

~~374.013
A512~~

PN-AAS-391
ISN 39229

PARTICIPANT ASSESSMENT OF AID TRAINING PROGRAMS

A Descriptive Statistical Report

May 1968

**Office of International Training
Agency for International Development
U.S. Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20523**

000175

~~A.I.D. HISTORICAL AND
TECHNICAL REFERENCE
ROOM 1858 NS~~

PN-AAS 391

PARTICIPANT ASSESSMENT

OF

AID TRAINING PROGRAMS

A Descriptive Statistical Report

1 May 1968

**Office of International Training
Agency for International Development
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Washington, D.C. 20523**

FOREWORD

This report was prepared by Dr. Paul R. Kimmel, Dr. William A. Lybrand, and Dr. William C. Ockey, of The American University's Development Education and Training Research Institute, under contract AID/csd-1839.

They were ably assisted by Miss Ann Fenderson, Mr. Eugene B. Kassman, Mr. Donald F. Mayer, Jr., and Miss Mary Ann Dyer, also of the DETRI staff.

The data analyses in this report were professionally reviewed by an Advisory Committee made up of Mr. Lloyd Free, Director of the Institute for International Social Research; Dr. Eugene H. Jacobson, Associate Dean for Research and Development, International Programs, Michigan State University; Dr. Harley O. Preston, Executive Secretary, Committee on Psychology in National and International Affairs, American Psychological Association; and Dr. Bryant Wedge, Director, Institute for the Study of International Behavior. The technical quality of the document reflects the committee's suggestions, but, of course, the members cannot be held responsible for any inadequacies which may still exist.

The authors wish to express their appreciation to Dr. John Stabler and Dr. Forrest Clements of the AID/W Office of International Training for carefully reviewing the report draft and suggesting ways in which the statistical summaries might most usefully be presented. They did this without intruding upon the scientific integrity of the DETRI staff, which is vital to any objective evaluation of operating program effectiveness. Mr. Daly Lavergne, Director, and Dr. Martin McLaughlin, Deputy Director, of A/IT have

provided continuing encouragement to the exit interview study, which has given a sense of meaning and significance to the work of the DETRI staff that is deeply appreciated.

Thanks are also due Mrs. Miriam Hope and Mrs. Maria Moore of the AID/W Office of International Training for their supportive cooperation with the DETRI staff, particularly in coordinating the DETRI exit interviews with the operations of that office.

**Part 1. General Findings and Conclusions for
All Participants**

PREFACE

This first semi-annual Descriptive Statistical Report on exit interviews conducted with participants in the Agency for International Development, Office of International Training programs has been prepared in three parts. Part I includes aggregate data for all participants described throughout the report. Part 2 includes aggregate data for Academic and Special program participants interviewed between July 17, 1967, and January 31, 1968. Part 3 is a report on Observational Tour Groups interviewed between August 22, 1967, and February 29, 1968. Each part has been prepared so that it is "self-contained" and can be read independently, depending upon the interests of the user.

The purpose of this report is summarized by the title, "Descriptive Statistical." The report provides an overview of the participants' perceptions of, and reactions to, their entire training programs. As such, it is not designed as an incisively analytic examination of relationships among factors associated with any particular type of program or group of participants. That type of examination will be presented in the annual analytic report, when the cumulative number of participants interviewed will allow more meaningful in-depth analyses of the information collected.

In Part 1 of the report there are three chapters, each with topical sections. These chapters are (1) Principal Findings and Conclusions; (2) Participants' Backgrounds and Training Programs; and (3) Participants' Satisfactions with Their Entire Program Experience.

The first chapter in each part of the report presents a number of overall impressions gained from a review of the

statistical results of the interviewing. Within each section of most of the other chapters, statistical results are presented in a standard manner. First a question is posed, second a table of percentages* answering that question is presented, and third a description of the percentages in the table appears.

Two types of tables are presented. The first type of table aggregates the answers given to the question by all participants. The second type of table breaks down findings in the aggregate tables on the basis of important dimensions of the participants' backgrounds and training programs. Usually these dimensions are: the region from which the participants came, the type of training program the participant had, and the field of training of the participant. In a few instances, breakdowns by participating agency and A/IT training branch are presented. These cross-breaks were made whenever the distribution of data in the aggregate descriptive tables suggested that such further analysis might be of interest.

The number of people represented in the two types of tables varies slightly and is determined by two factors. The first factor is the size of the total population which was asked a given question. (Not all participants are asked all questions.) The second factor is the number of the participants for whom data may be missing for the group asked the question.

*The percentages are presented to one decimal place to avoid confusion due to rounding errors and to provide the reader with exact information on the number of participants giving each response. This extra decimal place is not intended to convey vital statistical information.

There are several reasons why small amounts of data may be missing for a group. Since no coercion is used in the interviewing process at DETRI, there are a few questions that some participants chose not to answer. In a few instances, participants inadvertently skipped or gave double answers to items that were undetected by the screening processes set up at DETRI. Improved quality control procedures have been instituted so that future analyses will be more complete. Finally there is the small margin of error which comes into the analysis of the data due to problems with key-punching and IBM machine handling of the data on the questionnaires and interview forms. Therefore, although most tables add to 100%, a few add to slightly less. The small amounts of missing data involved could not significantly affect the distribution in these tables.

The reader will notice that the number of participants which appear in the cross-break tables is usually less than the number of participants in the descriptive table on which they are based. This occurs because only those participants for whom there was usable information on both the item in the descriptive table and the dimension used for the breakdown can be presented in such a cross-tabulation.

The reader will also notice that in these cross-break tables some of the categories in the descriptive tables on which they are based have been collapsed. This was done because the numbers of participants in the collapsed categories was too small to allow meaningful comparisons along the cross-break dimensions. No dimension or category on which there is less than 90 participants was used in setting up the cross-break tables.

In the data analysis, important cross-breaks were examined for statistical significance. Only those relationships which were found to be significant at the .05 level are presented in this report. This means that the relationship between the dimension (e.g., type of program) and the participants' responses to the question could have occurred by chance alone less than once in 20 times.

In describing the results of any descriptive or cross-break table, no interpretive conclusions have been drawn. Because of the amount of data available for analysis in this report, and the purpose of the report itself, such conclusions would be premature. However, Chapter I in each Part does present impressions derived from the data presented in that part of the report. It is vital that the reader remember that these implications are based exclusively upon the perceptions of the participants who passed through Washington, D.C., on their return to their home countries, between the dates indicated in the first paragraph, and who appeared at The American University's Development Education and Training Research Institute for an exit interview. Only to the extent that these participants are representative of the entire population of participants can the findings and implications presented throughout this report be considered generalizable to the perceptions of all participants in programs of the Office of International Training.

Following is a glossary which presents the acronyms used throughout this report.

GLOSSARY

- ACAD:** Academic program participant; a student who has attended a university or college during the majority of his training program and taken courses in which academic credit is earned.
- AID/W:** Agency headquarters in Washington, D.C.
- A/IT:** AID Office of International Training.
- DETRI:** Development Education and Training Research Institute, The American University, Washington, D.C.
- H.C.:** home country; the participant's country of residence.
- Host government:** the participant's home country government.
- Mean:** average; the sum of a series of values divided by the number of values in the series.
- Median:** the middle number in a series, which divides a series into two equal groups, one having numbers of higher value and the other having numbers of lower value.
- Observational Tour Group:** trainees from one or more countries who proceed together through their training and whose program consists of visits to a variety of training sites at which operations are observed and discussed.
- SPEC:** Special program participant; a participant whose training included special academic courses, lectures, and seminars; on-the-job work experience; observational visits; or some combination of these types of training.
- TOUR:** Observational Tour Group.
- USAID:** AID Mission overseas.
- USAID technician:** AID representative in another country.
- WIC:** Washington International Center.

CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
Foreword	iii
Preface	v
I Principal Findings and Conclusions	1
II Participants' Backgrounds and Training Programs	5
III Participants' Satisfaction with Their Entire Program Experience	13

CHAPTER I

PRINCIPAL FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The general impression obtained from the first 1201 participants interviewed at DETRI is that they feel their programs, technically and non-technically, have been satisfying and relevant to their countries' needs. The greater number of participants generally want longer periods of the type of training they are receiving, and do not ask for any major changes while in the United States. Nearly all feel the training they have received will be usable immediately as well as five years hence in their home countries.

In this context of general satisfaction, there were a number of constructive comments of probable interest to those planning future programs. (Specific responses and the number of participants making them are provided in tables throughout the three parts of this report.) A summary of these comments follows.

Many participants want to know more about why their training program was planned as it was. They have little understanding of how program details were determined, of the difficulties encountered in scheduling, or of the reasons for changes required during the course of their program. Although almost all participants wanted to be involved in planning, only about two-thirds felt that they did participate and nearly half of these considered their involvement insufficient.

Another concern of many participants is what they consider irrelevance or duplication in the content of their training programs. For the highly task-oriented participant, this seems to create general dissatisfaction, even though the

bulk of his training may be considered useful and relevant. Many participants feel that they had too little opportunity for guided application of their training. This is especially true for Special program participants, who report receiving less on-the-job training than either observational tour visits or classroom training, and who request more on-the-job training. Both Academic and Special program participants feel they should be more involved in laboratory work, field trips, and other practical experiences that would enable them to apply their general theoretical training before returning home. The Special Communication Seminars (particularly those sponsored by Michigan State University), which emphasize training applications, are generally well-received by the participants.

In terms of the non-technical aspects of the training program, many of the participants find housing an area that offers problems. These problems generally center around the issues of selection of housing, cost, and discrimination. A number of participants suggest that AID be more involved with selection of housing, from providing lists of approved housing to actually making arrangements for participants who so desire. A number of participants note that living allowances are perhaps out of date with housing costs in this country. Many observe that housing expenses leave little money for eating, entertainment, and miscellaneous expenses such as laundry, haircuts, and in-town transportation.

The most successful administrative part of the program, as far as the participants see the situation, are the travel arrangements that have been made for them. The only suggestion made in this area is that some transportation be by bus or train so that more of the country may be seen in trips between training sites.

Another area of experience that is almost always seen favorably is the home hospitality that is provided by Americans during the participant's visits to cities and other training sites. We have had no complaints about such home hospitality and a great number of participants have suggested that more be provided, both in terms of longer visits and more frequent visits.

Some participants feel that they were given inadequate information by USAIDs about their program and about social conditions in the United States. Lack of information and/or time before departure from the home country frequently prohibits many desirable activities, such as making final job and family arrangements, shopping for clothing, obtaining more English language training, planning for the handling of expenses, or coordinating communication plans with relatives and friends. Participants who had talked with former AID trainees before departing feel better prepared and more satisfied with their briefing at USAIDs.

Among the participants who required English language training, those who had the training in their home countries generally are more satisfied with its usefulness than those who lacked such training prior to coming to the United States

Most of the participants anticipate some problems in using their training in their home countries. The major difficulties that are foreseen are a lack of funds, equipment, tools and supplies, qualified staff, and general resistance to changing ways of doing things. Most of the participants feel that USAID technical personnel can assist them in dealing with these problems on a continuing basis after they return to their home countries.

In summary, the overall impact of the AID training programs on the participants is most positive. The majority of participants expressed general satisfaction with their entire program experience. However, some aspects of the training programs are viewed more favorably than other aspects by most of the participants, and some types of participants are significantly less satisfied than other participants with part or all of their U.S. experience. The statistical summaries presented in other parts of this report indicate where these differences among aspects of the program and types of participants occur. The annual analytic report from DETRI will yield more definitive information on the factors which account for differences in satisfaction with different aspects of the training programs and between various types of participants.

CHAPTER II
PARTICIPANTS' BACKGROUNDS AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

Q. What regions of the world were the participants from?

REGION	PERCENTAGE (%)
Near East-South Asia (NESA)	26.7
Far East (FE)	20.5
Latin America (LA)	23.5
Africa (AFR)	29.3

TOTAL N	(1201)

The total sample of participants were relatively evenly divided among the 4 major regions. Africa had the highest proportion of the participants (29.3%), while the Far East had the lowest (20.5%).

Q. What types of programs did the participants participate in?

TYPE OF PROGRAM	PERCENTAGE (%)
Academic	26.6
Special	44.9
Tour	28.5
<hr/>	
TOTAL N	(1201)

The highest proportion of the participants were in Special training programs (44.9%). The remainder of the participants were about equally divided between Observational Tour (28.5%) and Academic (26.6%) programs.

Q. How long were the participants' sojourns in the U.S.?

TIME IN U.S. (IN MONTHS)	PERCENTAGE (%)
Less than 1	2.0
1-2	14.7
3	18.3
4-5	13.7
6	9.6
7-11	11.1
12	9.4
13-23	7.7
24	4.4
25-36	4.1
37 and over	5.1

TOTAL N	(1201)

Almost 1/2 the participants were in the U.S. for less than 6 months (48.7%). 30% were in the U.S. for 6 months to a year and 20.3% were here over one year. The average (mean) length of sojourn in the United States was 44 weeks. The median length of sojourn was 22 weeks.

Q. What were the participants' training fields?

FIELD OF TRAINING	PERCENTAGE %
Agriculture (AGRIC)	26.1
Industry & Mining (I&M)	6.2
Transportation (TR)	6.7
Labor (LAB)	11.2
Public Health (PH)	9.1
Education (ED)	14.4
Public Administration (PA)	19.5
Community Development (COMM. DEV.)	1.7
Military (MIL)	2.7
General & Miscellaneous (GEN. & MISC.)	2.4

TOTAL N	(1201)

More than 1 participant out of 4 was in Agriculture (26.1%). Other fields which accounted for more than 10% of the participants were Public Administration (19.5%), Education (14.4%) and Labor (11.2%).

Q. What A/IT Training Branches programmed the participants?

A/IT TRAINING BRANCHES	PERCENTAGE %
Program Support Branch	13.9
Near East-South Asia Branch	21.8
Far East Branch	16.7
Latin America Branch	21.5
Africa Branch	26.1

TOTAL N	(1201)

The Africa Training Branch programmed the most participants (26.1%), while the Program Support Branch programmed the fewest (13.9%). Near East-South Asia Training Branch and Latin America Training Branch each programmed about 1 participant out of 5 (21.8% and 21.5%), while the Far East Training Branch programmed about 1 participant in 6 (16.7%).

Q. What government agencies, other than AID, participated in the training programs?

PARTICIPATING AGENCY	PERCENTAGE %
None (AID only)	41.3
Agriculture	21.8
Labor	12.2
Health, Education and Welfare	9.5
Federal Aviation Agency	4.4
Internal Revenue Service	3.9
Interior	2.6
Commerce	2.4
Other	1.9

TOTAL N	(1201)

41.3% of the participants were handled only by AID. The Department of Agriculture was the participating agency with the highest proportion of participants (21.8%), followed by the Department of Labor (12.2%) and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (9.5%).

Q. What were the ages of the participants?

AGE	PERCENTAGE (%)
Less than 27	17.2
28-30	17.8
31-34	20.5
35-39	19.8
40-45	14.7
46-67	10.0
TOTAL N	(1160)*

*Data on age was not available on the IBM cards for every Academic and Special participant. In addition, complete biographical information was not received at DETRI for some Observational Tour Group members.

About 1 participant in 3 (35%) was 30 years of age or younger. The average age of the participants was 35. Only 10% of the participants were over 45.

Q. How many years of education did the participants have before they came to the U.S.?

YEARS OF EDUCATION	PERCENTAGE (%)
6 and under	1.6
7-11	9.4
12	9.8
13-15	27.0
16	20.5
17-18	21.0
19 and over	10.8

TOTAL N	(1085)*

*Data on years of education were not available on the IBM cards for every Academic and Special participant. In addition, complete biographical information was not received at DETRI for some Observational Tour Group members.

Only 1 participant out of 9 had less than 12 years of education (11%). Over 1/2 the participants (52.3%) had the equivalent of a U.S. college education (16 years) or more. The average number of years of education was 15.

Q. What was the sex of the participants?

SEX	PERCENTAGE (%)
Male	87.2
Female	12.8

TOTAL N	(1201)

8 participants out of 9 (87.2%) were males.

CHAPTER III
PARTICIPANTS' SATISFACTIONS WITH THEIR
ENTIRE PROGRAM EXPERIENCE

Q. How satisfied were the participants with their training program as a whole? (Item 120)*

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely satisfied)	22.3
2	42.3
3	22.3
4	8.0
5	3.4
6	0.8
7 (Not at all satisfied)	0.8
TOTAL N	
	(1195)**

*The questions preceding the tables are not worded precisely as they appear in the interview instruments, but are presented in a form which may be more useful to the reader of this report. The item number(s) of the exact questions used are provided for reference purposes.

**Ratings given by 2 Observational Tour Group participants and 4 Academic and Special program participants were not usable.

More than 1 participant in 5 (22.3%) indicated that he was "extremely satisfied" and his "training program could not have been better." Less than 1 participant in 100 indicated he was "not at all satisfied" and his "training program could not have been worse." 86.9% of the participants rated their satisfaction with the training program as a whole above the middle point on the satisfaction scale.

Q. Did participants in different training programs vary in their ratings of satisfaction with the training program as a whole?

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE (%) IN TYPE OF TRAINING			TOTAL N
	ACAD	SPEC	TOUR	
1	20.3	30.1	11.8	(266)
2	45.6	41.9	40.0	(506)
3	22.8	17.4	29.7	(267)
4-7	11.3	10.7	18.5	(156)
TOTAL N	(320)	(535)	(340)	(1195)

The participants in Special training programs were most satisfied with their training programs as a whole, while the participants in Observation Tour Groups gave proportionately more low ratings (3 through 7). It is possible that the lower ratings given by the Observation Tour Groups are due to the secret ballot technique used to collect their ratings of overall satisfaction. Participants in Academic and Special training programs must sign their names on their questionnaires, while the participants in Observation Tour Groups remain anonymous.

Q. Did participants from different regions vary in their ratings of satisfaction with the training program as a whole?

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
1	21.4	24.8	16.3	27.5	(263)
2	40.8	46.2	44.4	40.4	(494)
3	33.3	20.6	25.2	19.3	(255)
4-7	14.6	8.4	14.1	12.9	(147)
TOTAL N	(309)	(238)	(270)	(342)	(1159)*

*Does not include ratings given by 35 participants in 2 multi-regional Observational Tour Groups. Since these ratings were given through a "secret ballot" technique, attribution to participants from the individual regions was not possible.

Participants from the Far East and Africa more often rated their training program as highly satisfying (gave a higher proportion of 1 and 2 ratings), than did participants from the Near East-South Asia and Latin America (who gave more ratings of 3 through 7).

**Part 2. General Findings and Conclusions for
Academic and Special Program Participants**

PREFACE

Part 2 of the report is based on data from 859 Academic and Special program participants. The exit interview for these participants consists of two parts. The first part is a standardized, structured, written questionnaire that is completed under the supervision of a questionnaire administrator in individual or group sessions. Data from the questionnaires are presented in Chapters II through VIII. The second part is an oral interview administered to each participant on a private, anonymous basis. Each interview is conducted as a conversation between the participant and the interviewer. The interview is essentially unstructured but the interviewer guides the conversation to the extent necessary to center it on the participant's experiences in the United States. Chapter IX provides information about the interviews, including procedures used in coding the data, topics most frequently discussed by participants, and ideas expressed by participants.

In part 2 of the report there are 9 chapters with subsections. These chapters are: (1) Principal Findings and Conclusions; (2) Participants' Backgrounds and Training Programs; (3) Participants' Overall Evaluations of the Subject Matter and Personal-Social Aspects of Their Entire Program Experience; (4) Participants' Views on Planning and Utilization of Training; (5) Participants' Reactions to Non-Substantive Aspects of Study in Their Field of Training; (6) Participants' Social and Personal Experiences in the United States; (7) Participants' Views on English Language Training, Orientation Programs, and Special Communication Seminars; (8) Participants' Views on Administrative Arrangements; and (9) Individual, Oral Interviews. There is also an Appendix attached to this part of the report which includes tables of responses by Academic and Special program participants to those questionnaire items of less direct relevance to potential users of this report.

CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page</u>
	Preface.	i
I	Principal Findings and Conclusions	1
II	Participants' Backgrounds and Training Programs	5
	A. The Regions the Participants Came from and the Kinds of Training They Received	5
	B. The Education, Age, and Sex of the Participants	12
	C. The A/IT Branches and Other U.S. Government Agencies Who Programmed the Participants	20
III	Participants' Overall Evaluations of the Subject Matter (Technical) and Personal-Social (Non-Technical) Aspects of Their Entire Program Experience	25
	A. Participants' Satisfactions with Their Entire Program Experience	25
	B. Participants' Views on Aspects of Their Entire Program Experience Needing Change	28
IV	Participants' Views on Planning and Anticipation About Utilization of Their Training	42
	A. Participants' Satisfactions and Difficulties with Program Planning	42
	B. Participants' Ideas About Utilization of Training and USAID Assistance	57
V	Participants' Reactions to Non-Substantive Aspects of Study in Their Field of Training	71
	A. Reactions of Participants in Academic Programs to Non-Substantive Aspects of Study in Their Field of Training	71
	B. Reactions of Participants in Special Programs to Non-Substantive Aspects of Study in Their Field of Training	82

28

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page</u>
VI	Participants' Personal and Social Experiences in the United States	92
	A. Participants' Comfort, Friendships and Social Activities in the United States	92
	B. Participants' Personal and Social Problems in the United States	103
	C. Participants' Use of Advisors and Special Services for Personal and Social Needs	107
VII	Participants' Views on English Language Training, Orientation Programs, and Special Communication Seminars	112
	A. Participants' Use and Evaluation of English Language Training	112
	B. Participants' Experience with and Evaluation of Orientation Programs	117
	C. Participants' Experience with and Evaluation of Special Communication Seminars	120
VIII	Participants' Views on Administrative Arrangements Associated with Their Training Programs	125
	A. Participants' Experiences Prior to Departure for the United States	125
	B. Participants' Problems with Their Travel Arrangements	128
	C. Participants' Experiences, Problems, and Evaluations in Regard to Their Living Arrangements	130
	D. Participants' Problems with Their Money Allowances	147
IX	Individual, Oral Interviews	155
	A. Individual Interview Objectives and Procedures	155
	B. Individual Interview Ratings	158
	C. Individual Interviewer Impressions	166
Appendix	173

CHAPTER I

PRINCIPAL FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The general impression provided by the results in Part 2 of the report is that the Academic and Special program participants were very satisfied with their training programs. The questionnaire data (Chapters II through VIII) include 17 evaluation scales which ask the participants to rate their satisfaction with the various aspects of their training programs. On 16 of the 17 scales, 75% or more of the participants rated their satisfaction above the mid-point of the scale. (There were few differences between participants from different regions or in different fields of training in the high levels of satisfaction expressed on all of these scales.) The interviewers who conducted the individual interviews rated 2 out of 3 participants as becoming more friendly toward the United States during their sojourn here.

The training received by the participants in their fields of specialization was felt to be quite applicable in their home country situations. 95% of the participants indicated that they intend to use their AID training to instruct other people and/or to change projects now on-going in their home countries. However, 2 out of 3 participants indicated that they expected to have problems in utilizing their training in their home countries due to a lack of equipment, tools, facilities, money, qualified staff, and/or resistance to change in general.

This general positive evaluation of the A/IT training programs was not made uncritically by the participants, however. For instance, a majority indicated that (1) their money allowances and (2) the planning of their training programs were in need of some or much change.

The Academic program participants, in particular, felt that the cost of housing, returning hospitality, recreation,

and other personal expenses were greater than their money allowance provided for. The Special program participants also experienced a lack of funds in these areas, but since their total sojourn and their stay at any one place in the United States was usually not as long as that of the Academic program participants, their criticisms about money allowances were not as numerous. A majority of Academic and Special program participants felt that their per diem while traveling was not adequate to meet their needs (although general travel arrangements, excluding funds, was the one aspect of their U.S. experience which most participants found completely satisfactory).

