PN-AAS-411

ISN 39277

PARTICIPANT ASSESSMENT

OF

USAID NIGERIA

Reference Room

PROFILE REPORT

February 1971

The American University
DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION AND TRAINING RESEARCH INSTITUTE
2139 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

INTRODUCTION

This first Profile Report on Participant Assessment of USAIDs was prepared under Contract No. AID/csd-2865 by The American University Development Education and Training Research Institute (DETRI). The findings and conclusions contained in the report are those of the contractor and not necessarily those of the Agency for International Development.

In providing a "profile" report rather than an annual report, we are embarking on a new form of reporting. DETRI had prepared a first Annual Report of the participants' assessment of their training programs in May 1969 and a second Annual Report in July 1970. These reports presented comprehensive findings on participants' reactions to all the aspects of their A.I.D. experience, and analyzed the relationships between some of these reactions and training program characteristics. They were distributed widely to provide information to many different types of audiences involved with A.I.D. participants.

With the advent of the data bank as a part of DETRI's operation, it is now possible to prepare a wider variety of reports designed for special reader audiences. There will be profile reports prepared especially for USAIDs, for participating agencies, for major training facilities, etc. This USAID profile report series is intended for use primarily by A.I.D. Missions overseas. These USAID profiles will compare some of the responses of participants from selected countries with the responses of other A.I.D. participants from the same region and from the world.

This first USAID profile report provides information from participants interviewed between July 1967 and December 1970. Countries which had 125 or more participants completing exit-interviews during this time period will receive reports. The

USAID profile reports will appear annually, with the second profile report being planned for February 1972.

The purpose of this report is to provide feedback information to the Missions on that portion of the total training experience which they largely manage (the selection, the pre-departure preparation, etc.). With many Missions, each with somewhat different management "styles," there are bound to be different reactions on the part of the participants themselves. Further, the information about what happened during the pre-departure period was gathered in an exit interview after the participants' training was completed. In those cases where the training period was long, a "memory factor" creeps in.

We plan to deal with this by transferring these items on pre-departure experience to an entry interview, given shortly after the participant arrives from his home country. Until we can correct our own system this way, the information in this profile report is our best and most reliable reference source. It is hoped that the material here will be received in the spirit in which it is offered. Where your intent is to improve the management of your program, you can now listen to your participants speak for themselves.

Robert E. Matteson
Director
Office of International Training

February 1971

PREFACE

These DETRI USAID profile reports will be prepared for those countries which had 125 participants or more trained in the United States and given exit interviews by DETRI in the particular time period covered.* For these profile reports, the authors have selected 9 of the items which made up the criteria yardsticks (outcomes) in the First and Second Annual Reports to A.I.D. Responses to these items have been analyzed separately for each country for the Fiscal Years 1968 (if available), 1969, 1970, and the first half of Fiscal 1971, to make apparent any trends or changes in participant evaluations over time. The remainder of the items in the report were chosen because of their importance for monitoring participant reactions to their A.I.D.-related home country experiences. In the choice of these latter items, emphasis has been placed on selecting factors over which USAIDs have some measure of administrative control. These responses will be presented for comparison with the responses of A.I.D. participants from the same geographical region and from the world.

The data in these profile reports were collected in the same manner as the data presented in the first and second Annual Reports from DETRI to A.I.D. (May 1969, and July 1970). Academic and Special program participants fill out a printed standardized, structured questionnaire under the supervision of a person trained in its administration. They also receive an oral, unstructured interview conducted by cultural communication specialists on a private, anonymous basis. A standardized, structured questionnaire is administered orally to the members of Observation Training Teams as a group. (Definitions of categories of participant trainees are given in the Glossary.) More detailed information on the instruments and procedures used to collect the exit interview data are included in the Final

---

*Responses from fewer than 125 participants cannot be reliably or meaningfully interpreted.

Report on A.I.D. Participant Training Exit-Interview Development Study, December 1967, and the Guide for Users of the DETRI Exit Interview, November 1970.

There is ample evidence that these data are both reliable and valid for the participants interviewed. Tests of (1) the internal consistency of participant responses to the questionnaire, (2) interviewers' estimates of the validity of participants' responses, and (3) comparisons with results of other studies show the data to be technically acceptable. (For more detailed information see the First Annual Report, May 1969, pp iv-v.)

It is vital that the reader remember that the data presented in these reports come only from those participants who passed through Washington, D.C., on their return to their home countries, and who appeared at the DETRI exit interview. Participants who depart from Miami, New Orleans, and San Francisco account for losses in data, especially in the case of Latin American participants. Therefore, the information in these reports does not represent all the A.I.D. participant trainees who departed from the United States. It does, however, represent the most systematically gathered, and most dependable data on the largest group of foreign trainees ever studied.

