

PNAAS-421

The American University in Cairo

1An 39291

SOCIAL RESEARCH CENTER

Leila Shukry El Hamamsy, Director

001759

EVALUATION SURVEY

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC - UNITED STATES

PARTICIPANT TRAINING PROGRAM

1952-1962

prepared by

Nadia Haggag Youssef

Cairo, Egypt, U.A.R.

1963

Foreword

The Social Research Center of the American University in Cairo undertook this Evaluation Survey of the Returned Participants for the United States Agency for International Development Mission to the United Arab Republic.

This study is part of a world-wide survey sponsored by the Agency for International Development. A.I.D. itself planned the whole survey and undertook the building of the interview schedules and of the coding system. The Social Research Center was responsible for all the field work in the U.A.R., and the processing of the data.

Nadia Haggag Youssef was specifically responsible for supervising the field work, the coding, the tabulation of the data as well as for the preparation of the preliminary draft.

Laila Shukry El Hamamsy

Acknowledgements

For their advice and assistance at various stages of the study, the author wishes to thank the staff of the Social Research Center. In particular, Dr. Laila Shukry El Hamamsy, Director of the Center, provided invaluable guidance and generous advice in planning and developing the project and revising the analysis of the statistical data. I am also grateful to Elizabeth W. Fernea for editing the final version of the manuscript.

The author also wishes to acknowledge the assistance of Assaad Nadim who helped with the checking of the field work, Fadwa el Guindi and Sana' Azmi who aided in the coding and tabulation of all pertinent material, and all other personnel who were responsible for the interviewing. Thanks are also due to Linda Sayegh who so patiently typed the manuscript and the attached tabulations.

Finally, I wish to express my appreciation for the cooperation and conscientious effort of the interviewees who kindly provided all the requested information.

N. H. Y.

INTRODUCTION

Between the years 1952 and 1962, 445 Egyptian men and women were sent abroad to receive training under the guidance and sponsorship of the United Arab Republic Government and the USAID[■] Technical Program in Egypt. The training took place mainly in the United States, but some of the programs included trips to other countries.

In order to evaluate the overall training program a survey of 445 returned participants was conducted during the summer of 1962. They represent those participants who had returned from training abroad prior to January 1, 1962, and not all of those who departed for training. These participants were interviewed about the preparation they received for the training, the contents of the training program and the use made of such training by both the participant and the UAR Government.

Interviewers were trained and the majority of interviews conducted in Cairo, though some were also carried out in Alexandria, Abis, Kafr el Sheian, Benha and Kafr Dawar.

Not all of the original 445 participants could be interviewed. One hundred and thirty-six cases were not examined for administrative reasons. The remaining 309 cases were investigated with the following results:

Completed cases	217
Mortality cases:	
Outside the UAR	45)
Not located	26)
Refusals	13) 92
Deceased	6)
Half terminated sched.	2)
TOTAL:	309

[■] During the years 1952-62, USAID had several titles, among them USOM and ICA. For stylistic reasons, we have used USAID, the current title, throughout this report.

The group under study departed for the training program over the years as follows:

<u>Year</u>	<u>No. of Participants departing</u>
1951	11
1952	16
1953	22
1954	14
1955	60
1956	29
1957 [■]	-
1958 [■]	-
1959	15
1960	30
1961	20
1962	-

217

Interviews were carried out at the offices of the participants. Only when such meetings were difficult or if the respondent himself requested it, were interviews conducted in private homes.

An attempt was also made to reach the present supervisors of the participants. Fifty-five, who supervised 79 of the participants under study, were interviewed. Several supervisors were out of Cairo at the time of the survey and 25 respondents claimed they had no supervisors. In other instances supervisors were very highly placed ministry officials who could not be reached. A more detailed description of the supervisors' evaluations will be found in Section V.

I. Background of participants at time of selection.

The people selected for participation in the USAID training program were Egyptian nationals, most of them residents of Cairo, and all but

[■] The USAID Technical Program ceased activities in Egypt during 1957 and 1958.

six of them men. All but three were 25 years of age and over, and 77 percent were married. The great majority of the participants, 70 percent (153 persons) were between 30 and 44 years of age; 16 percent (35 persons) were over 45 and 13 percent (29 persons) were under 30 (tables 1-3)^m.

Eighty-three percent of the participants held college degrees, almost all from the Egyptian universities in Cairo and Alexandria. Twenty had attended a university abroad - 11 in England, 8 in America, and 1 in Lebanon. The distribution of degrees may be seen in the following table (tables 4-6).

Bachelor of Arts or Science (excluding Law and Medicine)	127
Master of Arts or Science (excluding Law and Medicine)	18
Doctor of Philosophy (excluding Law and Medicine)	11
Law degrees	9
Medical degrees	10
Doctor of Veterinary Medicine	<u>3</u>
	178

The specialization of the university-trained participants shows a definite emphasis on technical fields and little in the arts and humanities. In the social sciences, only economics (related to commerce

^m All the tables mentioned in the text are available in the Appendix.

was represented in any large number, as may be seen below:

Agriculture & Agronomy	51
Engineering	49
Commerce & Economics	29
Science	11
Medicine	10
Law	9
Humanities	6
Veterinary Science	5
Sociology	5
Public Administration	2
Pharmacy	1
Photography	1
Meteorology	1
	<hr/>
	180 ^a

Forty-two of these university graduates had received additional training in specialized schools in such applied fields as education, community development, military training, public administration, public health, special languages, business and commerce, agriculture, engineering, industry, mass communication or statistics (tables 8-10).

Thirty participants (13 percent of the group), of whom two are women, had not had any university training but had attended certain specialized schools (such as military schools, engineering, public health, etc.) (table 10).

Only seven participants or three percent of the group had no previous academic training in their field prior to their selection for training abroad (table 10).

Over 95 percent of the trainees were government employees and few were in nationalized industries (table 11). Eighty one percent of the selected group had been - before departure - specialized in their

^a Two, never finished their degrees, which explains the discrepancy between table of degree distribution and table of area specialization.

particular professional fields for over five years. Of these 80 percent had been specialized ten years and more (table 12).

At the time of selection, 40 percent of the group were in the professions; of these about half were engineers, civil, agricultural or electrical. Agricultural scientists formed the next largest group of professionals, followed by university and high technical institute teachers; only a few social, physical or biological scientists were included. Thirty five percent were administrative officials in subordinate management, responsible for inspection, training, research, personnel, and general administration. Eighteen percent were in sub-professional occupations and five percent were second top level policy makers. There was only one clerical worker and one student (table 13).

When classifying the trainees by economic activities, we found that most of the trainees fell into three major groups: government administrative, technically specialized or management services; transport (mainly air and tele-communication systems); and agricultural services (mainly crop and livestock production). Only a few were engaged in engineering and construction and in manufacturing, maintenance and repair (table 14).

Due to the nature of their jobs, about 52 percent of the group were supervising from one to less than 50 people; 18 percent were supervising from 50 to 500 people. Sixteen percent indicated they did not supervise anyone (table 16).

Since almost all the participants were government officials, it follows that governmental ministries sponsored nearly every trainee. From information available on file we were able to compile data on the different ministries sponsoring the training of the 445 participants who formed the total group of participants sent abroad.

<u>Name of Ministry or govt. dept.</u>	<u>Sponsoring for total group</u>		<u>Sponsoring for group under study</u>	
	No.	%	No.	%
Agriculture	100	22.47	61	28.12
Defense	80	17.98	45	20.74
Social Affairs	49	11.01	12	5.53
Public Health	39	8.77	19	8.75
Education	43	9.66	16	7.37
Research, Development & Planning [#]	25	5.62	15	6.91
Interior	18	4.04	1	0.46
Communication	17	3.82	4	1.84
Finance	15	3.37	10	4.61
Industry	11	2.47	7	3.22
Public works	11	2.47	4	1.84
Transportation	9	2.02	9	4.15
Labor	1	.23	1	0.46
Justice	1	.23	-	-
Other agencies	19	4.27	10	4.61
Non government	<u>7</u>	<u>1.57</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1.39</u>
	445	100.00	217	100.00

Likewise, we have a complete picture of the fields for which all 445 participants were selected, as well as of the fields of the 217

[#] Under research development and planning, the following departments and councils were included: Dept. of Statistics, National Planning, Diwan El Mohasaba, Diwan El Mowazafeen, National Research Council, Tahrir Province, National Production Council, Presidency and Council of Ministers.

completed cases. In this way, we can see more clearly to what extent the completed cases are representative of the total group.

<u>Training field of activity</u>	<u>Total participants</u>		<u>Participants surveyed</u> ^m	
	No.	%	No.	%
Agriculture	97	21.79	53	24.42
Public Administration	71	15.95	36	16.59
Transportation	65	14.60	50	23.04
Industry	46	10.33	23	10.60
Community Development	41	9.21	14	6.45
Health and Sanitation	40	8.98	17	7.83
Education	28	6.29	8	3.69
Labor	5	1.12	1	.46
Army	2	.50	2	.92
Others (namely: Geology, Flow of Capital, Map & Chart Production, Prison Administration, Physics, Nuclear Science, Radio Communio.)	<u>50</u>	<u>11.23</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>6.00</u>
Total:	445	100.00	217	100.00

Almost all respondents, (i.e. 202) had been selected to attend the training program by their direct supervisors or by the ministry in which they worked. Of the thirteen who had applied on their own, five applied directly to their supervisors, two to USAID, one to the ministry and the others to non-governmental and non-USAID organizations. Only nine participants stated they had been selected directly by USAID, including the one mentioned above as having applied directly to that organization (tables 19, 20, 21, 22).

^m See table 18 for specific functional fields of training activity.

- 2 -

In the opinion of the group, the most decisive factors influencing their final selection were "personal ability," "the needs of the job," and "professional and educational" qualifications, which 94 percent rated as "very important." A somewhat smaller percentage, i.e. 77 percent considered "language ability" as "very important" in determining the choice (table 23). All 44 percent who rated "personal contacts" as a "very important" factor in their selection considered "personal ability," "needs of the job," "professional and educational qualifications" and "language ability" to be "very important" as well (tables 24-27).

II. Contents of the Training Program

The training program included observation tours, on-the-job training, university attendance and special group programs. Seventy percent of the trainees took part in two or more of these activities; 30 percent were offered only one. Seventy three percent of the whole group took part in observation tours, 67 percent received on-the-job training; 39 percent were enrolled in universities; and nine percent were given special group programs (tables 28-32).

Where two or more activities were combined, (as with 48 percent) the most frequent combination was observation tours with on-the-job training (28 percent), and where three activities were combined (as with 18 percent of the group), the largest number was offered observation tours,

on-the-job training and university enrollment. Only 1.4 percent combined all four phases of the program (table 33).

Eighty-five members (39 percent) were enrolled in universities (table 34). Of these, 19 received Master's degrees, in health and sanitation (5); education (4); agriculture and natural resources (3); industry (3); public administration (3); and community development (1). An additional 22 received non-academic certificates, in agriculture and natural resources (8); transportation (5); public administration (5); industry (2); and general and miscellaneous training (2) (table 35). The remaining 44 trainees, although they attended universities, did not receive degrees or certificates (table 36).

In addition to the training sessions, a seminar in communications was offered at the end of the program. This was designed to demonstrate to the trainees various specific ways in which they might utilize their training and transmit it to others. Only 27 percent of the group attended the seminar (table 41), and of these, most were trainees in public administration, transportation and agriculture (table 45).

The communication seminar seems to have been a general success, for all who attended, with the exception of two, found it useful (table 42). Seventy six percent of the group attended the seminar indicated that they were able to apply to their work some ideas gained there (table 43). Only a few criticisms were mentioned, that the seminar was too intensive or too short, or the location unsuitable (table 44).

The occupational groups apparently more successful in using ideas and materials from the seminar were subordinate management personnel, and professionals (with the exception of engineers). Twenty-three percent

of the group as a whole were unable to use their training gained in the seminar as against 40 percent of the engineers alone (table 46).

Curiously enough, attendance at the seminar did not seem to influence the participant's total utilization score.[■] Sixty-eight-percent of those who had attended the seminar had the highest utilization score, as against 84 percent with the highest utilization score who had not attended the seminar (table 47).

III. Program Planning & Orientation

Orientation

Before departure, many of the participants received some kind of briefing, such as general orientation, English language instruction, or information about the host country. In addition, some took part in the actual planning of their program. Let us see how they fared.

Eighty percent of the participants were offered orientation sessions by USAID. The majority of those attending (91 percent) found them very valuable, although 8 percent would have preferred to spend the time in the actual training program (table 48). Approximately 60 percent of those who attended considered the sessions adequate. The rest suggested possible improvements, for example, prolonging the sessions and including more information on the country of training. Further suggestions cited were: a) the orientation sessions should be conducted in respondent's own country; b) they should be better organized; c) visual aids should be used; d) sessions should not be confined to government officials; e) not much propaganda should be included; and f) the organizers of the sessions should be aware of participant's difficulties (table 49).

[■] Results of answers to a group of related questions designed to cross-check the over-all effect of the training on the participant.

English language instruction was also arranged. Eighty-eight and nine-tenths percent of the group, however, did not receive any English language instruction (table 50) and of these 22 percent felt they could have made use of such instruction (table 51). From the total group, 23 percent had language difficulties during their program (table 52). Even among the 19 participants who had received English language instruction, six still found difficulty either in understanding or in being understood (table 53). On the other hand 7.7 percent of those who had not received training in the use of the language met with no difficulties (table 54).

Before leaving, 184 members of the group felt they had been given an adequate[■] amount of information about life in the host country - the use of restaurants and public facilities, colloquial speech, religious practices, usage of currency and other general information about manners and customs.

However, 33 members of the group felt in varying degrees that more briefing on these subjects would have been useful. Among these, nine had not received information on any one of the items above mentioned, and 11 had received very little information (table 55).

The areas in which participants mentioned they needed most briefing were use of restaurants and public utilities, manners and customs and colloquial speech. Almost all knew about currency usage (table 56). A few did point out that they would have liked more background information

■
"Adequate" is defined as having enough information on all or all but one of the items concerning the host country.

on the host country's history, economic and political structure, and its political, religious and racial attitudes (table 57).

Among occupational groups, all second top policy makers indicated they had adequate information on either all, or all but one of the items concerning the host country. We also find more among subordinate management officials (90 percent) indicating they had adequate information than among other occupational groups - such as professionals (76 percent) and sub-professionals (82 percent) (table 58).

All but one of the participants aged over 45 said they had received enough information (table 59), and only one stated he had any language problem (table 60). But it is worth mentioning that in this, as in other answers, the older groups may be reluctant to admit their difficulties, or, since they have returned several years ago, may not have as fresh memories of their difficulties as the younger trainees.

Program Planning:

Sixty three percent of the participants stated they had no opportunity to participate in the planning of their training program¹ (table 63). On the other hand, 16 percent considered that their program had been based totally on their own ideas, ten percent indicated they had planned the program jointly with USAID, and one percent that USAID alone² had managed it (table 64).