In regard to the planning of the training programs, the two major problems cited by the participants were the shortness of the sojourns and the lack of personal involvement in the planning. The participants in the Special training programs particularly expressed a desire for longer sojourns in order to obtain the training they desired. Academic and Special program participants equally often expressed a need for more personal involvement in the planning. About 2 out of 3 participants felt they did have some hand in planning their training programs, but most wanted more involvement than they had experienced.

To better understand the desire of the participants for more involvement in planning their training programs, their evaluations of the non-substantive aspects of training in their fields were examined. The problems most frequently cited by participants were too much reading, theory, and general courses. This finding, supplemented by the participants suggestions that more field trips, laboratory work, shop experience, and on-the-job training be provided for future participants, suggests that a major difficulty

perceived by the participants was an insufficiency of practical training. This suggestion is further documented by the general satisfaction expressed by the participants with the Special Communication Seminars, whose programs include practical training in the dissemination of information.

The emphasis on practical training does not mean that the participants found the other aspects of their training unnecessary. Over 85% of the participants evaluated their classroom experience above the mid-point on the satisfaction scales. However, as expressed in the individual interviews, participants felt strongly that more practical training following the classroom experience they had received would better equip them to utilize this experience when they returned to their home countries.

Participants indicated that the pre-program information provided by the USAIDs in their home countries regarding their training programs and social conditions in the United States was not complete and specific enough. They also felt that more time should be allowed between the notification of their departure and the day on which they left their home countries. Approximately 2 out of 3 participants looked forward to receiving help in the utilization of their training from USAID upon their return to their home countries.

Three other general problems were mentioned by 2 out of 3 participants as posing difficulties for them during their sojourns. These included problems with American slang and accents, homesickness, and differences in climatic conditions. Obviously, these are problems that travelers to any foreign country are likely to encounter. Programs supported by A/IT helped to mitigate the first two of these problems. Participants indicated that language training, especially

that provided in their home countries, was useful in helping them with their training programs. Home hospitality (especially that provided by the Washington International Center) was helpful in alleviating the participants' feelings of homesickness. There were some differences in the proportion of participants from different regions reporting difficulties with these three major problems. However, the generally small size of the samples involved do not permit general conclusions to be drawn here.

As noted above, with a few exceptions, participants from the different regions or in different fields of training did not differ in their satisfaction with specific aspects of their experience in the United States. However, one grouping of responses by region is worth noting. The African participants, who constituted 1/3 of the Academic and Special program trainees, more often reported difficulties in their living arrangements and with their personal and social activities than did participants from the other three regions. In particular, they less often felt comfortable and welcome in the United States; they did not as often enjoy the social activities specifically provided for them; they more often found the cost of housing too high; they more often suggested changing their living arrangements and social activities; and they more often experienced racial discrimination, especially in obtaining housing.

CHAPTER II
PARTICIPANTS' BACKGROUNDS AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

Section A

The Regions the Participants Came From
and the Kinds of Training They Received

Q. What regions of the world were the participants from?

REGION	PERCENTAGE %
NESA	28.3
FE	24.7
LA	12.6
AFR	34.4

TOTAL N	(859)

Over 1/3 (34.4%) of the Academic and Special participants were from Africa. This was more than from any other region. Approximately 1 participant in 4 came from each of the two Asian regions: the Far East (24.7%) and the Near East-South Asia (28.3%). Latin America contributed about 1 Academic-Special participant out of 8 (12.6%) interviewed between July 17, 1967, and January 31, 1968. (However, nearly half of the members (48%) of Observational Tour Groups during the same time period were from Latin America. See Part 3.)

Q. How many of the participants had Academic training programs and how many had Special training programs?

TYPE OF PROGRAM	PERCENTAGE %
ACAD	37.2
SPEC	62.8

TOTAL N	(859)

About 3 out of every 5 participants (62.8%) had Special training programs

Q. Did participants in different training programs vary in the regions from which they came?

REGION	PERCENTAGE (%) IN TYPE OF PROGRAM		TOTAL N
	ACAD	SPEC	
NESA	28.4	28.3	(243)
FE	15.0	30.5	(212)
LA	11.9	13.0	(108)
AFR	44.7	28.3	(295)

TOTAL N	(320)	(539)	(859)

More Academic participants came from Africa than from any other region. The Special participants were evenly divided among Near East-South Asia, the Far East, and Africa. Latin America had the fewest participants in both types of training programs.

Q. In which fields did the participants receive their education or training?

FIELD OF TRAINING	PERCENTAGE %
Agriculture	21.5
Industry and Mining	8.4
Transportation	8.1
Public Health	10.0
Education	19.1
Public Administration	20.7
Other	12.1

TOTAL N	(859)

The majority of the participants (61.3%) were studying Agriculture, Education, or Public Administration. Public Health, Industry and Mining, and Transportation accounted for 26.5% of the participants.

Q. Did participants in different fields of training vary by the regions they came from?

REGION	PERCENTAGE (%) IN FIELD OF TRAINING			TOTAL N
	AGRIC	ED	PA	
NESA	8.6	20.7	34.3	(111)
FE	4.3	11.6	35.9	(91)
LA	7.1	28.1	14.0	(84)
AFR	80.0	39.6	15.8	(241)
TOTAL N	(185)	(164)	(178)	(527)

8 out of 10 (80%) of the participants in Agriculture and about 2 out of 5 (39.6%) of those in Education were from Africa. About 1/3 of the participants in Public Administration were from the Near East-South Asia (34.3%) and the Far East (35.9%).

Q. Did participants in different training programs vary in their fields of training?

FIELD OF TRAINING	PERCENTAGE (%) IN TYPE OF PROGRAM		TOTAL N
	ACAD	SPEC	
AGRIC	26.4	23.3	(185)
I&M	2.8	13.7	(72)
TR	1.4	14.1	(70)
PH	11.1	11.6	(86)
ED	41.0	9.9	(164)
PA	17.4	27.4	(178)
TOTAL N	(288)	(467)	(755)

The highest proportion of the participants in Academic programs (41.0%) and the lowest proportion of the participants in Special programs (9.9%) were in Education. About an equal proportion of participants in each type of training program were in Agriculture (26.4% Academic versus 23.3% Special) and in Public Health (11.1% Academic versus 11.6% Special). Public Administration was the field of training for about 1 out of 6 Academic participants (17.4%) and 1 out of 4 Special participants (27.4%). The fields of Industry and Mining, and Transportation accounted for 27.8% of the Special participants, but only 4.2% of the Academic participants.

Q. Did participants in different fields of training vary by the training branches which programmed them?

TRAINING BRANCH	PERCENTAGE (%) IN FIELD OF TRAINING			TOTAL N
	AGRIC	ED	PA	
PSB	4.3	1.2	28.6	(61)
NESA	8.2	20.7	27.0	(97)
FE	3.2	11.6	28.1	(75)
LA	5.9	26.9	7.3	(68)
AFR	78.4	39.6	9.0	(225)
TOTAL N	(185)	(164)	(178)	(527)

More than 3/4 of the participants in Agriculture (78.4%) and almost 2 out of 5 (39.6%) of those in Education were programmed by the Africa Training Branch. Participants in Public Administration were programmed about equally often by the Program Support Branch (28.6%), the Near East-South Asia Branch (27%), and the Far East Branch (28.1%).

Q. How long were the participants' sojourns in the United States?

LENGTH OF PROGRAM (IN MONTHS)	PERCENTAGE %
1 or 2	3.8
3	12.6
4 or 5	14.4
6	10.7
7 to 11	15.6
12	13.2
13 to 23	10.8
24	6.2
25 to 36	5.7
37 or more	7.1
<hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/>	
TOTAL N	(859)

The majority (57.1%) of the Academic and Special participants interviewed by DETRI were in the United States for less than 1 year. Only 12.8% were in the United States for more than 2 years. The average (mean) sojourn in the United States was 13.5 months. The median length of sojourn in the United States was 9.4 months.

Section B

THE EDUCATION, AGE, AND SEX OF THE PARTICIPANTS

- Q. How many years of education did the participants have before they came to the United States for their training programs? (Item 128)*

YEARS OF EDUCATION	PERCENTAGE %
7-11	7.3
12	10.1
13-15	30.0
16	21.3
17-18	19.9
19 and over	11.4
TOTAL N	(859)

*The questions preceding the tables in this part of the report are based on the items asked in the questionnaire filled out by all Academic and Special program participants. These questions are not worded precisely as they appear in the questionnaire, but are presented in a form which may be more useful to the reader of this report. The item number(s) of the exact questions used are provided for reference purposes.

Most participants (82.6%) have had more than the equivalent of a U.S. high school education. Over 30% have more years of education than a U.S. college graduate. The average number of years of education was 15.4.

Q. Did participants from different regions vary in their educational levels? (Item 128)

YEARS OF EDUCATION	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
7-11	3.0	3.9	10.4	12.3	(61)
12	5.5	4.9	13.2	16.5	(84)
13-15	35.6	29.4	27.4	26.8	(249)
16	25.8	24.0	14.2	18.3	(177)
17-18	19.5	23.0	24.5	16.2	(165)
19 and over	10.6	14.7	10.4	9.9	(94)
TOTAL N	(236)	(204)	(106)	(284)	(830)

The Latin American and African participants generally had fewer years of education than the participants from the Near East-South Asia and the Far East.

Q. Did participants in different training programs vary in their educational levels?

YEARS OF EDUCATION	PERCENTAGE (%) IN TYPE OF PROGRAM		TOTAL N
	ACAD	SPEC	
7-11	1.3	10.9	(61)
12	6.5	12.3	(84)
13-15	33.0	28.2	(249)
16	24.3	19.5	(177)
17-18	23.9	17.4	(165)
19 and over	11.0	11.7	(95)
TOTAL N	(309)	(522)	(831)

The participants in Academic training programs more often had 13 through 18 years of education prior to their U.S. sojourn than did the participants in Special training programs. The participants in Special training programs more often had 7 through 12 years of education.

Q. Did participants in different fields of training vary in their educational levels? (Item 128)

YEARS OF EDUCATION	PERCENTAGE (%) IN FIELD OF TRAINING			TOTAL N
	AGRIC	ED	PA	
7-11	14.6	7.5	5.3	(47)
12	14.0	11.3	9.4	(59)
13-15	27.0	31.4	27.5	(145)
16	14.0	23.9	28.7	(112)
17-18	17.4	19.5	18.1	(93)
19 or more	12.9	6.3	11.1	(52)
TOTAL N	(178)	(159)	(171)	(508)

Participants in Agriculture more often reported less than 12 years of education than did participants in other fields of training.

Q. What were the ages of the participants? (Item 122)

AGE	PERCENTAGE %
21-27	18.5
28-30	19.5
31-34	22.5
35-39	18.6
40-45	13.2
46-67	7.7

TOTAL N	(859)

The participants were generally young, more than half of them being under 35 (60.5%). Very few participants (7.7%) were over 45. The average age of the participants was 33.6 years.

Q. Did participants from different regions vary in age?
(Item 122)

AGE	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Less than 27	16.2	10.4	16.7	26.9	(158)
28-30	17.0	15.1	17.6	25.5	(167)
31-34	24.9	22.2	22.2	21.1	(193)
35-39	19.9	23.1	15.7	15.3	(159)
40-45	12.4	18.4	18.5	8.2	(113)
Over 46	9.5	10.8	9.3	3.1	(65)
TOTAL N	(241)	(212)	(108)	(294)	(855)

The participants from the Far East tended to be older than the participants from other regions, while the participants from Africa were younger.

Q. Did participants in different training programs vary in age? (Item 122)

AGE	PERCENTAGE (%) IN TYPE OF PROGRAM		TOTAL N
	ACAD	SPEC	
Less than 27	24.8	14.7	(158)
28-30	28.0	14.5	(167)
31-34	23.3	22.1	(193)
35-39	16.0	20.1	(159)
40-45	5.0	18.0	(113)
Over 46	2.8	10.6	(66)
TOTAL N	(318)	(538)	(856)

The participants in Academic training programs were younger than the participants in Special training programs.

Q. What was the sex of the participants? (Item 122)

SEX	PERCENTAGE %
Male	85.8
Female	14.2
TOTAL N	(859)

About 6 out of every 7 participants (85.8%) were males.

47

Q. Did participants from different regions vary by sex?
(Item 123)

SEX	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Male	91.3	77.8	67.0	93.9	(737)
Female	8.7	22.2	33.0	6.1	(122)
TOTAL N	(242)	(212)	(109)	(296)	(859)

The majority of participants from each of the 4 regions were males. Proportionately more females came from Latin America and the Far East than came from Africa and the Near East-South Asia.

Q. Did participants in different fields of training vary by sex? (Item 123)

SEX	PERCENTAGE (%) IN FIELD OF TRAINING			TOTAL N
	AGRIC	ED	.PA	
Male	91.9	75.3	90.3	(450)
Female	8.1	24.7	9.7	(72)
TOTAL N	(185)	(162)	(175)	(522)

There were proportionately more female participants in Education than there were in other fields of training.

Section C

THE A/IT BRANCHES AND OTHER U.S. GOVERNMENT AGENCIES WHO PROGRAMMED THE PARTICIPANTS

Q. How many of the participants were programmed by each A/IT training branch?

TRAINING BRANCH	PERCENTAGE %
PSB	16.6
NESA	21.6
FE	20.4
LA	10.5
AFR	30.8

TOTAL N	(859)

The Africa Branch programmed the most participants (30.8%), while the Latin America Branch handled the fewest (10.5%). (It should be noted, however, that more Observational Tour Group members were handled by the Latin America Branch than any other. See Part 3.) The Near East-South Asia Branch and the Far East Branch programmed approximately the same number of participants (21.6% and 20.4%, respectively). The Program Support Branch handled 1/6 of the participants.

49

Q. Did participants programmed by the different A/IT training branches vary in the type of training program they had?

TYPE OF PROGRAM	PERCENTAGE (%) BY TRAINING BRANCH					TOTAL N
	PSB	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
ACAD	18.9	40.4	27.7	39.3	50.4	(320)
SPEC	81.1	59.6	72.3	60.7	49.6	(539)
TOTAL N	(143)	(188)	(173)	(89)	(266)	(859)

The Africa Training Branch handled an equal number of Academic and Special participants. All the other training branches handled more Special than Academic participants, with the Program Support Branch (81.1%) and the Far East Branch (72.3%) having the highest proportion of Special participants.

Q. Did participants programmed by the different A/IT training branches vary in their fields of training?

FIELD OF TRAINING	PERCENTAGE (%) BY TRAINING BRANCH					TOTAL N
	PSB	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
AGRIC	13.1	15.5	8.0	16.2	64.1	(185)
ED	3.3	35.0	25.3	64.7	28.8	(164)
PA	83.6	49.5	66.7	19.1	7.1	(178)
TOTAL N	(61)	(97)	(75)	(68)	(226)	(527)

Public Administration was the field of training for a majority of the participants programmed by the Program Support Branch (83.6%) and the Far East Branch (66.7%). Almost half of the participants programmed by the Near East-South Asia Branch also were in Public Administration. Almost 2 out of 3 participants programmed by the Latin America Branch (64.7%) were in Education. About the same proportion of participants programmed by the Africa Training Branch (64.1%) were in Agriculture.

Q. What government agencies, other than AID, participated in the training programs?

PARTICIPATING AGENCY	PERCENTAGE (%)
None (AID only)	57.2
Agriculture	16.1
Health, Education & Welfare	9.8
Federal Aviation Agency	6.2
Labor	3.8
Commerce	2.2
Interior	2.1
Other	2.7
<hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/>	
TOTAL N	(859)

The majority (57.2%) of the Academic and Special participants were handled only by AID. The Department of Agriculture was the participating agency with the highest percentage of Academic and Special participants (16.1%). No other agency handled more than 10% of the Academic and Special participants.

Q. Did participants from different regions vary by the agencies which programmed them?

PROGRAMMING AGENCY	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
AID	65.4	59.4	65.8	45.4	(490)
Other government agency	34.6	40.6	34.2	54.6	(368)
TOTAL N	(243)	(212)	(108)	(295)	(858)

Almost 2 out of 3 participants from the Near East-South Asia (65.4%) and Latin America (65.8%) and approximately 3 out of 5 participants from the Far East (59.4%) were programmed by AID. African participants were more often handled by other government agencies than by AID.

Q. Did participants in different types of training programs vary by the agencies which programmed them?

PROGRAMMING AGENCY	PERCENTAGE (%) IN TYPE OF PROGRAM		TOTAL N
	ACAD	SPEC	
AID	66.6	51.6	(491)
Other government agency	33.4	48.4	(368)
TOTAL N	(320)	(539)	(859)

A majority of both Academic (66.6%) and Special (51.6%) participants were handled by AID.

CHAPTER 11

PARTICIPANTS' OVERALL EVALUATIONS OF THE SUBJECT MATTER (TECHNICAL) AND PERSONAL-SOCIAL (NON-TECHNICAL) ASPECTS OF THEIR ENTIRE PROGRAM EXPERIENCE

Section A

Participants' Satisfaction with Their Entire Program Experience

Q. How satisfied were the participants with their training program as a whole? (Item 120)

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely satisfied)	26.3
2	43.1
3	19.3
4	6.3
5	2.9
6	0.7
7 (Not at all satisfied)	0.9
<hr/>	
TOTAL N	(859)

The majority of the participants (69.4%) expressed a high degree of satisfaction with their training program, rating it 1 or 2. Only 4.5% of the participants gave a rating below the middle of the scale.

Q. Did participants in different training programs vary in their ratings of satisfaction with the training program as a whole? (Item 120)

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE (%) IN TYPE OF PROGRAM		TOTAL N
	ACAD	SPEC	
1	20.3	30.1	(226)
2	45.6	41.9	(370)
3	22.8	17.4	(166)
4-7	11.3	10.7	(93)
TOTAL N	(320)	(535)	(855)

The participants in Special programs were more satisfied with their total training program than were the Academic participants. Nearly 10% more of the Special program participants than of the Academic program participants rated their training programs 1 (i.e., "extremely satisfied, training program could not have been better"). Conversely, the Academic participants more often used the ratings 2-7, indicating less satisfaction with their training program as a whole.

There was not a statistically significant relationship between ratings of satisfaction with the total training program given by participants and either the region the participants came from or their field of training.

Q. How did the participants perceive the relative importance of their subject matter versus their personal-social experiences in the United States? (Item 119)

MORE IMPORTANT	PERCENTAGE (%)
Subject matter	81.7
Personal-social	17.2

TOTAL N	(859)

Subject matter aspects include both formal training in the participant's field and related programs sponsored by AID which enhance and support this training. All other aspects of a participant's experience in the United States comprise the personal-social aspects.

Almost 5 out of 6 participants (81.7%) felt that the subject matter aspect of their sojourn were more important to them than the personal-social aspects.

Section B

PARTICIPANTS' VIEWS ON ASPECTS OF
THEIR ENTIRE PROGRAM EXPERIENCE NEEDING CHANGE

Q. What aspects of their entire program experience did the participants think needed changing? (Item 118)

ASPECT OF PROGRAM	PERCENTAGE (%) SUGGESTING CHANGE NEEDED*		
	Yes	No	No Knowledge
Selection	39.8	26.2	33.6
Language training	36.6	41.4	20.5
Planning	63.6	24.7	11.2
Orientations	54.1	45.3	x
Programs	56.4	41.8	x
Living arrangements	50.6	48.5	x
Social activities	46.8	51.0	x
Travel arrangements	35.1	63.7	x
Money allowances	72.9	26.4	x
Communication Seminar	27.7	35.5	30.2
TOTAL N	(859)		

*Percentages add to 100% across rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

Since these aspects of the program are referred to throughout this report, we shall provide some details about them here. Selection refers to the formal interviews and examinations and the informal preparations the participants

go through to be selected as an AID trainee. Language training, planning, and orientations refer to these aspects of the participant's pre-program experience both in his home country and in the United States. Programs refer to the non-substantive aspects of the participant's training in his field of specialization. Living arrangements and social activities include all of the non-program aspects of the participant's sojourn in the United States. They do not include per diem or other money allowances. Travel arrangements and money allowances refer to AID administrative procedures in these areas. Communication Seminar includes any special seminar (such as the one provided by MSU) to give the participants practical training in the dissemination of information.

About 2 participants out of 3 (63.7%) felt that their travel arrangements needed no change. At the other extreme, 72.9% of the participants felt that the AID money allowances should be changed. Selection processes, planning of training and orientations in the home country and in the United States, and actual programs at sites were rated as needing change by a majority of the participants who had knowledge of them. The other aspects of the AID experience received about as many "no need for change" ratings as they did "need for change" ratings.

Q. Did participants from different regions vary in suggesting changes in the selection of participants? (Item 118a)

CHANGE SELECTION	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	44.5	51.2	45.7	26.1	(342)
No	28.0	23.7	23.4	27.6	(224)
No knowledge	27.6	25.1	30.8	46.3	(289)
TOTAL N	(243)	(211)	(107)	(294)	(855)

The participants from Africa more often indicated that they had no knowledge of how participants were selected than did participants from other regions. Among those participants who had information about selection, the African participants less often thought the procedures used to select AID participants needed changing than did participants from other regions.

Q. Did participants in different fields of training vary in suggesting changes in the selection of participants? (Item 118a)

CHANGE SELECTION	PERCENTAGE (%) IN FIELD OF TRAINING			TOTAL N
	AGRIC	ED	PA	
Yes	25.0	49.1	41.8	(200)
No	28.8	20.2	23.2	(127)
No knowledge	46.2	30.7	35.0	(197)
TOTAL N	(184)	(163)	(177)	(524)

The participants in Agriculture less often had information about the selection of participants than did participants in other fields. Among the participants who had information, those in Education most often suggested changing the procedures for selecting AID participants, while the participants in Agriculture least often made this suggestion.

Q. Did participants from different regions vary in suggesting changes in English language training? (Item 118b)

CHANGE LANGUAGE TRAINING	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	37.3	47.3	53.7	23.6	(314)
No	47.0	36.8	36.1	43.8	(355)
No knowledge	15.7	15.8	10.2	32.5	(176)
TOTAL N	(236)	(209)	(108)	(292)	(845)

The participants from Africa less often had information about language training than did participants from other regions. Among those participants who had information about language training, the participants from the Far East and Latin America more often suggested changing this training than did the participants from the Near East-South Asia and Africa.

Q. Did participants in different training programs vary in suggesting changes in English language training? (Item 118b)

CHANGE LANGUAGE TRAINING	PERCENTAGE (%) IN TYPE OF PROGRAM		TOTAL N
	ACAD	SPEC	
Yes	44.0	33.0	(314)
No	34.3	46.8	(356)
No knowledge	21.7	20.3	(176)
TOTAL N	(318)	(528)	(846)

The participants in Academic training programs more often suggested changing the language training for AID participants than did the Special program participants.

Q. Did participants in different training programs vary in suggesting changes in the planning of training? (Item 118c)

CHANGE PLANNING	PERCENTAGE (%) IN TYPE OF PROGRAM		TOTAL N
	ACAD	SPEC	
Yes	72.5	58.8	(546)
No	17.0	29.4	(212)
No knowledge	10.4	11.7	(96)
TOTAL N	(317)	(537)	(854)

The participants in Academic training programs more often thought the planning of their training needed changing than did participants in Special training programs.

There was not a statistically significant relationship between either regions the participants came from or their fields of training and suggesting changes in the planning of training.

Q. Did participants in different training programs vary in suggesting changes in orientations? (Item 118d)

CHANGE ORIENTATION	PERCENTAGE (%) IN TYPE OF PROGRAM		TOTAL N
	ACAD	SPEC	
Yes	67.5	46.7	(464)
No	32.5	53.4	(389)
TOTAL N	(317)	(536)	(853)

The participants in Academic training programs more often thought the orientations they received needed changing than did the participants in Special training programs.