This profile report has been prepared in six parts. Part I presents aggregate data on descriptive characteristics of all Academic and Special program participants. Parts II and III present fiscal year analyses for these participants on items which represent their overall reactions or which make some contribution to their overall reactions. Parts IV and V present comparative data for these participants on their home country experiences and expectations. Part VI presents aggregate data for the Observation Training Team members from the countries which had 3 or more teams completing exit interviews. (There were no exclusively Nigerian Observation Training Teams interviewed at DETRI during this reporting period. Therefore, Part VI does not appear in this report.)

Within each part of this report, there is usually a narrative description of the information given by participants interviewed from the country being reported on. Whenever the responses given by these participants differs significantly* from the responses given by the participants from the same region on any of the items presented in Parts IV and V, the differences will be discussed. If there is no statistically significant difference, no mention will be made of the information gathered from the regional participants. World-wide data are provided for reference purposes only.

This report was prepared by Paul R. Kimmel, William A. Lybrand, and William C. Ockey of The American University, DETRI, under Contract AID/csd-2865. The authors were ably assisted by Mary Ann Edsall, Ann Fenderson, and Roma Vaswani, also of the DETRI staff.

---

*"Significantly" means statistically significant. The test used was one of the "1% level of confidence." This means that the differences between the data from participants in the country and in the corresponding region could have occurred by chance alone less than 1 in 100 times. It is unlikely that such obtained differences are a result of chance alone. It is probable (99 out of 100 times) that the differences obtained are attributable to causal factors--although the causes may not be known.

CONTENTS

PART		PAGE
	Introduction	
	Preface	i
	Glossary	v
	References	vi
I.	Participant Characteristics	1
II.	Overall Reactions	5
III.	Contributing Outcomes	11
IV.	Home Country Experiences	
	A. Selection Factors	15
	B. Briefings	20
	C. Planning	23
V.	The Training Program and Home Country Utilization	
	A. Training Program Changes	27
	B. Language Training	28
	C. Home Country Position	29
	D. Expected Utilization Problems	32
	E. Expected USAID Assistance	36

GLOSSARY

Academic program participant: a student who had a training program for one or more academic terms in regular curriculum courses in an accredited institution which grants an academic degree, whether or not a degree is the objective and whether or not courses are audited or taken for credit.

Special program participant: a participant whose training included one or more of the following types of training: (1) courses, seminars, or other organized programs in a specialized field which may result in the award of a certificate or diploma; (2) intensive briefings and instruction on a specific job or group of related jobs with an opportunity for close observation of the work activities, actual work experience, or both; (3) brief visits to offices, businesses, factories, government agencies, or other organizations to observe work processes and activities.

Observation training team participants: trainees who have training programs of short duration, who usually are higher level people, and who learn primarily through observation at a number of facilities usually in a number of cities or other geographic areas.

REFERENCES

A.I.D. Participant Training Exit Interview Development Study. Washington, D.C., Office of International Training, Agency for International Development, ARC* Catalog No. 374.013, A 512c, U.S. Department of State, December 1967.

A narrative report which discusses the purpose, scope, and background rationale for the Exit Interview; the requirements for the Exit Interview program; the plan for developing instruments and procedures; technical considerations in constructing instruments, gathering data, and recording results; and reports from DETRI to AID/OIT. (5 Appendices)

Participant Assessment of A.I.D. Training Programs: A Descriptive Statistical Report. Washington, D.C., Office of International Training, Agency for International Development, ARC Catalog No. 374.013, A 512, U.S. Department of State, May 1968.

Descriptive findings from Exit Interviews conducted with 859 Academic and Special participants and 342 Observation Training Team members between July 1967 and February 1968. An overview of these participants' perceptions of, and reactions to, their entire training programs.

Participant Assessment of A.I.D. Training Programs: First Annual Report. Washington, D.C., Office of International Training, Agency for International Development, ARC Catalog No. 374.013, A 512a, U.S. Department of State, May 1969.

Descriptive and analytic findings from Exit Interviews conducted with 1810 Academic and Special participants and

---

*A.I.D. Reference Center, Room 1656 NS, AID/State Department, Washington, D.C., 20523.

610 Observation Training Team members between July 1967 and September 1968. An overview of these participants' reactions to various aspects of their A.I.D. experience and an examination of the relationship between key responses and training program characteristics. Includes a special intensive analysis of the principal satisfactions of Academic and Special participants. Recommendations. (One Appendix)

Participant Assessment of A.I.D. Training Programs: Second Annual Report. Washington, D.C., Office of International Training, Agency for International Development, ARC Catalog No. 374.013, A 512a, U.S. Department of State, July 1970.

Descriptive and analytic findings from Exit Interviews conducted with 1384 Academic and Special participants and 503 Observation Training Team members between September 1968 and September 1969. (Same format as First Annual Report, above.)

Guide for Users of the DETRI Exit Interview. Washington, D.C., Office of International Training, Agency for International Development, ARC Catalog No. 374.013 A 265f, U.S. Department of State, November 1970.

A narrative handbook to answer questions of those who have received Exit Interview questionnaires and reports and to reassure those who believe participant reactions imply personal criticism. A discussion of common problems raised by users of the Exit Interview with suggestions for reading individual questionnaires and using results in future programming.