¹ It is feared that in some instances questions pertaining to program planning might have been understood in terms of plans made regarding the program upon arrival in host country and not (as intended) prior to departure.

² The rest, or 7 percent, said they participated but did not remember how

Prior to departure, the majority 171 (78 percent) of the participants stated they had received complete or at least adequate¹ information about the training program (table 65). The other 46^m participants felt they needed more briefing, particularly on the subjects they would be learning and the places they would be visiting (table 66). Among those who stated they had complete or adequate information on all aspects of the program, second top policy makers and subordinate management officials rank higher (91 percent and 81 percent) than other occupational groups. For example, only 72 percent of the professionals and 75 percent of the engineers said they had enough information (table 67).

Employers were not generally a source of information about the program. Fifty-three percent stated their employers said nothing to them about planning their training program (table 70); fewer still were briefed by their respective ministries² (table 72). Of those participants who indicated they were kept informed about the program, one third were either employed by USAID or engaged in a joint project with USAID (table 73).

Seventy-one percent of the group indicated they were satisfied with the program before departure, while about eight percent (18) stated they were "not well satisfied" (table 74). Of the latter group, eight persons were in transportation and four in public administration (table 75).

1

"Adequate" is defined as having enough information on all or all but one of the items concerning the training program.

m

One respondent's answer could not be ascertained.

2

Considering that the overwhelming majority were government employees, "employer" and "ministry" are really one. It is supposed that when asked about "employer," respondents tended to think of their direct supervisors, or chiefs; while when "ministry" was mentioned, it was taken to mean another administrative unit (than their own) in the ministry.

A further 20 percent felt they did not know enough about their programs prior to departure to express either satisfaction or dissatisfaction. These were trainees mainly in the fields of agriculture and natural resources (table 75).

Although there is a slightly smaller percentage of participants expressing dissatisfaction with their program among those who had participated in its planning than among those who had not participated, the difference is too slight to show any definite relationship between participation in the planning and eventual satisfaction (table 76).

IV. Evaluation of Program

Participants' Evaluation

In the participants' own statements, we find general satisfaction with the training program. Fifty-eight percent found the entire program "very satisfactory." Was the program also important to them? Sixty-one percent said it was. Seventy two percent of the group found the level of their programs just right. Ninety-five percent of the group felt they had received enough guidance and counselling. Many suggested changes, and commented on individual aspects of the program; thirty-five percent had negative comments to offer. Let us look more closely at some of the details which emerge from this section of the survey.

Almost all of the participants (86 percent) felt they were given enough attention upon arrival (table 78). Generally, participants were assigned project managers and in most of these cases, the project manager

himself met the participant when he arrived in the country of training to discuss the program with him (table 79), and offered him guidance throughout course of the training (table 80). About 59 percent of the group found their program arranged in complete detail when they arrived, about 29 percent in partial detail and 11 percent indicated their programs had not been set up at all (table 81).

Eleven participants (five percent of the group) complained that they did not get enough attention and guidance during the course of their program; all except one of these were met upon arrival by their project manager (table 82). Six of the eleven had their programs managed by a USAID official, the other five by someone connected with the U.S. government (table 83). Eight members of this group had not helped to plan their program (table 84). We do find that all but two of this dissatisfied group had no complete program arranged for them when they arrived (table 85).

The percentage of programs not set up at all is slightly higher, (i.e. 18 percent) in agriculture and natural resources and in community development (14 percent). On the other hand, none of the participants in education had found their programs unplanned and only one in the field of industry and mining (table 88).

About forty three percent found their programs just right, 54 percent found their programs too short; and only one percent found them too long (table 89). A slightly lower percentage among those in the fields of sanitation and transport (41 percent) found their programs just right and a higher percentage among participants in the fields of industry and mining (65 percent) (table 90).

Regarding the level of the program, 71 percent indicated it was about right. Twenty one percent found it was too simple, and five percent felt it was too advanced (table 91). Finding the level of the program advanced does not seem in any way related to language difficulties (table 92). Previous university training was not a factor either, for among the five percent who found the level too advanced, was found an equal number of university graduates and non-graduates (table 93).

As compared to the total percentage of those who found the level of the program too advanced, i.e. five percent, we found 21 percent of trainees in Community Development, 11 percent of the trainees in health and sanitation and eight percent in public administration. None in the fields of agriculture or education found their program too difficult. Trainees in general and miscellaneous fields and in transportation were proportionately highest in finding the program too simple (table 94).

None of the 19 participants who had less than two years of specialization in their own fields found the training too simple. Nineteen percent of those who were specialized for "two to less than five years" found their programs "simple" as over against 22 percent for those with "five to less than ten" and 24 percent for those who have had ten or more years of specialization (table 95).

An interesting sidelight is found in the fact that of the 12 who found the level too difficult, seven had not had an opportunity to participate in the planning of their program (table 96).

About 73 percent of the group indicated also that they had followed the program as it was originally planned (table 97). In 22 percent of the cases programs underwent important changes such as shifting location or adding subjects (table 98), and this was done mostly at the request of the participants themselves (table 99) who considered these changes necessary (table 100). Five participants changed to a degree program during the course of their stay (table 98).

Participants were asked to indicate what were the "most" as well as the "least" useful and valuable parts of their experience. Seventeen percent of the group stated that "everything" they saw and did during their training was both useful and valuable. A large number (71 percent) specifically mentioned as the most useful and valuable part of their experience aspects of the program itself; mainly on-the-job training and practical work and observation tours and visits to industrial firms. To a lesser extent studies in general, specific subjects studied, specific techniques or procedures observed and university attendance were indicated .

Another seven percent found most valuable the opportunity to observe conditions in the host country such as staff discipline and teamwork, modern procedures and equipment, or ways in which offices and agencies are organized.

A minor percentage (almost 3 percent) felt that gaining better understanding of other peoples and greater knowledge of another country's way of life was most meaningful (table 101).

Only 82 participants or 37 percent offered negative comments about their experience (table 102). Of this group, the majority had remained in training less than a year (table 103). To break down this group farther, 56 percent of the sub-professionals had found parts of their experience neither useful or valuable, while only 35 percent of the professionals and only 27 percent of the subordinate management group at time of selection had criticisms to offer (table 104).

Ninety percent of the negative comments were related to aspects of the training program such as universities or specific courses participants attended (31 percent); visits made to specific places (28 percent); and to a much lesser extent, the on-the-job training (10 percent); and the orientation program (two percent). Only ten percent mentioned factors unrelated to the program itself. These included in almost equal number discriminatory attitudes towards races or nationalities that participants either experienced, observed or read about; social and recreational activities, and customs and cultural attitudes which appeared to them strange, embarrassing, or uninteresting (tables 102-105).

When asked whether their training required them to do or to see too many different things, 48 percent of the group replied they were satisfied, though as many as 32 percent indicated they would have liked their training program to have included more. The other 18 percent felt they had been made to see or to do too much (table 106).

A higher proportion of trainees in the fields of transportation (38 percent) and industry and mining (43 percent) than in other training fields indicated they would have liked more included in their programs (table 107).

Length of stay does not seem to be a factor here, for we find only a very slight difference in the percentage of participants indicating they would have liked to see more from among those who had spent six months or less in the country and among those who had spent more than six months (table 108).

Though almost 60 percent of the group felt the program was complete, the general feeling of the other 40 percent was for more social, cultural and recreational activities and for more travel (table 109). This feeling was not particularly related either to respondent's profession or education.

On the other hand, 56 percent of the participants indicated they had had enough social activities arranged for them (table 110), and a large majority indicated they had been entertained in private homes (table 111).

Respondents were asked what changes they would recommend in case they were to go through the program again. Of the 269 multiple answers received in this query, only 13 specifically stated that they desired no changes or improvements. One hundred and twenty three proposed changes in the emphasis of the training program. This group felt that the training was too general and would have preferred it to be somewhat longer and with broader objectives (68 of the 123). The next largest group (34) desired more specialized training. To a lesser extent, some wished it had been more specifically related to the needs of their job (21).

Seventy-six suggestions were in favor of changes in the arrangement of the training program; specific requests included more advance information on the program (25) a chance to plan the program (20); better planning of the program (18), and lastly, more help in their daily living expenses (13). Fifty-seven of the replies were suggestions for changes in the type of training, i.e. that it include more university or academic activities (23), more practical work (20) and more observation (14) (table 112).

Asked how they felt about the entire training program, both before and after, participants reacted as follows:

<u>Before Training</u>			<u>After Training</u>		
	No	%		No	%
Well satisfied	154	70.97	Very satisfactory	127	58.53
Not very	18	8.29	Moderately so	60	27.65
Don't know	44	20.28	Not too satisfactory	20	9.22
Not ascertained	<u>1</u>	<u>0.46</u>	Not satisfactory at all	7	3.22
	217	100.00	Not ascertained	<u>3</u>	<u>1.38</u>
				217	100.00

Analyzing the 27 participants who were either "not too satisfied" (20) or "not satisfied at all" (7), 22 of them are aged 39 and under, and a progressive increase in degree of satisfaction is found as the age groups increase; this is especially apparent with those aged 40 and over (table 113). Also, when examining the occupational categories of the "dissatisfied" group (at time of selection) we find that 20 percent are in the sub-professional group, as compared to ten percent from the professionals (not engineers), seven percent from the engineers and 12 percent from subordinate management level (table 114). Trainees in industry and mining, and in education were most satisfied with their programs (almost 100 percent each). Eighteen percent of those in functional fields in transportation were dissatisfied as compared to 15 percent of those in agriculture, and eight percent of those in public administration fields (table 115).

The number of dissatisfied people is relatively lower among those who did not attend orientation sessions (9) than among those who did (18) (table 116). Also, 13 from among the dissatisfied group had earlier indicated they had English language difficulties during their stay abroad (table 117). The length of the program also showed itself as a factor in creating dissatisfaction for as many as 18 out of the 27 under discussion felt their program was too short (table 118).

Of those who attended universities or took special courses during their training program (85), all those who received degrees (19), and all but two out of the 22 who received certificates were positively satisfied with the program. Seven out of the 44 who did not receive either degrees or certificates expressed dissatisfaction with the program (table 119). A large number (17 out of 27) of the dissatisfied were also participants who felt they had not had sufficient social activities arranged for them (tables 120-127).

The reactions of the group towards the importance of the training program to them as a whole was as follows:

61 percent felt it was "most important"

37 percent felt it was of "in-between importance"

1 percent felt it was a "waste of time"

Fifty percent of the group commented that the money USAID made available for them was insufficient for the high cost of living in the United States. A few persons also indicated that the money should be adjusted to individual needs (tables 128, 129). Persons from all occupational backgrounds as at time of selection were dissatisfied with the cash allowance. However, a somewhat higher percentage is found among the engineers (63 percent), the sub-professionals (61 percent) and the second level top policy makers (58 percent),

than among other groups. Forty three percent of the subordinate management officials and 38 percent of the professionals felt the money was inadequate (table 130).

V. Supervisors' evaluation of the program

In order to evaluate and appraise the USAID training program more completely, we attempted to contact and interview the present supervisor of each participant.

Unfortunately we were only able to locate 55 such supervisors, who in turn were supervising 79 (or 36 percent) of our total group of 217 respondents. Twenty-five participants maintained they did not have supervisors; in other instances supervisors were out of Cairo at the time of the survey or occupying very high governmental positions (ministers or under-secretary of State) and as such were almost impossible to contact. In many cases, supervisors constantly postponed meeting interviewers and when field work had to be abruptly interrupted, many interviews were still pending.

The forthcoming discussion and analysis is therefore limited to interviews with 55 supervisors¹ about 79 participants.

Many of the supervisors we interviewed were in a good position to evaluate the effect of the program on the participant. Of the 79 participant under discussion, 30 were still working under the same supervisor they had before their training abroad.²

¹ Fourteen of these supervisors had themselves participated in the USAID training program during the past ten years.

² Supervisors indicated that, in addition to the 30 participants under their direct supervision, they were also familiar with the training program of another five participants.

Eighty percent (24) had been recommended for the training program by these same supervisors. And before 26 of these participants left, the organizations for which they worked had already made special plans for the utilization of their future training.

However, the supervisor did not seem to play a major role in initiating or planning the program for the participant. According to the supervisors, ten of the 35 participants had initiated their own training program, 17 had it initiated by someone in their department or section and in eight cases by the ministry or other government officials. Supervisors had helped only 13 participants to plan their programs, either entirely, or by deciding on or suggesting subjects to be studied, or activities to be observed. To a lesser extent, supervisors recommended the country or the university, organization or company to which the trainee should be assigned.

Many of the supervisors had known the participants for several years; twenty two of the participants had been known by their supervisors for from 11 to over 20 years; in 52 cases, the supervisors had known the participants for from one to ten years. Only one participant had been known to his supervisor for less than a year.

Perhaps even more important, in 48 cases, supervisors stated they now spent from 8 to 16 hours or even more per week with the participants. In 20 cases, the supervisor spent less than four hours per week with the participant. Thirty seven of the participants had, since returning, discussed their studies abroad with their supervisors. Twenty-seven had also shared with their supervisors some general experiences of their travel and training.

Evaluation of Participants' training

General praise for the training program came from the supervisors we interviewed. For 65 out of the 79 participants, the supervisors felt that the training was "essential" (53) or "very important" (12 cases). For eight participants superiors indicated that the training, though "helpful," was "not very important." Only in three cases did supervisors feel the training was "not useful."

A further confirmation of the value of the program came from the supervisors who asserted that the program was worth both the time and money involved as far as 62 of the participants were concerned. Only for five trainees did the supervisors feel the program was not worth either the trouble or money involved.■

How suitable was the course and how useful has it proved to be to the organizations to which the participants are attached? In 63 cases, supervisors answered, the training was excellent and quite suitable. Supervisors for eight of the 63 specifically mentioned that a) participants are applying their training in their work; b) this is valuable to the employer and to the country; and c) as a result of the training, the participant has become more efficient.

The supervisors also agreed that many of the participants had been able to convey to others some of the information learned during their training period. According to the supervisors, 53 had been successful in this, through formal teaching, lectures, seminars, and training sessions. Radio or

■ Supervisors could not remember, or did not know enough about the matter to express a definite view for 15 percent of the cases.

television broadcasts had also been used, as well as films and slides. To a lesser extent participants revised or improved methods and equipment, or introduced new methods and equipment. A few participants had also written articles, books, or manuals, had translated publications or held demonstrations.

The few negative comments offered by supervisors for five participants were mainly that training was unsuitable either in general terms or specifically because it was a) not appropriate to the work the participant is doing; b) cannot be applied; c) is not appropriate to the participants' training and ability, or d) participant is not teaching it to others. For another ten, the supervisors said they could not evaluate the suitability of the program because they either did not know enough about the program or about the participant or both.

What changes would the supervisors recommend if and when other trainees were to be sent abroad for similar training? The multiple suggestions made are tabulated below.