Q. Did participants in different fields of training vary in suggesting changes in orientations? (Item 118d)

CHANGE ORIENTATION	PERCENTAGE (%) IN FIELD OF TRAINING			TOTAL N
	AGRIC	ED	PA	
Yes	51.3	70.7	49.8	(296)
No	48.6	29.4	50.3	(226)
TOTAL N	(185)	(160)	(177)	(522)

The participants in Education most often thought that the orientations needed changing.

There was not a statistically significant relationship between the regions the participants came from and suggesting changes in orientation programs.

Q. Did participants from different regions vary in suggesting changes in the substantive content of their programs? (Item 118e)

CHANGE PROGRAM CONTENT	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	63.2	60.7	46.2	54.5	(484)
No	36.8	39.3	53.8	45.5	(358)
TOTAL N	(239)	(211)	(104)	(288)	(842)

The participants from the Near East-South Asia and the Far East more often suggested changing the content of programs at the training sites than did participants from other regions. Participants from Latin America made this suggestion least often.

There was not a statistically significant relationship between either the participants' training program or their fields of training and suggesting changes in the content of training programs.

Q. Did participants from different regions vary in suggesting changes in living arrangements? (Item 118f)

CHANGE LIVING ARRANGEMENTS	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	51.2	44.2	50.0	56.3	(435)
No	48.8	55.7	50.0	43.7	(416)
TOTAL N	(242)	(210)	(106)	(293)	(851)

Participants from Africa most often suggested changing living arrangements. Participants from the Far East least often made this suggestion.

Q. Did participants in different training programs vary in suggesting changes in living arrangements? (Item 118f)

CHANGE LIVING ARRANGEMENTS	PERCENTAGE (%) IN TYPE OF PROGRAM		TOTAL N
	ACAD	SPEC	
Yes	61.5	44.8	(435)
No	38.6	55.2	(417)
TOTAL N	(319)	(533)	(852)

The participants in Academic training programs more often suggested changing living arrangements than did participants in Special training programs.

Q. Did participants from different regions vary in suggesting changes in social activities? (Item 118g)

CHANGE SOCIAL ACTIVITIES	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	48.5	41.0	42.5	54.6	(402)
No	51.5	59.0	57.5	45.4	(437)
TOTAL N	(239)	(210)	(106)	(284)	(839)

The participants from Africa most often suggested changing social activities. The participants from the Far East and Latin America least often made this suggestion.

Q. Did participants in different training programs vary in suggesting changes in social activities? (Item 118g)

CHANGE SOCIAL ACTIVITIES	PERCENTAGE (%) IN TYPE OF PROGRAM		TOTAL N
	ACAD	SPEC	
Yes	55.5	43.3	(402)
No	44.4	56.8	(438)
TOTAL N	(315)	(525)	(840)

The participants in Academic training programs more often suggested changing social activities than did the participants in Special training programs.

Q. Did participants in different training programs vary in suggesting changes in travel arrangements? (Item 118h)

CHANGE TRAVEL ARRANGEMENTS	PERCENTAGE (%) IN TYPE OF PROGRAM		TOTAL N
	ACAD	SPEC	
Yes	41.8	31.8	(301)
No	58.1	68.2	(547)
TOTAL N	(313)	(535)	(848)

The participants in Academic training programs more often suggested changing travel arrangements than did the participants in Special training programs.

Q. Did participants in different training programs vary in suggesting changes in money allowances? (Item 118i)

CHANGE MONEY ALLOWANCES	PERCENTAGE (%) IN TYPE OF PROGRAM		TOTAL N
	ACAD	SPEC	
Yes	81.1	68.9	(526)
No	18.9	31.2	(227)
TOTAL N	(317)	(536)	(853)

The participants in Academic training programs more often suggested changing money allowances than did the participants in Special training programs.

Q. Did participants in different training programs vary in suggesting changes in Special Communication Seminars? (Item 118j)

CHANGE SPECIAL COMMUNICATION SEMINAR	PERCENTAGE (%) IN TYPE OF PROGRAM		TOTAL N
	ACAD	SPEC	
Yes	35.7	26.0	(238)
No	33.1	41.1	(305)
No knowledge	31.2	33.0	(259)
TOTAL N	(308)	(494)	(802)

The participants in Academic training programs more often suggested changing Special Communication Seminars than did the participants in Special training programs.

Q. Did participants from different regions vary in suggesting changes in Special Communication Seminars?
(Item 118j)

CHANGE SPECIAL COMMUNICATION SEMINAR	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	31.6	24.0	24.1	34.4	(238)
No	36.5	38.3	27.9	43.0	(305)
No knowledge	32.0	37.8	48.1	22.6	(258)
TOTAL N	(222)	(196)	(104)	(279)	(801)

Participants from Latin America less often had knowledge about Special Communication Seminars than did participants from the other regions. There were no differences among regions in the distribution of suggestions for changes in Special Communication Seminars among participants who had information about them.

CHAPTER IV

PARTICIPANTS' VIEWS ON PLANNING AND ANTICIPATION ABOUT UTILIZATION OF THEIR TRAINING

Section A

Participants' Satisfactions and Difficulties with Program Planning

Q. How satisfied were the participants with the planning of their training programs? (Item 29)

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely satisfied)	23.0
2	34.9
3	19.3
4	12.6
5	5.5
6	2.4
7	1.3

TOTAL N	(859)

The majority (57.9%) of the participants rated their satisfaction with the planning of their training program at 1 or 2. Less than 1 participant out of 10 (9.2%) rated his satisfaction below the mid-point on the scale.

Q. Did the Academic and Special participants differ in their satisfaction with the planning of their training programs? (Item 29)

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE (%) IN TYPE OF PROGRAM		TOTAL N
	ACAD	SPEC	
1	19.4	25.6	(198)
2	33.2	36.5	(300)
3	21.0	18.6	(166)
4-7	26.3	19.4	(187)
TOTAL N	(319)	(532)	(851)

The Special participants were more often satisfied with the planning of their training programs than were the Academic participants.

Q. What parts of the training program did the participants recall as being planned in detail before they reached their training sites? (Item 19)

PART PLANNED	PERCENTAGE %
Objectives	72.6
Location(s)	67.3
Substance	59.5
Total length	70.3
Length of parts	45.5
Required reports	43.0
Advisors	53.9
Utilization	46.9

TOTAL N	(859)

*Percentages add to more than 100% because participants were allowed more than one answer.

The objectives (72.6%), total length (70.3%), and location (67.3%) of the training program were reported by 2 of 3 participants as being planned in advance of their arrival at training sites. Over half of the participants indicated they knew about the content of their training program (59.5%) and whom to inform about training program problems (53.9%) before they arrived. Plans for utilization of training in the home country (46.9%), time allotted to each part of the training program (45.5%), and training reports required (43.0%) were recalled as being planned in advance by slightly less than 1/2 of the participants.

Q. What kinds of problems did the participants report with the planning of their training programs? (Item 28)

PROBLEM WITH PLANNING	PERCENTAGE (%) HAVING PROBLEM*	
	Yes	No
Not enough personal participation	47.0	52.3
Not enough participation by supervisor(s)	27.4	70.6
Lack of information on content	38.8	60.8
Lack of information on site	29.5	69.4
Plan not suited to H.C.	26.0	73.2
Plan not suited to previous training	17.7	81.1
Plan not suited to expected use	23.9	74.8
Not enough time	44.6	54.6
Plan not completed soon enough	18.0	80.0
Plan too rigid	31.3	67.2
TOTAL N	(859)	

*Percentages add to 100% across rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

The two problems with planning most often mentioned by participants were lack of personal participation (47%) and lack of time allowed for the training program (44.6). The two problems least often mentioned were that the plan was not suited to the participants' previous training (17.7%) and that it was not completed in time (18%). 1 participant out of 4 felt that the training plan was not suited to his home country and/or expected use.

Q. Did the participants want to participate in the planning of their training programs? (Item 22)

WANTED TO PARTICIPATE	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	86.3
No	13.7

TOTAL N	(859)

Seventeen out of 20 participants (86.3%) indicated that they had wished to participate in planning their training programs.

Q. Did the participants feel that they were personally involved in the planning of their training programs? (Item 21a)

PARTICIPATED IN PLANNING	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	67.4
No	32.6

TOTAL N	(536)

About 2 out of 3 participants (67.4%) felt they were involved in the planning of their training programs. 32.6% of the participants indicated that they were not involved in this planning.

Q. Did participants programmed by the A/IT training branches vary in their feeling of personal involvement in planning their training programs? (Item 21a)

PARTICIPATED IN PLANNING	PERCENTAGE (%) BY TRAINING BRANCH					TOTAL N
	PSB	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	53.3	67.0	82.2	78.7	60.0	(360)
No	46.7	33.0	17.8	21.3	40.0	(175)
TOTAL N	(92)	(109)	(118)	(61)	(155)	(535)

Participants programmed by the Far East and Latin America Training Branches more often felt they were personally involved in the planning of their training program than did the participants programmed by the other AID training branches.

Q. Who else did the participants believe took part in planning their training programs? (Item 21)

PERSONS	PERCENTAGE (%) REPORTING PERSONS PARTICIPATED*		
	Yes	No	No Knowledge
Participant's supervisor	65.4	20.7	13.9
USAID technician	90.0	9.2	.8
Host government official	34.3	33.0	32.7
AID PDO	79.9	12.0	8.0
Other U.S. PO	55.0	14.5	30.5
Personnel at training site	71.7	10.1	18.2
TOTAL N		(633)	

*Percentages add to 100% by rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

The 633 participants who answered this question felt that AID officials both in their home country and in the United States were most involved in the planning of their training programs. 90% of these participants thought that USAID personnel participated to some extent in the planning of their training programs, while 79.9% thought AID PDOs so participated. Personnel at the training sites were seen as being involved in training program planning by 71.7% of the participants. The participants' supervisors and other host government officials were thought to be less involved in program planning.

Q. Did participants from different regions vary in their perceptions of their supervisors' participation in planning their program? (Item 21b)

PARTICIPATED IN PLANNING	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	47.3	53.3	40.7	47.8	(413)
No	14.8	12.7	23.1	14.6	(131)
No knowledge	37.9	34.0	36.1	37.6	(314)
TOTAL N	(243)	(212)	(108)	(295)	(858)

The Latin American participants less often felt that their supervisors were involved in this planning than did participants from the other 3 regions.

Q. Did participants programmed by the A/IT training branches vary in their perceptions of their PDOs' participation in the planning of their training programs? (Item 21e)

PARTICIPATED IN PLANNING	PERCENTAGE (%) BY TRAINING BRANCH					TOTAL N
	PSB	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	49.7	51.1	63.6	70.0	62.2	(504)
No	11.2	11.3	8.1	5.6	7.5	(76)
No knowledge	39.2	37.6	28.3	24.4	30.2	(277)
TOTAL N	(143)	(186)	(173)	(90)	(265)	(857)

The participants programmed by the Near East-South Asia Training Branch and Program Support Branch less often thought that their Program Development Officers participated in planning their training programs than did participants handled by other A/IT training branches.

Q. Did participants from different regions vary in their feelings about the time allotted for their training programs? (Item 28h)

HAD PROBLEM WITH ADEQUACY OF TIME	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	44.6	48.1	33.6	47.3	(383)
No	55.4	51.9	66.4	52.7	(468)
TOTAL N	(242)	(210)	(107)	(292)	(851)

The participants from Latin America more often felt that enough time was allowed for their training program than did the participants from the other regions.

Q. Did participants in different training programs vary in their assessment of the adequacy of the time allotted for their training programs? (Item 28h)

HAD PROBLEM WITH ADEQUACY OF TIME	PERCENTAGE (%) IN TYPE OF PROGRAM		TOTAL N
	ACAD	SPEC	
Yes	38.6	48.7	(383)
No	61.4	51.2	(469)
TOTAL N	(319)	(533)	(852)

The Special participants more often reported that not enough time was allotted for their training programs in the planning.

Q. Did the participants in different training fields vary in their perceptions of the adequacy of the time allotted for their training programs? (Item 28h)

HAD PROBLEM WITH ADEQUACY OF TIME	PERCENTAGE (%) IN FIELD OF TRAINING			TOTAL N
	AGRIC	ED	PA	
Yes	51.4	38.9	41.0	(230)
No	48.6	61.1	59.0	(293)
TOTAL N	(183)	(162)	(178)	(523)

Participants in Education and Public Administration more often thought enough time had been allotted in the planning of their training programs than did participants in Agriculture.

Q. What changes did the Academic participants request in their training programs? (Items 48 & 49a)

CHANGE REQUESTED	PERCENTAGE (%)*
None	55.3
Academic institution	10.0
Major field of study	12.2
Length of program	24.7

TOTAL N	(320)

*Percentages add to more than 100% because participants were allowed more than one answer.

Over half the Academic participants did not request any changes in their training program (55.3%). The change most frequently asked for by those making requests was a change in the length of the training program (24.7%). About 1 participant out of 8 (12.2%) requested a change in his major field of study, i.e., the subject he was majoring in, while 1 participant out of 10 asked to change his academic institution.

Q. What changes were made in Academic participants' training programs after they began? (Items 50 & 51a)

CHANGE MADE	PERCENTAGE (%)*
None	64.7
Academic institution	5.0
Major field of study	9.7
Length of program	21.2

TOTAL N	(320)

*Percentages add to more than 100% because participants were allowed more than one answer.

Nearly 2 out of 3 Academic participants (64.7%) did not experience any changes in their training programs after they began. The change most frequently noted was in the length of the training program (21.2%). 1 participant out of 10 changed his major field of study after his training program began.

Q. What change did the Special participants request in their training programs? (Items 56 & 57)

CHANGE REQUESTED	PERCENTAGE (%)*
None	62.5
Institution	4.4
Length of program	14.1
Classroom training	8.2
Observation training visits	17.2
On-the-job work experience	8.0

TOTAL N	(539)

*Percentages add to more than 100% because participants were allowed more than one answer.

Over 60% of the Special participants did not request any change in their training program. The 2 changes most frequently asked for by those making requests were changes in their observation training visits (17.2%) and changes in the length of their training program (14.1%).

84

Q. What changes were made in Special participants' training programs after they began? (Items 58 & 59)

CHANGE MADE	PERCENTAGE (%)*
None	63.3
Institution	5.4
Length of program	16.1
Classroom training	5.9
Observation training visits	16.7
On-the-job work experience	7.4
<hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/>	
TOTAL N	(539)

*Percentages add to more than 100% because participants were allowed more than one answer.

Over 60% of the Special participants did not experience any changes in their training programs after they began. The 2 changes most frequently noted were changes in observation training visits (16.7%) and in the length of the training program (16.1%).

Section B

PARTICIPANTS' IDEAS ABOUT UTILIZATION OF TRAINING AND USAID ASSISTANCE

Q. How did the participants expect to use their training in their home countries? (Items 107 & 108)

TYPE OF EXPECTED USE OF TRAINING	PERCENTAGE %
Training others	62.2
Academic teaching	33.2
Initiating projects	63.7
Changing on-going projects	43.7
None of the above	4.9

TOTAL N	(859)

*Percentages add to more than 100% because participants were allowed more than one answer.

More than 3 out of 5 participants reported they expected to use the AID training to train others in specific work skills (62.2%) and/or initiate new projects (63.7%). Only 4.9% indicated they would not use their training to instruct others or develop projects.

Q. How much of their AID training did the participants expect to use right away on their jobs? (Item 109)

AMOUNT USABLE RIGHT AWAY	PERCENTAGE %
None	.9
A little	7.0
Some	49.7
A great amount	42.3

TOTAL N	(859)

Ninety-two per cent of the participants indicated that they expected to use "some" or "a great amount" of their AID training right away on their jobs.

Q. How much of their AID training did the participants expect to use eventually on their jobs? (Item 110)

AMOUNT USABLE EVENTUALLY	PERCENTAGE %
None	.5
A little	3.8
Some	36.3
A great amount	58.8

TOTAL N	(859)

Over 1/2 of the participants (58.8%) expected to use "a great amount" of their AID training eventually on their jobs.

Q. Did participants from different regions vary in their expectations about how much of their AID training they eventually will use on their jobs? (Item 110)

AMOUNT EVENTUALLY USABLE	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Some	42.6	47.9	44.3	33.3	(349)
A great amount	57.4	52.1	55.7	66.7	(504)
TOTAL N	(242)	(211)	(106)	(294)	(853)

The participants from Africa more often reported that they expected to use a great deal of their AID training eventually on their jobs than did participants from other regions.

There was not a statistically significant relationship between the participants' training programs and the amount of AID training they expected to use eventually on their jobs.

Q. Did participants in different fields of training vary in their expectations about how much of their AID training they will eventually use on their jobs? (Item 110)

AMOUNT EVENTUALLY USABLE	PERCENTAGE (%) IN FIELD OF TRAINING			TOTAL N
	AGRIC	ED	PA	
Some	34.1	46.3	51.7	(230)
A great amount	65.9	53.7	48.3	(295)
TOTAL N	(185)	(164)	(176)	(525)

Participants in Agriculture expected to be able to use a greater amount of the training eventually on their jobs than did participants in other fields of training. Participants in Public Administration did not expect to use as much of their training eventually as participants in other fields.

Q. Did participants programmed by the AID training branches vary in their expectations about how much of their AID training they eventually will use in their jobs?
(Item 110)

AMOUNT EVENTUALLY USABLE	PERCENTAGE (%) BY TRAINING BRANCH					TOTAL N
	PSB	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Some	40.6	42.7	47.1	48.9	33.3	(349)
A great amount	59.4	57.3	52.9	51.1	66.7	(503)
TOTAL N	(143)	(185)	(172)	(88)	(264)	(852)

The participants programmed by the Africa Training Branch more often reported that they expected to use a great deal of their training eventually on their jobs than did participants programmed by the other AID training branches. The participants programmed by the Far East and Latin America Training Branches more often reported they expected to use some of their training eventually.

Q. What problems do the participants expect to face in using their training when they return to their home countries? (Item 115)

PROBLEM EXPECTED	PERCENTAGE (%) EXPECTING PROBLEM*	
	Yes	No
Lack of equipment and facilities	61.9	36.8
Lack of money	69.6	29.9
Lack of time	30.3	66.5
Lack of qualified staff	59.8	39.1
Lack of help from supervisor	31.3	65.9
Lack of support from higher officials	41.9	55.2
Resistance to change	60.0	38.2
TOTAL N	(859)	

*Percentages add to 100% across rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

About 3 out of 5 participants expected to have difficulty in using their training in their home countries due to lack of money (69.6%), lack of equipment, tools and facilities (61.9%), resistance to change (60.0%), and lack of qualified staff (59.8%). Less than 1 in 3 participants expected difficulty due to lack of time (30.3%) or help from immediate supervisor (31.3%).

Q. Did participants from different regions vary in their expectations of home country problems due to a lack of money? (Item 115b)

LACK OF MONEY EXPECTED	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	63.8	73.0	77.2	69.5	(589)
No	36.3	27.0	22.9	30.4	(256)
TOTAL N	(240)	(211)	(105)	(289)	(845)

Participants from the Near East-South Asia expected to have difficulties in using their training due to a lack of money less often than did participants from other regions.

Q. Did participants in different fields of training vary in their expectations of home country problems due to lack of money? (Item 115b)

LACK OF MONEY EXPECTED	PERCENTAGE (%) IN FIELD OF TRAINING			TOTAL N
	AGRIC	ED	PA	
Yes	67.0	80.1	68.2	(371)
No	33.0	19.9	31.8	(148)
TOTAL N	(182)	(161)	(176)	(519)

Participants in Education expected to have difficulties in using their training in their home country due to a lack of money, more often than participants in other fields of training.

- Q. Did participants in different fields of training vary in their expectations of home country problems due to a lack of equipment, tools, and facilities? (Item 115a)

LACK OF EQUIP., TOOLS AND FACIL. EXPECTED	PERCENTAGE (%) IN FIELD OF TRAINING			TOTAL N
	AGRIC	ED	PA	
Yes	63.6	72.1	56.5	(333)
No	36.4	28.0	43.5	(189)
TOTAL N	(184)	(161)	(177)	(522)

Participants in Education and Agriculture expected to have difficulties in using their training in their home country due to a lack of equipment, tools and facilities, more often than participants in Public Administration.

- Q. Did participants from different regions vary in their expectations of home country problems due to a lack of equipment, tools, and facilities? (Item 115a)

LACK OF EQUIP. TOOLS & FACIL. EXPECTED	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	51.0	69.3	68.3	65.6	(532)
No	48.9	30.7	31.8	34.4	(315)
TOTAL N	(237)	(212)	(107)	(291)	(847)

Participants from the Near East-South Asia expected to have difficulties in using their training due to a lack of equipment, tools and facilities, less often than did participants from the other 3 regions.

Q. Were the instruments and equipment used in the Academic participants' courses similar to those available in their home countries? (Items A54 & A55)

INSTRUMENTS AND EQUIPMENT SIMILAR	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	35.6
No	33.8
No instruments and equipment used	31.6

TOTAL N	(320)

About half the Academic participants who used instruments and equipment in their courses said these were not similar to instruments and equipment now available in their home countries. However, a great majority of these participants felt such instruments and equipment would be available in their home countries in the near future. (See Appendix, Item A56.)

Q. Were the instruments and equipment used in the Special participants' classroom training similar to those available in their home country? (Items S38 & S39)

INSTRUMENTS AND EQUIPMENT SIMILAR	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	34.1
No	25.4
No instruments and equipment used	40.5

TOTAL N	(417)

About 40% of the Special participants who used instruments and equipment in their classroom training said these were not similar to instruments and equipment now available in their home country. However, a great majority of these participants felt that such instruments and equipment would be available in their home country in the near future (see Appendix, Item S40).

Q. Were the instruments and equipment used in the Special Participants on-the-job work experience similar to those available in their home country? (S51 & S52)

INSTRUMENTS & EQUIPMENT SIMILAR	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	36.0
No	27.0
No instruments & equipment used	37.1

TOTAL N	(291)

About 40% of the Special Participants who used instruments and equipment in their on-the-job work experience said these were not similar to instruments and equipment now available in their home country. However, a great majority of these participants felt that such instruments and equipment would be available in their home country in the near future (see Appendix, Item S53).

Q. Did participants from different regions vary in their expectations of home country problems due to resistance to change? (Item 115g)

RESISTANCE TO CHANGE EXPECTED	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	52.7	63.1	76.1	61.2	(515)
No	47.3	36.8	23.8	38.8	(327)
TOTAL N	(239)	(209)	(105)	(289)	(842)

The participants from Latin America expected to have difficulties in using their training due to a resistance to changing ways of doing things more often than did participant from other regions. Participants from the Near East-South Asia expected to have this difficulty less often than participants from other regions.

There was not a statistically significant relationship between the participants' field of training and their expectations of home country problems due to resistance to change.

Q. Did participants from different regions vary in their expectations of home country problems due to a lack of qualified staff? (Item 115d)

LACK OF QUALIFIED STAFF EXPECTED	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	50.2	65.0	65.7	64.0	(514)
No	49.8	35.1	34.2	36.0	(335)
TOTAL N	(241)	(211)	(108)	(289)	(849)

The participants from the Near East-South Asia less often expected to have difficulties in using their training due to a lack of qualified staff than did participants from other regions.

Q. How many participants indicated that the USAID in their home country could help them use their training? (Item 116)

USAID COULD HELP	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	62.3
No	32.5
TOTAL N	(859)

Almost 2 out of 3 participants (62.3%) felt that the USAID could help them in using their AID training in their home country.

Q. Did participants from different regions vary in their assessments of whether the USAID could help them use their U.S. training? (Item 116)

USAID COULD HELP	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	50.6	72.6	74.3	70.4	(535)
No	49.4	27.4	25.7	29.6	(278)
TOTAL N	(231)	(201)	(101)	(280)	(813)

About 1/2 of the participants from the Near East-South Asia felt that the USAID in their home country could help them in using their training after they returned. This was less than the proportion of participants from the other regions expressing that view.