PARTICIPANT ASSESSMENT OF USAID-NIGERIA

From July 1967 through December 1970, 247 A.I.D. participants in Special and Academic training programs from Nigeria received exit interviews at The American University DETRI. This report presents aggregate data from these participants on items that are relevant to USAID activities in Nigeria. As the questionnaire for Special and Academic participants was revised during this reporting period, not all of these questions were asked of all the participants. Consequently, the total number of responses in each table does not always equal 247.

PART I

PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS

Seventy-five percent of the Nigerian participants were in Academic training programs, while 25% received Special training programs (Table 1). Fifty-five percent received training in the field of agriculture, 20% in education, and 18% in public administration (Table 2). The median length of sojourn for the Academic participants was about 25 months, whereas the median sojourn length for participants in Special training programs was about 5 months (Table 3).

The median number of years of education for Nigerian participants prior to their U.S. training programs was about 16 years (Table 4). Their median age was 29 (Table 5). Ninety-four percent of the Nigerian participants who received exit interviews during this reporting period were males (Table 6).

Table 1

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

TYPE OF PROGRAM	PARTICIPANTS %	N
Academic	75.3	186
Special	24.7	61
TOTALS	100.0	247

Table 2

Q. In what fields of training were the participants?

FIELD OF TRAINING*	PARTICIPANTS %	N
Agriculture	54.7	75
Industry & Mining	0.0	0
Transportation	1.5	2
Health & Sanitation	5.8	8
Education	19.7	27
Public Administration	18.2	25
TOTALS	100.0	137

* This table presents only those categories used in the annual reports.

Table 3

Q. How long were the participants' sojourns in the United States? (Item 182)

LENGTH OF PROGRAM (Months)	ACADEMIC PARTICIPANTS		SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS	
	%	N	%	N
1-4	0.0	0	53.2	25
5-6	0.0	0	8.5	4
7-11	15.3	15	29.8	14
12-15	5.1	5	6.4	3
16-24	12.2	12	2.1	1
25 or more	67.3	66	0.0	0
TOTALS	100.0	98	100.0	47

Table 4

Q. How many years of education did the participants have before beginning their A.I.D. training programs? (Item 169)

YEARS OF EDUCATION	PARTICIPANTS	
	%	N
7-11	4.2	6
12	11.3	16
13-15	9.9	14
16	21.1	30
17-18	25.3	36
19 and over	28.2	40
TOTALS	100.0	142

Table 5

Q. What were the ages of the participants? (Item 164)

AGE	PARTICIPANTS %	N
27 or less	38.5	95
28-30	19.0	47
31-34	15.8	39
35-39	14.5	36
40-45	9.7	24
46 or more	2.4	6
TOTALS	100.0	247

Table 6

Q. What was the sex of the participants? (Item 165)

SEX	PARTICIPANTS %	N
Male	94.3	233
Female	5.7	14
TOTALS	100.0	247

PART II

OVERALL REACTIONS

The 5 tables which appear in this part of the report present data on items that were found to be important measures of participants' overall reactions in DETRI's 2 annual reports (May 1969 and July 1970). The Nigerian participants' responses to these items are presented by fiscal year to show any changes in overall reactions that may have occurred over time.

Between 25 and 32% of the Nigerian participants indicated that they were "extremely satisfied" ("1" ratings) with their total experience as A.I.D. participants in each of the 3 1/2 fiscal years during which DETRI has been gathering data. Less than 5% of the participants in any fiscal year indicated much lower feelings of satisfaction by rating their total experience as A.I.D. participants below the mid-point on this satisfaction scale in any of the 3 1/2 fiscal years (Table 7). There are no statistically significant changes over time in these satisfaction ratings.

Between 27 and 60% of the Academic participants from Nigeria indicated that they were "extremely satisfied" ("1" ratings) with the total technical training they received in the 3 1/2 fiscal years under consideration. Less than 4% in any fiscal year indicated low satisfaction (ratings below the mid-point on this scale). These ratings indicate increasing satisfaction during the 3 1/2 fiscal year time period (Table 8).

Between 59 and 74% of the Nigerian participants who took part in Special training programs in Fiscal 1970 and the first half of Fiscal 1971 gave high satisfaction ratings ("1" or "2") to these programs. (Since only 2 participants gave ratings in Fiscal 1969, no comparison with the other

fiscal periods is meaningful.) Only 1 participant gave a rating below the mid-point on the satisfaction scale (Table 9).

Between 46 and 63% of the Nigerian participants were rated by the DETRI interviewers as becoming "more positive" toward the United States as a society in Fiscal 1969, 1970, and the first half of Fiscal 1971 (Table 10). The DETRI interviewers' ratings of the participants' feelings about the American people ranged from 54.9% becoming "more positive" toward the American people in Fiscal 1970 to 75.5% in Fiscal 1969 (Table 11). There are no statistically significant changes over time in either of these tables.

