too short, 85 percent of participants critical of program pace thought that it was too fast, and 79 percent of critical participants thought that amount of training material was too little and did not have enough variety. Participants who rank low on this scale, therefore, are mostly participants who believed that their programs were not sophisticated enough, that duration was too short and pace too fast, and that amount of training material was too little and did not have enough variety.

To determine the characteristics shared by respondents with similar scores on the index, we examined all the possible effects on the index that might be related to socio-demographic characteristics of participants, training fields and specializations, dates of the training programs, English language skills, involvement in program initiation and planning, program duration, classification and methods of training.

To our surprise, the overall evaluation of program aspects did not seem to be influenced by characteristics of those programs. In other words, there were no differences in program evaluation that could be attributed to differences in program duration, classification of program as academic or non-academic, or to whether the main training method used was lectures, practical training or field observations. Also, there were no differences in the evaluation of program aspects that could be attributed to age, sex, educational or occupational levels, or to when the training program took place.

However, there are four major factors that associate with the evaluation of program aspects. These four factors are: (1) predeparture knowledge of training plans and of life in the U.S.; (2) accommodation problems faced during the training program; (3) the desire for recreational and cultural activities and visits and for the development of social contacts; and (4) English level in reading, understanding lectures and participation in discussions. Each of these four relationships is analyzed below.

A. Evaluation of Program Aspects and Predeparture Knowledge and Orientation

Predeparture knowledge and preparation of participants are strongly related to their evaluations of their training programs. As shown in Table 1 following, there is a strong relationship between participants' evaluations of technical aspects of their training programs on the one hand, and their levels of predeparture involvement in planning their programs, the existence of unclear program aspects, prior knowledge of training plans, and prior knowledge of the United States on the other hand.

TABLE 1

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EVALUATION OF PROGRAM ASPECTS AND PREDEPARTURE ORIENTATIONS AND KNOWLEDGE *

Predeparture Orientation and Knowledge	Total	Evaluation of Program Aspects		
		Low	Medium	High
Level of predeparture involvement in planning programs. 1	(N) (629)	%	%	%
Low	(470)	34.0	37.0	29.0
High	(159)	13.0	37.0	50.0
Existence of unclear program aspects. 2	(600)			
No	(252)	17.0	38.0	45.0
Yes	(348)	36.0	36.0	28.0
Prior knowledge of training plans. 3	(639)			
Low	(249)	39.0	36.0	26.0
High	(390)	22.0	39.0	40.0
Prior knowledge of the U.S. 4	(634)			
Low	(411)	32.0	39.0	29.0
High	(223)	22.0	34.0	44.0

* Differences are significant at the 0.01 level.

1. Contingency Coefficient = 0.23
2. Contingency Coefficient = 0.22
3. Contingency Coefficient = 0.19
4. Contingency Coefficient = 0.16

Table 1 reveals the following specific findings:

1. There is a strong relationship between the evaluation of program aspects and the level of predeparture involvement in program planning. Thus, while only 13 percent of participants who were highly involved in planning their programs evaluated their program aspects as low, this percentage is tripled for participants who had low levels of involvement in program planning. On the other hand, only 29 percent of participants with low levels of involvement in program planning highly evaluated aspects of their training programs, as opposed to 50 percent of participants who were more involved in planning their programs.
2. Predeparture knowledge of the training plans has the same kind of relationship with evaluation of program aspects as level of involvement. Thus, participants who evaluated aspects of their programs highly were more likely to have had better knowledge of the training plans prior to their departure to the U.S. Participants who highly evaluated their program aspects were also more likely to have been clearer prior to their departure as to what the aspects of their training programs were. The same type of relationship exists with respect to level of predeparture knowledge of the United States. Participants who knew more about the U.S. prior to their departure from Egypt were more likely to evaluate their training programs more positively.

B. Evaluation of Program Aspects and Index of Accommodation Problems

A little over one-half of all participants did not have any problems with housing, food, transportation, etc. However, about 30 percent had some problems, and 17 percent had a greater number of problems related to accommodation. When cross-tabulated with evaluation aspects, the index of accommodation problems is found to be strongly related, as shown in Table 2 below.