CHAPTER V

PARTICIPANTS' REACTIONS TO NON-SUBSTANTIVE ASPECTS OF STUDY IN THEIR FIELD OF TRAINING

Section A

Reactions of Participants in Academic Programs to Non-Substantive Aspects of Study in Their Field of Training

Q. How many of the Academic participants expected to earn a U.S. academic degree? (Item 38a)

EXPECTED DEGREE	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	73.4
No	22.8
TOTAL N	(320)

Nearly 3 out of 4 (73.4%) of the Academic participants said their training program included a plan for them to earn an academic degree in the United States.

Q. What degrees did the Academic participants earn in the U.S.? (Items 39 & 40).

U.S. DEGREE EARNED	PERCENTAGE* %
None	27.8
BA/BS	25.0
MA/MS	45.3
Ph.D.	6.6
<hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/>	
TOTAL N	(320)

*Percentages add to more than 100% because participants were allowed more than one answer.

About 7 Academic participants out of 10 (71.2%) earned academic degrees in the U.S. The majority of these participants earned an MA or MS degree (63.6%).

Q. How satisfied were the Academic participants with the education they received in the U.S.? (Item 60a)

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely satisfied)	30.6
2	39.4
3	18.4
4	7.2
5	2.2
6	.3
7 (Not at all satisfied)	1.9

TOTAL N	(320)

About 3 out of 10 Academic participants (30.6%) indicated they were "extremely satisfied" with their academic programs, and that it "could not have been better." Only 11.6% of the Academic participants rated their satisfaction with their academic education at or below the middle point on the rating scale.

There was not a statistically significant relationship between the Academics' fields of training or the region they came from and their satisfaction with the education they received.

Q. How useful did Academic participants find the help provided by their Faculty Advisors? (Item 44a)

UTILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE (%)
1 (Extremely useful)	53.0
2	22.5
3	11.6
4	7.9
5	2.0
6	1.3
7 (Not at all useful)	1.7
<hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/>	
TOTAL N	(302)

Over half the Academic participants who received help in scheduling courses from faculty advisors found their help "extremely useful," "could not have been better." 87.1% of these participants rated the utility of their advisors' help above the middle point on the scale.

Q. From whom did Academic participants get informal help in arranging their course schedules? (Items 45 & 46a)

RECEIVED HELP FROM	PERCENTAGE* %
No one	33.1
Faculty at training site	47.8
Foreign students	34.7
U.S. students	27.8

TOTAL N	(320)

*Percentages add to more than 100% because participants were allowed more than one answer.

2 out of 3 Academic participants (62.5%) received informal help in arranging their course schedules. The highest proportion got help from the faculty and staff at their training sites.

Q. How useful did Academic participants find the informal help they received with their course schedules? (Item 47a)

UTILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE (%)
1 (Extremely useful)	34.4
2	30.7
3	17.2
4	12.6
5	3.7
6	0.9
7 (Not at all useful)	0.5
<hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/>	
TOTAL N	(215)

About 1 out of 3 Academic participants (34.4%) who received informal help with their course schedules rated that help "extremely useful," "could not have been better." 82.3% of these participants rated the utility of this help above the middle point on the scale.

Q. How useful did the Academic participants find their separate courses? (Item 58a)

UTILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE (%)
1 (Extremely useful)	34.4
2	40.9
3	16.9
4	5.6
5	1.6
6	0.3
7 (Not at all useful)	0.3

TOTAL N	(320)

More than 1 Academic participant out of 3 (34.4%) rated their classes as "extremely useful," "could not have been better." Over 90% (92.3%) rated the utility of their classes in achieving their training objectives above the middle point on the scale.

There was not a statistically significant relationship between the Academics' fields of training or the regions they came from and their ratings of the utility of their courses.

Q. What recommendations did the Academic participants make regarding the educational techniques used in their training programs? (Item A59a)

EDUCATIONAL TECHNIQUE	PERCENTAGE (%) RECOMMENDING*		
	Right Amount	More Needed	Less Needed
Lectures	76.2	11.6	8.8
Seminars	52.2	37.8	5.6
Laboratory or shop work	39.1	44.4	4.4
Individual research	50.3	39.1	3.1
Field trips	37.8	52.5	6.2
TOTAL N	(320)		

*Percentages add to 100% by rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

Academic participants were most satisfied with the amount of training time devoted to lectures, 76.2% indicating it was about right. A majority (52.5%) of the participants suggested more field trips were needed, while 44.4% suggested more laboratory and shop work.

Q. How many Academic participants went on field trips during their training program? (Item 52)

HAD FIELD TRIP	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	83.1
No	16.9

TOTAL N	(320)

About 6 out of 7 Academic participants (83.1%) went on field trips during their training programs.

Q. How useful did the Academic participants find their field trips? (Item 53a)

UTILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE(%)
1 (Extremely useful)	40.2
2	25.9
3	17.3
4	9.0
5	4.6
6	1.9
7 (Not at all useful)	1.1

TOTAL N	(266)

40.2% of the Academic participants who took field trips found them "extremely useful, "could not have been better." 83.4% of these participants rated the utility of the field trips above the middle point on the scale.

Q. What problems did the Academic participants have with their training programs? (Item A57)

PROBLEM WITH TRAINING	PERCENTAGE (%) HAVING PROBLEM*	
	Yes	No
Courses too simple	24.3	75.3
Courses too advanced	28.0	70.9
Instruction too theoretical	39.7	59.7
Instruction too detailed	22.2	76.2
Not enough lecturing	19.1	80.3
Not enough discussion	27.5	72.2
Too much reading	61.3	38.4
Not enough reading	4.7	91.9
Too many unrelated courses	29.1	70.3
Too much duplication	33.1	66.2
TOTAL N	(320)	

*Percentages add to more than 100% because participants were allowed more than one answer.

The most frequently mentioned problem was the amount of reading assigned the Academic participants. 61.3% felt they had too much reading to do, while only 4.7% indicated there was not enough assigned reading. The next most often noted problem was that instruction was too theoretical (39.7%).

Section B

REACTIONS OF PARTICIPANTS IN SPECIAL PROGRAMS
TO NON-SUBSTANTIVE ASPECTS OF STUDY
IN THEIR FIELD OF TRAINING

Q. What kinds of training did the participants in Special training programs have? (Items S36, S43, & S49)

KIND OF TRAINING	PERCENTAGE (%) HAVING TRAINING*	
	Yes	No
Classroom	76.6	21.9
Observation training visits	95.4	4.3
On-the-job work experience	44.7	54.2
TOTAL N		(539)

*Percentages add to 100% by rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

About 3 out of 4 participants (76.6%) in Special training programs received classroom training. All but 4.3% made observation training visits. More than 1/2 of the Special participants (54.2%) indicated that they received no on-the-job work experience in their training programs.

Q. What recommendations did the Special participants make regarding the amount of time devoted to the different kinds of training in their training programs? (Item S60)

KIND OF TRAINING	PERCENTAGE (%) RECOMMENDING*		
	Right Amount	More Needed	Less Needed
Classroom	44.0	33.8	12.8
Observation training visits	44.5	37.5	12.1
On-the-job work experience	22.3	44.9	6.7
TOTAL N	(539)		

*Percentages add to 100% by rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

The suggestion most frequently made by the Special participants was that they be given more on-the-job work experience (44.9%). About identical numbers of Special participants felt they had had the right amount of classroom (44.0%) and observation training visits (44.5%). Three times as many participants recommended more of these two types of training as those recommending less.

Q. How useful did the Special participants find their classroom training? (Item 42)

UTILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE (%)
1 (Extremely useful)	36.4
2	33.3
3	18.7
4	6.1
5	4.5
6	1.0
7 (Not at all useful)	1.0
<hr/>	
TOTAL N	(423)

More than 1 out of 3 (36.4%) Special participants felt their classes were "extremely useful" and "could not have been better." Almost 90% of these participants rated their classroom training above the middle point on the scale (88.4%).

Q. What problems did the Special participants have with their classroom training? (Item S41)

PROBLEM WITH CLASSES	PERCENTAGE (%) HAVING PROBLEM*		TOTAL N
	Yes	No	
Too simple	28.0	72.0	(420)
Too advanced	28.0	72.0	(414)
Too general	34.0	66.0	(421)
Too detailed	23.4	76.6	(414)
Not enough lecturing	28.0	72.0	(419)
Not enough discussion	29.1	70.9	(418)
Too much reading	40.0	60.0	(422)
Not enough reading	15.3	84.7	(412)
Too much duplication	27.6	72.4	(417)
Too many subjects	26.3	73.7	(419)

*Percentages add to 100% by rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

Assigned classroom reading was the most frequently mentioned problem. Only 15.3% of the Special participants felt there was not enough assigned reading, while 40% felt there was too much. All of the other problems listed presented difficulties for between 23% and 34% of the Special participants. One out of 3 Special participants found the level of instruction of his classroom training too general.

Q. How useful did the Special participants find their observation training visits? (Item 48)

UTILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE (%)
1 (Extremely useful)	35.7
2	35.0
3	16.4
4	9.0
5	2.1
6	1.4
7 (Not at all useful)	1.0

TOTAL N	(513)

More than 1 out of 3 (35.7%) Special participants felt their observation training visits were "extremely useful" and "could not have been better." Almost 90% of these participants rated their observation training visits above the middle point on the scale (87.1%).

Q. How many training sites did the Special participants visit on their observational tours? (Item 46)

NUMBER OF SITES	PERCENTAGE (%)
1-3	22.2
4-6	24.0
7-9	12.4
10-19	17.4
20-29	14.8
30 or more	9.2
<hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/>	
TOTAL N	(379)

Nearly 46.2% of the Special participants visited 6 or less training sites. 24.0% visited 20 or more sites.

Q. What problems did the Special participants have on their observation training visits? (Item S47)

PROBLEM WITH TOUR VISITS	PERCENTAGE (%) HAVING PROBLEM*		TOTAL N
	Yes	No	
Did not visit important places	38.6	61.4	(513)
Visited unimportant places	36.2	63.8	(511)
Activities too similar	43.7	56.3	(510)
Observation time too short	45.9	54.1	(510)
Too many insignificant activities.	23.5	76.5	(507)
Descriptions not clear	22.4	77.6	(504)

*Percentages add to 100% by rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

Over 40% of the Special participants indicated that their observation tour visits were not long enough (45.9%) and that the places they visited were too similar (43.7%). Only about half this number of these participants noted that too many insignificant activities were observed (23.5%) or that these activities were not clearly described (22.4%).

Q. How useful did the Special participants find their on-the-job work experience? (Item S55)

UTILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE (%)
1 (Extremely useful)	40.2
2	36.6
3	13.0
4	6.7
5	2.4
6	0.4
7 (Not at all useful)	0.8
<hr/>	
TOTAL N	(254)

4 out of 10 Special participants (40.2%) who had on-the-job work experience rated it "extremely useful," "could not have been better." 89.8% rated this training above the middle point on the scale.

Q. What problems did the Special participants have in their on-the-job work experience? (Item S54)

PROBLEM WITH WORK EXPERIENCE	PERCENTAGE (%) HAVING PROBLEM*		TOTAL N
	Yes	No	
Work too simple	26.0	74.0	(250)
Work too advanced	30.8	69.2	(250)
Work too specialized	38.2	61.8	(251)
Work not specialized enough	17.8	82.2	(247)
Too much to do	13.3	86.7	(249)
Too little to do	24.9	75.1	(249)
Too much supervision	12.5	87.5	(248)
Too little supervision	20.6	79.4	(247)
Inadequate working conditions	17.6	82.4	(245)
Lack of tools and equipment	9.7	90.3	(248)

*Percentages add to 100% by rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

Less than 15% of the Special participants indicated that they experienced a lack of needed tools and equipment (9.7%), too much supervision (12.5%), or too much to do (13.3%) in the on-the-job training. The two problems noted most frequently were that the work was too specialized (38.2%) or too advanced (30.8%).

Q. Did Special participants programmed by the A/IT training branches vary in their suggestions about the needed amount of on-the-job work experience? (Item S60b)

AMOUNT NEEDED	PERCENTAGE (%) BY TRAINING BRANCH					TOTAL N
	PSB	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
More	76.3	47.8	63.9	60.6	59.8	(241)
Less	8.5	7.8	6.5	9.1	13.1	(36)
Right amount	15.3	44.4	29.6	30.3	27.1	(120)
TOTAL N	(59)	(90)	(108)	(33)	(107)	(397)

The participants programmed by the Near East-South Asia Training Branch more often indicated they experienced about the right amount of on-the-job work experience than did the participants programmed by other A/IT training branches. The participants programmed by the Program Support Branch more often suggested that more on-the-job work experience was needed than participants programmed by other A/IT training branches.

CHAPTER VI

PARTICIPANTS' PERSONAL AND SOCIAL EXPERIENCES IN THE UNITED STATES

Section A

Participants' Comfort, Friendships and Social Activities in the United States

Q. How comfortable and welcome did the participants feel in the United States? (Item 94)

COMFORT/WELCOME RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely comfortable)	39.8
2	30.2
3	15.8
4	9.7
5	2.9
6	1.3
7 (Not at all comfortable)	0.2

TOTAL N	(859)

Nearly 40% of the participants felt "extremely comfortable" and "always welcome" in the United States. 85.8% of the participants rated their feelings of comfort and welcome above the middle point on the scale.

Q. Did participants from different regions vary in feeling comfortable and welcome in the United States? (item 94)

COMFORT/WELCOME RATING	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
1	49.2	40.6	42.6	30.5	(341)
2	29.3	34.0	35.2	26.4	(259)
3	13.6	14.2	11.1	20.7	(136)
4-7	7.9	11.3	11.1	22.4	(121)
TOTAL N	(242)	(212)	(108)	(295)	(857)

Participants from Africa less often rated their feelings of comfort in the United States high than did the participants from other regions. Less than 1 African participant in 3 (30.5%) indicated that he felt "extremely comfortable" and "always welcome" in the United States (a 1 rating on the scale).

Q. Did the participants in different training programs vary in feeling comfortable and welcome in the U.S.? (Item 94)

COMFORT/WELCOME RATING	PERCENTAGE (%) IN TYPE OF PROGRAM		TOTAL N
	ACAD	SPEC	
1	24.4	49.1	(342)
2	32.8	28.6	(259)
3	21.3	12.6	(136)
4-7	21.6	9.7	(121)
TOTAL N	(320)	(538)	(858)

The Special participants gave proportionately twice as many ratings of "extremely comfortable, always felt welcome in the United States" (1 rating on the scale) as did the Academic participants. More than 1 in 5 participants (21.6%) in Academic training programs rated their feeling of comfort in the United States at or below the middle of the rating scale.

Q. What kinds of Americans did the participants have personal friendships with? (Items 84 & 85)

AMERICAN FRIENDS	PERCENTAGE (%)*
None	6.2
Teachers	53.0
Other University staff	38.1
Students	64.4
Farmers	22.2
Businessmen	30.5
AID representatives	29.4
Public officials	34.0
Job training instructors	37.4

TOTAL N	(859)

*Percentages add to more than 100% because participants were allowed more than one answer.

Only 6.2% of the participants made no American friends during their sojourn. The 2 categories of Americans most often chosen as friends by the participants were students (64.4%) and teachers (53%).

Q. Did the participants feel their friendships with Americans contributed to their training experience? (Item 86)

FRIENDSHIPS CONTRIBUTED	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	82.8
No	17.2
<hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/>	
TOTAL N	(796)

More than 4 out of 5 participants (83%) who had friendships with Americans felt that they contributed directly to improving their training experience.

Q. How much did the participants enjoy specially arranged (for them) social and recreational activities? (Item 79)

ENJOYMENT RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely enjoyable)	41.4
2	31.9
3	16.0
4	7.5
5	2.3
6	0.3
7 (Not at all enjoyable)	1.0

TOTAL N	(597)

More than 2 out of 5 participants (41.4%) who participated in specially arranged social activities found them "extremely enjoyable," "could not have been better". 89% of these participants rated the activities above the middle point on the scale.

Q. Did participants from different regions vary in their enjoyment of the social activities specially arranged for them? (Item 79)

ENJOYMENT RATING	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
1	48.7	34.5	39.0	40.8	(265)
2	31.0	38.8	35.1	26.3	(205)
3-7	20.3	26.7	26.0	32.9	(172)
TOTAL N	(187)	(165)	(77)	(213)	(642)

Participants from Africa more often gave low ratings of enjoyment to the social activities arranged for them than did participants from the other regions. Participants from the Near East-South Asia more often reported high ratings of enjoyment.

Q. Did the participants in different training programs vary in their ratings of enjoyment of social activities specially arranged for them. (Item 79)

ENJOYMENT RATING	PERCENTAGE (%) IN TYPE OF PROGRAM		TOTAL N
	ACAD	SPEC	
1	30.3	47.1	(266)
2	29.4	33.2	(205)
3-7	40.4	19.8	(172)
TOTAL N	(218)	(425)	(643)

Participants in Special training programs more often found the social activities arranged for them "extremely enjoyable, could not be better" (1 rating on the scale) than did participants in Academic training programs.

Q. Did participants programmed by government agencies vary in their enjoyment of the social activities specially arranged for them? (Item 79)

ENJOYMENT RATING	PERCENTAGE (%) BY GOVERNMENT AGENCY			TOTAL N
	AID	USDA	Other Agency	
1	35.2	53.1	46.7	(266)
2	33.2	24.8	33.7	(205)
3-7	31.6	22.1	19.5	(172)
TOTAL N	(361)	(113)	(169)	(643)

The participants programmed by the Department of Agriculture and government agencies other than AID more often gave the social activities arranged for them high enjoyment ratings (1 and 2) than did the participants programmed by AID.

Q. What kinds of specially arranged social and recreational activities did the participants take part in? (Items 75, 76, & 77).

ACTIVITIES PARTICIPATED IN	PERCENTAGE* %
Visits to home	67.6
Dances	23.5
Parties	46.4
Picnics	40.8
No activities available	24.4
Did not participate	6.3

TOTAL N	(859)

*Percentages add to more than 100% because participants were allowed more than one answer.

The social activity most often organized for and participated in by AID participants was visits to American homes. 2 out of 3 participants (67.6%) indicated they received home hospitality during their sojourn. 46.4% went to parties arranged for them and 40.8% to picnics. About 1 participant in 4 (24.4%) noted that no special social or recreational activities were organized for them.

Q. Who arranged the special social activities for the participants? (Item 78)

ACTIVITIES ARRANGED BY	PERCENTAGE* %
Program advisors	48.6
Church groups	32.0
University officials	44.1
Students	31.3
WIC volunteers	66.8

TOTAL N	(597)

*Percentages add to more than 100% because participants were allowed more than one answer.

Washington International Center volunteers were remembered by more participants for organized special social activities than any other group (67%).

Section B

Participants' Personal and Social Problems
in the United States

Q. What personal and social problems did participants have during their stay in the United States? (Item 93)

PROBLEM: EXPERIENCED	PERCENTAGE (%) HAVING PROBLEM*	
	Yes	No
Not knowing manners	35.8	63.3
Weather too hot	29.6	67.4
Weather too cold	61.0	37.8
Food distasteful	43.8	55.3
Homesickness	61.1	37.8
Loneliness	46.2	53.2
Illness	20.0	78.9
Dishonest people	14.7	84.6
Rude, unfriendly people	27.5	72.1
Not enough time for unprogrammed activities	36.9	62.0
Not enough money for recreation	59.4	40.1
Not enough money to return hospitality	57.2	41.9
Racial dsicrimination against participant	21.3	78.4
Racial discrimination against others	31.0	66.2
TOTAL N	(859)	

* Percentages add to 100% by rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

The problems mentioned by more than 1/2 the participants were cold weather (61%), homesickness (61.1%), lack of money for recreation (59.4%), and lack of money to return hospitality (57.2%). Less than 1 participant in 4 was ill (20%), dealt with dishonest people (14.7%), or experienced racial discrimination (21.3%).

(Participants' problems with money allowances will be discussed in more detail in Chapter VIII.)

Q. Did the participants from different regions vary in their problems with the taste of U.S. food? (Item 93d)

HAD FOOD-TASTE PROBLEM	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	40.3	58.7	44.9	37.0	(376)
No	59.7	41.3	55.1	63.0	(474)
TOTAL N	(243)	(208)	(107)	(292)	(850)

Participants from the Far East more often reported that U.S. food was distasteful than did participants from the other regions.

Q. Did the participants from different regions vary in their problems with feeling lonely while in the United States? (Item 93f)

HAD PROBLEM WITH LONELINESS	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	36.2	62.9	49.5	42.1	(396)
No	63.8	37.1	50.5	57.9	(456)
TOTAL N	(243)	(210)	(107)	(292)	(852)

Participants from the Far East more often reported problems with feeling lonely in the United States, while participants from the Near East-South Asia reported this problem least often.

- Q. Did participants from different regions vary in their problems with homesickness while in the United States?
(Item 93e)

HAD PROBLEM W/ HOMESICKNESS	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	46.5	76.7	64.5	61.9	(525)
No	53.5	23.3	35.5	38.9	(329)
TOTAL N	(243)	(210)	(107)	(294)	(854)

Participants from the Near East-South Asia less often reported problems with homesickness than did participants from other regions. Participants from the Far East most often reported cases of homesickness.

- Q. Did participants from different regions vary in their problems with cold weather in the United States?
(Item 93c)

HAD PROBLEM W/ COLD WEATHER	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	39.2	70.0	64.1	73.6	(524)
No	60.8	30.0	35.8	26.4	(324)
TOTAL N	(240)	(210)	(106)	(292)	(848)

Participants from the Far East, Latin America and Africa more often reported problems with cold weather in the United States than did participants from the Near East-South Asia.

Q. Did the participants from different regions vary in their problems with insufficient time for unprogrammed activities? (Item 93j)

HAD PROBLEM WITH TIME	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	34.3	46.0	36.1	34.0	(317)
No	65.7	54.0	63.9	66.0	(532)
TOTAL N	(239)	(211)	(108)	(291)	(849)

Participants from the Far East more often reported problems with insufficient time for unprogrammed activities in the United States than did participants from the other regions.

Q. Did the participants from different regions vary in their problems with U.S. manners? (Item 93a)

HAD PROBLEM WITH MANNERS	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	24.7	42.9	29.9	43.3	(308)
No	75.3	57.1	70.1	56.7	(543)
TOTAL N	(243)	(210)	(107)	(291)	(851)

Participants from the Far East and Africa more often reported problems with not knowing expected manners in the United States than did participants from the Near East-South Asia and Latin America.

Section C

PARTICIPANTS' USE OF ADVISORS AND SPECIAL SERVICES
FOR PERSONAL AND SOCIAL NEEDS

Q. How many participants talked with a Foreign Student
Advisor or Job Trainee Advisor? (Item 90)

TALKED WITH ADVISOR	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	67.9
No	31.5

TOTAL N	(859)

About 2 participants out of 3 (67.9%) talked with a
foreign student or job trainee advisor.

Q. How useful did the participants find the help provided by their Foreign Student Advisor or Job Trainee Advisor? (Item 92)

UTILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE (%)
1 (Extremely useful)	39.5
2	24.1
3	17.5
4	10.5
5	4.1
6	2.7
7 (Not at all useful)	1.5
<hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/>	
TOTAL N	(582)

39.5% of the participants found their advisor's help "extremely useful," "could not have been better." 81.1% of the participants rated the utility of the help above the middle point on the scale.

Q. Did the participants in different training programs vary in their ratings of the help provided by their Foreign Student Advisors or Job Trainee Advisors? (Item 92)

UTILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE (%) IN TYPE OF PROGRAM		TOTAL N
	ACAD	SPEC	
1	31.2	47.2	(230)
2	22.9	25.1	(140)
3	21.1	14.2	(102)
4-7	24.7	13.5	(110)
TOTAL N	(279)	(303)	(582)

The participants in Special training programs rated the utility of the help provided by the Foreign Student Advisors or Job Trainee Advisors higher than did participants in Academic training programs.