Table 7

Q. How satisfied were the participants with their total experience as an A.I.D. participant? (Item 162)

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '68		FY '69		FY '70		FY '71 Jul-Dec	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	26.4	23	29.5	18	25.0	15	31.6	12
2	48.3	42	41.0	25	41.7	25	50.0	19
3	16.1	14	18.0	11	25.0	15	10.5	4
4	5.7	5	6.6	4	5.0	3	7.9	3
5) 6) 7 (Not at all satisfied))	3.4	3	4.9	3	3.3	2	0.0	0
TOTALS	100.0	87	100.0	61	100.0	60	100.0	38

Table 8

Q. Overall, how satisfied were the Academic participants with the total technical training they received? (Item 84A)

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '68		FY '69		FY '70		FY '71 Jul-Dec	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	28.2	24	27.3	15	47.4	18	60.0	9
2	54.1	46	29.1	16	21.1	8	40.0	6
3	9.4	8	20.0	11	23.7	9	0.0	0
4	4.7	4	20.0	11	5.3	2	0.0	0
5) 6) 7 (Not at all satisfied))	3.5	3	3.6	2	2.6	1	0.0	0
TOTALS	100.0	85	100.0	55	100.0	38	100.0	15

Table 9

Q. Overall, how satisfied were the Special participants with the total technical training they received? (Item 81S)

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71 Jul-Dec	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	100.0	2	27.3	6	30.4	7
2	0.0	0	31.8	7	43.5	10
3	0.0	0	18.2	4	17.4	4
4	0.0	0	18.2	4	8.7	2
5	0.0	0	4.5	1	0.0	0
6	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
7 (Not at all satisfied)	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
TOTALS	100.0	2	100.0	22	100.0	23

Table 10

Q. How did the interviewers rate the participants' feelings about the U.S. society?

FEELINGS ABOUT U.S. SOCIETY	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71 Jul-Dec	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Became more positive	62.9	22	46.2	24	54.3	19
Stayed the same	8.6	3	23.1	12	31.4	11
Became more negative	28.6	10	30.8	16	14.3	5
TOTALS	100.0	35	100.0	52	100.0	35

Table 11

Q. How did the interviewers rate the participants' feelings about the American people?

FEELINGS ABOUT AMERICAN PEOPLE	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71 Jul-Dec	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Became more positive	72.5	29	54.9	28	57.1	20
Stayed the same	12.5	5	29.4	15	34.3	12
Became more negative	15.0	6	15.7	8	8.6	3
TOTALS	100.0	40	100.0	51	100.0	35

PART III

CONTRIBUTING OUTCOMES

The 4 items discussed in this part of the report were found to be related to the participants' overall reactions in DETRI's First and Second Annual Reports (May 1969 and July 1970). They are presented by fiscal year to show any changes that may have occurred. Fiscal 1968 does not appear in these tables because these items were not asked during that time period.

Between 42 and 69% of the Nigerian participants rated their satisfaction with the planning of their training program in Nigeria at 1 of the top 2 scale positions in the 2 1/2 fiscal years. Conversely, between 4 and 16% rated their satisfaction below the mid-point on this scale. Although these data suggest increasing satisfaction over time with planning in Nigeria, they are not statistically significant (Table 12).

In the 2 1/2 fiscal years, between 39 and 75% of the Nigerian participants rated the orientations they received in Nigeria at 1 of the top 2 scale positions. Between 6 and 18% gave satisfaction ratings below the mid-point on this scale. There are no statistically significant changes over time in this table (Table 13).

Between 54 and 100% of the Academic participants rated the suitability of their technical training program to home country conditions at 1 of the top 2 scale positions on the rating scale during the 2 1/2 fiscal years. Only 1 participant in each of 2 fiscal years gave a rating below the mid-point on the scale. While the data in Table 14 indicate that Academic participants felt their training programs were suitable to their home country conditions more frequently over the time period, the relatively small

number of participants in the first half of Fiscal 1971 makes time comparisons somewhat unreliable (Table 14).

Approximately 64% of the participants in Special training programs in Fiscal 1970, and 78% in the first half of Fiscal 1971 gave ratings of "1" or "2" to the suitability of their programs to their home country conditions. (No ratings were given by Special program participants in Fiscal 1969). Only 1 participant in each of the 2 fiscal periods gave a rating below the mid-point on the scale. Ratings given in the first half of Fiscal 1971 indicate a higher feeling of suitability of the technical training programs to home country conditions than those given in Fiscal 1970 (Table 15).