TABLE 2

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EVALUATION OF PROGRAM ASPECTS AND THE INDEX OF ACCOMMODATION PROBLEMS *

Evaluation of Program Aspects	Total	Index of Accommodation Problems		
		None	Some	Several
Total	(631) 100.0	(334) 100.0	(188) 100.0	(109) 100.0
Low	28.0	22.0	31.0	45.0
Medium	37.0	38.0	35.0	36.0
High	35.0	40.0	34.0	19.0

* Differences are significant at the 0.01 level, Contingency coefficient = 0.20.

As illustrated in Table 2 above, only 22 percent of participants who did not have accommodation problems rated their training programs negatively, as compared to 45 percent of participants who had several accommodation problems. On the other hand, 40 percent of those who had no accommodation problems rated their programs highly, compared to only 19 percent of participants who had several accommodation problems.

It is clear, therefore, that whether or not the participant faces problems with housing, food and transportation is quite related to the participants'

overall evaluation of even the technical aspects of the training program.

C. Program Evaluation and Desire for Recreational Activities

As illustrated, evaluation of program aspects is related to index of recreational activities desired. The main finding here is that participants who wanted more out of their training programs than just technical training were more likely to have a somewhat negative evaluation of technical aspects of their programs.

TABLE 3

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WANTING RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES AND EVALUATION OF PROGRAM ASPECTS *

Evaluation of Program Aspects	Total	Wanting Recreational Activities		
		Low	Medium	High
Total	(627) 100.0	(71) 100.0	(233) 100.0	(323) 100.0
Low	28.0	17.0	24.0	35.0
Medium	37.0	32.0	36.0	39.0
High	35.0	51.0	40.0	26.0

* Differences are significant at the 0.01 level, Contingency coefficient = 0.19.

Table 3 shows that there is a strong positive relationship between the evaluation of program aspects and the desire for recreational activities. Thus, we notice that of those who did not want extra-curricular activities, 17 percent evaluated the program as low and 51 percent evaluated it highly. On the other hand, of those who wanted a lot of additional extra-curricular activities 35 percent had a low evaluation of their programs, and only 26 percent had high evaluations. It should be mentioned that "recreational activites" here

include tours, cultural and social visits and contacts, as well as personal visits and activities such as shopping.

D. English Proficiency and Evaluation of Program Aspects

The index of English proficiency is also strongly related to the evaluation of program aspects, as shown in Table 4 below.

TABLE 4

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ENGLISH PROFICIENCY AND THE EVALUATION OF PROGRAM ASPECTS *

Evaluation of Program Aspects	Total	English Proficiency Low	English Proficiency High
Total	(620) 100.0	(319) 100.0	(301) 100.0
Low	28.0	32.0	24.0
Medium	37.0	42.0	34.0
High	35.0	26.0	42.0

* Differences are significant at the 0.01 level, Contingency coefficient = 0.17.

Table 4 shows that participants whose English levels were low also had low evaluations of technical aspects of their programs, and the opposite is true. Participants' English problems during the training program itself, with respect to ability to read and understand written training material, listen to and understand lectures, and ability to participate in discussions constitute this index of English proficiency which is a summary of the participants' problems in these three aspects.

Thus, we find that participants whose levels of English proficiency were low were less likely to have high evaluations of program, aspects, as opposed to

participants whose English proficiency was high and were more likely to highly evaluate their program aspects.

Finally, it should be emphasized here that independent variables which correlate with the index of evaluation of program aspects also correlate with the evaluations of specific program aspects. However, there are of course some instances where either not all the independent variables identified above relate to a specific program aspect, or where some independent variables other than the ones discussed above are found to relate to a specific program aspect. Following is a brief discussion of such instances.

Evaluation of program relevance is also found to be associated with some socio-demographic factors, especially occupation and sex, where programs were more likely to be evaluated as very relevant by university professors, while professionals tended to be the group most critical of program relevance. Bureaucrats were mid-way between those two occupational groups. As for sex differences, males were more likely than females to mention that their programs were very relevant. Programs were also evaluated as more sophisticated by university professors, with higher percentages of professionals and bureaucrats saying that their programs were not sophisticated enough.

On the other hand, while predeparture levels of knowledge of training plans and of life in the U.S., as well as levels of English, proved to relate to participants' evaluations of any and all technical aspects of their training programs, accommodation problems and desire for recreational activities were particularly related to evaluations of program pace and duration. For example, it was found that more participants criticize their programs as too short if they had desired

more recreational and cultural activities during their U.S. programs.