Q. What special services did the participants make use of?
(Items 87, 88 & 89)

SERVICE USED	PERCENTAGE (%)*
None	48.9
Medical	49.8
Legal	1.0
Counselling	6.8

TOTAL N	(859)

*Percentages add to more than 100% because participants were allowed more than one answer.

Nearly half (48.9%) of the participants did not use any special service (8.4% said they did not know where to get such services). 49.8% of the participants made some use of American medical services. Less than 10% used legal (1.0%) or counselling (6.8%) services.

Q. Did the participants from different regions vary in their use of medical, legal and/or counselling services? (Item 88)

SERVICE USED	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	71.0	83.1	93.2	80.6	(347)
No	29.0	16.9	6.8	19.4	(88)
TOTAL N	(131)	(136)	(44)	(124)	(435)

The participants from Latin America used medical, legal and/or counselling services in the United States more often than participants from other regions. Participants from the Near East-South Asia used these services least often.

CHAPTER VII
 PARTICIPANTS' VIEWS ON ENGLISH LANGUAGE
 TRAINING, ORIENTATION PROGRAMS, AND
 SPECIAL COMMUNICATION SEMINARS

Section A
 Participants' Use and Evaluation
 of English Language Training

Q. How many participants received special English language training for their trip, and where did they receive it? (Items 14 & 15)

ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING	PERCENTAGE %
In home country only	16.5
In U.S. only	11.1
In home country and U.S.	16.2
No training	55.5

TOTAL N	(859)

Slightly more than 1/2 (55.5%) of the participants received no special English language training. Of those who did receive such training, more were instructed in their home countries (16.5%) than in the U.S. (11.1%). About 1 participant out of 6 (16.2%) had English language training both in his home country and the U.S.

Q. How useful did the participants find the English language training they received? (Item 16)

UTILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE (%)
1 (Extremely useful)	31.3
2	20.5
3	18.7
4	16.3
5	8.7
6	2.1
7 (Not at all useful)	2.4

TOTAL N	(380)

About 1/3 (31%) of the participants who received English language training found it extremely useful. Over 70% rated the utility of their language training above the middle point on the scale.

142

Q. Did the participants who received English-language training in their home country rate its utility differently than those who were trained in the United States? (Items 15 & 16)

UTILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE (%) RECEIVING TRAINING			TOTAL N
	In H.C. Only	In U.S. Only	In Both H.C.&U.S.	
1	38.0	15.8	35.3	(118)
2-3	33.1	42.1	43.9	(148)
4-7	28.9	42.1	20.9	(110)
TOTAL N	(142)	(95)	(139)	(376)

Those participants who received English-language training in their home countries rated it significantly more useful than those who received their training only in the United States. Those who received training both in their home countries and in the United States rated it more useful (79.2% 1, 2 or 3 ratings) than either the participants who had home country training (71.1% 1, 2 or 3 ratings) or U.S. training (57.9% 1, 2 or 3 ratings) only.

(It is possible that the participants' ratings of the usefulness of their language training is directly related to the amount of this training they received.)

Q. What kinds of problems did the participants have with the English language during their sojourns? (Item 17)

PROBLEM WITH ENGLISH	PERCENTAGE (%) HAVING PROBLEM*	
	Yes	No
Slang	72.9	27.0
Accents	61.1	38.5
Conversations	31.7	68.1
Instructors' speech	27.4	72.5
Public services	26.2	73.2
Reading	18.5	80.5
Signs	16.8	83.2
Numbers	17.0	82.8
TOTAL N	(859)	

*Percentages add to more than 100% because participants were allowed more than one answer.

Difficulties with slang (72.9%) and accents (61.1%) seem to be the only two problems which bothered a majority of the participants. Less than 1 participant out of 3 had language difficulties with personal conversations (31.7%), teachers' or supervisors' speech (27.4%), getting public services (26.2%), reading class assignments (18.5%), numbering systems (17.0%), or signs and directions (16.8%).

144

Q. What are the languages which have been used most often by the participants since they were 18 years of age? (Item 13)

LANGUAGE	PERCENTAGE (%) USING LANGUAGE			
	Most Often	2nd Most Often	3rd Most Often	At All
English	22.9	53.7	34.9	97.0
French	1.0	9.4	9.6	18.1
Urdu	2.5	4.8	6.6	11.6
Spanish	3.3	2.1	4.6	10.3
Portuguese	9.3	0.0	.4	9.8
Thai	8.5	0.0	0.0	8.5
Vietnamese	7.9	.5	0.0	8.3
Hindu	.8	1.6	6.2	6.5
Arabic	2.3	.5	.8	3.8
Other	41.7	27.3	36.9	
TOTAL N	(398)	(374)	(241)	

No language except English was used by more than 20% of the trainees. 97% of the participants listed English as one of the languages most often used. 53 other languages were listed as "used most often." (This question was not analyzed for the first 450 participants, as they were used to build the language code.)

Section B

PARTICIPANTS' EXPERIENCE WITH AND EVALUATION
OF ORIENTATION PROGRAMS

Q. Where did the participants receive orientation about the U.S.? (Item 31)

PLACE	PERCENTAGE (%)*
USAID	89.6
AID/Washington	84.6
Other government agencies	27.9
Washington International Center	82.1
Pre-university workshop	21.0
Training site	24.4

TOTAL N	(859)

*Percentages add to more than 100% because participants were allowed more than one answer.

Over 80% of the participants were given orientations by their USAID, AID/Washington and/or the Washington International Center. About 1 participant in 4 got orientations from another U.S. government agency (27.9%), a pre-university workshop (21.0%) and/or a formal program at their training site (24.4%).

Q. Where did the participants feel they received the most helpful orientation information on given topics? (Item 34).

TOPIC PRESENTED	PERCENTAGE (%) ATTENDING PROGRAM*			
	USAID	WIC	Formal Univ. Program	No Helpful Information on This Topic
Facts for getting along in U.S.	31.6	44.0	16.7	6.3
U.S. social activities	16.9	63.3	25.2	7.4
Ways of life in U.S.	23.4	57.7	24.8	5.8
U.S. education	15.7	37.7	46.7	10.2
U.S. government	11.2	46.1	32.0	11.3
Economic facts about U.S.	11.8	46.4	36.7	12.2
Religion in U.S.	10.4	60.7	22.4	12.3
Race relations in U.S.	10.1	56.7	22.4	13.5
TOTAL N	(770)	(705)	(210)	(859)

*Percentages add to more than 100% because participants were allowed more than one response.

More than 7 out of 8 participants felt they got helpful information on all of the topics listed in the table. The Washington International Center was rated as giving the most helpful information on every topic except education in U.S. universities, where the formal university orientations received more "most helpful" ratings.

Q. What difficulties did the participants have with the various orientation programs? (Item 33)

DIFFICULTY WITH PROGRAM	PERCENTAGE (%) ATTENDING PROGRAM*				
	USAID	AID/Washington	WIC	Pre-Univ. Workshop	Formal Univ. Program
Information not specific	26.1	11.6	4.8	8.9	9.0
Not enough information	24.2	11.1	3.8	7.8	6.2
Too much information	3.5	5.1	6.2	3.3	2.8
Information inaccurate	7.7	3.4	1.8	1.7	2.4
Not enough discussion	16.4	11.3	3.6	5.0	6.7
Not able to understand speakers	2.2	2.9	2.2	2.2	4.8
No printed matter	3.8	1.1	1.4	.6	3.3
No films	7.5	3.3	2.0	5.0	5.2
No former AID participants	11.1	x	x	x	x
No difficulties with this agency's presentation	63.1	78.0	75.7	66.7	81.4
TOTAL N	(770)	(727)	(705)	(180)	(210)

*Percentages add to more than 100% because participants were allowed more than one response.

Most of the participants attending orientation programs indicated that they had no difficulties with the agency's presentation. The only difficulties mentioned by more than 20% of the participants were with their USAIDS' presentations, where 1 participant out of 4 felt that the information given was too general (26.1%) and not sufficient (24.2%).

Section C

PARTICIPANTS' EXPERIENCE WITH AND EVALUATION OF SPECIAL COMMUNICATION SEMINARS

Q. How many participants went to the Michigan State University Seminar and other Special Communication Seminars? (Item 100)

SEMINAR ATTENDED	PERCENTAGE %
MSU	54.2
Other	8.3
None	36.7

TOTAL N	(852)

Slightly more than 1/2 of the participants (54.2%) went to the Michigan State University Special Communication Seminar during their sojourn. More than 1 out of 3 participants (36.7%) had not attended a Special Communication Seminar at the time of their interview at DETRI.

Q. Did participants programmed by the A/IT training branches vary in the Special Communication Seminar they attended?

SPECIAL COMMUNICATION SEMINAR	PERCENTAGE (%) BY TRAINING BRANCH					TOTAL N
	PSB	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
MSU	91.0	92.9	95.0	76.2	80.5	(466)
OTHER	9.0	7.1	5.0	23.8	19.5	(71)
TOTAL N	(67)	(113)	(100)	(42)	(215)	(537)

The participants programmed by the Latin America and the Africa Training Branches were more likely to go to a Special Communication Seminar not run by Michigan State University than were those programmed by the other training branches.

Q. How satisfied were the participants with the Special Communication Seminars they attended? (Item 106)

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely satisfied)	29.5
2	27.7
3	22.0
4	12.2
5	4.2
6	3.9
7 (Not at all satisfied)	0.6

TOTAL N	(542)

80% of the participants attending Special Communication Seminars rated them above the middle point on the satisfaction scale.

151

Q. How much of the subject matter covered in a Special Communication Seminar do the participants think they will be able to use in their work? (Item 105)

AMOUNT USABLE	PERCENTAGE %
All	15.1
Almost all	24.5
Most	30.4
Some	24.2
Little	5.7

TOTAL N	(542)

70% of the participants attending a Special Communication Seminar thought that they would be able to use a majority (all, almost all, most) of the subject matter covered when they arrived home.

Q. What problems did the participants have at their Special Communication Seminar? (Item 104)

PROBLEM WITH SPECIAL COMMUNICATION SEMINAR	PERCENTAGE (%) HAVING PROBLEM*		TOTAL N
	Yes	No	
Too many lectures	23.8	77.2	(540)
Subject matter not specific	37.0	63.0	(543)
Instruction too detailed	18.3	81.7	(540)
Too much repetition	25.3	74.7	(542)
Not enough discussion	20.4	79.6	(540)
Lack of social activities	42.1	57.9	(546)

*Percentages add to 100% by rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

The two problems mentioned most frequently by participants who attended the Special Communication Seminar were a lack of social activities (42.1%) and subject matter that was not specific enough (37%).

CHAPTER VIII

PARTICIPANTS' VIEWS ON ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH THEIR TRAINING PROGRAMS

Section A

Participants' Experiences Prior to Departure for the United States

- Q. Did the participants feel they had enough time after notification of their selection by AID to make necessary occupational and social arrangements prior to their trip to the U.S.? (Item 7)

HAD ENOUGH TIME	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	70.6
No	28.6

TOTAL N	(859)

Seven out of every 10 participants (70.6%) felt they had sufficient time to arrange their affairs at home after they were officially notified of their selection by AID.

Q. Did the participants feel they had enough time to pack and otherwise get ready for their trip to the U.S. after being notified of their date of departure? (Item 9)

HAD ENOUGH TIME	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	59.2
No	40.0

TOTAL N	(859)

Six out of 10 participants (59.2%) felt they had sufficient time to pack and prepare for their trip to the U.S. after being notified of their date of departure.

Q. Did participants from different regions vary in their feelings about the sufficiency of the time they had after notification of their selection by AID for making necessary occupational and social arrangements? (Item 7)

HAD ENOUGH TIME	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	66.8	76.3	62.6	74.0	(605)
No	33.2	23.7	37.4	26.0	(246)

TOTAL N	(241)	(211)	(107)	(292)	(851)

The African (74.0%) and Far Eastern (76.3%) participants were more likely to feel they had sufficient time after notification of their selection by AID than were the participants from the Near East-South Asia (66.8%) and Latin America (62.6%).

Q. Did participants from different regions vary in their feelings about the sufficiency of time available after being notified of their date of departure to pack and otherwise get ready for their trip? (Item 9)

HAD ENOUGH TIME	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	53.8	62.3	51.9	65.4	(508)
No	46.3	37.7	48.1	34.6	(344)
TOTAL N	(240)	(212)	(108)	(292)	(852)

The African (65.4%) and the Far Eastern participants (62.3%) were more likely than the Near East-South Asian (53.8%) and Latin American (51.9%) participants to feel they had enough time to get ready as they wanted after being notified of their date of departure.

Section B

PARTICIPANTS' PROBLEMS
WITH THEIR TRAVEL ARRANGEMENTS

Q. What problems did the participants have with their travel arrangements in the United States? (Item 95)

PROBLEM WITH TRAVEL	PERCENTAGE (%) HAVING PROBLEM*	
	Yes	No
No companionship	21.5	78.1
No help or information	9.1	90.6
Not being met	27.7	71.6
No lodging arranged	13.4	85.4
Trips too long	24.6	74.7
Trips too short	38.1	60.3
TOTAL N	(859)	

*Percentages add to 100% across rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

The problem mentioned most often (38.1%) was that the participants found their trips too short; no opportunity was provided them to see the country. Less than 10% of the participants indicated that they had travel problems due to a lack of help or information.

Q. Did participants programmed by different A/IT training branches vary in their problems with long and tiring trips? (Item 95e)

TRIPS LONG AND TIRING	PERCENTAGE (%) BY TRAINING BRANCH					TOTAL N
	PSB	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	26.1	15.3	30.6	19.1	28.8	(211)
No	73.9	84.7	69.4	80.9	71.2	(640)
TOTAL N	(142)	(183)	(173)	(89)	(264)	(851)

Participants programmed by the Near East-South Asia and Latin America Branches of A/IT less often reported problems with trips being long and tiring than did participants programmed by the other A/IT training branches.

Q. Did participants programmed by different A/IT training branches vary in their problems with being met at airports or depots? (Item 95c)

HAD PROBLEM WITH BEING MET	PERCENTAGE (%) BY TRAINING BRANCH					TOTAL N
	PSB	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	18.4	20.4	25.7	23.3	41.4	(238)
No	81.6	79.6	74.3	76.7	58.6	(613)
TOTAL N	(141)	(186)	(171)	(90)	(263)	(851)

Participants programmed by the Africa Branch of A/IT more often reported problems with not being met at airports and depots than participants programmed by the other A/IT training branches.

158

Section C

PARTICIPANTS' EXPERIENCES, PROBLEMS, AND
EVALUATIONS IN REGARD TO THEIR LIVING ARRANGEMENTS

Q. How satisfied were the participants with their living arrangements in the United States? (Item 69)

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely satisfied)	27.0
2	34.7
3	19.7
4	9.3
5	5.0
6	2.1
7 (Not at all satisfied)	1.5

TOTAL N	(859)

27% of the participants were "extremely satisfied" with their living arrangements and felt "they could not have been better." 81.4% rated their satisfaction with housing above the middle point on the scale.

Q. Did participants in different training programs vary in their ratings of satisfaction with their living arrangements? (Item 69)

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE (%) IN TYPE OF PROGRAM		TOTAL N
	ACAD	SPEC	
1	20.9	31.0	(232)
2	31.3	37.1	(298)
3	25.6	16.3	(169)
4-7	22.2	15.6	(154)
-----	-----	-----	-----
TOTAL N	(320)	(533)	(853)

The participants in Academic training programs were less often satisfied with their living arrangements than participants in Special training programs.

Q. What types of housing did the participants have at the place where they stayed the longest time in the U.S.? (Item 66)

TYPE OF HOUSING	PERCENTAGE (%)*
Hotel	23.8
Motel	5.1
YMCA-YWCA	5.7
Room in private home	10.1
Dormitory	29.2
Apartment	44.2
House	6.1

TOTAL N	(859)

*Percentages add to more than 100% because participants were allowed more than one answer.

More participants lived in apartments (44.2%) at the place where they stayed longest in the U.S. than in any other type of housing. The other two types of housing lived in by more than 20% of the participants were dormitories (29.2%) and hotels (23.8%).

Q. How long did the participants live in the place where they stayed the longest time in the U.S.? (Item 67)

LENGTH OF TIME	PERCENTAGE (%)
Less than 30 days	10.7
1 to 4 months	33.0
5 to 12 months	33.6
More than 12 months	21.1

TOTAL N	(859)

About 2 out of 3 participants (66.6%) lived between 1 and 12 months at the place where they stayed longest in the U.S. Almost an equal number stayed 1 to 4 months (33.0%), as stayed 5 to 12 months (33.6%). 21.1% of the participants lived over 1 year in the place where they stayed longest.

Q. Did participants in different training programs vary in the types of housing they lived in longest during their sojourns? (Item 66)

TYPE OF HOUSING	PERCENTAGE (%) IN TYPE OF PROGRAM		TOTAL N
	ACAD	SPEC	
Apartment	59.4	35.3	(380)
Dormitory	34.1	26.3	(251)
Hotel	4.4	35.3	(204)
-----	-----	-----	-----
TOTAL N	(313)	(526)	(835)

Participants in Academic training programs more often lived in apartments than did participants in Special training programs. Participants in Special training programs more often lived in hotels. This result is, of course, not unexpected. The results are reported to provide exact figures and a comparison with the other tables on the types of housing participants in different training programs occupied.

Q. Did participants who lived in apartments vary in their ratings of satisfaction with living arrangements? (Items 66f & 69)

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE (%) LIVING IN APARTMENT		TOTAL N
	Yes	No	
1	20.7	32.4	(232)
2	37.4	33.0	(298)
3	21.8	18.3	(169)
4-7	20.2	16.4	(154)
TOTAL N	(377)	(476)	(853)

The participants who lived in apartments gave lower ratings of satisfaction with living arrangements than participants who did not live in apartments.

Q. Did participants who lived in dormitories vary in their ratings of satisfaction with living arrangements? (Items 66e & 69)

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE (%) LIVING IN DORMITORY		TOTAL N
	Yes	No	
1	33.6	24.5	(232)
2	28.4	27.6	(298)
3	20.4	19.6	(169)
4-7	17.6	18.2	(154)
----- TOTAL N	(250)	(603)	(853)

Participants who lived in dormitories in the United States more often said they were "extremely satisfied" with their living arrangements (1 rating on the scale) than participants who did not live in dormitories.

Q. Did participants who lived in hotels vary in their ratings of satisfaction with living arrangements? (Items 66a & 69)

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE (%) LIVING IN HOTEL		TOTAL N
	Yes	No	
1	35.3	24.7	(232)
2	35.8	34.7	(298)
3	14.7	21.4	(169)
4-7	14.2	19.3	(154)
TOTAL N	(204)	(649)	(853)

Participants who lived in U.S. hotels gave higher ratings of satisfaction with living arrangements than participants who did not live in hotels.

Q. Did participants from different regions live in apartments in different proportions? (Item 66i)

LIVED IN APARTMENT	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	59.3	40.6	37.0	37.3	(380)
No	40.7	59.4	63.0	62.7	(478)
TOTAL N	(243)	(212)	(108)	(295)	(858)

The participants from the Near East-South Asia more often reported living in apartments than did the participants from the other regions.

Q. Did participants from different regions live in dormitories in different proportions? (Item 66e)

LIVED IN DORMITORY	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	23.9	27.8	21.3	37.6	(251)
No	76.1	72.2	78.7	62.4	(607)
TOTAL N	(243)	(212)	(108)	(295)	(858)

The participants from Africa more often reported living in dormitories than did participants from the other regions.

There was not a statistically significant difference by regions among the participants who reported that they lived in a hotel at the place where they stayed longest in the United States.

Q. With whom did the participants live in the United States?
(Item 65)

LIVING COMPANIONS	PERCENTAGE (%)*
Own family	8.4
Home country AID trainees	55.6
Other country AID trainees	36.9
Foreign nationals other than AID trainees	24.7
U.S. students	32.2
Other U.S. citizens	23.2
Lived alone only	12.2

TOTAL N	(859)

*Percentages add to more than 100% because participants were allowed more than one answer.

Participants lived with other AID trainees from their home country more often than any other group (55.6%). Only 1 participant in 8 (12.2%) reported living alone during his entire sojourn, and only 1 in 12 (8.4%) said he had his family with him.

Q. From whom did participants get help in finding housing at their training sites? (Items 62 & 63)

HELP WITH HOUSING	PERCENTAGE* %
No one	12.5
AID representatives	28.3
Other government agency officials	18.0
Officials at training site	54.4
Other Americans	11.4
Fellow nationals	19.6
Visitors from other countries	5.7
<hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/>	
TOTAL N	(859)

*Percentages add to more than 100% because participants were allowed more than one answer.

Participants got help most frequently from officials at their training sites (54.4%). Representatives of AID provide help to the second highest proportion of participants (28.3%) Foreign visitors from countries other than the participant's home country were the least often used sources of help in finding housing.

Q. How useful did the participants find the help they got in locating housing at their training sites? (Item 64)

UTILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE (%)
1 (Extremely useful)	56.3
2	22.7
3	10.5
4	5.3
5.	3.1
6	1.2
7 (Not at all useful)	1.0

TOTAL N	(736)

A majority of the participants (56.3%) found the help "extremely useful"; "could not have been better. 90% of the participants rated the utility of the help above the middle point on the scale.

Q. What problems did participants have with their housing arrangements? (Item 68)

PROBLEM WITH HOUSING	PERCENTAGE (%) HAVING PROBLEM*	
	Yes	No
No information about housing	26.4	72.1
Cost too great	56.0	43.0
Below desired living standard	20.6	77.8
Troublesome landlord	9.8	88.0
Too far from training site	21.9	77.4
Too far from businesses	22.4	76.4
Inadequate transportation	25.3	73.9
Undesirable location	13.4	85.4
Separation from friends	12.7	86.3
Too much noise	21.0	77.9
No cooking facilities	25.8	73.3
TOTAL N	(859)	

*Percentages add to 100% across rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

The problem noted by the highest proportion of participants was that the cost of housing was too high (56.0%). No other problem was mentioned by more than 26% of the participants. Only 9.8% of the participants had a troublesome landlord and less than 15% mentioned being in an undesirable location (13.4%) or being separated from people they wanted to live with (12.7%).

Q. Did participants from different regions vary in their problems with the cost of housing? (Item 68b)

HAD HOUSING COST PROBLEMS	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	50.8	54.5	51.9	64.7	(481)
No	49.2	45.5	48.1	35.3	(368)
TOTAL N	(240)	(211)	(106)	(292)	(849)

Participants from Africa more often reported problems with the cost of housing than participants from any other region.

Q. Did participants in different training programs vary in their problems with the cost of housing? (Item 68b)

HAD HOUSING COST PROBLEM	PERCENTAGE (%) IN TYPE OF PROGRAM		TOTAL N
	ACAD	SPEC	
Yes	62.7	52.9	(481)
No	37.2	47.1	(369)
TOTAL N	(317)	(533)	(850)

The participants in Academic training programs more often reported problems with the cost of housing than did the participants in Special training programs.

Q. Did participants in different training programs vary in their problems with the living standards of their housing? (Item 68c)

LIVED BELOW DESIRED STANDARD	PERCENTAGE (%) IN TYPE OF PROGRAM		TOTAL N
	ACAD	SPEC	
Yes	26.3	17.7	(177)
No	73.7	82.7	(668)
TOTAL N	(315)	(530)	(845)

The participants in Academic training programs more often reported problems with their housing being below their desired standard of living than did the participants in Special training programs.

Q. Did participants in different training programs vary in their problems with being too far from the training site? (Item 68e)

TOO FAR FROM SITE	PERCENTAGE (%) IN TYPE OF PROGRAM		TOTAL N
	ACAD	SPEC	
Yes	14.8	26.4	(188)
No	85.2	73.6	(665)
TOTAL N	(318)	(535)	(853)

Participants in Special training programs more often reported problems with being too far from their training sites than did participants in Academic training programs.