Table 12

Q. How satisfied were the participants with the planning in their home country of their training program? (Item 49)

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71 Jul-Dec	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	20.9	9	34.0	18	37.1	13
2	20.9	9	18.9	10	31.4	11
3	30.2	13	30.2	16	11.4	4
4	11.6	5	13.2	7	11.4	4
5	7.0	3	1.9	1	0.0	0
6	2.3	1	1.9	1	5.7	2
7 (Not at all satisfied)	7.0	3	0.0	0	2.9	1
TOTALS	100.0	43	100.0	53	100.0	35

Table 13

Q. How satisfied were the participants with the orientations they received in their home country about the United States? (Item 51)

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71 Jul-Dec	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	21.4	9	20.0	9	41.7	15
2	26.2	11	17.8	8	33.3	12
3	21.4	9	24.4	11	11.1	4
4	16.7	7	20.0	9	8.3	3
5	7.1	3	13.3	6	2.8	1
6	4.8	2	4.4	2	0.0	0
7 (Not at all satisfied)	2.4	1	0.0	0	2.8	1
TOTALS	100.0	42	100.0	45	100.0	36

Table 14

Q. How suitable did the Academic participants feel their technical training program was to their home country conditions? (Item 83b)

SUITABILITY RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71 Jul-Dec	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely suitable)	27.9	12	47.4	18	60.0	9
2	25.6	11	21.1	8	40.0	6
3	23.3	10	23.7	9	0.0	0
4	20.9	9	5.3	2	0.0	0
5	2.3	1	0.0	0	0.0	0
6	0.0	0	2.6	1	0.0	0
7 (Not at all suitable)	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
TOTALS	100.0	43	100.0	38	100.0	15

Table 15

Q. How suitable did the Special participants feel their technical training program was to their home country conditions? (Item 80b)

SUITABILITY RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71 Jul-Dec	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely suitable)	0.0	0	27.3	6	34.8	8
2	0.0	0	36.4	8	43.5	10
3	0.0	0	22.7	5	8.7	2
4	0.0	0	9.1	2	8.7	2
5	0.0	0	4.5	1	4.3	1
6	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
7 (Not at all suitable)	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
TOTALS	0.0	0	100.0	22	100.0	23

PART IV

HOME COUNTRY EXPERIENCES

The remaining 2 parts of this report present items felt by DETRI and AID/OIT to be of interest to the USAID. Data on these items are presented in 3 columns in each table. The first column shows the distribution of responses for Nigeria, the second column the distribution for other African countries, and the third column for all participants (world-wide data). The data in these tables have been combined for all of the fiscal years reported on.

A. Selection Factors

About 54% of the Nigerian participants said they were not working on projects in their home country on which A.I.D. technicians were also working. This percentage is comparable to that for other African countries (Table 16).

About 47% of the Nigerian participants indicated that they had met with representatives of their home country government to discuss their qualifications to take part in the A.I.D. training program. This is a higher percentage than that for other African countries. About 38% said they had no formal discussions with any government officials about their qualifications to take part in their program prior to their selection. This percentage is comparable to that given by participants from other African countries (Table 17).

About 20% of the Nigerian participants did not recall having to pass any examinations to qualify to take part in their training program. About 78% recalled having taken medical examinations and about 41% said they had had to take an English language examination to qualify. All of these percentages are comparable to those from other African

countries (Table 18).

About 60% of the Nigerian participants said they had had enough time between their notification of participation in the A.I.D. training program and notification of their departure date to make necessary arrangements (Table 19). About 62% of the Nigerian participants said they had had adequate time between notification of their departure date and the actual day on which they left their home country (Table 20). These percentages are comparable to those for other African countries.

Table 16

Q. At the time of their selection, were the participants working on a project in their home country on which A.I.D. technicians were also working? (Item 3)

WORKING WITH A.I.D. TECHNICIANS	NIGERIA		OTHER AFRICA		WORLD-WIDE	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
No	53.6	75	60.9	412	57.4	1952
Yes	45.0	63	32.8	222	36.2	1229
Don't know	1.4	2	6.4	43	6.4	215
TOTALS	100.0	140	100.0	677	100.0	3396

Table 17*

Q. Before the participants finally knew they would be a participant, did they have any formal discussions with any government officials about their qualifications to take part in the A.I.D. training program? If so, who were these officials? (Items 4 & 5)

GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS	NIGERIA		OTHER AFRICA		WORLD-WIDE	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	37.7	55	39.7	282	42.4	2290
A.I.D. representatives	45.3	112	38.2	456	30.7	1670
Other U.S. government representatives	5.5	8	7.7	55	5.8	211
Representatives of home country government	47.4	117	37.0	441	36.0	1957

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

Table 18*

Q. Before they finally knew they would be a participant, did the participants have to pass medical, English language, or other special examinations to qualify to take part in the training program? If so, which examinations? (Items 6 & 7)

EXAMINATION	NIGERIA		OTHER AFRICA		WORLD-WIDE	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	19.9	29	16.8	119	23.4	1023
Medical	78.1	114	74.9	537	73.1	2649
English language	41.1	60	51.2	367	59.6	2162
Other	20.5	30	15.8	113	11.7	424

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

Table 19

Q. Was the time between when the participants finally knew they would be a participant and when they were notified of their departure date adequate to make necessary arrangements? (Item 9)

ENOUGH TIME	NIGERIA		OTHER AFRICA		WORLD-WIDE	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
No	30.2	74	26.3	311	25.3	1364
Yes	69.8	171	73.7	871	74.7	4027
TOTALS	100.0	245	100.0	1182	100.0	5391