In the beginning of this report it was mentioned that the evaluation index used was rather insensitive to reasons participants had for their evaluations of specific program aspects. Therefore, we investigated the possibilities that the index might have overlooked any significant findings. Our analysis indicates that there are strong differences in English levels between participants who believed their programs were too sophisticated and those who said that they were not sophisticated enough. Also related is our finding that participants who encountered problems with logistics and accommodation in the U.S. were more likely to criticize program durations on grounds that their programs were too long, that is, they were more anxious to see the end of their training programs sooner. However, it should also be noted that even those who said that their programs were too short were also more likely to have had more accommodation problems than participants who were satisfied with their program durations.

SECTION II

FACTORS INFLUENCING MEETING THE PARTICIPANTS' OBJECTIVES

The importance of program aspects discussed above increases markedly if it turns out that these aspects influence the extent to which participants meet their training objectives. In other words, if there is a relationship, for example, between program pace and the extent to which participants met their objectives when attending the program, then the participants' evaluation of program pace should be seriously considered, since it is more than just a complaint on the part of participants. On the other hand, if program aspects do not seem to affect the achievement of program objectives, then perhaps no serious consideration of the participants' evaluations of those aspects is required.

As illustrated below, participants who had complaints about program aspects were much less likely to achieve the objectives they had set for themselves when attending their programs. When asked to classify each of the eight different objectives they had as major or secondary objectives, or as objectives they did not have, participants ranked gaining of technical information, acquiring of technical skills and exchange of professional ideas and information as the most important three objectives. (For more information, see Report Number One, pp. 13-14.) Other relatively important objectives were seeing the U.S., making professional and personal contacts and improving English.

Participants who considered any of these possible objectives a major or secondary objective were then asked whether that objective was fully achieved, partly achieve, or if it was not achieved at all. The following table provides information on the extent to which each of the participants' objectives was achieved.

Of most of participants

TABLE 5

MEETING OF PARTICIPANTS' OBJECTIVES

Objective	Total	Meeting of Objectives		
		Not met	Partly met	Fully met
Gaining technical information	100.0 (637)	3.0	46.0	51.0
Making professional contacts	100.0 (533)	10.0	52.0	38.0
Making personal contacts	100.0 (466)	8.0	49.0	43.0
Gaining Technical skills	100.0 (609)	8.0	46.0	46.0
Exchange ideas	100.0 (623)	2.0	43.0	55.0
See United States	100.0 (590)	4.0	50.0	46.0
Improve English	100.0 (431)	2.0	48.0	50.0
Strengthen Egypt-U.S. ties	100.0 (510)	1.0	39.0	60.0

Table 5 shows that the percentages of participants who did not meet their objectives were rather small, ranging between one and ten percent. The rest of participants were almost split, on the average, between achieving their objectives fully or partially.

At this point one wonders whether or not there were any program aspects that had any significant bearing on the extent to which participants met their training objectives. Our analysis shows that the extent to

which any of the specified eight objectives was met is associated with all technical aspects of the training programs. That is, participants whose evaluations of any of the technical aspects were negative were more likely not to have met their objectives or to have only partly met them. This finding applies to all technical aspects and to all training objectives of participants. That is, if we put the six technical program aspects horizontally, and the eight objectives vertically, we will see a significant relationship in each cell of the resulting table. It would be both redundant and pointless, however, to show each of these relationships here. Therefore, the summary index of technical program aspects will be used as a substitute. The three strongest and most important of these relationships are shown in Table 6 below.

Table 6 clearly illustrates the very strong relationship between techncial aspects of the program, (i.e., sophistication, level, duration, pace, material covered and variety) on the one hand, and each of the three participants' goals: to gain technical information, to acquire skill and to develop professional contacts, on the other hand. For all of the three goals, the same pattern of relationship with technical aspects of their program exists. Participants who negatively evaluated technical aspects of their programs were much more likely not to have met their objectives, or to have met them only partly at most. On the other hand, participants who positively evaluated technical aspects of their training programs were more likely to have met their goals. In fact, every participant who highly evaluted technical aspects of his or her program managed to meet, either partly or fully, the goal to gain technical information, and only two percent of these participants who highly evaluated their program aspects did not meet the goal to acquire technical skills.