Q. Did participants from different regions vary in their problems of eating as they wanted? (item 68k)

HAD EATING PROBLEM	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	22.4	33.6	18.7	26.4	(222)
No	77.6	66.4	81.3	73.6	(629)
TOTAL N	(241)	(211)	(107)	(292)	(851)

The participants from the Far East had the most difficulty eating as they wanted, while the participants from Latin America had the least difficulty.

Section D

PARTICIPANTS' PROBLEMS WITH THEIR MONEY ALLOWANCES

Q. What problems did the participants have with AID money allowances during their U.S. sojourns? (Item 96)

PROBLEM WITH MONEY	PERCENTAGE (%) HAVING PROBLEM*	
	Yes	No
Unable to maintain usual standard of living	43.0	56.3
Not enough money for books and training material	47.0	52.5
Travel per diem too small	52.3	46.4
Not enough money for other program expenses	36.7	55.4
Not enough money for personal expenses	50.5	43.0
TOTAL N	(859)	

*Percentages add to 100% across rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

Between 37% and 52% of the participants had some problems with their per diem and money allowances.

Q. Did participants from different regions vary in their difficulties in maintaining their usual standard of living in the United States? (Item 96a)

UNABLE TO MAINTAIN USUAL LIVING STANDARD	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	41.3	31.8	55.8	48.8	(369)
No	58.7	68.2	44.2	51.2	(483)
TOTAL N	(242)	(211)	(104)	(295)	(852)

The participants from the Far East least often reported difficulty in maintaining their usual standard of living in the United States, while the participants from Latin America most often reported this difficulty.

Q. Did participants in different training programs vary in their difficulties in maintaining their usual standard of living in the United States? (Item 96a)

UNABLE TO MAINTAIN USUAL LIVING STANDARD	PERCENTAGE (%) IN TYPE OF PROGRAM		TOTAL N
	ACAD	SPEC	
Yes	52.8	37.6	(369)
No	47.2	62.4	(484)
TOTAL N	(318)	(535)	(853)

The participants in Academic training programs more often had difficulties in maintaining their usual standard of living in the United States than did the participants in Special training programs.

Q. Did participants from different regions vary in their problems with the AID money allowance for books and training materials? (Item 96b)

TOO LITTLE BOOK ALLOWANCE	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR	
Yes	35.5	53.1	44.3	53.7	(403)
No	64.5	46.9	55.7	46.3	(450)
TOTAL N	(242)	(211)	(106)	(294)	(853)

The participants from the Near East-South Asia and Latin America least often reported problems with their book allowances than did the participants from Africa and the Far East.

Q. Did participants in different fields of training vary in their problems with the AID money allowance for books and training materials? (Item 96b)

TOO LITTLE BOOK ALLOWANCE	PERCENTAGE (%) IN FIELD OF TRAINING			TOTAL N
	AGRIC	ED	PA	
Yes	51.4	41.4	46.3	(263)
No	38.6	53.7	53.7	(262)
TOTAL N	(184)	(164)	(177)	(525)

Participants in Agriculture most often reported difficulty in buying books and training material with the money allotted by AID. Participants in Education least often reported this difficulty.

There was not a statistically significant relationship between the participants' training programs and their reports of problems with money allowances for books and training materials.

Q. Did participants in different fields of training vary in their problems with the AID money allowance for program expenses? (Item 96d)

TOO LITTLE MONEY FOR PROGRAM EXPENSES	PERCENTAGE (%) IN FIELD OF TRAINING			TOTAL N
	AGRIC	ED	PA	
Yes	35.0	52.0	41.4	(206)
No	65.0	48.0	58.6	(280)
TOTAL N	(177)	(152)	(157)	(486)

Participants in Education significantly more often reported difficulty in meeting their program expenses with their AID money allowance than did participants in other fields of training. (These expenses include, e.g., those for laboratory fees, typing of theses, purchase of equipment, shipping books and private training school fees.)

Q. Did participants in different training programs vary in their problems with the AID money allowances for program expenses other than books, training materials, and travel per diem? (Item 96d)

TOO LITTLE MONEY FOR PROGRAM EXPENSES	PERCENTAGE (%) IN TYPE OF PROGRAM		TOTAL N
	ACAD	SPEC	
Yes	46.6	35.6	(315)
No	53.4	64.4	(476)
TOTAL N	(305)	(486)	(791)

The participants in Academic training programs more often had problems with their money allowances for program expenses than did the participants in Special training programs.

Q. Did participants in different training programs vary in their problems with money available for personal expenses? (Item 96e)

TOO LITTLE MONEY FOR PERSONAL EXPENSES	PERCENTAGE (%) IN TYPE OF PROGRAM		TOTAL N
	ACAD	SPEC	
Yes	62.6	48.8	(434)
No	37.4	51.2	(369)
TOTAL N	(305)	(498)	(803)

The participants in Academic training programs more often reported problems in handling their personal expenses with their AID per diem than did the participants in Special training programs.

CHAPTER IX
INDIVIDUAL, ORAL INTERVIEWS

Section A

Individual Interview Objectives and Procedures*

Individual, oral interviews are held with Academic and Special program participants as the second phase of their exit interview. During the Standard Introduction to the participants that begins the exit interview, a clear distinction is made between the objectives and use of the structured questionnaire and the oral interview. Participants are assured of anonymity in the latter. Information provided in the oral interviews is treated confidentially and is reported to AID only in aggregate form.

The main objective of the oral interviews is to obtain interviewer assessments of participant attitudes toward U.S. experiences. While the questionnaire is best for obtaining descriptive information and evaluations of various aspects of the participant's training program, important attitudinal

*The topics and ratings presented in this chapter are from a sample of 631 of the 859 exit interviews conducted at DETRI between July 17, 1967, and January 31, 1968. The missing data are due to unreliable coding done on some of the earlier interviews; participants who did not receive an individual interview at DETRI because of other pretesting, lack of time, language difficulties, or illness; and participants who were given the exit interview questionnaire in other cities where facilities for the individual interviews were not available. In terms of region, training program, and education, the sample of 631 is representative of the 859 participants for whom data are presented in the earlier chapters of this report.

information is frequently better expressed in a spontaneous and confidential exchange of views.

To reach this objective, it is necessary to keep the interview process relatively unstructured, in a technical sense. A predetermined question and answer approach would not permit the rapport that is necessary for the participant to speak freely to the interviewer and would miss many topics that are of concern to him. Therefore, the interviews are conducted as conversations between the participant and the interviewer, using an unstructured, but focused approach to ensure that the conversation centers around the participant's experiences in the United States.

When the participant speaks spontaneously, as the majority do, the interviewer asks questions only when necessary for clarification or to elaborate the conversation. In those instances when the participant is somewhat reticent, the interviewer usually elicits comments by the use of more direct questions about the relevance of the participant's training program or about any unusual patterns of response the participant made in his written questionnaire. Only those topics which stem from these techniques are elicited directly by the interviewer.

Participants have almost always responded favorably to the individual, oral interviews. The interviewers felt that approximately 2 out of every 3 participants had experienced a definite feeling of personal communication. A number of participants spontaneously expressed appreciation for the opportunity to talk at length to a sympathetic, knowledgeable, and understanding listener. For example, a woman from the Far East said, "What a wonderful thing to be

able to talk about my experiences. You are the first person I've met who understands"; and a man from Latin America commented, "It is good to have had a chance to talk with someone about my experiences," adding that because of his difficulty in speaking English it had been hard for him to talk to anyone during his stay. In several cases, serious misconceptions were corrected and unfounded anxieties allayed by the interviewer (e.g., a Nigerian who thought he was being sent back to Biafra was convinced he actually would be returning to Cameroon, as AID had informed him).

To give an indication of the quality of the communication process, the interviewer is asked to rate his rapport with each participant. For the interviews on which data are presented in this chapter, the ratings are as follows:

Table 1

RATING OF RAPPORT	PERCENTAGE %
Excellent	21.7
Good	42.6
Average	24.3
Poor	10.4
None	1.0
<hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/>	
TOTAL N	(617)

In about 9 out of 10 interviews (89%) therefore, the interviewer felt that his rapport with the participant was as good or better than average for a personal conversation.

Section B

INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEW RATINGS

During the interview, the interviewer makes simple notations as necessary to recall the content of the conversation. As soon as possible thereafter, he prepares a narrative write-up of the conversation. The write-up is then analyzed by the interviewer. The various topics are listed. Notations are made if the interviewer feels any of the topics were of pervasive concern to the participant. A number of ratings of the participant's attitudes, based on the interviewer's evaluations of direct attitudinal statements and inferences drawn from the participants' discussion of topics, are made.

Before meeting the participant, the individual interviewer looks over his responses on the structured questionnaire. This permits a second check on the completeness of the questionnaire, and alerts the interviewer to special concerns of the participant. After the individual interview is completed, the interviewer indicates whether or not he has any reason to suspect the participant's answers on the questionnaire. This rating, which is based on the information spontaneously provided by the participant in the interview, is usually of an inferential nature, since the participant is not asked direct questions about his questionnaire responses. Results from these ratings are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

RATING OF QUESTIONNAIRE VALIDITY	PERCENTAGE %
Suspect	10.8
Do not suspect	89.2

TOTAL N	(594)

In about 9 out of 10 individual interviews, nothing the participant said led the interviewer to doubt the validity of his responses on the structured questionnaire.*

The interviewer also makes ratings of the participant's feelings about the United States, AID and/or his participating agency, and his training institution(s). These are ratings of change in the participant's attitudes between the beginning of his program and the time of his exit interview. Thus, a participant who the interviewer feels began with positive feelings about the United States and still has a positive attitude toward it at the time of the interview is rated as having stayed the same in his attitude.

*In those few cases where the interviewer does discover a discrepancy between the participant's written and oral statements, due to a misunderstanding of the questionnaire item, he brings it to the participant's attention near the conclusion of the interview, and corrects it with the participant's consent.

Results from these ratings are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

RATING OF ATTITUDE CHANGE	PARTICIPANT'S ATTITUDE TOWARD*		
	U.S. %	AID and/or Part. Agency %	Training Institution %
Has become more positive	66.4	43.6	60.4
Has stayed the same	20.7	30.4	20.7
Has become more negative	12.9	26.0	18.9
TOTAL N	(604)	(578)	(502)

*The total numbers for each category vary, and are less than 631, because there were some instances when the interviewer did not have sufficient evidence to make one or more of these judgments. In addition, the category "training institution" was not relevant for participants in Special programs whose training consisted primarily of observational visits.

As might be expected, the data show that AID and/or the participating agency have more often become more negatively viewed than either the United States or the participant's training institution. It is likely that these more negative attitudes are based mainly on the rules and regulations that these agencies must enforce with participants in the United States. It is the conflicts produced by these rules that participants often spontaneously talk about (as indicated by the topics listed in Table 4). The United States, on the other hand, is a broad category, including people,

institutions, and values toward which most participants were generally favorably disposed. Training institutions were seen almost as positively as the United States by the participants who mentioned them, in the interviewers' opinions. It should be noted that in all three ratings, the interviewers thought that more participants had become more favorably disposed than had become less favorably disposed during their sojourns.

When the interviewer analyzes his write-ups to list topics and their pervasiveness, he assesses the meaning of the participant's remarks in context. For example, if the central point made by the participant is judged to be the quality of his training program, this is the topic listed. However, if the participant mentions the quality of his program primarily in the context of a concern with the relevance of his training, the latter heading would be listed. Thus the topics listed represent general themes in the individual interview and not an exhaustive categorization of everything the participant mentions. Topics mentioned by more than 10% of the participants are listed in Table 4 in order of relative frequency from most often to least often mentioned. It should be recalled from the discussion of the interviewing techniques used (Section A), that with the possible exception of the first topic listed in Table 4 (Relevance of training program for participant) the mentioning of topics is usually spontaneously initiated by the participant.

Table 4

TOPIC	PERCENTAGE (%) MENTIONING
Relevance of training program for participant	67.7
Experiences with American hospitality	57.2
Experiences involving discrimination	45.0
Program Development Officer, Program Officer, and other program officials	40.0
Length of training program	34.5
American technology	32.6
Opinions of American family life	31.5
AID rules	29.6
Participant's family separation	29.5
Participant's personal experiences in the United States	29.0
Types of living arrangements	23.8
Opinions of American youth	23.4
American food	23.0
Current world affairs	20.6
Participant's housing	20.1
Relevance of training program for participant's home country	19.2
Opinions of American foreign policy	19.2
American university degree	18.4
AID/participant interactions	16.8
American characteristics and behavior	16.3
Specific aspects of the training program	15.2
The participant's home country	13.5
Americans' knowledge of participant's home country	13.2
American educational system	13.0
Training program instructors and facilities	12.8

Table 4 (continued)

TOPIC	PERCENTAGE (%) MENTIONING
Opinions of race relations in the United States	12.5
Climate in the United States	11.7
Opinions of poverty in the United States	11.6
Experiences with American sincerity	11.6
USAID Mission in home country	11.4
Opinions of American customs and manners	11.1

TOTAL N	(631)

The two topics that were mentioned by more than 1/2 of the Academic and Special program participants in their individual, oral interviews were the relevance of their training programs in terms of their interests, abilities, and home country job needs (67.7%), and the hospitality they received in U.S. homes (57.2%). 45% of these participants spoke about discrimination against themselves or others they knew, based on color, nationality, sex, status, and/or being an AID participant; while 40% mentioned the people responsible for arranging and/or managing their training programs. About 1 participant out of 3 mentioned their training program's length (34.5%); America's technological skill and development (32.6%); family life and marriage in the United States (31.5%); AID rules and regulations governing their behavior in the United States (29.6%); and/or problems in being separated from loved ones (29.5%).

In addition, there were another 20 topics discussed by between 1% and 9% of these participants. (The latter

are not shown in Table 4.) Thus, it is apparent that a wide range of pertinent information is being gathered through the individual oral interviews.

Table 5 lists in rank order the 10 topics most frequently rated by the interviewers as being pervasively discussed by the participants. To provide an impression of the tone of these conversations, the number of participants who spoke pervasively about each topic is divided into those whose comments were generally positive and those whose comments were generally negative.

Table 5

PERVASIVE TOPICS	NUMBER MAKING POSITIVE COMMENTS	NUMBER MAKING NEGATIVE COMMENTS	TOTAL N
Relevance of training program for participant	16	27	43
Program Development Officer, Program Officer, and other program officials	14	15	29
Experiences involving discrimination	0	28	28
Opportunity to come to the United States	25	0	25
American university degree	15	6	21
AID rules	0	16	16
Training program instructors and facilities	15	1	16
Participant's family separation	0	14	14
Experiences with American hospitality	14	0	14
Length of training program	2	11	13

Section C

INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWER IMPRESSIONS

Looking forward to the Annual Analytic Report, a great deal of useful information remains to be extracted from the write-ups of the individual, oral interviews. Further analyses of the content will provide a list of critical incidents which color the total impression some participants have of their U.S. experience. Topics can be further refined and categorized as positive or negative ideas or experiences and related to participants' satisfactions. Breakdowns of the data by participants' training programs, regions, fields of training, etc., will be possible as more participants are interviewed. Additional dimensions of the participant and the interview conversations to be rated by the interviewers are being developed.

To provide an idea of the wealth of information that is already available, the individual interviewers each wrote a summary of ideas expressed by the participants that they wanted to communicate to A/IT. These summaries were integrated into one report which makes up the last section of this chapter. The ideas presented below are not intended to be policy recommendations. They are not necessarily representative of all the participants, nor even any sub-grouping thereof, nor are they always consistent. However, they do provide a sample of the kinds of suggestions that are being obtained through the individual oral interview process.

To provide a proper perspective, it is important to note that the suggestions offered by the participants for improving the AID training programs are made in light of a generally favorable impression of the United States and the training they received. Most of the participants viewed their training programs as well-organized, high in quality, and rewarding, in their technical and professional aspects. Participants who have the opportunity to actively participate in appropriate on-the-job training are very enthusiastic. Almost all the participants expressed their appreciation for the opportunity to come to the United States and broaden their technical and social horizons, and Americans were seen as friendly and helpful by a large majority of the participants.

Home Country Selection and Preparation

Selection of participants on the basis of English language facility has been good. Only rarely have participants reported or demonstrated serious problems with English; even these cases seemed to be more a lack of self-confidence than of ability.

Participants have reported a lack of information from USAID on the nature of their training, the institution(s) they will attend, and where they will be in the United States (with regard to the type of climate to be prepared for). They would like to have this information two or three weeks in advance of the USAID orientation, to allow them to prepare questions. Training programs described in the PIO/Ps are not always followed in the United States. Many participants do not understand why there are discrepancies.

Some participants have requested that the information given them about the United States be accompanied by more

explanation and by comparisons with things in their home culture. Those who will be studying a particular government operation often want more details about that section of the government; academic students would appreciate information on how the American educational system differs from theirs in types of examination given, grading, classroom discussions, study techniques, etc.

Participants who must make provision for their families and/or relatives during their absence have reported inadequate amount of notice regarding their departure date.

Arrival, Orientations, and Communication Seminars

Careful planning of a participant's first days in the United States is important. Instructions for reaching someone with whom they can communicate during this time gives many participants a feeling of welcome and security.

In U.S. orientation programs, lectures on the American way of life, government, and individual freedom are sometimes viewed as "indoctrination." Many participants would like to have more panel presentations with the opportunity for question and answer sessions, and less lectures.

Many participants have been enthusiastic about the Communication Seminar and the Washington International Center program. They have felt the discussions were important, and have found that the opportunity to share experiences with participants from all over the world helped to overcome many prejudices they had held.

The Role of the PDO

Program Officers and/or Arrangers who are knowledgeable about the participants' fields of training and the needs of their home countries are always praised by the participants.

Most participants have little understanding of the variety and number of tasks a PDO has. To a participant, the PDO often initially appears as personal advisor and arranger. These participants expect regular contact, by both correspondence and periodic visits. A lack of these is seen by some as personal rejection, or is confusing. Efforts to keep in touch on more than routine administrative matters are appreciated.

Often a participant does not know who has the final decision on requests he makes and holds the PDO responsible for all such decisions. Equally important is the feeling of some participants that their requests for changes in their training program are not being given serious consideration. Often this results from the participant's not having been informed of his PDO's efforts to assist him or not being given reasons for the PDO's inability to do so. Of course, when requested changes are made, the PDO gets the credit.

Training Programs

A minority of participants have been given training programs that they feel have little relevance to the needs and resources of their home countries and/or their jobs. The work-oriented participant tends to feel so strongly about receiving any irrelevant training that this negatively affects his general attitude toward AID and the United

States, even though he considers much of his training quite relevant and high in quality.

Training programs are sometimes felt to be too advanced for the present conditions in developing countries. This is particularly true of academic programs.

Some Academic participants have indicated they would like more applied training during the summer. Others would like to take additional academic work, or a seminar-type program. U.S. degrees are very important to many participants and the opportunity to earn one while here is greatly appreciated. However, when participants spend considerable time in academic work and are not permitted to earn a degree, this is frequently a source of dissatisfaction that leads to negative feelings about their entire sojourn experience.

Groups of Special program participants attending classes sometimes prefer homogeneous groupings so that the lectures can be addressed to their common interests at their level of competence.

Timing of applied training is sometimes reported as a problem, as for instance when Special program participants are scheduled for on-the-job training in construction or farming during the winter, or for training in education during the summer. Participants often prefer training sites that are similar to the area in the home country where they live and work.

Observation Training Visits

Participants have reported that on some of their observation tour visits to private businesses they are not

expected. In some instances, officials at these sites know nothing about the backgrounds and interests of the trainees or the types of activities they wish to observe. Participants are sometimes asked what they would like to see--a question they often do not expect and sometimes cannot answer.

Many participants in Special training programs have expressed a desire for longer assignments at training sites to allow time for actual practice and for absorbing information and because short trips are tiring and result in a feeling of being hurried. Frequently, when a large number of places are visited, participants report considerable duplication in the kinds of processes observed. Participants have felt they would have profited more from fewer trips which were more carefully coordinated and explained in advance. They have mentioned a need for an overall picture of the interrelations of various kinds and places of work observed.

Housing and Living Arrangements

A number of participants have encountered problems in finding suitable housing, stemming primarily from their unfamiliarity with housing conditions and methods of finding housing in the United States. Also, discrimination on the part of realtors and landlords has been referred to frequently by many of the African participants, especially those who are younger.

Many participants have mentioned the importance of having access to a kitchen, to enable them to prepare their own dishes. This seems to be important in combatting homesickness, as well as in providing a change from what many find to be bland American food.

Participants from cultures where family ties are strong have often been more comfortable living with a friendly American family than alone in an apartment or with fellow nationals. This is especially true for young women from these cultures. Home hospitality is enjoyed by all participants, almost without exception.

When reservations for housing are made ahead of time (as on observation tours), participants frequently report that the cost is excessive relative to the amount of their per diem.

AID Rules on Families and Automobiles

Many participants feel that it is a hardship to be separated from their families, particularly when they have a training program of more than a year's duration. In addition to loneliness, a gulf is sometimes created between spouses, the trainee being exposed to experiences the spouse at home has little knowledge of. Participants with longer programs who bring their spouses at their own expense often feel it has been worth the expense.

Participants who attend training sites in small towns and rural areas, where public transportation is inadequate or unavailable, frequently mention that the AID rules on driving make their stay in the United States more difficult. These participants sometimes make invidious comparisons with trainees who are in the United States on non-AID-sponsored training and are allowed to have their families with them and to own and/or operate automobiles.

APPENDIX

SELECTION PROCESS

ITEM 1

How did you become an AID Participant?

CATEGORY	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=859)*
I was nominated	81.5
I made a request	18.4

ITEM 2

Who encouraged you to take part in the AID training program?

PERSON (Multiple Answers Allowed)**	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=859)
No one	22.7
My boss	38.6
Representative(s) of my Government	31.2
AID Representative(s)	14.1

* In each table, the number included in parentheses indicates the total number of participants to which the percentage figures in the table apply.

** In those tables in which the phrase "Multiple Answers Allowed" appears, participants were permitted to check more than one item answer category, as appropriate to their experience. Therefore, the percentages in these tables will add to more than 100%.

ITEM 3

Before you were officially notified of your selection as an AID participant, did you have any interviews with officials?

RESPONSE	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=859)
Yes	60.7
No	37.8

ITEM 4

Who were the officials you had interviews with?

PERSON	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=522)
AID representatives	74.3
Home government representatives	53.1

ITEM 5

How long was the time between when you applied or were nominated and when you received official notice of your selection as an AID Participant?

MONTHS	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=859)
1	13.2
2	17.1
3	14.4
4 - 6	26.3
7 - 10	12.0
11 - 60	13.2

ITEM 6

How long was the time between when you received official notice of your selection as an AID Participant and when you received notice of the day you were to leave your country?

WEEKS	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=859)
1	16.3
2	17.6
3	11.2
4	12.2
5 - 11	20.2
12 - 99	19.2

ITEM 8

How long was the time between when you received notice of the date you were to leave your country and the day on which you left?

DAYS	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=859)
1 - 6	31.3
7	15.2
8 - 13	15.6
14 - 20	18.4
21 - 364	19.4

ITEM 10

Before you were officially notified of your selection as an AID Participant, did you have examinations of any kind?

RESPONSE	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=859)
Yes	71.6
No	27.5

ITEM 11

What were these examinations?

CATEGORY (Multiple answers allowed)	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=615)
English language	74.3
Medical*	72.8
Competitive	22.0

* Less than 100% is reported here because of the term "before you were officially notified of your selection".

ITEM 12

Did you have special training to prepare you for any of the exams you had before you were notified of selection?

RESPONSE	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=607)
Yes	32.9
No	67.1

PLANNING OF TRAINING

ITEM 23

Were any changes made in your training program before you reached the first training site?

RESPONSE	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=859)
Yes	23.4
No	75.9

ITEM 24

Who suggested the changes in your training program?