Table 20

Q. Was the time between when the participants were notified of their departure date and the actual day on which they left their home country adequate? (Item 11)

ENOUGH TIME	NIGERIA		OTHER AFRICA		WORLD-WIDE	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
No	38.4	94	38.0	447	38.0	2051
Yes	61.6	151	62.0	728	62.0	3337
TOTALS	100.0	245	100.0	1175	100.0	5388

B. Briefings

About 81% of the Nigerian participants said they attended formal planning and orientation meetings in their home country before they left for the United States. This percentage is comparable to that from other African countries (Table 21). About 28% of the Nigerian participants indicated that former A.I.D. participants from their country had attended the planning and orientation meetings. About 54% said that other A.I.D. participants going to the United States had attended the meetings, and about 66% said that A.I.D. representatives had attended. All of these percentages are comparable to those given by participants from other African countries (Table 22).

About 68% of the Nigerian participants said they heard about A.I.D. administrative policies and regulations at their home country planning and orientation meetings. About 53% said they heard about the general objectives of joint home country/A.I.D. development projects or programs, and 32% said that the specific objectives of their technical training program had been discussed. About 45% indicated that relationships between major cultural aspects of their country and those of the United States had been described. All of these percentages for Nigerian participants are comparable to those given by participants from other African countries (Table 23).

Table 21

Q. Did the participants attend any formal planning and orientation meeting(s) in their home country before they left? (Item 19)

ATTENDED MEETING	NIGERIA		OTHER AFRICA		WORLD-WIDE	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
No	18.6	27	21.5	154	23.3	842
Yes	81.4	118	78.5	563	76.7	2777
TOTALS	100.0	145	100.0	717	100.0	3619

Table 22*

Q. Who else attended the participants' planning and orientation meeting(s) in their home country? (Item 20)

PEOPLE ATTENDING	NIGERIA		OTHER AFRICA		WORLD-WIDE	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Supervisor	4.1	6	6.0	43	6.0	217
Representatives of home country government	15.8	23	14.4	103	13.5	490
A.I.D. representatives	66.4	97	63.3	454	59.0	2138
Former A.I.D. participants from home country	28.1	41	22.9	164	23.8	863
Other A.I.D. participants going to the United States	54.1	79	50.9	365	42.2	1531

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

Table 23*

Q. What did the participants hear about at their planning and orientation meeting(s) in their home country? (Item 21)

TOPICS DISCUSSED	NIGERIA		OTHER AFRICA		WORLD-WIDE	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
General objectives of joint home country/AID development projects or programs	53.4	78	44.6	320	44.0	1594
Specific objectives of technical training program	32.2	47	29.7	213	23.9	866
Relationship of objectives of technical training program to a development project or program in home country	29.5	43	27.8	199	20.6	747
Outline of the proposed plan for technical training program	28.8	42	30.5	219	23.1	837
A.I.D. administrative policies and regulations	67.8	99	58.4	419	52.3	1895
Relationships between major cultural aspects of my home country and those of the United States	45.2	66	46.9	336	41.4	1501

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

C. Planning

About 3 out of 4 of the Nigerian participants said they received a copy of their PIO/P before they left for the United States (Table 24). About 32% indicated that there were some aspects of the proposed plan for their technical training program with which they disagreed or which were not clear to them when they left Nigeria (Table 25). The 2 aspects of the proposed plan which were most often unclear or disagreed with were the general content of training and the overall length of training. Only 2% of the Nigerian participants indicated that they disagreed with or were unclear about how their training was planned to be used when they returned to their country. This is a lower percentage than that for other African countries (Table 26).

About 1 out of 4 of the Nigerian participants said that they had had an opportunity to make suggestions about the proposed plan for their technical training program prior to their departure for the United States. This is a comparable percentage to that given by participants in other African countries (Table 27). About 3 out of 5 of the Nigerian participants felt that their personal participation in the planning of their proposed programs was "adequate." About 40% felt that the participation of their supervisors was "adequate." Both of these percentages are comparable to those given by participants from other African countries (Tables 28 and 29).

Table 24

Q. Did the participants receive a copy of their PIO/P for their training before they left for the United States? (Item 18)

RECEIVED PIO/P	NIGERIA		OTHER AFRICA		WORLD-WIDE	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
No	24.8	36	25.8	184	20.3	732
Yes	75.2	109	74.2	529	79.7	2878
TOTALS	100.0	145	100.0	713	100.0	3610

Table 25

Q. At the time the participants left their home country, were there any aspects of the proposed plan for their technical training program with which they disagreed or that were not clear to them? (Item 26)

ASPECT UNCLEAR OR DISAGREED WITH	NIGERIA		OTHER AFRICA		WORLD-WIDE	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
No	68.3	99	71.6	509	68.4	2463
Yes	31.7	46	28.4	202	31.6	1136
TOTALS	100.0	145	100.0	711	100.0	3599

Table 26

Q. Which of the following aspects of their proposed plan did the participants disagree with or were unclear about? (Item 27)