No change	25
Changes in program planning	12
Changes in program content	36
Lengthen program	8
Other	3

In over-all rating of participants and program, the supervisors were scored on a series of four questions. To what extent had participants been able to convey to others information acquired on training program? Was the program worth the cost and difficulty involved? How suitable was the

training in increasing the participant's usefulness to the organization to which he is attached? How important did he consider the participants' training to be? The results formed another total utilization score, and the spread of scores was as follows:

The highest score for 46 participants

Second highest score for 13 participants

Lowest score for 2 participants

In the case of 18 participants, it was impossible to compute the total score, due to insufficient data on one or more of the questions.

When asked to appraise the overall program, a few supervisors (seven in one case, and up to ten in other cases) did not reply. For the rest, the responses were as follows:

a. Procedure of selection: Thirty-eight supervisors were satisfied with the actual procedure by which participants were selected for the training program. Four felt that participants should have been selected by supervisors; that knowledge and experience in the specific field should have been important criteria for selection; and that selection should have been more appropriate to the requirements of the participants' job, or to those of his employer or his country.

b. Subject matter of program: Thirty-eight supervisors were satisfied with the subject matter of the training program. Six found it inappropriate to participants' background, felt it was too broad; or believed it included too much theory and not enough practical work.

Two thirds of the supervisors felt the level of the program was satisfactory. Three indicated that the level was either too elementary or good for participants in some fields but not others.

We found fewer supervisors who were satisfied with the length of the program. As many as 18 found this aspect unsatisfactory, almost always because it was too short (one specifically indicated that participant did not have time to get a degree). Twelve felt the program was not long enough to permit practical experience, or that the amount of practical experience provided was insufficient, but 36 were satisfied in this respect. Several suggested that the programs should be planned to fit the specific needs of the participant, his employer or his country.

Again we find the majority (35) satisfied with the country or countries of training and only eight dissatisfied. Six of the latter felt that training should have included visits to more countries and one specifically mentioned that some of all of the training should be in Europe.

Supervisors also said they hoped more people would have an opportunity to take part in such training programs. Returned participants should, they added, have some means of keeping informed on new developments in their fields.

VI. Present Picture

When the survey was conducted, 65 percent of the participants had been back from their training program for from five to seven years and over. Almost all of the remainder had been back from six months to three years (table 132). Ninety four percent resided in capital city areas (as against 95 percent who did so before departure); four percent were living in rural or village areas and one percent in provincial city areas (table 133). Ninety-five percent were employed, principally by the government, two percent were

unemployed and one percent were on pension (table 135).¹

Let us look more closely at how the participant's job was affected by his training. Only 21 percent of the group, a total of 47 persons, were given posts upon returning which were different from those they had held before departure.²

Breakdown of group whose first job after return from training program was different to job held before departure

Given different jobs (but what they were expecting)	25
Given better jobs than expected (more salary, more responsibility, higher status)	10
Given job in field of training	1
Given job other than what was promised	3
Given job in a different profession	2
Given job not in field of training	1
Changed from private to government job	1
Given worse job (lower salary, lower status)	1
Given different job, not specified	3

1

Only one participant indicated he had never had a job since his return, while four more had apparently suffered from periods of unemployment ranging from one month to two years or more. The other unemployed respondent was vague about the periods he has not been working. The rest have never been unemployed since returning to the U.A.R. (table 136).

2

Throughout this section, the picture of job shifts has been affected by a confusion of terms arising out of the schedule itself. Two questions in this category will illustrate. Participants were asked, "was the first job you had when you returned from the training program the same as the job you had when you left for training?" and "is your present position the same as the one you had when you first returned or is it different?" (The latter apparently was meant to refer to promotions within the same job.) As the Arabic translation for "job" and "position" was identical, the answers reflect this, and thus we have no record of promotions or changes of position which may have been given to participants in the same job.

More job shifts occurred for participants in education and in industry and mining. Fifty percent of the trainees in education and 34 percent of those in industry and mining have assumed different positions, as against 17 percent of the trainees in agriculture and in health and sanitation respectively, and only seven percent of those in community development (table 137). A summary of the change in job status is shown below (table 138).

First job after return same as job before departure	170
First job after return different from job before departure	47
Present job same as first job after return	106
Present job different from first job after return	102

Of those who now have different jobs from those held when they first returned, 78 percent have been back from their training program for five years and longer, and 19 percent have been back from one to three years (table 139).

The following set of comparative tables will demonstrate the range of job shifts, as well as the changes in fields of interest which have taken place since the training program was completed. An expanded version of these tables will be found in the Appendix (table 140).

1

In the case of nine respondents, this question was not applicable.

Table 1

Occupations of Trainees Before and After Training

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Before Training</u>	<u>After Training</u> [#]
Top policy makers, executives and administrators (national level and/or national impact)	-	1
Second level policy makers, executives and administrators	12	28
Program and administrative officials, subordinate management	76	82
Professional engineers	41	26
Professional occupations (other than program and administrative officials and engineers)	47	35
Sub-professional occupations	39	37
Clerical workers	1	2

Table 2

Economic Activities of Trainees Before and After Training

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Before Training</u>	<u>After Training</u> [#]
Services, government and non-government	48	51
Government administrative and regulatory services	24	20
Specialized government technical services	18	15
Management services in government agencies	8	6
Agriculture, forestry and fisheries	40	36
Mining and quarrying	1	3
Manufacturing, maintenance and repair	9	12
Engineering and construction	15	16
Electricity, gas, water and sanitary services	4	3
Transport, storage and communication services	48	48
Commerce, banking and insurance	1	1

Excluding the six respondents who were unemployed at the time of the survey.

If we look closely at the group of tables, it seems apparent that no startling changes have taken place in the employment status of the participants since their return from the training program. One or two exceptions deserve mention, however. Second level policy makers more than doubled in number (from 12 to 28) and one from this group became a top policy level official. We also find a slight rise in the number of subordinate management officials (from 76 to 82) and curiously enough a drop in the professions from 41 to 26 among engineers and from 47 to 35 among all other professions. The latter may be explained by the fact that many of the professionals are now in administrative jobs, though still associated with their professions, and as such are classified under administration.

The participants themselves do not believe that the training program was a vital factor in changing their job status for 69 percent of the group stated that even if they had not taken the training, they felt their occupational status would have been the same. Fourteen percent felt it would not have been as good, while three percent thought it would have been better (table 142). All those who had a year or more of training thought that their present job would have been the same (57 percent) or not as good (21 percent) whether or not they had taken part in the program. The few who felt that the training made them miss better jobs are among those with less than one year of training (table 143).

How were the participants able to utilize their new skills and knowledge gained during the training program? To discover this, interviewers asked many different kinds of questions. Participants were first asked whether or not they were able to utilize their skills at all, how

they were able to utilize them, and whether or not they had been able to convey some of their ideas to others.

The response was generally positive. Eighty-four percent of the group, representing all fields, reported they were able to use, in varying degrees, some of their new knowledge in their current jobs (tables 144-147). Fifty-four percent said they had been able to use "almost everything" or "everything", and 27 percent were able to utilize "some" or "a little" of what they had learned (table 148). The supervisors of participants seemed also to welcome these new skills, for 63 percent of the participants who have supervisors indicated they found the latter "very helpful" (51 percent) or "somewhat helpful" (12 percent) in enabling them to put the new training into action (tables 149-151).

As far as conveying new ideas to others, this also has been achieved in varying degrees by 84 percent of the entire group (table 153). Fifty-three percent felt they were able to transmit "almost everything" or "everything;" 28 percent could only convey "some" or "a little". In all cases this was done mainly through lectures, formal training programs, teaching, on-the-job training, and informal discussions (table 153A).

The percentage of those who were able to convey what they learned during their training to others was lowest among the second level policy makers and the sub-professional groups as at time of selection, for four out of 12 of the former and 25 percent of the latter have not been able to convey what they learned to others. This compares rather startlingly with the other occupational groups such as the engineers and the other

professionals who by no less than 90 percent were able to transmit to others some of their new skills and practices (tables 154, 155).

Twenty-six percent of the total group stated they had no plans for using in the future training which had as yet not been utilized (table 157). Again the current second level policy makers and the sub-professionals were high in this group, 42 percent and 29 percent respectively. On the other hand very few (16 percent) of the professional groups combined indicated they had no future intention of using training which they have not until now been able to apply (table 158).

What were the difficulties which participants experienced in utilizing their skills or conveying them to other people? One hundred and seventeen said they had found no difficulty whatsoever. The other half of the group's reported difficulties cover a wide range. Lack of equipment was cited in 38 instances, lack of funds in eight; problems of personal relations in the job situation in another 31 cases, and general administrative reasons in 22. Insufficient authority was mentioned, as was lack of opportunity, and difficulties arising from the training program itself. The latter were very few in number (table 159).

Participants' activities

Participants were also asked about what they had done in their jobs when they first returned to the UAR. Had they tried to introduce improvements? If so, what were those improvements? Were they in any way related to the training they had just received? What did the participant himself consider the most outstanding thing he had done in his job since returning?

Eighty-three percent (182 persons) of the group related that they had been stimulated to new activity upon return. The kinds of things they did may be seen below:

Changed or improved procedures	78
Performed job in superior way or assumed additional responsibilities	24
Taught others	18
Did research	17
Wrote books	10
Constructed something (dam, irrigation system, etc.)	11
Made formal plans for future development	8
Instituted new curriculum, organization	8
Bought or instituted purchase of new equipment	5
Continued studies	2
Other	1

About 95 percent of this group felt that in these activities they used the knowledge acquired from the USAID training program (table 160,. Over 81 percent of the group indicated or implied that they themselves had initiated and implemented the activities they had reported (table 161

Those who reported an activity which they believed to be outstanding were in the following fields:

Agriculture	23 percent
Transportation	21 "
Public administration	15 "
Industry	9 "
Health	9 "
Education	8 "
Community development	6 "
Labor	1 "
Other activities	5 "

If we turn to the 35 persons who had no first activity to report at all, we find that the trainees in the field of transportation form the single largest group (24 percent) (tables 162, 163).

The schedule included a question on other new activities. Half the group (110 persons) reported that they had undertaken, upon their return from training, a second activity which they believed to be outstanding. The distribution, according to the kind of action and the fields in which it was undertaken, follows the same pattern as the first activity (tables 164-169).

Utilization score

In order to cross-check the effect of the training program on the participants a group of six questions were combined, and the results tabulated into what is called a "total utilization score." The questions are related not only to the participants' employment status since their return, but also to their ability to utilize newly-acquired skills and convey them to other people. From an analysis of the participants' "utilization score," we may glean a further final insight into the program and its consequences for the individual participants.

Fifty-nine percent of the group under study received the highest utilization score (75 or higher); 15 percent the second highest (50-74) and none had less than a score of 50.[■] The break-down by occupation is interesting; all trainees in industry and mining and all but one in education received the highest utilization score (table 170). In the middle range (50-74) are found relatively more of the sub-professionals (as at the time of selection) (table 171), subordinate management and health and sanitation trainees.

[■] It should be noted that 24 percent of the group did not receive any utilization score because of the lack of data on one or more questions.

Of those participants who emerged with the second highest score (50-74) 33 percent of these had found the level of the program too simple. Yet we still find that 26 percent of those participants with the highest score reported they did not find their program just right in one way or another (tables 172-181).

The over-all survey seems to show a certain relationship between satisfaction with the program and the person's ability to utilize the training. Among those who received the highest utilization score, only seven percent had not been satisfied with the program as against 21 percent dissatisfied among those who received the second highest utilization score (table 182).

Contact with USAID

At the time of selection, 54 (24 percent) of the respondents had been employed full time either directly or in a joint project with USAID. An additional six worked part-time or occasionally with USAID or in a joint government project (table 183).

After their return from the training program, most participants apparently maintained little contact with USAID (table 184). Only 67 people (almost 31 percent of the group) have had some dealings with USAID; 24 of them have worked for USAID or in a joint project with USAID since their return (table 185).

Relatively more trainees in community development, transportation, and industry and mining seem to have maintained their relationship with USAID. For example 50 percent of the former and about 40 percent of the two latter have continued some contact, as compared to 30 percent of those in

public administration, 25 percent of those in education, 23 percent of those in health and sanitation and 22 percent of those in agriculture (table 186). Also, there are relatively more among this group from sub-professional ranks than from other occupational ranks at the time of selection. Forty-eight percent of their total have had contact with USAID compared to 33 percent of the second level policy makers, 30 percent of the combined professional groups and 21 percent of the subordinate management officials (table 187). Even in terms of their current occupations we find sub-professional groups maintaining relatively more contact with USAID (table 188).

Sixty-six persons (30 percent of the group) indicated that a USAID technician is available to them (table 189). Twenty-six have frequent contact with him, 35 meet him occasionally, five have never met him at all.) (tables 190-192).

After their return, participants rarely asked for help from USAID. Of the 30 who did, (table 193) most requested technical advice or printed material (table 194); one third however never received the help they requested (table 195). A proportionately larger group from among the current professionals (other than engineers) asked for help than from any other occupational category. We find that 25 percent of the professionals had requested help from USAID as compared to 16 percent of the sub-professionals, ten percent of those in subordinate management, seven percent of the engineers and three percent of the second level top policy makers (tables 196-198).

Out of the 174 participants who attended general orientation sessions and as such should be receiving a newsletter, only 52 percent indicated they were regular recipients (table 199).

Of the total group, 50 joined U.S. professional societies during their training program (table 200) and of these 35 are members of these associations (table 201) today.

SUMMARY

Judging the success of a program such as the USAID training program depends on the criteria used. If, for example, we take change in job status as a criterion, then the program was not overwhelmingly successful, for half of the trainees surveyed are still in the same jobs they held before departure and 69 percent stated that even if they had not participated in the training program, they believed their occupational status would have been the same. However, the number of the second-level policy makers among the participants is twice what it was before the program began and a number of professionals seem to have gone into administration in their own fields. Both facts are presumably signs of some promotion.

But if we take as our criteria the participant's own view of whether or not the program was important to him or whether or not he was able to use his training in his job, then the program seems considerably more successful. Sixty-one percent of the group believed the program to be most important to them, and 84 percent, representing all fields, reported they were able to use, in varying degrees, some of their newly-acquired knowledge in their current jobs. The direct superiors of the participants also seemed to welcome these new skills, for 63 percent of the participants found their supervisors "very" or "somewhat" helpful in enabling them to put their new training into action. Again, 84 percent of the participants felt they were able to teach these skills to others. One of the most interesting results is that the majority of respondents were able to use their training and initiate new programs and procedures despite obstacles they may have encountered upon their return. Another indication of the favorable impression made by the program is found in the supervisors'

comments that more people should have an opportunity to take part in such training.

Fifty-eight percent of the participants found the program very satisfactory in almost every respect. Over 70 percent approved of the level of the program. The one single most frequent complaint was that the program was too short (both supervisors and participants mentioned this). In fact we find that 184 out of 217, or 84.7 percent of the programs lasted for less than one year. This may have been a limiting factor in the success of the entire program for many of the participants, because the majority of those trainees who did stay long enough to earn degrees or certificates were satisfied with the program, and many report shifts of jobs which presumably were improvements for them.