Table (6): THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EVALUATION OF PROGRAM ASPECTS AND ACHIEVING PARTICIPANTS' GOALS *

EVALUATION OF TECHNICAL PROGRAM ASPECTS	TOTAL	GAIN TECHNICAL INFO.			ACQUIRE TECHNICAL SKILL			DEVELOP PROFESS. CONTACTS		
		Not met	Partly met	Fully met	Not met	Partly met	Fully met	Not met	Partly met	Fully met
Total	100.0	100.0 (15)	100.0 (289)	100.0 (324)	100.0 (44)	100.0 (280)	100.0 (279)	100.0 (54)	100.0 (272)	100.0 (201)
Low	28.0	80.0	41.0	14.0	75.0	39.0	11.0	41.0	34.0	15.0
Medium	37.0	20.0	40.0	35.0	23.0	38.0	38.0	41.0	36.0	36.0
High	35.0	00.0	19.0	51.0	2.0	23.0	51.0	18.0	30.0	49.0

* Differences are significant at the 0.01 level. Contingency coefficients are, respectively, 0.38, 0.41, and 0.26.

In contrast, of those who negatively evaluated the technical aspects of their programs, as many as 80 percent said that they did not meet the objective of gaining technical information, 75 percent did not meet their goal to acquire technical skill and 41 percent did not meet their goal to develop professional contacts. It should be recalled that participants who negatively evaluated the technical aspects of their training programs were the ones who reported that their programs were not sophisticated enough, the duration was too short, the program pace too fast and the amount of material covered not adequate and had too little variety.

SECTION III

GENERAL EVALUATION OF THE TRAINING EXPERIENCE

This last section reports on the participants' evaluations of three general facets of their U.S. experience. First, we will investigate factors that relate to enjoying the experience of attending training programs in the U.S., regardless of the success of the program itself. Second, we will attempt to uncover factors which make it more possible for participants to make friends in the U.S. Finally, we will describe the characteristics of participants who were more likely either to like or dislike things about the U.S. during their training there.

A. Enjoying the Training Experience

All participants in this study were asked this question: "Regardless of how successful you feel your training program was, did you enjoy the experience of joining that program?" On a scale from one to four, the large majority of participants, 84 percent, said that they enjoyed their programs a great deal. The remaining 16 percent ranged between somewhat enjoying their programs and enjoying them only a little. When examined more closely, however, we find that this distribution is influenced by certain characteristics of participants. Before we detail those characteristics, we should emphasize that none of them was socio-demographic. That is, participants' educational or occupational levels, age, sex or geographical residence did not have any relationship with how much they enjoyed their U.S. training experiences.

On the other hand, factors such as prior knowledge of the training programs, extent to which participants' objectives in attending training program were met, extent to which participants encountered problems with food,

housing and other daily problems, and the degree of program relevance to participants' backgrounds and specializations are all associated with the extent to which participants enjoyed their training experiences.

Table 7 shows that a strong relationship exists between the extent of enjoying the training experience in the U.S. and factors mostly operating during the training stage itself. We know that 16 percent of our sample did not answer very positively when asked how much they enjoyed their training experiences. Table 7 shows that this percentage rises to 21 percent of participants who did not have adequate prior knowledge of their training plans, to 23 percent of participants who partly met their objectives and to 44 percent of those participatns who could not meet their objectives (represented by the objective to gain technical information). Furthermore, between 20 and 23 percent of participants who encountered problems with their accomodation in the States did not have a very positive evaluation of their training experiences. Finally, when training programs were not closely related to the participants' fields, the percentage of those who did not enjoy their U.S. experiences rose to 27 percent among participants whose programs were moderately related and to 41 percent of participants whose programs were poorly related to their fields of specialization.

Table (7): FACTORS RELATED TO ENJOYING THE U.S. TRAINING EXPERIENCE *

Enjoying the Experience	Total	Prior Knowledge of Plan		Meeting Objective to Gain Technical Information			Accommodation Problems			Program Relevance		
		Low	High	Not met	Partly met	Fully met	None	Some	Many	Low	Medium	High
Total	100.0	100.0 (249)	100.0 (394)	100.0 (16)	100.0 (292)	100.0 (324)	100.0 (334)	100.0 (190)	100.0 (109)	100.0 (27)	100.0 (144)	100.0 (473)
Low	16.0	21.0	12.0	44.0	23.0	7.0	11.0	20.0	23.0	41.0	27.0	11.0
High	84.0	79.0	88.0	56.0	77.0	93.0	89.0	80.0	77.0	59.0	73.0	89.0

* Differences are significant at the 0.01 level. Values of contingency coefficients are, respectively, 0.11, 0.24, 0.13, and 0.23.