ASPECT	NIGERIA		OTHER AFRICA		WORLD-WIDE	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Objectives of training program	3.4	5	5.2	37	6.1	220
How training was planned to be used upon return to home country	2.1	3	8.4	60	7.6	276
General content of training	13.7	20	10.7	77	13.0	472
Training facility(ies)	8.2	12	5.2	37	7.9	287
Overall length of training	11.6	17	10.7	77	9.7	351

Table 27

Q. Prior to their departure, did the participants have an opportunity to make suggestions about the proposed plan for their technical training program? (Item 22)

OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE SUGGESTIONS	NIGERIA		OTHER AFRICA		WORLD-WIDE	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
No	76.7	112	79.2	566	67.3	2430
Yes	23.3	34	20.8	149	32.7	1176
TOTALS	100.0	146	100.0	715	100.0	3606

Table 28

Q. How adequate was the participants' personal participation in the planning of their proposed technical training program? (Item 24)

ADEQUACY OF PARTICIPATION	NIGERIA		OTHER AFRICA		WORLD-WIDE	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Very inadequate	21.4	28	20.3	126	16.9	541
Somewhat inadequate	19.8	26	23.0	143	27.5	884
Adequate	58.8	77	56.8	353	55.6	1790
TOTALS	100.0	131	100.0	622	100.0	3215

Table 29

Q. How adequate was the participants' supervisors' participation in the planning of their proposed technical training program? (Item 25)

ADEQUACY OF SUPERVISORS' PARTICIPATION	NIGERIA		OTHER AFRICA		WORLD-WIDE	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Very inadequate	13.0	17	11.3	71	10.5	337
Somewhat inadequate	7.6	10	12.2	77	16.5	536
Adequate	40.5	53	42.0	264	41.8	1349
Don't know or not applicable	38.9	51	34.5	217	31.2	1012
TOTALS	100.0	131	100.0	629	100.0	3234

PART V

THE TRAINING PROGRAM AND HOME COUNTRY UTILIZATION

A. Training Program Changes

About 57% of the Nigerian participants indicated that no changes in their technical training program were made after they reached their first training facility in the United States. Over 3% said that any changes made were suggested by officials of their home country government. These percentages are comparable to those given by other African countries (Table 30).

Table 30*

Q. Were any changes made in the participants' technical training program after they reached their first training facility? If so, who suggested these changes? (Items 77A, 72S & 78A & 73S)

SUGGESTED CHANGES	NIGERIA		OTHER AFRICA		WORLD-WIDE	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	56.8	75	48.7	408	66.2	2305
Officials of home country government	3.4	5	3.5	25	3.6	126
Representatives of A.I.D. in home country	0.0	0	2.0	14	2.0	71

*Percentages do not add to 100% because not all alternatives in the item are listed.

B. Language Training

Twenty-five of the Nigerian participants said that they received English language training in Nigeria to prepare them for their experiences in the United States. Sixty-four percent of these participants felt that this training was "extremely useful" ("1" ratings) (Table 31).

Table 31

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

USEFULNESS RATING	NIGERIA		OTHER AFRICA		WORLD-WIDE	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely useful)	64.0	16	42.1	64	30.2	486
2	16.0	4	19.1	29	22.3	358
3	8.0	2	13.8	21	21.3	344
4	4.0	1	13.2	20	15.8	253
5	4.0	1	6.6	10	7.4	120
6	0.0	0	3.3	5	1.9	31
7 (Not at all useful)	4.0	1	2.0	3	1.1	19
TOTALS	100.0	25	100.0	152	100.0	1611

C. Home Country Position

About 75% of the Nigerian participants indicated they knew the job they would have when they returned to Nigeria (Table 32). About 88% of these participants said their jobs would involve training others in specific work skills or teaching students. This percentage is higher than that for other African countries (Table 33). About 84% of the Nigerian participants felt that their A.I.D. training in the United States would help them "a great amount" in their training or teaching in Nigeria. About 14% felt that the training would help "some" (Table 34).

Table 32

Q. Did the participants know the job they will have when they return to their country after completing their training program? (Item 152)

KNOW JOB	NIGERIA		OTHER AFRICA		WORLD-WIDE	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
No	24.5	60	21.1	249	17.4	936
Yes	75.5	185	78.9	931	82.6	4450
TOTALS	100.0	245	100.0	1180	100.0	5386

Table 33

Q. Will the participants' jobs involve training others in specific work skills or teaching students? (Item 156)

TEACH OTHERS	NIGERIA		OTHER AFRICA		WORLD-WIDE	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
No	11.9	12	23.6	124	27.1	790
Yes	88.1	89	76.4	402	72.9	2134
TOTALS	100.0	101	100.0	526	100.0	2924

Table 34

Q. How much of their A.I.D. training will help the participants in training or teaching? (Item 157)

TRAINING WILL HELP	NIGERIA		OTHER AFRICA		WORLD-WIDE	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
A little	2.2	2	2.4	10	2.9	64
Some	13.5	12	20.5	85	27.8	608
A great amount	84.3	75	77.1	319	69.3	1516
TOTALS	100.0	89	100.0	414	100.0	2188

D. Expected Utilization Problems

About 69% of the Nigerian participants said they expected difficulties in utilizing their training due to a lack of equipment, tools, or facilities in Nigeria (Table 35). About 3 out of 4 said that a lack of money would be a problem in utilizing their U.S. training (Table 36). Both percentages are comparable to those from other African countries.