PERSON (Multiple Answers Allowed)	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=201)
Myself	36.8
My supervisor	17.4
AID representatives in my home country	22.4
Someone else in my home country	8.4
AID Program Development Officer in the U.S.	36.8
Other Program Officer in the U.S.	24.4
Personnel at the training site(s)	19.4

ITEM 25

Which of the following parts of your training program was changed?

CATEGORY (Multiple Answers Allowed)	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=201)
Objective(s) of training	23.9
Training site	36.3
Training program contents	49.2
Length of time of training program	49.2
Time allotted to each part of training program	22.4
How training is planned to be used upon return to home country	14.0

ITEM 26

Did you like the results of the change?

RESPONSE	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=243)
Yes	71.6
No	28.4

ORIENTATIONS

ITEM 32

At which of the places you visited did you hear about each of the following topics?

TOPICS (Multiple Answers Allowed)	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING					
	USAID in home country (N=770)	AID/ Washington D.C. (N=727)	Other U.S. Gov- ernment Agency (N=240)	Washington Inter- national Center (N=705)	Pre- Univ. Workshop (N=180)	A formal Univer- sity Or- ientation (N=210)
Travel & visa arrangements	96.9	46.8	29.2			20.0
Sickness & accident insurance	43.8	92.0	25.4			21.9
Money available from AID	69.5	77.0	50.8			9.0
AID rules on use of cars	66.1	72.8	24.2			13.3
AID rules about families	67.8	47.9	12.9			11.4
AID rules on medical care	46.5	90.5	22.9			16.2
AID rules about extending time	45.9	61.1	26.2			9.0
AID Exit Interview(s) and Evaluations	14.2	81.7	53.3	3.5		12.8
Practical facts for getting along in the U.S.	54.7	44.2	36.2	67.6		40.5
Kinds of U.S. social activities	39.4	30.9	28.3	77.6	33.9	44.8
Ways of life in the U.S.	49.5	28.2	27.9	79.6	38.9	53.8
Education in U.S. universities	31.7	21.2	28.3	54.0	65.6	72.8
Operation of the U.S. government	23.4	18.7	45.4	62.8	46.1	53.8
Economic facts about the U.S.	21.0	15.5	35.4	63.8	35.6	51.4
Religious life in the U.S.	20.5	11.4	17.5	69.4	36.7	41.4
Race relations in the U.S.	19.6	11.1	22.1	69.4	31.7	43.8

2-181

012

ACADEMIC PARTICIPANTS' TRAINING PROGRAM

ITEM 37

What type of student were you?

CATEGORY (Multiple Answers Allowed)	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=320)
Graduate student	64.7
Undergraduate student	30.6
Non-degree student	17.1

ITEM 41

Did you have a Faculty Advisor to help you with your academic program at the institution where you had most of your training?

RESPONSE	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=320)
Yes	96.9
No	2.8

ITEM 42

Did he help you arrange your course schedule?

RESPONSE	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=310)
Yes	96.8
No	3.2

ITEM 43

How often did your Faculty Advisor help you arrange your course schedule?

FREQUENCY	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=299)
Every school term	84.9
Most school terms	8.4
A few school terms	6.7

ITEM 56

Do you expect instruments and equipment similar to instruments and equipment used in your courses will be available in your home country in the near future?

RESPONSE	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=117)
Yes	83.8
No	16.2

SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS' TRAINING PROGRAM

ITEM 40

Do you expect instruments and equipment similar to instruments and equipment used in your courses will be available in your home country in the near future?

RESPONSE	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=143)
Yes	88.1
No	11.9

ITEM 44

Did anyone go with you on your observation training visits?

RESPONSE	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=508)
Yes	85.2
No	14.8

ITEM 45

From what countries did those accompanying you on your observation training visits come?

CATEGORY (Multiple Answers Allowed)	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=433)
United States	62.1
My home country	59.4
Other countries	55.4

ITEM 53

Do you expect instruments and equipment similar to instruments and equipment used in your on-the-job work experience will be available in your home country in the near future?

RESPONSE	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=112)
Yes	90.1
No	9.8

SOCIAL ACTIVITIES AND SERVICES

ITEM 71

Did you join any formal organizations in the United States, such as student or community clubs or professional societies?

RESPONSE	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=859)
Yes	48.3
No	51.1

ITEM 73

Were there any formal organizations you wanted to join but were not able to?

RESPONSE	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=859)
Yes	15.4
No	83.0

ITEM 80

Did you participate in any informal (self-motivated) activities?

RESPONSE	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=859)
Yes	53.4
No	45.4

ITEM 81

What were these activities?

ACTIVITIES (Multiple Answers Allowed)	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=459)
Playing sports	63.6
Acting in plays	7.6
Singing in groups	33.3
Playing in Bands	3.7
Dancing	53.6

ITEM 82

Were there any informal activities you wanted to participate in but were not able to?

RESPONSE	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=859)
Yes	16.5
No	82.5

ITEM 91

How often was your Foreign Student Advisor or Job Trainee Advisor available to help you?

FREQUENCY	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=533)
Always available	53.8
Usually available	28.8
Sometimes available	17.3

MONEY ALLOWANCES

ITEM 97

Did you find your per diem too small in any of the cities where you stayed?

RESPONSE	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=859)
Yes	57.5
No	40.0

SPECIAL COMMUNICATION SEMINAR

ITEM 101

Was any of the subject matter of your training program repeated in the subject matter of the Communication Seminar?

RESPONSE	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=539)
Yes	35.4
No	64.6

EXPECTED USE OF TRAINING

ITEM 111

Is there a specific job you will take when you return to your home country?

RESPONSE	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=859)
Yes	84.9
No	14.2

ITEM 112

Is this the same job you had before you came to the U.S.?

RESPONSE	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=745)
Yes	78.3
No	21.7

ITEM 113

Do you think your job responsibilities will be changed as a result of your AID training?

RESPONSE	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=614)
Yes	62.7
No	37.3

ITEM 114

Were changes in your job responsibilities planned for you before you began your AID training?

RESPONSE	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=395)
Yes	49.9
No	50.1

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

ITEM 124

What is your marital status?

CATEGORY	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=859)
Single	34.8
Married	64.1
Other	.7

ITEM 125

How many children do you have?

CHILDREN	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=493)
1	18.2
2	28.6
3	20.3
4 - 5	21.1
6 - 11	11.8

ITEM 131

Before this trip, have you taken any trips lasting one month or more outside your home country?

RESPONSE	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=859)
Yes	44.1
No	55.5

ITEM 132

Before this trip, how many months (total) had you spent outside your home country?

MONTHS	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=366)
1 - 3	24.0
4 - 6	16.2
7 - 9	7.1
10 - 12	12.6
13 - 24	14.8
25 - 36	7.1
37 - 99	18.3

ITEM 133

Before this trip, how many countries had you visited?

COUNTRIES	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=370)
1	23.0
2 - 3	31.1
4 - 6	21.1
7 - 11	16.4
12 - 36	8.4

ITEM 134

What was the major purpose of your longest trip?

CATEGORY	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=378)
Education	50.0
Technical Training	27.8
Employment	7.1
Visiting	15.1

ITEM 135

Before this trip, have you ever visited the United States?

RESPONSE	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=857)
Yes	15.8
No	83.9

ITEM 136

How many months (total) had you spent in the United States before this trip?

MONTHS	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=140)
1 - 3	23.6
4 - 6	20.0
7 - 11	13.6
12 - 75	42.8

ITEM 137

How many states had you visited?

STATES	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=140)
1 - 3	30.7
4 - 6	34.3
7 - 9	12.1
10 and over	22.8

ITEM 138

What was the major purpose of your longest visit before this trip?

CATEGORY	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=135)
Education	40.0
Technical training	37.8
Employment	6.7
Visiting	15.6

ITEM 139

How large was the place where you lived most of the time before you were 11 years of age?

SIZE	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=859)
Under population of 500	9.2
500 to 1,999	12.9
2,000 to 24,999	26.1
25,000 to 99,999	15.5
100,000 to 499,999	16.3
500,000 to 999,999	7.0
Over population of 1,000,000	12.6

ITEM 140

How large was the place where you lived most of the time after you were 18 years of age?

SIZE	PER CENT (%) RESPONDING (N=859)
Under population of 500	1.0
500 to 1,999	4.4
2,000 to 24,999	9.8
25,000 to 99,999	13.4
100,000 to 499,999	19.7
500,000 to 999,999	14.2
Over population of 1,000,000	36.7

Part 3. General Findings and Conclusions for
Observational Tour Groups

PREFACE

Part 3 of the report is based on data from 50 Observational Tour Groups, comprising 342 participants. In the interviews for each of these Tour Groups, the standard Observational Tour Group interview report form and questionnaire administration procedures for Observational Tour Groups were utilized.

In brief, the questionnaire used in a Tour Group interview is administered orally to the group,* the group members respond orally, and their responses are recorded by the interviewer and reported on the Observational Tour Group interview report form. The interviewer encourages all members of the Tour Group to participate fully in answering the questions and informs them that no individual group member will be identified in the report with any remark made in the interview. Answers given by each member of the group are recorded by the interviewer, but he does not attach names to the responses. Biographical information is obtained from A/IT on the Tour Group members.

Part 3 of the report contains 14 sections: (1) Principal Findings and Conclusions; (2) Description of the Tour Groups; (3) Overall Satisfaction of Participants with Their Training Program; (4) Pre-departure Preparations; (5) Washington International Center Orientations; (6) Participant Handbook; (7) Planning of Training Program; (8) Program

*The interview is conducted with the assistance of an interpreter when participants are not sufficiently fluent in English.

Content; (9) Travel and Living Arrangements; (10) Money Allowances and Expenses; (11) Personal and Social Experiences; (12) Communication Seminar; (13) Utilization of Training; and (14) Spontaneous Expression of Views by Participants.

The number of persons represented varies in some of the tables in Sections III-XIII because not all of the participants were required to answer all of the questions. In Section II the missing data is due to the fact that biographical information was not received by DETRI for some Observational Tour Group members.

CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>		<u>Page</u>
	Preface	11
I	Principal Findings and Conclusions	1
II	Description of the Tour Groups.	
	Size and Origin	5
	Participating Agency.	7
	Length of Program	10
	Language Used by Participants	11
	Age, Sex, and Education of Participants.	12
	Validity of Participant Responses	15
III	Overall Satisfaction of Participants with Training Program	18
IV	Pre-Departure Preparations.	20
	Selection	20
	Examinations.	20
	USAID Briefings	21
V	Washington International Center Orientation	23
VI	Participant Handbook.	26
VII	Planning of Training Program.	28
VIII	Program Content	30
IX	Travel and Living Arrangements.	34
X	Money Allowances and Expenses	35
XI	Personal and Social Experiences	37
XII	Communication Seminar	41

<u>Section</u>		<u>Page</u>
XIII	Utilization of Training	42
XIV	Spontaneous Expression of Views by Participants	44

I. PRINCIPAL FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. The large majority of participants comprising the 50 Tour Groups were generally satisfied with their training programs and experiences during their sojourn in the United States. They were not uncritical but, with the exception of a few instances, their criticisms and suggestions were offered in a constructive manner to help improve the programs for future participants.

2. Although 95% of the participants considered the USAID briefings useful, suggestions for improvement in the briefings and pre-departure activities were received from all but 6 Tour Groups (5% of the participants). The most frequent suggestions were:

- (a) participants should be notified sooner of their selection and of their departure date in order to make necessary preparations;
- (b) instruction in basic English should be given to all participants;
- (c) at least a tentative plan of the training program should be provided to participants before departure;
- (d) more pre-departure discussion should be conducted with participants about AID regulations and money allowances, and about climatic conditions and other facts relating to the major places to be visited during the training program.

3. Participants, generally, said they found the Participant Handbook to be useful and clearly written. Turkish participants constituted an exception; they could not read the Handbook, which they received in English, and recommended that it be printed in Turkish for future participants from their country.

4. Participants wanted an opportunity to comment on their training program and offer their suggestions before the training plan was completely formulated. Almost 3/5 (59%) said they did not participate in any way in the planning of their training programs. Also, a source of satisfaction with a training program lies in the responsiveness of those conducting the program to suggestions made by participants for changes in it; that is to say, participants had a more favorable attitude toward their training program when they felt that their suggestions were given full consideration and were accepted whenever possible.

5. The most frequent suggestions for improvement in the content of training programs were to:

- (a) reduce repetition and duplication in activities observed to the greatest extent possible;
- (b) lengthen the programs (preferred) or reduce the number of visits so that programs are not rushed and too full;
- (c) have persons responsible for developing and conducting the training sessions be familiar with the educational and professional backgrounds and training interests of the participants in each Tour Group so that presentations can be adjusted appropriately to the nature of the group members;

- (d) assign participants to groups which are homogeneous as far as education and professional background are concerned.

6. A large majority of the participants (92%) expressed satisfaction with the travel arrangements made for their tour visits. However, a fairly large number (43%) of the participants indicated that they had some problems with their housing arrangements. Most frequently mentioned were:

- (a) the high prices, which forced participants to share rooms in order to economize;
- (b) the location of motels and hotels in outlying sections of the cities visited which increased the cost of transportation to training sites, limited the participants' ability to observe the customs and ways of life of the people, and restricted sight-seeing and other social activities.

Generally, participants found the hotels clean, comfortable, and to give good service, although in a few instances specific hotels were reported to be deficient in one or more of these attributes.

7. Inability to speak basic English limited the range of social activities for many participants (see item 2, above). Some recommended that a greater effort be made to arrange organized social activities for participants, especially on weekends.

8. Approximately 40% of the participants indicated that they found their per diem sufficient to meet their

236

living expenses on the tour; the majority (60%) said the per diem rate was too low. The time required to recover reimbursable expenditures caused some participants difficulty; they suggested that the problem might be handled most easily by an advance of funds.

9. Slightly more than 4/5 (81%) of the participants said that the USAID in their country could help them utilize their training. Assistance most frequently suggested was the provision of professional materials, books, journals, and technical advice.

231

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE TOUR GROUPS

Size and Origin

The 50 Tour Groups ranged in size from 1 to 24 participants with the heaviest concentration (58%) in groups of 6 participants or less. Slightly under one-fourth (22%) were in groups containing 10 or more participants. (See Table 1.)

Table 1
SIZE OF OBSERVATIONAL TOUR GROUPS

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	TOUR GROUPS	
	No.	%
1-3	13	26
4-6	16	32
7-9	10	20
10-12	4	8
13-15	3	6
16-24	4	8
TOTALS	50	100

Participants in 80% of the groups came from a single country; in the remaining 20%, 2 groups were made up of participants from 2 countries, 1 group from 3 countries, 2 groups from 4 countries, 2 groups from 5 countries, and 1

group each from 7, 8 and 14 countries.

Regional distribution of the Observational Tour Groups is shown in Table 2. Nearly half (48%) of the participants were in 22 groups from Latin America; the Near East and South Asia had 20% of all participants in 12 groups; and Africa accounted for 14% of the participants in 7 groups. Average size of the Tour Groups from the Far East was smaller; 7 groups accounted for 8% of all participants.

Table 2
DISTRIBUTION OF OBSERVATIONAL TOUR GROUPS
BY REGION

REGION	TOUR GROUPS		PARTICIPANTS	
	No.	%	No.	%
Africa	7	14	48	14
Far East	7	14	27	8
Latin America	22	44	162	48
Near East and South Asia	12	24	70	20
Multi-regional	2	4	35	10
TOTALS	50	100	342	100

239

Participating Agency

Eight participating U.S. Government agencies were responsible for participants in one or more groups. The Department of Agriculture (36%) and the Department of Labor (33%) were each responsible for approximately 1/3 of the total participants. The Internal Revenue Service arranged programs for 14% of the participants; the other five agencies were responsible for from 6 to 1% of the total number of participants.

Table 3
DISTRIBUTION OF OBSERVATIONAL TOUR GROUPS
BY PARTICIPATING AGENCY

PARTICIPATING AGENCY	TOUR GROUPS		PARTICIPANTS	
	No.	%	No.	%
Department of Agriculture	15	30	124	36
Department of Labor	18	36	113	33
Internal Revenue Service	5	10	47	14
Public Health Service	2	4	21	6
Bureau of Public Roads	3	6	10	3
Office of Education	2	4	9	3
Bureau of Reclamation	2	4	9	3
Geological Survey	1	2	4	1
No Participating Agency	2	4	5	1
TOTALS	50	100	342	100

Division of the Tour Groups according to their region and participating agency is shown in Table 4. The groups from each region, with the exception of Latin America, were handled by a limited number of participating agencies. Participants from Africa, for the most part, had programs arranged by the Department of Agriculture (84%); the bulk of the participants from the Far East had programs in which the Department of Labor (52%) or the Bureau of Public Roads (37%) participated; 11 groups from the Near East and South Asia were handled by the Department of Labor (93%); the Departments of Agriculture and Labor each were responsible for 1 multi-regional group. Participants from Latin America had a relatively wide distribution of programs; 7 participating agencies engaged in programs for the 162 participants. The Department of Agriculture and the Internal Revenue Service handled over 2/3 (68%) of the Latin American participants; the Public Health Service and the Department of Labor followed with 13 and 10%, respectively.

Table 4
DISTRIBUTION OF OBSERVATIONAL TOUR GROUPS
BY PARTICIPATING AGENCY AND REGION

PARTICIPATING AGENCY	AFRICA			FAR EAST			LATIN AMERICA			NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA			MULTI-REGION		
	No. of Groups	Participants		No. of Groups	Participants		No. of Groups	Participants		No. of Groups	Participants		No. of Groups	Participants	
		No.	%		No.	%		No.	%		No.	%		No.	%
Department of Agriculture	5	40	84				8	63	39	1	5	7	1	16	46
Department of Labor				2	14	52	4	15	10	11	65	93	1	19	54
Internal Revenue Service							5	47	29						
Public Health Service							2	21	13						
Bureau of Public Roads				3	10	37									
Office of Education	1	5	10				1	4	2						
Bureau of Reclamation				1	1	4	1	8	5						
Geological Survey							1	4	2						
No Participating Agency	1	3	6	1	2	7									
TOTALS	7	48	100	7	27	100	22	162	100	12	70	100	2	35	100

242

Length of Program

The 50 Tour Groups had programs ranging in length from 3 weeks to 24 weeks. As shown in Table 5, 32 groups (55% of the participants) had programs of 9 weeks or less, and 11 groups (26% of the participants) had programs of 10 to 13 weeks. Among the 7 groups having programs extending for more than 14 weeks, 4 groups had a program of 16 weeks duration, 1 of 17 weeks, 1 of 21 weeks and 1 of 24 weeks. The length of program for all groups averaged slightly more than 9 weeks.

Table 5
DISTRIBUTION OF OBSERVATIONAL TOUR GROUPS
BY LENGTH OF TOUR

LENGTH OF TOUR (Weeks)	TOUR GROUPS		PARTICIPANTS	
	No.	%	No.	%
3-5	6	12	34	10
6-9	26	52	155	45
10-13	11	22	88	26
14-24	7	14	65	19
TOTALS	50	100	342	100

243

Language Used By Participants

Only 10 of the exit interviews (12% of the participants) were conducted in English; the balance was handled with the assistance of interpreters. The breakdown by language used in the interviews and the number of participants using each language is shown in Table 6. Portuguese was the language used by participants in 14 interviews, Spanish in 10, Turkish in 10, and French in 7. Three interviews (5% of the participants) were conducted with the assistance of Vietnamese interpreters.

Table 6

DISTRIBUTION OF OBSERVATIONAL TOUR GROUPS ACCORDING TO LANGUAGE USED BY PARTICIPANTS IN INTERVIEWS

LANGUAGE USED	INTERVIEWS		PARTICIPANTS	
	No.	%	No.	%
English	10	18	41	12
Portuguese	14	27	102	30
Spanish	10	18	66	19
Turkish	10	18	62	18
French	7	13	53	16
Vietnamese	3	6	18	5
TOTALS	54*	100	342	100

* Four Tour Groups were divided into 2 sections each to facilitate interviewing; 2 groups because of language differences and 2 because of the size of the groups.

244

Age, Sex, and Education of Participants

Age distribution of 305 Tour Group participants, for whom information was received, is shown in Table 7. Ages ranged from 18 to 62 years, with the average age of all participants in the group being 37 years. At the extremes, 1 participant was 18 years old, 1 was 21, 1 was 60, and 1 was 62. About 1/4 (26%) of the participants were 30 and younger; the large majority (59%) were 35 and older (17% were over 45 years old).

Table 7

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF OBSERVATIONAL
TOUR GROUP PARTICIPANTS

YEARS	PARTICIPANTS	
	No.	%
18-27	42	14
28-30	38	12
31-34	45	15
35-39	71	23
40-45	58	19
46-62	51	17
TOTALS	305	100

Sex of the Tour Group participants is shown in Table 8. Of the 342 participants, 91% (310 participants) were male and 9% (32 participants) were female. A comparison by

245

regions shows that Africa had a considerably lower proportion of female participants (5%) than the other regions. The Far East, with 12% female participants had the highest proportion; however, this represents only 4 women. The sex distribution of participants from the other two regions was about the same, with 10% female participants from Latin America and 9% from the Near East and South Asia.

Table 8
SEX OF OBSERVATIONAL TOUR GROUP PARTICIPANTS
BY REGIONS*

REGION	Male		Female	
	No.	%**	No.	%**
Africa	57	95	3	5
Far East	28	88	4	12
Latin America	155	90	18	10
Near East and South Asia	70	91	7	9
TOTALS	310	91	32	9

* The regional distribution of participants in Table 8 includes participants in both single and multi-regional Tour Groups.

** Percentages add to 100% by rows in this table.

Information concerning the educational level attained by Tour Group participants was available for only 246 participants (72% of the total) as complete biographic information for the remaining 28% was not received. A breakdown

giving the years of formal schooling for the 246 participants is presented in Table 9. 20% of the participants had less than 12 years of schooling, whereas 80% had 12 or more years of education. The average length of schooling for the entire group was 14.5 years.

Table 9
EDUCATION OF OBSERVATIONAL TOUR GROUP PARTICIPANTS

YEARS OF SCHOOLING	PARTICIPANTS	
	No.	%
6 and under	9	4
7-11	41	16
12	22	9
13-15	44	18
16	45	18
17-18	63	26
19 and over	22	9
TOTALS	246	100

247

Validity of Participant Responses

Responses of members of the Tour Groups, for the most part, have been cheerfully given; have reflected a serious effort to present both favorable and unfavorable reactions as a means of offering constructive suggestions; and have been frank, complete and objective. Not all participants, however, were equally responsive, as indicated by the appraisals made by the interviewers concerning the validity, frankness, and completeness of the information received. These appraisals are based on observations made by the interviewers during the interview and on the opinions expressed by the interpreters. The interpreters of the group are asked privately by the interviewer after the interview whether they believe that the group gave complete and accurate information; whether the group members felt free to express themselves; how well the group members got along with each other during their tour; and whether any unusual incidents occurred that were not brought out during the interview.

A summary based on these appraisals of the participants' responses is given in Table 10.

Table 10

VALIDITY, COMPLETENESS, AND FRANKNESS OF OBSERVATION
TOUR GROUP PARTICIPANT RESPONSES

APPRAISAL OF RESPONSES	TOUR GROUPS		PARTICIPANTS	
	No.	%	No.	%
Fully valid, complete and frank	33	66	266	77
Valid and frank, not fully complete	66	12	26	8
Valid, not fully frank	4	8	20	6
Not fully valid, complete or frank	7	14	30	9
TOTALS	50	100	342	100

Information given by 77% of the participants was considered to be fully valid, complete and frank while that received from the remaining 23% was believed to be somewhat deficient. Information obtained from 8% of the participants was considered to be valid and frank, but not fully complete. Generally, the reason for the lack of completeness was the inability to establish full communication between the interviewer and participants. Some participants were not sufficiently fluent in English (when the interview was conducted in that language) to express their thoughts completely. A few participants were disinterested and gave a minimum of information in their responses. In two instances difficulties existed in translating the questions and answers from English to the participants' language and back to English

so that complete information was not forthcoming.