It is interesting that participants in some fields seem to have benefited in more than others. In education and in industry and mining especially, trainees show general satisfaction with the program and report they were able to utilize their training. Also more job shifts occurred after training for persons in these fields.[■]

Further investigation into the experience of trainees in other fields might show in what ways the program could have been made more meaningful for them, or why they encountered difficulties upon their return to the UAR which were not present for education and industry and mining.

The reason is not clear, but most of the complaints and criticisms about the program seem to have come from those in the 30-44 age group. Many of those who said they lacked adequate information on the host country or

[■] The respondents in education numbered 8 persons; those in industry and mining totalled 23.

on their training program were in this group, and this was also the group which indicated more difficulty with the English language.

When the question was asked, "what was the least valuable part of your experience?," only two people mentioned the orientation program. One wonders however why 42 of the participants did not take part in the orientation sessions and why 88.9 (193) of the participants did not receive any English language instruction. Twenty-three percent (46 persons) of this latter group felt they could have benefited by such instruction. And only 60 of the entire group of 217 attended the seminar in communications, although the seminar was set up to show the participants specific ways and methods of applying their training and teaching it to others.

Follow-up is another area in which the program seems to be weak. Even though only 30 of the participants requested help from USAID after their return, one third of this group never received the help (technical advice or printed material) which they requested. Of the 174 participants who attended general orientation sessions and as such should be receiving a newsletter, only 52 percent said they were regular recipients.

The beneficial effects of such training, for Egypt as well as for the individual participant might well be maximized if some of the suggestions of both participants and supervisors could be incorporated into future programs.

Table 1.

PARTICIPANTS AREA OF RESIDENCE
AT TIME OF SELECTION

Area of Residence	No.	%
Capital city	207	95.39
Provincial city	3	1.39
Rural place, town	7	3.22
Total	217	100.00

=====

Table 2.

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF RETURNED PARTICIPANTS
AS OF TIME OF SELECTION

Age Groups	No.	%
Less than 25	3	1.38
25 - 29	26	11.98
30 - 34	57	26.27
35 - 39	61	28.11
40 - 44	35	16.13
45 - 49	19	8.76
50 - 54	13	5.99
55 & over	3	1.38
Total	217	100.00

=====

Table 3.

MARITAL STATUS OF RETURNED PARTICIPANTS
AT TIME OF SELECTION

Marital Status	No.	%
Married	169	77.88
Not married	48	22.12
Total	217	100.00

Table 4.

UNIVERSITY ATTENDANCE OF PARTICIPANTS
PRIOR TO USAID TRAINING

Attendance	No.	%
Attended	180	82.95
Did not attend	37	17.05
Total	217	100.00

Table 5.

LOCATION OF UNIVERSITY ATTENDED
PRIOR TO USAID TRAINING

Country of location	No.	%
Egypt	160	73.73
England	11	5.07
U.S.A.	8	3.69
Lebanon	1	.46
Did not attend University	37	17.05
Total	217	100.00

Table 6.

ACADEMIC DEGREE RECEIVED BY PARTICIPANTS
BEFORE USAID TRAINING

	No.	%
Received degrees	178	82.03
Did not receive	2	.92
Did not attend Universities	37	17.05
Total	217	100.00

Table 7.

PARTICIPANTS ATTENDANCE AT SPECIAL SCHOOLS
PRIOR TO USAID TRAINING

Attendance	No.	%
Attended	72	33.18
Did not attend	145	66.82
Total	217	100.00

Table 8.

TYPE OF SPECIAL SCHOOL ATTENDED
PRIOR TO USAID TRAINING

Type of special school	No.
Military school	11
Teachers schools	8
Public Health schools	6
Social Service schools	6
Public Administration schools	6
Business and Commercial schools	5
Engineering schools	4
Industrial and Trade schools	3
Special Language schools	3
Agricultural schools	2
Nursing schools	1
Secretarial schools	1
Mass Communication	1
Others	13
Not ascertained	2
Total	72

Table 9.

UNIVERSITY ATTENDANCE OF PARTICIPANTS
AND ATTENDANCE AT SPECIAL SCHOOLS
PRIOR TO USAID TRAINING

Special school attendance	Attended		Did not attend		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Attended	42	23.33	30	81.08	72	33.18
Did not attend	138	76.67	7	18.92	145	66.82
Total	180	100.00	37	100.00	217	100.00

Table 10.

PARTICIPANTS UNIVERSITY ATTENDANCE PRIOR TO USAID
TRAINING AND TYPE OF SPECIAL SCHOOL ATTENDED BEFORE
DEPARTURE

Type of special school attended	University attendance prior to USAID training		Total
	Attended university	Did not attend university	
Military	4	8	12
Agriculture	2	-	2
Engineering	1	3	4
Industrial	1	2	3
Public health	3	3	6
Nursing	-	1	1
Teachers	6	2	8
Business and Commerce	2	3	5
Public administration	3	2	5
Secretarial	-	1	1
Mass communication	1	-	1
Community development	4	2	6
Special language	2	1	3
Others	12	1	13
Not ascertained	1	1	2
Did not attend	138	7	145
Total	180	37	217

Table 11.

PARTICIPANTS OCCUPATION OR TYPE OF
EMPLOYER AT TIME OF SELECTION

Type of occupation or employer	No.	%
Government	208	95.85
Nationalized industry	6	2.77
Private	1	.46
Other	2	.92
Total	217	100.00

Table 12.

PARTICIPANTS TOTAL TIME OF SPECIALIZATION
AT TIME OF SELECTION

Years of specialization	No.	%
None	1	.46
Less than one	15	6.91
One to less than two	3	1.39
Two to less than five	21	9.67
Five to less than ten	35	16.13
Ten years or more	142	65.44
Total	217	100.00

Table 13.

OCCUPATIONS OF TRAINEES BEFORE TRAINING

Occupational rank	No.
<u>Second level policy makers, executive and administrators:</u>	12
Regional or local government agency directors and deputy directors, general directors, division directors.	5
Controller general, controllers	7

Table 13 (cont'd.)

OCCUPATIONS OF TRAINEES BEFORE TRAINING

Occupational rank	No.
<u>Program and administrative officials - subordinate management:</u>	76
Chief inspectors, head of training, research, administrative chiefs, section chiefs, program division chiefs, field office directors	26
Staff planners	2
Personnel & welfare officers, finance officers, property & supply officers, legal officers, administrative officers	11
Executive assistants, technical advisors, marketing specialists, public relation and press officers	11
School principals, inspectors of education, hospitals and clinic administrators, etc.	3
Other subordinate line and staff management program and administrative officials	23
<u>Professional engineers:</u>	41
Civil engineers	12
Chemical engineers	1
Electronic engineers	10
Mechanical engineers	1
Agricultural engineers	12
Aeronautical engineers	5

48

Table 13 (cont'd.)

OCCUPATIONS OF TRAINEES BEFORE TRAINING

Occupational rank	No.
<u>Professional occupations</u>	
<u>(other than program and administrative officials and engineers):</u>	47
Agricultural scientists	25
Sociological and life scientists	4
Medical scientists	1
Economists	1
Social scientists (except Economists)	5
Physical scientists	3
Teachers, university level, sciences other than social sciences	7
Teachers, instructors	1
<u>Sub-professional occupations:</u>	
Laboratory testers	1
Nurses	1
Medical and public health technicians	2
Other sub-professional occupations	35
<u>Clerical workers</u>	1

Table 14

ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES OF TRAINEES
BEFORE TRAINING

Classification of Economic activities	No.
<u>Services, government and non-government:</u> <u>(business, education, medical, legal,</u> <u>housing, public security)</u>	48
Business, and professional enterprise (performing services by contract or fee)	5
Educational services (Univ. & Tech.)	8
Educational services (primary, secondary and kindergarten)	4
Educational services, vocational and trade schools	2
Educational services, other	2
Medical services, general	8
Medical services, public health	8
Welfare, social & employment Security Service	7
Community development	2
Public safety services	2
<u>Government administrative and regulatory services</u>	24
<u>Specialized government technical services</u>	18
<u>Management services in government agencies</u>	8
<u>Agriculture, forestry and fisheries:</u>	40
Crop production	14
Livestock production & development	11
Land and water resources	9
Agriculture and home economics extension	3
Forestry and logging	1
Other agricultural services	2

Table 14 (cont'd.)

ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES OF TRAINEES
BEFORE TRAINING

Classification of economic activities	No.
<u>Mining and quarrying</u>	1
<u>Manufacturing, maintenance and repair:</u>	9
Tobacco manufactures	1
Textile mill products	3
Paper and allied products	1
Chemicals and allied products	1
Machinery, except electrical	1
Electrical machinery, Equipment and supplies	1
Professional, scientific and controlling instruments, photographic, etc.	1
<u>Engineering and construction:</u>	15
General building	6
Highways and streets	7
Heavy construction	2
<u>Electricity, gas, water and sanitary services</u>	4
<u>Transport, storage and communication services:</u>	48
Air transportation and related services	30
Postal system operations	1
Telephone, telegraph and tele-communications system	16
Other	1
<u>Commerce, banking and insurance:</u>	1
Wholesale and retail trade	1

Table 15.

RANK OR LEVEL OF PARTICIPANTS' JOB
BY AGE AT TIME OF SELECTION

Age groups	Rank of participants job													
	Second level policy makers		Subordinate management		Engineers		Professionals		Sub-professionals		Clericals		Not working	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Less than 25					1	2.44			1	2.56			1	100.00
25 - 29			4	5.26	10	24.39	7	14.89	5	12.82				
30 - 34			18	23.69	14	34.15	17	36.18	8	20.51				
35 - 39	3	25.00	22	28.95	10	24.39	14	29.78	12	30.77				
40 - 44	2	16.67	13	17.11	4	9.75	7	14.89	9	23.08				
45 - 49	2	16.67	11	14.47	1	2.44	1	2.13	4	10.26				
50 - 55	4	33.33	7	9.21	1	2.44	1	2.13						
55 & over	1	8.33	1	1.31									1	100.00
Total	12	100.00	76	100.00	41	100.00	47	100.00	39	100.00	1	100.00	1	100.00

Table 16.

NUMBER OF PEOPLE SUPERVISED BY PARTICIPANTS IN
POSITIONS HELD AT TIME OF SELECTION

Number of people supervised	No. %	
	No.	%
None	36	16.59
1 - 5	42	19.36
6 - 19	40	18.43
20 - 49	32	14.75
50 - 199	25	11.52
200 - 499	14	6.45
500 - 999	6	2.76
1000 & over	13	5.99
Not ascertained	9	4.15
Total	217	100.00

52

Table 17.

PARTICIPANTS TOTAL TIME IN FIELD OF SPECIALIZATION
BY AGE AT TIME OF SELECTION

Age groups	Total years in field of specialization											
	None		Less than one		One to less than two		Two to less than five		Five to less than ten		Ten and over	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Less than 25							1	4.76			2	1.41
25 - 29			1	6.67			7	33.33	10	28.57	8	5.63
30 - 34			3	20.00	1	33.33	5	23.81	15	42.86	33	23.24
35 - 39	1		4	26.67	1	33.33	6	28.57	8	22.86	41	28.87
40 - 44			2	13.33					2	5.71	31	21.83
45 - 49			3	20.00	1	33.34	2	9.53			13	9.16
50 - 55			2	13.33							11	7.75
55 & over											3	2.11
Total	1		15	100.00	3	100.00	21	100.00	35	100.00	142	100.00

Table 18.

FUNCTIONAL FIELDS OF PARTICIPANTS TRAINING
ACTIVITIES BY SEX

Functional fields	Male	Female	Total
<u>Direct military support:</u>			2
Airfield construction	1		
Badar and communication network construction	1		
<u>Agriculture and natural resources:</u>			53
Research, agricultural education, and extension	10		
Land and water resources	10		
Crop and livestock development	21		
Agricultural economics, farm organization and agricultural credit	7		
Agricultural marketing and processing	2		
Other agriculture and natural resources	3		

53

Table 18 (cont'd.)

FUNCTIONAL FIELDS OF PARTICIPANTS TRAINING
ACTIVITIES BY SEX

Functional fields	Male	Female	Total
<u>Industry and mining:</u>			23
Power and communications	1		
Manufacturing and processing	4		
Engineering and construction	11		
Marketing and distribution	3		
Industrial management	2		
Industrial training	2		
<u>Transportation:</u>			50
Highways	6		
Air transport	44		
<u>Labor:</u>			1
Labor management relations	1		
<u>Health and sanitation:</u>			17
Environmental sanitation	6		
Health training and education	8		
All other health and sanitation (public health administration, health statistics)	3		
<u>Education:</u>			8
Vocational agriculture education	1		
Professional and higher education			
All other education (teacher training, educational research techniques)	6		
<u>Public administration:</u>			36
Public administration	6		
Government wide organization and management	5		
Public personnel administration	1		
Organization and management of particular ministries or programs	2		
Public budgeting and finance administra- tion	1		
Organization and administration of institutes or schools for public or business administration	1		
Statistics, General and Census	12		
All other public administration (Accounting and Auditing, Economic research and analysis)	8		

Table 18 (cont'd.)

FUNCTIONAL FIELDS OF PARTICIPANTS TRAINING
ACTIVITIES BY SEX

Functional fields	Male	Female	Total
<u>Community development, social welfare and housing:</u>			14
Community development	1	2	
Social welfare	5	3	
Housing	1		
Supporting projects, housing	2		
<u>General and miscellaneous:</u>			13
(including: Geology, Chart production, Mapping, Solar, Energy, Nuclear Science, Prison administration, Formation and Flow of capital)	13		
Total	211	6	217

55

Table 19.

FIRST STEP MADE BY PARTICIPANTS
IN TRAINING PROGRAM

First Step made	No.	%
Made application	13	5.99
Was selected	202	93.09
Can't remember	1	.46
Not ascertained	1	.46
Total	217	100.00

Table 20.

PARTICIPANTS FIRST SOURCE OF INFORMATION
REGARDING USAID TRAINING PROGRAM IN THEIR FIELD

First Source of Information	No.
From supervisor	5
Non personnel source	3
From USAID personnel	2
From colleague	1
From Ministry or government official	1
From other organizations	1
Selected or invited	202
Not ascertained	2
Total	217

Table 21.

ORGANIZATION OR PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR
SELECTING PARTICIPANTS FOR TRAINING PROGRAM

Organization selecting participants	No.
Supervisors	163
Ministry	27
USAID	9
Other organization	6
Special board	3
Employer	2
Won scholarship	1
Ministry/USAID	1
Don't remember	2
Not ascertained	2
Not applicable	1
Total	217

Table 22.

FIRST STEP MADE BY PARTICIPANT IN USAID
TRAINING PROGRAM BY OFFICIAL RESPONSIBLE
FOR THEIR SELECTION

Official responsible for selection	First step made by participant				Total
	Made application	Selected by others	Don't know	Not As- certained	
Supervisor	8	155			163
Ministry	1	26			27
USAID	1	8			9
Other officials	2	4			6
Special board		3			3
Scholarship		1			1
Ministry/USAID		1			1
Employer		2			2
Don't remember	1	1			2
Not ascertained		1		1	2
Not applicable			1		1
Total	13	202	1	1	217

57

Table 23.