B. Participants Who Made Friends in the United States

As mentioned in the first report of this series, roughly one-half of all participants in our sample claimed to have made American friends during their training in the United States. Our analysis indicates that the factors most importantly related to making friends in the U.S. are the participants' prior knowledge of the U.S. and of their training plans, their English levels and their subscriptions to journals and to professional associations. Apparently, it seems that the term "friends" here was understood by interviewees to mean both personal as well as professional relationships developed with Americans. The number of programs attended was also found to be an important factor positively related to making such relationships. Finally, our analysis indicates that the participants' levels in reading and speaking English is perhaps the strongest factor related to potential for making friends in the U.S. Table 8 illustrates some of these relationships.

Not shown in Table 8 are significant relationships between making fiends in the U.S. on the one hand, and factors such as subscription to journals and joining professional associations on the other hand. At any rate, the table shows that the percentage of participants claiming to have made American friends during their training in the U.S. rises to 53 percent among those with better knowledge of plans for their programs prior to departure, to 55 percent of participants who encountered no English language difficulties while attending their programs, and to 63 percent of participants who have attended more than one training program. On the other hand, the percentage falls from the overall average of 48 percent to 39 percent among those who had low predeparture knowledge of their training plans, and to only 33 percent of participants whose English comprehension of program material and discussion was not very good.

Table (8): DIFFERENCES IN PARTICIPANTS' ABILITIES TO MAKE FRIENDS WITH AMERICANS *

Making Friends in the U.S.	Total	Number Of Programs Attended		Prior Knowledge of Training Plans		English Comprehension		
		One	More than one	Low	High	Low	Medium	High
Total	100.0	100.0 (559)	100.0 (78)	100.0 (250)	100.0 (389)	100.0 (73)	100.0 (245)	100.0 (300)
None	52.0	54.0	37.0	61.0	47.0	67.0	56.0	45.0
Yes	48.0	46.0	63.0	39.0	53.0	33.0	44.0	55.0

* Differences are significant at the 0.01 level. Contingency coefficients are, respectively, 0.11, 0.13, and 0.15.

C. Overall Impression of the United States

As shown in Report Number One, our participants' attitudes towards the United States were overwhelmingly positive. When asked whether they generally liked or disliked the U.S., 85 percent stated that they liked it very much. The remaining 15 percent said that they liked the U.S. to some extent. This overwhelming positive impression, however, was influenced by certain factors to be analyzed in this final section of the report.

It should be stated at the outset that liking or disliking the U.S. is not found to be associated with any of the socio-demographic variables considered in this study. These variables include age, sex, occupation, educational and occupational level, as well as geographical residence. On the other hand, our analysis shows moderately strong relationships between degree of liking the U.S. and factors that belong to either predeparture preparation and knowledge, or to problems encountered during the program. These is also a strong relationship between extent of liking the U.S. and extent to which participants' goals were met. That is, participants who fully achieved their goals during their programs had the most positive impressions of the U.S., and the opposite is true. These relationships are shown in Table 9 below.

Table 9 clearly illustrates the importance of both predeparture variables and problems encountered by participants. Bearing in mind that 15 percent of all participants did not have very positive impressions of the U.S., this percentage increases to as much as 25 for certain sub-groups of participants. Thus, the percentage of those who did not like the U.S. very much rises from the overall of 15 percent to 18 percent of participants who had low levels of predeparture knowledge of the U.S., to 19 percent for whom the training plans were not very clear, to 21 percent who acieved their goals only partially to 25 percent of participants who did not meet their goals.