Responses from 6% of the participants were considered to be valid as far as they went; it was evident in these cases that the participants held back information on one or more important points, and so were rated as not being fully frank.

Responses from 9% of the participants were considered to be not fully valid, complete or frank. The principal problem in these cases was the lack of rapport, or an indication of friction, between members of the group; some of the information given under these circumstances was not believed to reflect fully the views of all the group members.

III. OVERALL SATISFACTION OF PARTICIPANTS WITH TRAINING PROGRAM

Observational Tour Group participants are requested to indicate, through a "secret ballot" technique, their overall satisfaction with their training programs on a rating scale with 7 positions; a scale position of 1 representing high satisfaction, a position of 7, high dissatisfaction. At the close of the exit interview, each participant is given a rating sheet, the meaning of the rating scale is carefully explained to the group, and the participants are requested to mark, but not sign, the sheets. In this way there is no possibility of a participant's response being attributed to him personally. •The overall satisfaction rating scale and ratings given by members of the 50 Tour Groups included in this report, are shown below:

Table 11

OVERALL SATISFACTION RATING			
RATING SCALE		PARTICIPANTS	
		No.	%
Extremely satisfied, things could not have been better . . .	1	40	12
	2	136	40
	3	101	30
	4	42	12
	5	16	5
	6	3	
Not at all satisfied, things could not have been worse . . .	7	2	1
		340*	100

* Ratings given by 2 participants were not made according to instructions and could not be included in the total.

251

The concentration of satisfaction ratings in the upper part of the scale (52% in positions 1 and 2) indicates that the majority of participants were generally satisfied with their training programs and the experiences they provided. The participants, however, were discriminating in their evaluations and not wholly uncritical; this conclusion is borne out by the distribution of ratings: 12% in position 1, 40% in 2, 30% in 3, 12% in 4, and 6% in 5 or below.

Comparisons of overall satisfaction ratings were made among the regions the participants came from and by their fields of training. No significant differences in the distributions of ratings given by participants from Latin America, Africa, and the Near East and South Asia were evident while the sample of participants from the Far East was not large enough to provide a basis for conclusions.

In all fields of training except Agriculture, Labor, and Public Administration, the numbers of participants involved were too small to permit conclusions to be drawn. The percentage distribution of satisfaction ratings by participants in the other three fields of training indicated that the satisfaction ratings of participants in Public Administration were slightly lower than those in Agriculture and Labor.

IV. PRE-DEPARTURE PREPARATIONS

A summary of replies by participants in the 50 Tour Groups to questions asked in their exit interviews is presented in the following sections (IV-XIII) of the report. The item number from the Observational Tour Group Interview Report Form is also given for each question. Questions are quoted, then answers are tabulated numerically, together with the numbers and percentages of participants responding. Questions which call for opinions or suggestions are not quoted, but are identified in the text by their item numbers.

Selection

Participants in the Tour Groups, for the most part, were designated, and did not apply, for selection as participants in the training programs.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Did your supervisor participate in your selection? (Item 17)	Yes	243	71
	No	99	29
Q. Did you participate in any way in making application for this training tour? (Item 18)	Yes	58	17
	No	284	83

Examinations

The Tour Group participants, except in a relatively few cases, were not required to take examinations before selection.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Were you required to take a competitive examination? (Item 23)	Yes	8	2
	No	334	98
Q. Were you required to take any English examinations? (Item 22)	Yes	44	13
	No	298	87

Participants in a few countries reported that their government policy called for all participants to take an English examination. Generally, however, if the training programs were to be conducted with the assistance of interpreters, no English examinations were required.

USAID Briefings

All but 16 (5%) of the participants reported that they were given one or more briefings at the USAID in their countries. Timing of the briefings ranged from the day of departure to 8 weeks before leaving.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. How close to the time you left for the U.S. were the briefings held? (Item 25)	5 days or less	206	63
	6 days to 2 weeks	85	26
	3 to 4 weeks	21	7
	5 to 6 weeks	12	
	7 to 8 weeks	2	4

Timing of the briefings was not mentioned by participants as constituting a problem unless it contributed to hasty pre-departure preparations or inadequacy of the information presented. Briefings held on the day of departure often were mentioned as being deficient.

All but 15 (5%) of the participants reported that they found the USAID briefings were useful

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. To what extent do you feel that the USAID briefings were useful? (Item 28)	Very useful	209	64
	Somewhat useful	102	31
	Not very useful	11	4
	No reply	4	1

Although 95% of the participants considered that the USAID briefings were useful, suggestions for improvement in the briefings and other pre-departure activities (Item 30)

284

were received from all but 6 Tour Groups (5% of the participants). Greatest emphasis was given by the participants to the following suggestions:

(1) participants should be given a description of their training program in detail before their departure; a discussion of the program would be helpful in the USAID briefing.

(2) specific information about AID regulations, money allowances, climatic conditions and other facts about the places to be visited on the training tour should be given in the USAID briefing. Some group members recommended that the Participant Handbook be given to participants before their departure.

(3) participants should receive official notice of selection at least 30 days, and notice of the departure date at least 15 days before the date of departure.

(4) participants should receive some instruction in basic English prior to their departure.

V. WASHINGTON INTERNATIONAL CENTER ORIENTATION

Over 3/4 (77%) of the Tour Group participants reported that they had attended the WIC orientation. Numbers and percentages attending and not attending by regions are shown in Table 12.

Table 12

OBSERVATIONAL TOUR GROUP PARTICIPANTS ATTENDING AND NOT ATTENDING WIC ORIENTATION BY REGIONS

REGION	PARTICIPANTS		
	No. Not Attending	No. Attending	% Attending
Africa	5	52	91
Far East	11	23	68
Latin America	6	168	97
Near East and South Asia	56	21	27
TOTALS	78	264	77

Participants from the Far East who did not attend the orientation were all members of one Tour Group which reported that it arrived in Washington, D.C., on a Thursday and began the training program on the following Monday. The group members said they took part in the Mt. Vernon tour sponsored by WIC. The 56 participants from the Near East and South Asia who did not attend the orientation comprised 8 of the 10 Tour Groups from Turkey. Participants in some of these groups also indicated that they had gone on the Mt. Vernon tour.

256

Of the 264 participants who attended the WIC orientation, all but 6% judged them to be either very useful or somewhat useful. About 2/3 (65%) thought the orientation helped them to adjust to life in the United States.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. To what extent was the WIC orientation useful? (Item 40)	Very useful	201	76
	Somewhat useful	48	18
	Not very useful	15	6
Q. Did this orientation help prepare you for daily life in the U.S.? (Item 41)	Yes	176	65
	No	88	35

About 1/2 (52%) of the participants who attended the WIC orientation offered suggestions for improving the orientation.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Do you have any ideas for improving the orientation for other participants? (Item 42)	Yes	138	52
	No	126	48

Suggestions from the 138 participants who had ideas for improving the WIC orientation (Item 43) covered a wide range, with little clustering of opinions. No regional pattern in the suggestions was apparent. Some of the suggestions were contradictory, as might be expected from diverse groups. A few participants thought the orientations were too long, while others suggested that more time be devoted to them. Several recommended that more emphasis be given to the subject of race relations; others said there was too much frankness and emphasis on race relations. Some participants thought the lectures were too broad and general; a few suggested that the lectures be given only in the morning of each day because they found the program to be too heavy and tiring. There seemed to be general agreement that information

presented about hotels, restaurants, public transportation and other facts about daily living in Washington, D.C., was very helpful; suggestions were made that similar information should be given for other cities visited by many participants.

VI. PARTICIPANT HANDBOOK

All but 8 (2%) of the participants said they had received the Participant Handbook; the number and percentage of Handbooks distributed in each of four languages is shown in Table 13.

Table 13
DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANT HANDBOOKS
BY LANGUAGE OF PRINTING

LANGUAGE	PARTICIPANTS	
	No.	%
English	98	29
Portuguese	107	32
French	69	21
Spanish	60	18
TOTALS	334	100

Participants, generally, said they found the Handbook (Item 37) to be useful and clearly written (some indicated they had read it completely and others said they used it as a reference). One exception should be noted: 62 of the 98 Handbooks issued in English went to Turkish participants who, with one exception, said they could not read English. They naturally stated that the Handbook had been of no direct use to them. They indicated that parts had been interpreted for them and they were familiar, therefore, with

the general content. All recommended that the Handbook be translated and printed in Turkish for future participants from their country.

VII. PLANNING OF TRAINING PROGRAM

Over 1/2 (58%) of the participants indicated that they had no knowledge of who planned their training program or how it was planned.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. As far as you know, how was your training program planned? (Item 48)	Had some knowledge	144	42
	Had no knowledge	198	58

Almost all (98%) of the participants indicated that they wanted to participate in planning their training programs, but a majority (59%) said they did not participate.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Did you want to participate in the planning of your training? (Item 49)	Yes	334	98
	No	7	2
	No reply	1	
Q. Did you participate in the planning of your training? (Item 50)	Yes	140	41
	No	202	59

A majority (60%) of the participants reported that they were satisfied with the planning of their training programs, but a substantial number (38%) expressed dissatisfaction with the planning.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Were you satisfied or dissatisfied with the planning of your training program? (Item 55)	Satisfied	206	60
	Dissatisfied	129	38
	No response	7	2

Participants were asked for their ideas (Item 58) as to how the planning of their training programs could be improved; almost 3/4 (73%) offered suggestions. Not all of the participants making suggestions were dissatisfied with the planning; many responded in an effort to improve the program for future participants.

The most common suggestion advanced was that participants should be given an opportunity to comment on their proposed training programs before the plan was completely formulated. They would like to have had a tentative plan in their countries sufficiently in advance of their departure to submit suggestions for consideration. Then, upon their arrival in Washington, D.C., they would have liked an opportunity to discuss the detailed training plan and make further suggestions. The planning of programs for some participants followed this procedure; these participants invariably expressed strong satisfaction with the planning.

VIII. PROGRAM CONTENT

Participants' reactions to certain aspects of their training programs are shown in their responses to the following questions.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Were there places which you felt were important to your training program that you were unable to visit? (Item 61)	Yes	198	58
	No	140	41
	Don't know	4	1
Q. Were there places that you did visit which you felt were unimportant to your training program? (Item 63)	Yes	181	53
	No	161	47
Q. Were you able to observe significant activities for a long enough period of time? (Item 65)	Yes	262	80
	No	80	20
Q. Were any of the activities you observed not clearly presented to you? (Item 67)	Yes	101	30
	No	241	70

Participant responses to each of the first two questions showed a slightly larger number who indicated some change would have been desirable in places visited (a "Yes" answer to either question) than those who desired no change (a "No" answer to either question). A somewhat higher percentage (58%) thought there were places important to their training programs that they were unable to visit (Item 61) than those (53%) who felt they visited places that were

unimportant to their programs (Item 63).

A greater unanimity of viewpoint is shown in the answers to Items 65 and 67. 80% of the participants indicated that they were able to observe significant activities for a long enough time, while 70% said that the activities observed were clearly presented.

Responses to Items 61 and 63 were also tabulated for participants who had training programs in Agriculture, Labor, and Public Administration (the 3 fields having the most participants). Responses of participants in these 3 fields of training did not vary significantly from the responses of all participants (see above) except in two instances: (A) only 38% of the participants in Public Administration programs felt there were places important to their training program that they were unable to visit (compared to 58% of all participants), (B) 73% of the Labor participants said they visited places that they felt were unimportant to their training program (compared to 53% of all participants).

Tabulations of responses to Items 61 and 63 also were made by regions. Significant variations from the responses made by all participants were apparent only for the Africa and Near East and South Asian regions. In responding to Item 61, 35% of the African participants and 81% of the Near East-South Asian participants indicated that they felt there were places important to their training program that they were unable to visit. (58% of all participants gave this answer.) Responses to Item 63 showed that 44% of the African participants and 70% of the Near East-South Asian participants felt they had visited places which were unimportant to their training program (compared to 53% of all participants).

A possible source of dissatisfaction with a training program lies in the responsiveness of those conducting the program to suggestions made by participants for changes in it. Answers to the following two questions, while not constituting a measure of dissatisfaction, give some indication of responsiveness.

	<u>Response</u>		<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
	Yes	No		
Q. After your tour visits began, did you ask for them to be changed? (Item 69)	144	198		42 58
Q. After your tour visits began, were changes made in them? (Item 71)	168	174		49 51

While 42% of the participants said that they asked for changes to be made in their tour visits and 49% said changes were made, the data do not show a direct causal relationship. Some changes were made as a result of participant request, while others were made without such a request. A generalization, based on responses to other questions dealing with the planning and content of the participants' programs (Items 58 and 73), is possible: participants have a more favorable attitude toward their training program when they feel that their suggestions are given full consideration and are accepted when possible by program planners and managers.

Despite the generally high level of satisfaction expressed by participants with their training programs (see Table 11), members of 39 Tour Groups (84% of all participants) responded with suggestions (Item 73) when asked how they believed the content of training programs could be improved in terms of the objectives of their own programs. The suggestions offered were varied; a few, however, were of concern to many participants.

265

An observation common to many tour groups was that their program was rushed, too full, and called for them to observe essentially the same activities in a number of different places. Participants believed that the objectives of their programs could be met more fully if repetition in activities observed was reduced to the greatest extent possible. They suggested that this might be accomplished by scheduling fewer visits and devoting more time to each.

Many participants suggested that the persons responsible for developing and conducting the training programs should be familiar with the educational and professional backgrounds and training interests of the participants in each tour group. They felt that the utilization of this information would result in training programs that more fully met the individual interests and requirements of the participants.

Another suggestion frequently expressed was that groups selected for training programs should be homogeneous as far as education and professional background were concerned. Reasons given for this suggestion were that the interests of the group would tend to be more nearly the same and the level of training could be fixed at an optimum point for all members. The belief was expressed that, where participants with differing backgrounds and interests comprise a tour group, the training tended to be given at the level of the least qualified members and other participants were held back as a result.

When lectures constituted an important part of a training program, participants advanced the suggestion that the lecturers should be aware of the educational level of the group members and pitch their discussions accordingly.

IX. TRAVEL AND LIVING ARRANGEMENTS

A large majority (92%) of the participants expressed satisfaction with the travel arrangements made for their tour visits. 43% indicated that they had had problems with their housing accommodations during the tours.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Were you satisfied or dissatisfied with arrangements for getting you from one place to another? (Item 74)	Satisfied	317	92
	Dissatisfied	25	8
Q. Did you have any problems with your housing arrangements? (Item 76)	Yes	147	43
	No	195	57

One of the most common problems expressed concerning housing arrangements (Item 77) was related to the rate of per diem. Many participants objected to sharing hotel rooms, but said they were forced to do so in order to economize. Another fairly common complaint was that the hotels and motels in which the tour groups were housed were located in outlying areas of the places visited; participants wanted to stay near the city centers so they could observe the people, the customs and ways of life, and the places of tourist interest. They also pointed to the higher outlay required for taxi fares when they were not housed in the downtown areas. In a few instances, participants reported that a specific hotel was unclean, uncomfortable, or gave poor service; generally the participants found the hotels were satisfactory in these regards but, in their view, high-priced. Participants in a few Tour Groups said they felt they should be permitted to find their own hotel and not be required to stay in an "approved" hotel if another, less expensive one, could be found.

X. MONEY ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES

Participants, for the most part, expressed complete satisfaction with the arrangements by which they received their travel and money allowances. Only 25 (8%) indicated that they did not always receive their allowances on time.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Were your travel and money allowances always on time? (Item 7)	Always on time	317	92
	Sometimes late	25	8

Approximately 40% (138 participants) indicated (Item 80) that they found their per diem allowances sufficient to meet their expenses on the tour. The majority (60%) indicated that the per diem was insufficient; some qualified this statement by saying that they were able to meet their expenses for food and lodging by living three in a room in hotels and practicing strict economy throughout their tour. Reimbursable expenditures, according to some participants caused difficulty; they had to pay these expenditures out of their per diem and wait, sometimes until the end of their program, for reimbursement. They suggested that the rate of per diem should be adjusted to the positions held by participants in their own countries; they thought people of higher rank should not receive the standard rate given to all.¹

1. Provision is made by AID for variable per diem rates based on participants' positions.

About 1/2 (51%) of the participants considered that their allowance for books and training materials was sufficient.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Is the amount of your training materials allowance sufficient? (Item 81)	Sufficient	173	51
	Insufficient	148	43
	No allowance	21	6

Participants who considered their training materials allowance insufficient indicated (Item 82) that the principal difficulty was the high cost of books. Another observation made frequently by participants was that they would like to use the book allowance before their departure, but could not afford to advance the purchase price and be reimbursed. Some participants objected to the alternate procedure of selecting books for later delivery to them after they returned home, because, in their opinion, this would cause a long delay in actually receiving the books. A few participants said that they could not use their allowance because they could not read English and no books were available in their language for purchase here.

269

XI. PERSONAL AND SOCIAL EXPERIENCES

A preponderance of the participants (92%) reported that they had engaged in social activities specially organized for them. These activities included home hospitality, dinners, lunches, picnics, an occasional football game, theater and night clubs. Sight-seeing tours occasionally were mentioned as having been arranged.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Were there any social activities specially organized for your group? (Item 84)	Yes	317	92
	No	25	8

Slightly over 1/2 (53%) of the participants felt that they had had enough opportunities to engage in social activities that they wanted. The remaining 47% considered that their trip was deficient in this respect.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Did you have enough opportunities to engage in the social activities that you wanted? (Item 86)	Yes	180	53
	No	162	47

The most common reason given by participants (Item 87) for their failure to engage in the range of social activities that they would have liked was the language problem; their inability to speak English limited their contact with Americans. Some participants felt (Item 88) that a greater effort should be made to set up organized social activities for participants, particularly on week-ends. Among the activities mentioned were sight-seeing tours to places of historic and cultural interest, home visits, sports, and other forms of recreation.

A majority (61%) of the participants felt that they

did not have an opportunity to meet as many different types of people in the United States as they would have liked.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Do you believe that you had the opportunity to meet as many different types of U.S. citizens as you wanted? (Item 89)	Yes	134	39
	No	208	61

Many participants said (Item 90) they would like to have met more "Average Americans"; in their opinion, their contacts had been rather closely restricted to personnel connected with their training program and tour visits. Some said they would like to have visited American workers in their homes; many indicated that they would have welcomed an opportunity to visit with Negro families. The non-English speaking participants recognized that the language barrier made contacts with varied U.S. citizens difficult.

The reactions of participants to life in the United States showed considerable variation.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Did you find living in the United States much as you expected it would be for you, or was it quite different? (Item 92)	Usually as expected	161	47
	Sometimes as expected	127	37
	Seldom as expected	52	15
	No response	2	1

Participants who indicated that they found living in the United States usually as they expected it would be, often remarked that they had done considerable reading about the United States, had seen movies and listened to radio and television programs dealing with American life, and sometimes indicated that they had had contacts with Americans in their home countries.

271

Those who found the situation in the United States different from their expectations (Item 93), usually pointed to specific instances to illustrate their point of view. Some said they had expected a high standard of living, but the reality far exceeded their expectations. Others thought, before their visit, that Americans were proud and aloof; they had been impressed with the friendliness and helpfulness of the people with whom they had come in contact. Some stressed the high level of technology, which was far greater than they had expected. A few said they had been surprised to learn of the wide use of household appliances among people of moderate and low incomes. A number of participants commented upon the energy and hard work put into their jobs by the U.S. people and said they found that the pace of life was much faster than expected.

Several remarked that they had impressions, gained from Hollywood movies, that all Americans were rich and all American women were dressed in the height of fashion; they said they found both of these impressions to be untrue. Some commented that they were surprised to find that Americans were so poorly informed about the history, geography, and politics of the United States; they expected, and found, that Americans generally, knew little about the countries from which, they, the participants, came.

Almost 4/5 (79%) of the participants said they felt very much at home in the United States.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Did you feel at home in the United States? (Item 94)	Very much	270	79
	Somewhat	64	19
	Very little	8	2

Failure to feel at home in the United States was attributed (Item 95) by most of the participants to their inability

272

to speak English. Other, more minor, difficulties mentioned involved cold weather, food, homesickness, strenuous travel and program activities, and insufficient funds.

XII. COMMUNICATION SEMINAR

A minority (38%) of the Tour Group participants attended a Communication Seminar. All but 6% of those who attended considered the Seminar to be very useful (79%) or somewhat useful (15%).

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Did you attend a Communication Seminar? (Item 96)	Yes	130	38
	No	212	62
Q. How useful do you feel the Seminar will be? (Item 99)	Very useful	102	79
	Somewhat useful	19	15
	Not very useful	7	5
	Not at all useful	2	1

Differing opinions were expressed as suggestions to improve the Seminar (Item 100). About 25% of the 130 participants attending thought the program should be lengthened; 17 participants suggested that the Seminar should provide more specific information about scheduled topics; 18 participants thought the level of instruction was lowered because of the diverse educational and cultural backgrounds of those comprising the Seminar group. The 9 participants (6%) who reported that the Seminar was not useful to them, found the material repeated other training they had received or objected to the procedures and techniques of instructions used.

XIII. UTILIZATION OF TRAINING

Most participants at the time of the exit interview were not able to be specific (Item 101) about the ways in which they expected to apply their training after their return home. They indicated that they had obtained many ideas and much information from their training programs which they would assimilate and adapt to local situations. A few participants felt that they could put to immediate use much, if not all, of the information obtained from their training.

More than 2/3 (68%) of the participants anticipated problems in utilizing the training they had received.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Do you anticipate any problems in your home country in utilizing the training that you gained here? (Item 102)	Yes	221	68
	No	97	28
	Don't know	12	2
	Declined to answer	12	2

Lack of money and resources was the problem most participants mentioned (Item 103) as constituting a limitation on the utilization of their training. Next most frequently mentioned was the fear of innovation and resistance to change on the part of their countrymen. Other problems anticipated were a shortage of trained personnel, lack of legislation to authorize changes, lack of consent and backing of policy-making officials, and difficulty in adapting training, which reflects United States conditions, to the situations in the participants' countries.

Slightly more than 4/5 (81%) of the participants said

that the USAID in their country could help them utilize their training.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Could the USAID in your home country help you to use your training after you return to your home country? (Item 104)	Yes	277	81
	No	56	16
	Declined to answer	9	3

The large majority of participants, who said the USAID could help them use their training, suggested (Item 105) that the USAID continue to provide professional materials, books, journals and technical advice. Next most frequently mentioned was the suggestion that the USAID use its influence to support participants in using the ideas and innovations that arose from their training. Some participants suggested that the USAID could provide them materials and equipment which they could use for training others.

XIV. SPONTANEOUS EXPRESSION OF VIEWS BY PARTICIPANTS

At the conclusion of the questionnaire administration, the interviewer asks the group (Item 106) if there are problems or suggestions they would like to discuss on any topic relating to their sojourn in the United States. Suggestions or comments were received from 39 Tour Groups (85% of all participants); the remaining groups offered no further observations.

A wide range of topics was mentioned. Some groups complimented their interpreters and Team Leaders; others expressed appreciation for their training programs; a few reiterated suggestions made previously concerning the planning and content of their training programs, ways to improve the orientation and briefing sessions, and the need for instruction in basic English before their departure from home.

In general, this unstructured, free discussion served as an opportunity for participants to express the intensity of their feelings about topics previously mentioned, or to add new ones (e.g., complimenting the interpreter), whether positive or negative. For many of the participants this was their first opportunity to spontaneously express their feelings about their entire U.S. sojourn. Unsolicited comments from the groups during the free discussion indicated that the total exit interview was perceived by most participants as a positive, rewarding experience, thus reflecting an awareness, if not full comprehension, of the expressive function of the interview, and of AID's interest in improving programs. It can be assumed that many of those who used the opportunity will be able to view their training in the United States with more perspective when they return to their home countries.