PARTICIPANTS EVALUATION OF FACTORS INFLUENCING THEIR SELECTION AND DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE OF EACH

Degree of importance of personal contacts	F a c t o r s									
	Personal ability		Needs of job		Personal contacts		Language ability		Prof. and Educ. qual	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very important	208	95.85	208	95.89	96	44.24	169	77.88	203	93.55
Not very important	7	3.23	7	3.23	119	54.84	44	20.28	14	6.45
Not ascertained	2	.92	2	.92	2	.92	4	1.84		
Total	217	100.00	217	100.00	217	100.00	217	100.00	217	100.00

Table 24.

PARTICIPANTS OPINION OF DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE OF PERSONAL ABILITY BY DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE OF PERSONAL CONTACTS AS FACTORS INFLUENCING THEIR SELECTION

Degree of importance of personal contacts	Degree of importance of personal ability					
	Very		Not very		Not ascertained	
Very important	95	45.67			1	50.00
Not very important	111	53.37	7	100.00	1	50.00
Not ascertained	2	.96	-			
Total	208	100.00	7	100.00	2	100.00

Table 25.

PARTICIPANTS OPINION OF DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE OF NEEDS OF JOB BY DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE OF PERSONAL CONTACTS AS FACTORS INFLUENCING THEIR SELECTION

Degree of importance of personal contacts	Degree of importance of needs of job					
	Very important		Not very important		Not ascertained	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very important	96	46.15				
Not very important	110	52.89	7	100.00	2	100.00
Not ascertained	2	.96				
Total	208	100.00	7	100.00	2	100.00

Table 26.

PARTICIPANTS OPINION OF DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE OF LANGUAGE ABILITY BY DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE OF PERSONAL CONTACTS AS FACTORS INFLUENCING THEIR SELECTION

Degree of importance of personal contacts	Degree of importance of language ability					
	Very important		Not very important		Not ascertained	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very important	89	52.66	6	13.64	1	25.00
Not very important	79	46.75	38	86.36	2	50.00
Not ascertained	1	.59			1	25.00
Total	169	100.00	44	100.00	4	100.00

Table 27.

PARTICIPANTS OPINION OF DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE OF PROFESSIONAL AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS BY DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE OF PERSONAL CONTACTS AS FACTORS INFLUENCING THEIR SELECTION

Degree of importance of personal contacts	Degree of importance of Prof. & Edu. qualifications					
	Very important		Not very important		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very important	92	45.32	4	28.57	96	44.24
Not very important	109	53.70	10	71.43	119	54.84
Not ascertained	2	.98			2	.92
Total	203	100.00	14	100.00	217	100.00

Table 28.

TYPES OF TRAINING PROGRAMS OFFERED TO PARTICIPANTS

Participants Attendance	Observation tours		On-the-job training		University attendance		Special group programs	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Attended	160	73.73	146	67.28	85	39.17	20	9.22
Did not attend	57	26.27	71	32.72	132	60.83	197	90.78
Total	217	100.00	217	100.00	217	100.00	217	100.00

Table 29.

LENGTH OF PARTICIPANTS ATTENDANCE OF
OBSERVATION TOURS
(Total 160)

Length of attendance	No.	%
Less than 2 weeks	18	11.25
2 weeks to less than 4 weeks	15	9.38
1 month to less than 2 months	26	16.25
2 months to less than 4 "	44	27.50
4 months to less than 6 "	28	17.50
6 months to less than 1 year	25	15.62
One year or longer	1	.63
Not ascertained	3	1.87
Total	160	100.00

Table 30.

LENGTH OF PARTICIPANTS ATTENDANCE OF
ON-THE-JOB TRAINING
(Total 146)

Length of attendance	No.	%
2 weeks to less than 4 weeks	5	3.43
1 month to less than 2 months	11	7.53
2 months to less than 4 months	30	20.55
4 months to less than 6 months	39	26.71
6 months to less than 1 year	51	34.93
One year or longer	8	5.48
Not ascertained	2	1.37
Total	146	100.00

Table 31.

LENGTH OF PARTICIPANTS UNIVERSITY ATTENDANCE
(Total 85)

Length of attendance	No.	%
2 weeks to less than 4 weeks	7	8.24
1 month to less than 2 months	11	12.94
2 months to less than 4 months	16	18.82
4 months to less than 6 months	9	10.59
6 months to less than 1 year	29	34.12
one year or longer	13	15.29
Total	85	100.00

Table 32.

LENGTH OF PARTICIPANTS ATTENDANCE OF SPECIAL GROUP
PROGRAM NOT AT A UNIVERSITY
(Total 20)

Length of attendance	No.	%
2 weeks to less than 4 weeks	1	5.00
1 month to less than 2 months	4	20.00
2 months to less than 4 months	8	40.00
4 months to less than 6 months	1	5.00
6 months to less than 1 year	3	15.00
one year or longer	1	5.00
Not ascertained	2	10.00
Total	20	100.00

Table 33.

TYPE OF TRAINING PROGRAM OFFERED TO PARTICIPANTS

Type of training program	No.	%
Observation tours only	33	15.21
On-the-job training only	20	9.22
University training only	13	5.99
Special programs only	2	.92
Observation tours and on-the-job training	61	28.11
Observation tours and university attendance	15	6.91
Observation tours and special program	7	3.23
On-the-job training and university attendance	20	9.22
On-the-job training and special group program	2	.92
Observation, on-the-job and university attendance	33	15.21
Observation, on-the-job and special group program	6	2.76
Observation, university and special group program	1	.46
Observation, on-the-job, university and special group program	3	1.38
Unknown	1	.46
Total	217	100.00

=====

TABLE 34.

UNIVERSITY ATTENDANCE DURING TRAINING PROGRAM
AND PARTICIPANTS FIELD OF ACTIVITY

Training field of activity	University attendance			Total
	Attended	Did not attend	Not ascertained	
Military		2		2
Agriculture and natural resources	31	22		53
Industry and mining	11	12		23
Transportation	6	43	1	50
Labor		1		1
Sanitation	6	11		17
Education	6	2		8
Public administration	16	20		36
Community development	3	11		14
Miscellaneous	6	7		13
Total	85	131	1	217

TABLE 35.

PARTICIPANTS RECEIVING DEGREES OR CERTIFICATES
DURING TRAINING PROGRAM AND THEIR TRAINING FIELD
OF ACTIVITY

Training field of activity	Degrees or Certificates period				Total
	Academic degree	Certificates	Nothing	Were not scheduled to	
Military				2	2
Agriculture and natural resources	3	8	20	22	53
Industry and mining	3	2	6	12	23
Transportation		5	1	44	50
Labor				1	1
Sanitation	5	-	1	11	17
Education	4	-	2	2	8
Public administration	3	5	8	20	36
Community development	1	-	2	11	14
Miscellaneous	-	2	4	7	13
Total	19	22	44	132	217

Table 36.

DEGREES OR DIPLOMAS RECEIVED BY PARTICIPANTS
ATTENDING UNIVERSITY DURING TRAINING

Degrees received	No.	%
Received academic degree	19	22.35
Received certificate	22	25.88
Did not receive	44	51.77
Total	85	100.00

Table 37.

PARTICIPANTS OPINION ON USEFULNESS OF DEGREE
FOR FUTURE CAREER

Usefulness of degree received	No.	%
Degree will help future career very much	17	89.47
Degree will not help future career	2	10.53
Total	19	100.00

65

Table 38.

PARTICIPANTS OFFERED OBSERVATION TOURS
AND TRAINING FIELD OF ACTIVITY

Training field of activity	Participants offered observation tours			Total
	Were offered	Were not offered	Not ascertained	
Military	2			2
Agriculture & natural resources	40	13		53
Industry and mining	15	8		23
Transportation	36	13	1	50
Labor	1			1
Sanitation	16	1		17
Education	4	4		8
Public administration	23	13		36
Community development	11	3		14
Miscellaneous	11	2		13
Total	159	57	1	217

Table 39.

PARTICIPANTS OFFERED ON THE JOB TRAINING
AND THEIR TRAINING FIELD OF ACTIVITY

Training field of activity	Participants offered on-the-job training			Total
	Were offered	Were not offered	Not ascertained	
Military	2			2
Agriculture and natural resources	33	20		53
Industry and mining	14	9		23
Transportation	48	1	1	50
Labor		1		1
Sanitation	12	5		17
Education	5	3		8
Public Administration	21	15		36
Community development	7	7		14
Miscellaneous	3	10		13
Total	145	71	1	217

Table 40,

PARTICIPANTS OFFERED SPECIAL GROUP PROGRAM
BY TRAINING FIELD OF ACTIVITY

Training field of activity	Special group program attendance			Total
	Attended	Did not attend	Not ascertained	
Military		2		2
Agriculture and natural resources	3	50		53
Industry and mining	1	22		23
Transportation	6	43	1	50
Labor		1		1
Sanitation	2	15		17
Education	1	7		8
Public adminis- tration	6	30		36
Community development		14		14
Miscellaneous	1	12		13
Total	20	196	1	217

Table 41.

PARTICIPANTS ATTENDANCE OF SEMINAR IN COMMUNICATIONS

Participants Attendance	No.	%
Attended	60	27.65
Did not attend	152	70.05
Don't remember	3	1.38
Not ascertained	2	.92
Total	217	100.00

Table 42.

POSITIVE COMMENTS OF PARTICIPANTS
ATTENDING SEMINAR IN COMMUNICATION
(Total 60)

Positive comments	No.	\$
Liked everything	11	18.34
Learning to communicate with others	19	31.07
Adapting to their country what was learnt	16	26.07
Teachers	2	3.33
Exchange ideas	2	3.33
Good advice given	2	3.33
Liked nothing	2	3.33
Others	3	5.00
Not ascertained	3	5.00
Total	60	100.00

Table 43.

PARTICIPANTS ABILITY TO UTILISE MATERIALS
OR IDEAS FROM SEMINAR IN THEIR WORK
(Total 60)

Ability to utilize material from seminar	No.	\$
Were able to utilize	46	76.66
Were not able to utilize	14	23.34
Total	60	100.00

Table 44.

NEGATIVE COMMENTS OF PARTICIPANTS ATTENDING
SEMINAR IN COMMUNICATIONS
(Total 60)

Negative comments	No.	%
Too intensive	3	5.00
Too short	1	1.67
Too superficial	1	1.67
Location not suitable	2	3.33
Other reasons	6	10.00
Don't remember	1	1.67
Liked everything	46	76.66
Total	60	100.00

Table 45.

PARTICIPANTS ABILITY TO UTILIZE MATERIALS
OR IDEAS FROM SEMINAR IN COMMUNICATION BY
THEIR TRAINING FIELD OF ACTIVITY
(Total 60)

Training field of activity	Ability to utilize materials				Total
	Were able		Were unable		
Agriculture	9	75.00	3	25.00	12 100.00
Industry and mining	2	40.00	3	60.00	5 100.00
Transportation	18	81.82	4	18.18	22 100.00
Sanitation	3	75.00	1	25.00	4 100.00
Education	2	100.00	-	-	2 100.00
Public administration	10	90.91	1	9.09	11 100.00
Community development			1	100.00	1 100.00
Miscellaneous	2	66.67	1	33.33	3 100.00
Total	46	76.67	14	23.33	60 100.00

Table 46.

PARTICIPANTS ABILITY TO UTILIZE MATERIALS
OR IDEAS FROM SEMINAR IN COMMUNICATION BY
RANK OF THEIR JOB AT TIME OF SELECTION

Rank of job held at time of selection	Ability to utilize materials				Total	
	Were able		Were unable			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Second level policy makers	2	100.00			2	100.00
Subordinate manage- ment	16	88.89	2	11.11	18	100.00
Engineers	7	60.00	5	40.00	12	100.00
Professionals	6	85.72	1	14.28	7	100.00
Sub-professionals	15	71.43	6	28.57	21	100.00
Total	46	76.67	14	23.33	60	100.00

Table 47.

PARTICIPANTS ATTENDANCE AT SEMINAR IN
COMMUNICATION BY THEIR TOTAL UTILIZATION SCORE

Total utilization score	Attendance of seminar in communication								Total	
	Attended		Did not attend		Don't remember		Not ascertained			
Highest score	32	68.00	95	84.00	1	100.00	2	100.00	130	79.14
Second highest score	15	32.00	18	16.00					33	20.86
Total	47	100.00	113	100.00	1	100.00	2	100.00	163*	100.00

It was impossible to give a total utilization score to 54 respondents because of inadequacy of data.

Table 48.

EVALUATION OF PARTICIPANTS ATTENDING
ORIENTATION SESSIONS
(Total 175)

Participants evaluation	No.	%
Orientation sessions were valuable	159	91.00
Would have preferred to spend time on rest of program	15	8.00
Not ascertained	1	1.00
Total	175	100.00

Table 49.

PARTICIPANTS SUGGESTIONS ON IMPROVEMENTS IN
ORIENTATION SESSIONS
(Multiple answers)

Suggestions for improvements	No.	%
No improvements needed	103	49.52
Sessions should be longer	15	7.21
Sessions should include more information on country of training	18	8.65
Sessions to be conducted in participants' own country before departure	8	3.85
Sessions should be shorter	7	3.37
Sessions should be better organized	5	2.41
Sessions should include more information on training program	4	1.92
Participants should be grouped by Nationality, age, specialization and orientation indicated to the knowledge or experience of these groups	4	1.92
Orientation to be conducted by someone from participants' own country or someone familiar with his country	3	1.44
Should include more social activity	3	1.44
Participants to meet people of country of training, visit families	2	.96
Others (mainly: sessions not confined to government officials; use visual aids, easier language, not use propaganda, etc.)	36	17.31
Total	208	100.00

Table 50.

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF PARTICIPANTS OFFERED
ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

English language Instruction offering	No.	%
Received	19	8.76
Did not receive	193	88.94
Not applicable	5	2.30
Total	217	100.00

Table 51.

NEED FELT FOR INSTRUCTION IN ENGLISH BY
PARTICIPANTS WHO HAD NOT RECEIVED ENGLISH
LANGUAGE TRAINING
(total 193)

Need for language instruction	No.	%
Felt the need	44	22.79
Did not feel the need	149	77.21
Total	193	100.00

Table 52.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED
BY PARTICIPANTS DURING PROGRAM

Difficulties encountered	No.	%
No difficulties	162	74.66
In being understood	20	9.22
In understanding others	15	6.91
In being understood and understanding others	15	6.91
Not ascertained	5	2.30
Total	217	100.00

Table 53.

NEED FELT FOR MORE INSTRUCTION IN ENGLISH
BY PARTICIPANTS WHO HAD RECEIVED ENGLISH
LANGUAGE TRAINING
(total 19)

Need felt for English language training	No.
Felt need	6
Did not feel need	13
Total	19

Table 54.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED BY PARTICIPANTS
DURING TRAINING PROGRAM BY PREVIOUS ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

Previous language instruction	English language difficulties encountered					Total
	No diffi- culties	Being understood	Understand- ing others	Don't remember	Not ascertained	
Received language instruction	13 68.41	2 10.53	2 10.53	2 10.53		19 100
Did not receive	149 77.20	18 9.32	13 6.74	13 6.74		193 100
Not ascertained					1 20.00 4 80.00	5 100
Total	162 74.65	20 9.22	15 6.91	15 6.91	1 .46 4 1.85	217 100

Table 55.