Table (9): FACTORS RELATED TO PARTICIPANTS LIKING OF THE U.S. *

LIKING THE U.S.	TOTAL	CLARITY OF PROGRAM PLANS		PREDEPARTURE LEVEL OF KNOWLEDGE OF U.S.		MEETING OF PARTICIPANT'S GOALS			ACCOMMODATION PROBLEMS			ENGLISH LEVEL	
		Some unclear	All clear	Low	High	No	Partly	Fully	Several	Little	None	Not good	Good
Total	100.0	100.0 (344)	100.0 (246)	100.0 (409)	100.0 (219)	100.0 (16)	100.0 (286)	100.0 (316)	100.0 (110)	100.0 (186)	100.0 (328)	100.0 (186)	100.0 (443)
Not very strong	15.0	19.0	10.0	18.0	10.0	25.0	21.0	10.0	25.0	16.0	12.0	23.0	12.0
Very strong	85.0	81.0	90.0	82.0	90.0	75.0	79.0	90.0	75.0	84.0	88.0	77.0	88.0

* All differences are significant at less than .05. Values of contingency coefficients are, respectively, 0.12, 0.11, 0.28, 0.15, and 0.14.

The percentage of participants who did not like the U.S. very much also increases to 23 percent of participants whose English was not adequate, and to 25 percent of participants who encountered problems with housing, food, money and other accommodation arrangements. On the other hand, the percentage of participants who stated very strong liking for the U.S. rose from 85 percent, the average for all participants, to 90 percent of those who were very clear about their program plans, those who knew more information about American life, and of participants who succeeded in meeting their goals fully. This percentage also increases to 88 percent of participants who had no English problems or encountered no problems with accommodation arrangements.

Of the five factors shown above to be related to participants' liking of the U.S., it is evident that the extent to which a participant meets his or her goals has the strongest relationship to the extent of liking the U.S. Participants' goals are represented to Table 9 by the goal to acquire technical information. The extent to which other goals were met also has a powerful relationship to the extent of liking the U.S. This finding indicates the importance of taking participnats' expectations and goals seriously, and the importance of factors found to affect the acievement of these goals, as discussed in a previous section of this report.

SECTION IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Participants' evaluations of their program aspects were not totally positive. Significant numbers of participants believed that their programs were not sophisticated enough, their levels were not very adequate, program duration was too short, pace was too fast and the amoung of training material covered was not very adequate and did not have enough variety.

These problems with program aspects did not face all participants equally. Instead, they were much more likely to be cited by participants who were inadequately involved in the planning of their training programs and by participants who lacked enough information on the details of these programs. Furthermore, problems with technical aspects of the training programs were encountered more often by participants who did not have sufficient English skills and consequently found it to be more difficult to benefit from their programs, given their fixed durations, pace, etc. However, participants whose English was not very adequate were less likely to agree with the majority of critical participants about the level and sophistication of these programs. That is, participants whose English was not good enough were more likely to criticize the sophistication or level of their programs on grounds that these programs were too sophisticated.

Another characteristic of participants who were critical of technical aspects of their programs was the extent of problems they encountered with accommodations and logistics. An additional factor which was found to be related to program evaluation was the participants' desire for recreational activities while in the U.S. Most participants wanted to have included in their programs activities such as cultural visits, spare

time and time for shopping, recreational trips, etc. The more these activities were desired by participants, the more critical they were when evaluating aspects of their programs.

While we are not about to recommend that training programs turn into shopping trips or be handled by tour agencies, it seems worth considering that more cultural and recreational elements be included in the training programs, or at least allowing more time in the participant's schedule for such activities. It would also be better if participants could get the information they need in this regard.

On the other hand, the importance of predeparture screening and preparation of participants keep surfacing once and again. Thorough and careful screening and orientation should ensure that participants possess levels of English sufficient for adequate participation in their programs. Orientations should prepare the selected participants adequately, with respect to all aspects of the program they will be attending, what is expected of them and what they should expect both from their programs and from the U.S. society and environment in general.

As we mentioned earlier, the participants' claim regarding aspects of their training programs would carry more weight if it turned out that there was a relationship between their evaluations of these aspects and the extent to which their goals in attending the training programs had been achieved. Now that such a relationship has been established, serious consideration should be given to program characteristics. Our preliminary analysis indicates that differences in goal achievement are related to aspects and characteristics of training programs, independently of the effects of background and predeparture factors, which suggests

that a comprehensive review and evaluation of program characteristics may be in order. For example, are these programs really not sophisticated enough, are the durations not adequate and the pace too fast? Is the training material sufficient and does it have enough variety? These are questions that need a more thorough investigation in an effort to improve the quality of training programs and their impacts on the participant trainees, at least as concerns the achievement of training goals envisioned by participants.