About 56% of the Nigerian participants expected to encounter utilization problems due to a lack of qualified staff (Table 37). Nearly 19% said that a lack of help from their immediate supervisor was likely to be a problem (Table 38). About 29% said that a lack of support from higher officials would hinder the utilization of their training (Table 39). Each of these 3 percentages is lower than that for other African countries. About 2 out of 3 of the Nigerian participants expected resistance by people in Nigeria to changing ways of doing things to be a problem for them. This is a comparable percentage to that given by participants from other African countries (Table 40).

Table 35

Q. Will the participants have a problem due to a lack of equipment, tools, or facilities in using their training? (Item 158a)

PROBLEM WITH LACK OF EQUIPMENT	NIGERIA		OTHER AFRICA		WORLD-WIDE	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	31.3	75	34.8	406	38.5	2048
Some	52.1	125	40.0	466	39.5	2104
Much	16.7	40	25.2	293	22.0	1173
TOTALS	100.0	240	100.0	1165	100.0	5325

Table 36

Q. Will lack of money be a problem for participants in using their training? (Item 158b)

PROBLEM WITH LACK OF MONEY	NIGERIA		OTHER AFRICA		WORLD-WIDE	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	25.6	61	27.1	314	29.3	1555
Some	53.8	128	40.6	470	42.6	2264
Much	20.6	49	32.4	375	28.1	1491
TOTALS	100.0	238	100.0	1159	100.0	5310

Table 37

Q. Will a lack of qualified staff be a problem for participants in using their training? (Item 158c)

PROBLEM WITH LACK OF QUALIFIED STAFF	NIGERIA		OTHER AFRICA		WORLD-WIDE	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	43.6	102	36.0	417	42.8	2273
Some	48.7	114	44.7	517	41.7	2213
Much	7.7	18	19.3	223	15.5	822
TOTALS	100.0	234	100.0	1157	100.0	5308

Table 38

Q. Will the participants have a problem in using their training due to lack of help from their immediate supervisor? (Item 158d)

PROBLEM WITH LACK OF HELP	NIGERIA		OTHER AFRICA		WORLD-WIDE	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	81.2	190	66.5	758	70.2	3689
Some	17.5	41	27.7	316	24.7	1298
Much	1.3	3	5.8	66	5.1	267
TOTALS	100.0	234	100.0	1140	100.0	5254

Table 39

Q. Will the participants have a problem with lack of support from higher officials in using their training? (Item 158e)

PROBLEM WITH LACK OF SUPPORT	NIGERIA		OTHER AFRICA		WORLD-WIDE	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	71.2	168	57.0	652	58.6	3083
Some	26.7	63	33.2	380	33.6	1765
Much	2.1	5	9.7	111	7.8	411
TOTALS	100.0	236	100.0	1143	100.0	5259

Table 40

Q. Will resistance by people to changing ways of doing things be a problem for the participants in using their training? (Item 158f)

PROBLEM WITH RESISTANCE	NIGERIA		OTHER AFRICA		WORLD-WIDE	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	33.8	80	37.1	428	41.5	2196
Some	48.5	115	47.9	552	46.1	2436
Much	17.7	42	15.0	173	12.4	658
TOTALS	100.0	237	100.0	1153	100.0	5290

E. Expected USAID Assistance

About 67% of the Nigerian participants indicated that USAID might assist by providing professional magazines, journals, and other printed materials; 50% suggested that USAID provide equipment, tools, and facilities; and 38% felt USAID might assist by providing technical advisors. About 47% suggested that USAID provide U.S. training for fellow workers; 47% also suggested that USAID help A.I.D. participants keep in touch with each other. Forty-one percent suggested USAID might help by conducting seminars, meetings, and conferences. All of these percentages are comparable to those given by participants from other African countries (Table 41).

Table 41*

Q. Do the participants expect to call on the A.I.D. Mission in their home country to help them use their training in their home country? If so, what ways may the Mission help? (Items 159&160)

HELP EXPECTED	NIGERIA		OTHER AFRICA		WORLD-WIDE	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	20.1	29	20.5	146	21.2	765
Provide technical advisors	38.4	56	36.7	263	37.4	1357
Provide equipment, tools, facilities	50.0	73	45.6	327	50.7	1837
Provide professional magazines, journals, and other printed material	67.1	98	65.8	472	66.1	2396
Conduct seminars, meetings and conferences	41.1	60	37.5	269	37.7	1368
Provide U.S. training for fellow workers	46.6	68	51.5	369	49.8	1806
Help A.I.D. participants keep in touch with each other	46.6	68	43.8	314	43.0	1560

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