DEGREE OF ADEQUACY OF INFORMATION RECEIVED BY
PARTICIPANTS ON COUNTRY OF TRAINING PRIOR TO
DEPARTURE (From a total of five items)

Number of items received information on	No.	%
Received adequate information on no item	9	4.15
Received adequate information on one item	7	3.23
Received adequate information on two items	4	1.84
Received adequate information on three "	13	5.99
Received adequate information on four "	18	8.29
Received adequate information on five "	166	76.50
Total	217	100.00

Table 56.

ADEQUACY AND TYPE OF INFORMATION RECEIVED
BY PARTICIPANTS ON COUNTRY OF TRAINING

Information received	Use of restaurants		Colloquial speech and idioms		Religious practices		Usage of money		Manners and customs	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Received enough information	182	83.87	187	86.18	193	88.94	204	94.01	183	84.33
Did not receive enough information	35	16.13	30	13.82	24	11.06	13	5.99	34	15.67
Total	217	100.00	217	100.00	217	100.00	217	100.00	217	100.00

Table 57.

ADDITIONAL TYPE OF INFORMATION PARTICIPANTS
WOULD HAVE LIKED TO KNOW BEFORE DEPARTURE
(Multiple answers)

Additional type of information	No.	%
No additional information desired	171	70.37
Additional information on content of program	19	7.82
Additional information on scheduling of program	5	2.06
Additional information on transportation	2	.82
Additional information on colloquial speech	2	.82
Customs and conditions in country of training (mainly background on country's, political, cultural and social conditions)	44	18.11
Total	243	100.00

Table 58.

DEGREE OF ADEQUACY OF INFORMATION ON COUNTRY OF TRAINING
RECEIVED BY PARTICIPANTS PRIOR TO DEPARTURE BY RANK OF
PARTICIPANTS JOB AT TIME OF SELECTION

Rank of participant's job	Adequacy of information received										Total			
	On no item		On 1 item		On 2 items		On 3 items		On 4 items				On all items	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Second level policy									2	16.67	10	83.33	12	100
Sub management	2	2.63	2	2.63	1	1.32	2	2.63	6	7.90	63	82.89	76	100
Professional engineers	3	7.32	1	2.44	-	-	4	9.76	4	9.76	29	70.72	41	100
Other Profession	3	6.38	1	2.13	2	4.26	5	10.64	3	6.38	33	70.21	47	100
Sub-profession	1	2.56	3	7.69	1	2.56	2	5.13	3	7.69	29	74.37	39	100
Clerical											1100.00		1	100
Student											1100.00		1	100
Total	9	4.15	7	3.23	4	1.84	13	5.99	18	8.29	166	76.50	217	100

Table 59.

DEGREE OF ADEQUACY OF INFORMATION ON COUNTRY OF TRAINING
RECEIVED BEFORE DEPARTURE BY AGE OF PARTICIPANTS

Age at time of selection	Adequacy of information received										Total			
	On no item		On 1 item		On 2 items		On 3 items		On 4 items				On all items	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Less than 25	1	11.11									2	1.20	3	1.38
25 - 29			2	28.57			1	7.69	1	5.56	22	13.26	26	11.98
30 - 34	3	33.33	2	28.57	1	25.00	2	15.39	8	44.44	41	24.70	57	26.27
35 - 39			1	14.29	2	50.00	9	69.23	5	27.76	44	26.51	61	28.11
40 - 44	4	44.45	2	28.57	1	25.00	1	7.69	1	5.56	26	15.66	35	16.13
45 - 49									1	5.56	18	10.84	19	8.76
50 - 55	1	11.11							1	5.56	11	6.63	13	5.99
55 & over									1	5.56	2	1.20	3	1.38
Total	9	100.00	7	100.00	4	100.00	13	100.00	18	100.00	166	100.00	217	100.00

Table 60.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED BY PARTICIPANTS
DURING TRAINING PROGRAM BY AGE OF PARTICIPANTS

Age at time of selection	Type of language difficulties encountered						Total
	No diffi- culties	Being under- stood	Under- standing others	Don't remember	Not applicable		
Less than 25		2	10.00	1	6.66		3 1.38
25 - 29	21	12.96		3	20.00	2	13.33 26 11.98
30 - 34	39	24.08	6	30.00	4	26.67	7 46.67 57 26.27
35 - 39	45	27.78	8	40.00	4	26.67	3 20.00 61 28.11
40 - 44	26	16.05	3	15.00	3	20.00	3 20.00 35 16.13
45 - 49	17	10.49	1	5.00			19 8.76
50 - 54	11	6.79					13 5.99
55 & over	3	1.85					3 1.38
Total	162	100.00	20	100.00	15	100.00	15 100.00 1 100.00 1 100.00 217 100.00

Table 61.

ADEQUACY OF INFORMATION RECEIVED ON COUNTRY OF TRAINING
BEFORE DEPARTURE BY PARTICIPANTS TRAINING FIELD OF ACTIVITY.

Training field of activity	Adequacy of information received						Total
	On no item	On 1 item	On 2 items	On 3 items	On 4 items	On all items	
Military						2	2
Agriculture and natural resources	2	3	1	4	6	37	53
Industry and mining	2			1	1	19	23
Transportation	2	2	1	5	5	35	50
Labor	1						1
Sanitation		1		1	2	13	17
Education					1	7	8
Public adminis- tration	1	1	2	1	2	29	36
Community development	1				1	12	14
Miscellaneous				1		12	13
Total	9	7	4	13	18	166	217

Table 62

ADEQUACY OF INFORMATION RECEIVED ON COUNTRY OF
TRAINING BEFORE DEPARTURE BY PARTICIPANTS
UNIVERSITY ATTENDANCE BEFORE TRAINING

University attendance prior to training	On no item		On one item		On two items		On three items		On four items		On all items		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Attended	8	88.89	6	85.71	3	75.00	11	84.62	14	77.78	138	83.13	180	82.95
Did not attend	1	11.11	1	14.29	1	25.00	2	15.38	4	22.22	28	16.87	37	17.05
Total	9	100.00	7	100.00	4	100.00	13	100.00	18	100.00	166	100.00	217	100.00

Table 63

PARTICIPANTS' PARTICIPATION IN PLANNING
OF TRAINING PROGRAM

Participants Participation in Program planning	No.	%
Participated	76	35.02
Did not participate	138	63.60
Don't know	3	1.38
Total	217	100.00

Table 64.

EXTENT OF TRAINEES PARTICIPATION IN
PLANNING BASIS OF TRAINING PROGRAM

Training program based on	No.	%
Trainees ideas	36	16.59
Ideas of others	2	.92
Ideas of both equally	22	10.14
Don't know	16	7.37
Did not participate in planning	141	64.98
Total	217	100.00

Table 65.

DEGREE OF ADEQUACY OF INFORMATION RECEIVED
BY PARTICIPANTS ON TRAINING PROGRAM

No. of items received information on	No.	%
On one item	6	2.77
On two items	14	6.45
On three items	26	11.98
On four items	33	15.21
On all items	137	63.13
Not ascertained	1	.46
Total	217	100.00

Table 66.

TYPE OF INFORMATION RECEIVED BY PARTICIPANTS
ON TRAINING PROGRAM

Information received	Subjects to be taken		Places to be visited		Date of departure		Length of program		Other aspects of program	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Information received	156	71.89	180	82.95	201	92.63	211	97.24	186	85.71
Did not receive information	61	28.11	37	17.05	16	7.37	6	2.76	31	14.29
Total	217	100.00	217	100.00	217	100.00	217	100.00	217	100.00

Table 67.

DEGREE OF ADEQUACY OF INFORMATION ON TRAINING
PROGRAM RECEIVED PRIOR TO DEPARTURE BY RANK OF
PARTICIPANT'S JOB AT TIME OF SELECTION

Rank of participant's job	Adequacy of information received													
	On one item		On two items		On three items		On four items		On all items		Not ascertained	Total		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		No.	%	
Second level policy	1	8.33					2	16.67	9	75.00		12	100.00	
Sub-management	1	1.32	4	5.26	9	11.84	11	14.47	51	67.11		76	100.00	
Engineers	1	2.44	4	9.76	4	9.76	7	17.07	24	58.53	1	41	100.00	
Professional	2	4.26	5	10.64	6	12.77	7	14.89	27	57.44		47	100.00	
Sub-professional	1	2.56	1	2.56	6	15.38	6	15.38	25	64.12		39	100.00	
Clerical									1	100.00		1	100.00	
Student					1	100.00						1	100.00	
Total	6	2.77	14	6.45	26	11.98	33	15.21	137	63.13	1	.46	217	100.00

Table 68.

ADEQUACY OF INFORMATION RECEIVED ON TRAINING PROGRAM BEFORE DEPARTURE BY PARTICIPANTS AGE AT TIME OF SELECTION

Age of participants at time of selection	Adequacy of information received												Total	
	On one item		On two items		On three items		On four items		On all items		Not ascertained			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Less than 25	1	33.33			1	33.33	1	33.34					3	100.00
25 - 29					1	3.85	5	19.23	20	76.92			26	100.00
30 - 34	1	1.75	4	7.02	9	15.79	8	14.04	35	61.40			57	100.00
35 - 39	3	4.92	6	9.84	6	9.84	12	19.67	33	54.10	1	1.63	61	100.00
40 - 44	1	2.86	3	8.57	7	20.00	3	8.57	21	60.00			35	100.00
45 - 49			1	5.26	2	10.53	2	10.53	14	73.68			19	100.00
50 - 54							1	7.69	12	92.31			13	100.00
55 & over							1	33.33	2	66.67			3	100.00
Total	6	12.76	14	16.45	26	11.98	33	15.21	137	63.14	1	.46	217	100.00

Table 69.

ADEQUACY OF INFORMATION RECEIVED BY PARTICIPANTS ON TRAINING PROGRAM BEFORE DEPARTURE BY TRAINING FIELD OF ACTIVITY

Training field of activity	Adequacy of information received							Total
	On one item	On two items	On three items	On four items	On all items	Not ascertained		
Military					2		2	
Agriculture	3	8	2	6	34		53	
Industry & mining	-	1	4	2	16		23	
Transportation	1	2	7	8	31	1	50	
Labor					1		1	
Sanitation		1	4	3	9		17	
Education			1	1	6		8	
Public administration	1	2	5	7	21		36	
Community development	1		1	4	8		14	
Miscellaneous			2	2	9		13	
Total	6	14	26	33	137	1	217	

Table 70.

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS INFORMED BY PLACE OF
EMPLOYMENT ON PROGRAM PLANNING

Information offered by employer	No.	%
Participant was informed	101	46.54
Participant was not informed	115	53.00
Can't remember	1	.46
Total	217	100.00

Table 71.

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS INFORMED BY PLACE OF
EMPLOYMENT ON PROGRAM PLANNING BY ADEQUACY
OF INFORMATION RECEIVED ON TRAINING PROGRAM
BEFORE DEPARTURE

Adequacy of information received	Employer gave in- formation		Employer did not give inf.		Don't know Don't re- member		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
On one item			6	5.22			6	2.77
On two items	1	.99	13	11.31			14	6.45
On three items	6	5.94	20	17.39			26	11.98
On four items	16	15.84	17	14.78			33	15.21
On all items	77	76.24	59	51.30	1	100.00	137	63.13
Not ascertained	1	.99					1	.46
Total	101	100.00	115	100.00	1	100.00	217	100.00

82

Table 72.

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS INFORMED BY THE MINISTRY
ON PROGRAM PLANNING

Information offered by Ministry	No.	%
Participant was informed	41	18.90
Participant was not informed	165	76.04
Ministry was employer	6	2.76
Don't remember	5	2.30
Total	217	100.00

Table 73.

PARTICIPANTS INFORMED BY PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT
ON PROGRAM PLANNING BY PARTICIPANTS EMPLOYMENT
WITH USAID AT TIME OF SELECTION

Employment with USAID	Employer gave in- formation		Employer did not give inf.		Don't know Don't re- member		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Was employed	35	34.65	26	22.61			61	28.11
Was not employed	65	64.36	85	73.91	1	100.00	151	69.59
Not ascertained	1	.99	4	3.48			5	2.30
Total	101	100.00	115	100.00	1	100.00	217	100.00

Table 74.

PARTICIPANTS DEGREE OF SATISFACTION WITH
TRAINING PROGRAM BEFORE DEPARTURE

Degree of satisfaction	No.	%
Well satisfied	155	71.43
Not very well satisfied	18	8.29
Did not know enough	44	20.28
Total	217	100.00

Table 75.

DEGREE OF SATISFACTION WITH TRAINING PROGRAM
BEFORE DEPARTURE BY PARTICIPANTS TRAINING
FIELD OF ACTIVITY

Training field of activity	Well satisfied	Not very well satisfied	Did not know enough	Total
Military	2			2
Agriculture and natural resources	37	1	15	53
Industry & mining	14	2	7	23
Transportation	37	8	5	50
Labor	1			1
Sanitation	14	1	2	17
Education	7		1	8
Public administration	26	4	6	36
Community development	9		5	14
Miscellaneous	8	2	3	13

Table 76.

PARTICIPANTS PARTICIPATION IN PLANNING OF THEIR PROGRAM BY SATISFACTION WITH TRAINING PROGRAM BEFORE DEPARTURE

Satisfaction with program before departure	Participation in Planning Program					
	Participated		Did not participate		Don't remember	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Well satisfied	60	78.95	95	68.84		
Not very well satisfied	6	7.89	12	8.70		
Did not know enough	10	13.16	31	22.46	3	100.00
Total	76	100.00	133	100.00	3	100.00

Table 77.

PARTICIPANTS SATISFACTION WITH TRAINING PROGRAM BY YEAR DEPARTING FOR TRAINING

Year	Degree of satisfaction						Total	
	Well		Not very		Don't know Don't remember			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1951	8	5.19			3	6.82	11	5.07
1952	11	6.49	1	5.56	4	9.09	16	7.37
1953	18	11.69	2	11.11	2	4.55	22	10.14
1954	12	7.79			2	4.55	14	6.45
1955	46	29.87	4	22.22	10	22.73	60	27.65
1956	18	11.69	3	16.67	8	18.18	29	13.37
1959	10	6.49	3	16.66	2	4.55	15	6.91
1960	18	11.69	4	22.22	8	18.18	30	13.82
1961	14	9.10	1	5.56	5	11.35	20	9.22
Total	155	100.00	18	100.00	44	100.00	217	100.00

85

Table 78.

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS MEETING UPON ARRIVAL
PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR PROGRAM ARRANGEMENT

Meeting persons responsible	No.	%
Were met by someone who discussed program	188	86.64
Were not met by anybody	29	13.36
Total	217	100.00

Table 79.

PERSONS MEETING PARTICIPANTS UPON ARRIVAL
IN COUNTRY OF TRAINING
(Total 188)

Persons meeting trainees	No.	%
Project manager or program specialist	154	81.91
Someone else	34	18.09
Total	188	100.00

Table 80.

PARTICIPANTS OPINION ON EXTENT OF ATTENTION AND GUIDANCE RECEIVED BY PERSON MEETING THEM UPON ARRIVAL DURING COURSE OF PROGRAM

Extent of attention and guidance received	No.	%
Received enough attention	176	81.11
Did not receive enough attention	11	5.07
Don't remember	1	.46
Were not met upon arrival	29	13.36
Total	217	100.00

Table 81.

EXTENT OF PROGRAM COMPLETION AS FOUND BY PARTICIPANTS UPON ARRIVAL IN COUNTRY OF TRAINING

Extent of program completion	No.	%
Set up in complete detail	129	59.45
Set up in partial detail	63	29.03
Not set up at all	25	11.52
Total	217	100.00

Table 82.

PERSONS MEETING PARTICIPANTS UPON ARRIVAL BY
EXTENT OF ATTENTION AND GUIDANCE RECEIVED BY
PARTICIPANTS DURING COURSE OF PROGRAM

Extent of attention and guidance received	Persons meeting participants		
	Project manager	Someone else	Not met
	No.	No.	No.
Received enough attention	143	33	
Did not receive enough attention	10	1	
Don't remember	1	-	
Not met upon arrival			29
Total	154	34	29

Table 83.

PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT OF OFFICIAL MANAGING PARTICIPANTS
PROGRAM BY EXTENT OF ATTENTION AND GUIDANCE RECEIVED BY
PARTICIPANTS DURING COURSE OF PROGRAM

Attention and guidance received from project manager	Place of Employment of program manager							
	USAID	Govern- ment	Uni- versity	Private	Other	Don't remember	Not Asc.	Not Applic.
Received enough attention	90	63	3	2	7	8	3	
Did not receive enough attention	6	4				1		
Don't remember		1						
Not met upon arrival								29
Total	96	68	3	2	7	9	3	29

Table 84.

EXTENT OF PARTICIPANTS PARTICIPATION IN
PLANNING TRAINING PROGRAM BY ATTENTION AND
GUIDANCE RECEIVED DURING COURSE OF PROGRAM

Extent of attention and guidance received	Program based on ideas of				
	Partici- pant	Others	Partici- pant & others	Don't remem- ber	Did not take part in planning
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
Received enough attention	35	1	18	13	108
Did not receive enough attention			3		8
Don't remember					1
Were not met by project manager	1	1	1	3	23
Total	36	2	22	16	140

Table 85.

EXTENT OF PROGRAM COMPLETION AS FOUND BY PARTICIPANTS
UPON ARRIVAL IN COUNTRY OF TRAINING BY ATTENTION AND
GUIDANCE RECEIVED DURING COURSE OF PROGRAM

Extent of attention and guidance received	Extent of program completion		
	Complete detail	Partial detail	Not set up at all
Received enough attention	110	47	19
Did not receive enough attention	2	6	3
Don't remember	1		
Were not met by project managers	16	10	3
Total	129	63	25

Table 86.

EXTENT OF ATTENTION AND GUIDANCE RECEIVED BY
PARTICIPANTS DURING COURSE OF PROGRAM BY TRAINING
FIELD OF ACTIVITY

Training field of activity	Attention and guidance received				Total
	Received enough	Did not receive enough	Don't remember	Were not met	
Military		1		1	2
Agriculture	47	3		3	53
Industry & mining	17	1		5	23
Transportation	41	2	1	6	50
Labor	1				1
Sanitation	16			1	17
Education	5	1		2	8
Public administration	25	3		8	36
Community development	12			2	14
Miscellaneous	12			1	13
Total	176	11	1	29	217

Table 87.

EXTENT OF ATTENTION AND GUIDANCE RECEIVED DURING COURSE
OF PROGRAM BY PARTICIPANTS OCCUPATION AT TIME OF SELECTION

Occupation at time of departure	Attention and guidance received				Total
	Received enough	Did not receive enough	Don't remember	Were not met	
Second level policy	10			2	12
Sub-management	62	3		11	76
Engineers	34	3	1	3	41
Professionals	40	2		5	47
Sub-professionals	29	3		7	39
Clerical	1				1
Other				1	1
Total	176	11	1	29	217

Table 88.

DEGREE OF PROGRAM COMPLETION BY PARTICIPANTS
TRAINING FIELD OF ACTIVITY

Training field of activity	Degree of program completion						Total	
	Arranged in complete detail		Arranged in partial detail		Not arranged at all		No.	%
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Military	1	50.00	1	50.00			2	100.00
Agriculture	29	54.72	14	26.41	10	18.87	53	100.00
Industry & mining	12	52.17	10	43.48	1	4.35	23	100.00
Transportation	32	64.00	12	24.00	6	12.00	50	100.00
Labor					1	100.00	1	100.00
Sanitation	11	64.71	5	29.41	1	5.88	17	100.00
Education	7	87.50	1	12.50			8	100.00
Public Administration	20	55.56	13	36.11	3	8.33	36	100.00
Community development	7	50.00	5	35.71	2	14.29	14	100.00
Miscellaneous	10	76.92	2	15.39	1	7.69	13	100.00

Table 89.

PARTICIPANTS OPINION ON LENGTH OF TRAINING PROGRAM

Opinion on length of program	No.	%
Too long	3	1.38
About right	95	43.78
Too short	119	54.84
Total	217	100.00

Table 90.

PARTICIPANTS OPINION ON LENGTH OF PROGRAM
BY TRAINING FIELD OF ACTIVITY

Training field of activity	Opinion on length of program									
	Too long		Just right		Too short		Not Ascer- tained		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Military			2	100.00					2	100.00
Agriculture	1	1.88	20	37.74	32	60.38			2	100.00
Industry and mining			15	65.22	8	34.78			23	100.00
Transportation			20	40.00	29	58.00	1	2.00	50	100.00
Labor					1	100.00			1	100.00
Sanitation			7	41.18	10	58.82			17	100.00
Education	1	12.50	3	37.50	4	50.00			8	100.00
Public administration	1	2.78	16	44.44	19	52.78			36	100.00
Community develop- ment			6	42.86	8	57.14			14	100.00
Miscellaneous			6	46.15	7	53.85			13	100.00

Table 91.

PARTICIPANTS EVALUATION OF LEVEL OF TRAINING PROGRAM

Opinion on level of program	No.	%
Too simple	46	21.20
Just right	154	70.97
Too advanced	12	5.53
Don't remember	4	1.84
Not ascertained	1	.46
Total	217	100.00

=====

94

Table 92.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED BY PARTICIPANTS DURING TRAINING PROGRAM BY THEIR EVALUATION OF PROGRAM LEVEL

Participants evaluation of program level	English language difficulties encountered								Total					
	None		Being under- stood		Under- standing others		Both		Don't remem- ber		Not ascer- tained			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Too simple	35	76.08	3	6.52	4	8.70	4	8.70					46	100.00
Just right	115	74.68	15	9.74	10	6.49	10	6.49	1	.65	3	1.95	154	100.00
Too advanced	9	75.00	1	8.33	1	8.33					1	8.34	12	100.00
Don't remem- ber	2	50.00	1	25.00			1	25.00					4	100.00
Not ascer- tained	1	100.00											1	100.00

Table 93.

PARTICIPANTS EVALUATION OF PROGRAM LEVEL BY PREVIOUS UNIVERSITY ATTENDANCE

Previous university attendance	Participants evaluation of program level										Total	
	Too simple		Just right		Too advanced		Don't remember		Not ascertained		No.	%
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Attended	40	86.96	131	85.06	6	50.00	3	75.00			180	82.95
Did not attend	6	13.04	23	14.94	6	50.00	1	25.00	1	100.00	37	17.05

Table 94.

PARTICIPANTS EVALUATION OF PROGRAM LEVEL BY TRAINING FIELD OF ACTIVITY

Training field of activity	Evaluation of Program level								Total			
	Too simple		Just right		Too advanced		Don't remember		Not ascertained			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Military			2	100.00					1	1.89	2	100.00
Agriculture	10	18.87	42	79.24							53	100.00
Industry and mining	3	13.04	18	78.26	1	4.35			1	4.35	23	100.00
Transportation	15	30.00	31	62.00	3	6.00			1	2.00	50	100.00
Labor			1	100.00							1	100.00
Sanitation	4	23.53	11	64.71	2	11.76					17	100.00
Education	1	12.50	7	87.50							8	100.00
Public administration	7	19.44	24	66.67	3	8.33	1	2.78	1	2.78	36	100.00
Community development	1	7.24	10	71.43	3	21.43					14	100.00
Miscellaneous	5	33.46	8	61.54							13	100.00

Table 95.

LENGTH OF TIME SPENT BY PARTICIPANTS IN FIELD OF SPECIALIZATION BY THEIR EVALUATION OF LEVEL OF PROGRAM

Participants opinion on level of program	Total time in field of specialization											
	None		less than one year		1-2 yrs.		2-5 yrs.		5-10 yrs.		Over 10 yrs.	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Too simple							4	19.05	8	22.86	34	23.94
Just right	1	100.00	14	93.33	2	66.67	14	66.67	24	68.57	99	69.72
Too advanced					1	33.33	3	14.28	2	5.71	6	4.23
Don't know, don't remember			1	6.67					1	2.86	2	1.41
Not ascertained											1	.70
Total	1	100.00	15	100.00	3	100.00	21	100.00	35	100.00	142	100.00

Table 96.

EXTENT OF PARTICIPANTS PARTICIPATION IN PLANNING
OF PROGRAM BY EVALUATION OF LEVEL OF PROGRAM

Participants opinion on level of program	Extent of participation in planning program							
	Participated		Did not participate		Don't know Don't re- member		Not as- certain- ed	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Simple	18	23.68	27	19.71	1	33.33	1	100.00
Just right	51	67.11	101	73.72	1	33.33		
Advanced	4	5.26	7	5.11	1	33.34		
Don't know, don't remember	2	2.63	2	1.46				
Not ascertained	1	1.32						
Total	76	100.00	137	100.00	3	100.00	1	100.00

Table 97.

PARTICIPANTS FOLLOWING PROGRAM AS ORIGINALLY PLANNED

Program followed by participants	No.	%
As originally planned	150	73.73
Underwent important changes	48	22.22
Not ascertained	9	4.15
Total	217	100.00

Table 98.

KINDS OF CHANGES MADE IN PARTICIPANTS PROGRAM
DURING THEIR TRAINING (multiple answers)
(Total 48)

Kinds of changes made	No.
Changed location of training	16
Changed or added to subjects	15
Included more observation	6
Changed to degree program	5
Included more practice (on-the-job training)	4
Made it a shorter program	4
Made it a longer program	2
Change not rejected	1
All other types of changes	2
Total	55

Table 99.

SOURCES RESPONSIBLE FOR CHANGES MADE IN
PARTICIPANTS PROGRAMS
(Total 48)

Source of changes made	No.	%
Changes requested by participant	31	64.58
Changes requested by others	2	4.17
Source of change not known, not remembered	15	31.25
Total	48	100.00

Table 100.

PARTICIPANTS OPINION ON THE NECESSITY OF
CHANGES MADE IN PROGRAM
(Total 48)

Participants opinion	No.	%
Changes were necessary	43	89.58
Changes were not necessary	5	10.42
Total	48	100.00

Table 101.

PARTICIPANTS EVALUATION OF THE MOST USEFUL AND
VALUABLE PART OF THEIR EXPERIENCE

Most useful and valuable experience	No.	%
Everything was valuable	38	17.51
<u>Program related comments:</u>		
On-the-job training	48	22.12
Observation tours	47	21.66
Studies	29	13.36
University attendance	21	9.68
Meeting & working with professionals	6	2.77
Others	4	1.84
<u>Comments on conditions seen:</u>		
Ways in which plants and offices are organized	10	4.61
Advanced procedures and equipment	5	2.30
<u>Comments on people</u>	6	2.77
Others	2	.92
Not ascertained	1	.46
Total	217	100.00

Table 102.

PARTICIPANTS' OPINION ON THE LEAST USEFUL OR VALUABLE
PART OF THEIR EXPERIENCE
(Total 82)

Least valuable experience	No.	%
<u>Program related comments:</u>		
University attendance	26	31.71
Visits to specific places	23	28.05
On-the-job training	9	10.98
Orientation program	2	2.44
Other program aspects	13	15.85
<u>Not program related comments:</u>		
	2	2.44
Social and recreational	1	1.22
Customs, culture practices	1	1.22
Other social aspects	4	4.87
Other comments	1	1.22
Total	82	100.00

Table 103.

LENGTH OF TIME SPENT BY PARTICIPANTS IN TRAINING
BY REASONS GIVEN FOR CONSIDERING CERTAIN PARTS OF
THEIR EXPERIENCE NOT USEFUL OR VALUABLE
(Total 82)

Reasons given by participants	Length of time spent in training				
	1-2 months	2-4 months	4-6 months	6-one year	One year & longer
Too short	1		1	6	1
Too elementary			1	6	1
Poorly planned		1	2	4	1
Not related to needs			2	4	1
Overlapping			1	5	
Unnecessary in parts	1	1	-	3	1
Too theoretical	1	1		3	1
Too long			1	3	
Too intensive			2	1	1
Too advanced			1		1
Not ascertained	1	2	2	12	-
Others			1	4	
Total	4	5	14	51	8

Table 104.

RANK OR LEVEL OF PARTICIPANTS JOB AT TIME OF SELECTION BY REASONS GIVEN FOR CONSIDERING CERTAIN PARTS OF THEIR EXPERIENCE NOT USEFUL OR VALUABLE

Reasons given by participants	Rank or level of participants job											
	2nd level policy makers		Sub-man-agement		Engineers		Pro-essionals		Sub-pro-essionals		Clerical Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Too short			1	1.32	3	7.32	3	6.38	2	5.13		
Too elementa-ry			2	2.63	3	7.32			2	5.13	1	100.00
Poorly planned	1	8.33	1	1.32	2	4.88	2	4.25	2	5.13		
Not related to needs	1	8.33	1	1.32			1	2.13	4	10.26		
Overlapping					1	2.44	3	6.38	2	5.13		
Unnecessary	1	8.33	2	2.63					3	7.69		
Too theoret-ical	1	8.33	2	2.63	1	2.44	2	4.25				
Too long			1	1.32	1	2.44	1	2.13	1	2.56		
Too intensive			1	1.32	1	2.44	1	2.13	1	2.56		
Too advan- ced	1	8.34					1	2.13				
Other comments	1	8.34	2	2.63			1	2.13	1	2.56		
Not ascertained			8	10.53	4	9.76	1	2.13	4	10.26		
Found all useful	6	50.00	55	72.35	25	60.96	31	65.96	17	43.59		1 100.00
Total	12	100.00	76	100.00	41	100.00	47	100.00	39	100.00	1	100.00

Table 105.

REASONS GIVEN BY PARTICIPANTS FOR CONSIDERING CERTAIN PARTS OF THEIR EXPERIENCE NOT USEFUL OR VALUABLE (Total 82)

Reasons given by participants	No.
Program too short or rigid	9
Program too elementary	8
Program poorly planned	8
Not related to participants needs	7
Too overlapping	6
Some parts unnecessary	6
Too theoretical	6
Too long	4
Too intensive	4
Too advanced or difficult for applicant	2
Other comments	5
Not ascertained	17
Total	82

Table 106.

PARTICIPANTS OPINION ON TRAINING REQUIREMENTS

Participants opinion on training requirements	No.	%
Required them to do or see too much	40	18.43
Would have liked to do or see more	70	32.26
Training alright as it was	105	48.39
Not ascertained	2	.92
Total	217	100.00

Table 107.

PARTICIPANTS OPINION ON TRAINING REQUIREMENTS
BY TRAINING FIELD OF ACTIVITY

Training field of activity	Opinion on training requirements									
	Too many		Wanted more		Just right		Not ascertained		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Military			1	50.00	1	50.00			2	100.00
Agriculture	9	16.98	19	35.85	25	47.17			53	100.00
Industry and mining	3	13.04	10	43.48	10	43.48			23	100.00
Transportation	5	10.00	19	38.00	25	50.00	1	2.00	50	100.00
Labor					1	100.00			1	100.00
Sanitation	4	23.53	4	23.53	9	52.94			17	100.00
Education	1	12.50	2	25.00	5	62.50			8	100.00
Public administration	9	25.00	8	22.22	18	50.00	1	2.78	36	100.00
Community development	5	35.71	2	14.29	7	50.00			14	100.00
Miscellaneous	4	30.77	5	38.46	4	30.77			13	100.00

Table 108.

PARTICIPANTS OPINION ON TRAINING REQUIREMENTS
BY LENGTH OF TIME SPENT IN TRAINING

Total length of time spent in training	Opinion on training requirements									
	Too many		Wanted more		Just right		Not as- certained		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1 less than 2 months	3	33.33	3	33.33	3	33.34			9	100.00
2 less than 4 months	3	13.04	10	43.48	10	43.48			23	100.00
4 less than 6 months	6	24.00	8	32.00	10	40.00	1	4.00	25	100.00
6 less than one year	23	18.11	44	34.65	59	46.46	1	.78	127	100.00
One year or more	5	15.15	5	15.15	23	69.70			33	100.00

Table 109.

TYPES OF ACTIVITIES PARTICIPANTS WOULD HAVE LIKED
MORE OF DURING THEIR TRAINING PROGRAM
(Multiple answers)

Types of activities	No.
Had enough activities during their stay	128
Would have liked more travel, excursions.	23
Would have liked more cultural activities	21
Would have liked more invitation to private homes	21
Would have liked more social and recreational activities	17
Would have liked more free time, (too many planned activities)	5
Would have liked more meetings with professional colleagues	3
Would have liked more meetings with groups from different countries	2
Other types of activities	10
Don't remember	3
Not ascertained	3
Total	236

Table 110.

PARTICIPANTS OPINION ON THE SOCIAL ACTIVITIES
ARRANGED FOR THEM DURING THEIR TRAINING

Opinion on social activities	No.	%
They were too many	2	.92
They were enough	123	56.68
They were not enough	90	41.48
Not ascertained	2	.92
Total	217	100.00

Table 111.

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS ENTERTAINED IN PRIVATE
HOMES DURING TRAINING

Entertained	No.	%
Were entertained	191	88.02
Were not entertained	26	11.98
Total	217	100.00

Table 112.

PARTICIPANTS RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGES TO BE
MADE IN THE TRAINING PROGRAM
(Multiple answers)

Types of changes recommended	No.	%
<u>No changes</u>	13	4.83
<u>Changes in emphasis of program:</u>		
More training	68	25.29
More specialized training program	34	12.64
More specifically related to needs of participant's job and country	21	7.81
<u>Changes in arrangement of training program:</u>		
More advanced information on program and country of training	25	9.29
Chance to plan their own program	20	7.44
Program better planned and organized	18	6.69
More help in daily living expenses	13	4.83
<u>Changes in type of training program:</u>		
Some or more academic training	23	8.55
Some or more practical work	20	7.44
Some or more observation	14	5.20
Total	269	100.00

Table 113.

AGE OF PARTICIPANTS AT TIME OF DEPARTURE BY
DEGREE OF SATISFACTION WITH TRAINING PROGRAM
UPON COMPLETION

Degree of satisfaction with training program upon completion	Age of participants															
	less than 25		25 - 29		30 - 34		35 - 39		40 - 44		45 - 49		50 - 55		55 & over	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very satisfied			11	42.30	31	54.38	37	60.65	25	71.43	12	63.16	9	69.23	2	66.67
Moderately satisfied	1	33.33	10	38.46	15	26.32	17	27.87	7	20.00	6	31.58	3	23.08	1	33.33
Not too satisfied	1	33.33	3	11.54	6	10.53	6	9.84	2	5.71	1	5.26	1	7.69		
Not satisfied at all	1	33.34	1	3.85	3	5.26	1	1.64	1	2.86						
Not ascertained			1	3.85	2	3.51										
Total	3	100.00	26	100.00	57	100.00	61	100.00	35	100.00	19	100.00	13	100.00	3	100.00

Table 114.

RANK OR LEVEL OF PARTICIPANTS JOB AT TIME OF DEPARTURE BY DEGREE OF SATISFACTION WITH TRAINING PROGRAM UPON COMPLETION

Degree of satisfaction with training program	Rank or level of participants job											
	2nd level policy maker		Sub-managment		Engi-neers		Pro-fessionals		Sub-Prof.		Clerical Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very satisfied	9	75.00	43	56.58	21	51.22	32	68.08	21	53.85	1	100.00
Moderately satisfied	2	16.67	24	31.58	14	34.14	10	21.28	10	25.64		
Not too satisfied	1	8.33	8	10.53	2	4.88	4	8.51	5	12.82		
Not satisfied at all			1	1.31	1	2.44	1	2.13	3	7.69		
Not ascertained					3	7.32						
Total	12	100.00	76	100.00	41	100.00	47	100.00	39	100.00	1	100.00

Table 115.

DEGREE OF SATISFACTION WITH TRAINING PROGRAM UPON COMPLETION BY PARTICIPANTS TRAINING FIELD OF ACTIVITY

Training field of activity	Degree of satisfaction										Total	
	Very satisfied		Modera-tely		Not too sa-tisfied		Not at all satisfied		Not as-certained		No.	%
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Military	2	100.00									2	100.00
Agriculture	28	52.83	14	26.42	7	13.20	1	1.89	3	5.66	53	100.00
Industry and mining	17	73.91	5	21.74			1	4.35			23	100.00
Transportation	28	56.00	13	26.00	6	12.00	3	6.00			50	100.00
Labor	1	100.00									1	100.00
Sanitation	13	76.47	2	11.77	1	5.88	1	5.88			17	100.00
Education	6	75.00	2	25.00							8	100.00
Public ad-ministration	17	47.22	16	44.45	3	8.33					36	100.00
Commuhity deve-lopment	9	64.29	3	21.42	1	7.14	1	7.14			14	100.00
Miscellaneous	6	46.15	5	38.46	2	15.39					13	100.00

Table 116.

PARTICIPANTS ATTENDANCE AT ORIENTATION SESSIONS BY DEGREE OF SATISFACTION WITH TRAINING PROGRAM UPON COMPLETION

Degree of satisfaction with training program	Attendance at Orientation sessions		
	Attended	Did not attend	Not ascertained
Very satisfied	105	21	1
Moderately satisfied	51	9	
Not too satisfied	12	8	
Not satisfied at all	6	1	
Not ascertained		3	
Total	174	42	1

Table 117.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED BY PARTICIPANTS BY DEGREE OF SATISFACTION WITH TRAINING PROGRAM UPON COMPLETION

Degree of satisfaction	English language difficulties encountered					
	None	Being understood	Under-standing others	Both	Don't know Don't re-member	Not as-certain
Very satisfied	106	7	8	4	1	1
Moderately satisfied	41	9	1	7		2
Not too satisfied	8	3	5	3		1
Not satisfied at all	5	1	1			
Not ascertained	2			1		
Total	162	20	15	15	1	4

Table 118.

PARTICIPANTS OPINION ON LENGTH OF PROGRAM BY
DEGREE OF SATISFACTION WITH PROGRAM UPON COMPLETION

Degree of satisfaction with training program	Participants opinion on length of program			
	Too long	Just right	Too short	Not ascertained
Very satisfied	2	64	60	1
Moderately satisfied		22	38	
Not too satisfied	1	7	12	
Not satisfied at all		1	6	
Not ascertained		1	2	
Total	3	95	118	1

Table 119.

PARTICIPANTS RECEIVING DEGREES OR DIPLOMAS DURING
TRAINING BY DEGREE OF SATISFACTION WITH TRAINING
PROGRAM UPON COMPLETION

Degree of satisfaction with training program upon completion	Participants receiving degrees or diplomas			
	Received degrees	Received certificates	Did not receive	Did not attend university
Very satisfied	16	12	28	71
Moderately satisfied	3	7	9	41
Not too satisfied	-	2	5	13
Not satisfied at all	-		2	5
Not ascertained		1		2
Total	19	22	44	132

Table 120.

PARTICIPANTS OPINION ON THE SOCIAL ACTIVITIES
ARRANGED FOR THEM DURING TRAINING BY DEGREE OF
SATISFACTION WITH TRAINING PROGRAM UPON COMPLETION

Degree of satisfaction with training program	Extent of social activities				
	Too many	Enough	Not enough	Don't remember	Not ascertained
Very satisfied	1	80	45	1	-
Moderately satisfied		32	27		1
Not too satisfied		7	12		1
Not satisfied at all		2	5		
Not ascertained		2	1		
Total	1	123	90	1	2

Table 121.

PARTICIPANTS OPINION ON TIME LEFT BY PROGRAM FOR
THEIR PERSONAL INTEREST BY DEGREE OF SATISFACTION
WITH TRAINING PROGRAM UPON COMPLETION

Degree of satisfaction with program	Time left for personal interests		
	Too much	Enough	Too little
Very satisfied	4	86	37
Moderately satisfied	5	32	23
Not too satisfied	3	14	3
Not satisfied at all		4	3
Not ascertained		2	1
Total	12	138	67

Table 122.

TOTAL LENGTH OF TIME SPENT IN TRAINING BY
DEGREE OF SATISFACTION WITH TRAINING PROGRAM
UPON COMPLETION

Degree of sa- tisfaction with training program	Total length of time spent in training				
	1 less than 2 months	2 less than 4 months	4 less than 6 months	6 months less than one year	one year and over
Very satisfied	4	9	14	75	25
Moderately sa- tisfied	3	10	14	38	5
Not too satis- fied	2	4	5	8	1
Not satisfied at all			2	3	2
Not ascertained				3	
Total	9	23	25	127	33

Table 123.

PARTICIPANTS FOLLOWING PROGRAM AS ORIGINALLY
PLANNED BY DEGREE OF SATISFACTION WITH TRAINING
PROGRAM UPON COMPLETION

Degree of sa- tisfaction with training program	Program followed by participants			
	As originally planned	Program underwent changes	Don't remember	Not ascertained
Very satisfied	97	26	3	1
Moderately satis- fied	40	15	5	-
Not too satisfied	16	3	1	
Not satisfied at all	4	3		
Not ascertained	3			
Total	160	47	9	1

Table 124.

MARITAL STATUS OF PARTICIPANTS AT TIME OF
SELECTION BY DEGREE OF SATISFACTION WITH
TRAINING PROGRAM UPON COMPLETION

Degree of satisfaction	Marital status	
	Married	Not married
Very satisfied	102	25
Moderately satisfied	47	13
Not too satisfied	14	6
Not satisfied at all	4	3
Not ascertained	2	1
Total	169	48

Table 125.

EXTENT OF PARTICIPANTS PARTICIPATION IN
PLANNING OF PROGRAM BY DEGREE OF SATIS-
FACTION WITH TRAINING PROGRAM UPON COMPLETION

Degree of satisfaction with training program	Participation in planning of program			
	Participated	Did not participate	Don't remember	Not ascertained
Very satisfied	51	75	1	
Moderately satisfied	17	41	1	1
Not too satisfied	5	15		
Not satisfied at all	2	4	1	
Not ascertained	1	2		
Total	76	137	3	1

Table 126.

DEGREE OF SATISFACTION WITH TRAINING PROGRAM
BY EXTENT OF PROGRAM COMPLETION

Extent of program completion	Degree of satisfaction with training program				
	Very satisfied	Moderately satisfied	Not too satisfied	Not satisfied at all	Not ascertained
In complete detail	86	28	8	4	3
In partial detail	27	26	8	2	
Not set up at all	14	6	4	1	
Total	127	60	20	7	3

Table 127.

DEGREE OF SATISFACTION WITH TRAINING PROGRAM
UPON COMPLETION AND YEAR PARTICIPANTS DEPARTED
FOR TRAINING

Years departed for training	Degree of satisfaction with training program					Total
	Very satisfied	Moderately satisfied	Not too satisfied	Not satisfied at all	Not ascertained	
1951	6	4	1			11
1952	8	5	3			16
1953	16	3	1	2		22
1954	13	-	1			14
1955	41	13	6			60
1956	16	12	1			29
1959	5	6	1	2	1	15
1960	13	11	3	3		30
1961	9	6	3		2	20

Table 128.

PARTICIPANTS OPINION ON ADEQUACY OF MONEY MADE
AVAILABLE TO THEM BY USAID

Participants opinion on money allotment	No.	%
Money was too little	109	50.22
Money was just right	103	47.48
Money was too much	3	1.38
Not ascertained	2	.92
Total	217	100.00

Table 129.

REASONS GIVEN BY PARTICIPANTS FOR THEIR OPINION ON
INADEQUACY OF MONEY MADE AVAILABLE TO THEM BY USAID

Reasons given for inadequacy of money	No.	%
Cost of living too high	47	21.66
Hotel and traveling expenses too high	20	9.21
Could not maintain standard of living	14	6.45
Had to borrow	12	5.52
Money to be adjusted to individual needs	10	4.61
Other reasons	11	5.07
Thought money allotted was right	103	47.48
Total	217	100.00

Table 130.

PARTICIPANTS OPINION ON ADEQUACY OF MONEY MADE
AVAILABLE TO THEM BY USAID BY RANK OR LEVEL OF
THEIR JOB AT TIME OF SELECTION

Rank or level of job	Adequacy of money made available by USAID								Total	
	Too little		Just right		Too much		Not as- certained		No.	%
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Second level policy maker	7	58.33	5	41.67					12	100.00
Sub-manage- ment	33	43.42	41	53.95	2	2.63			76	100.00
Engineers	26	63.41	15	36.59					41	100.00
Professional	18	38.30	28	59.57	1	2.13			47	100.00
Sub-pro- fessional	24	61.54	13	33.33			2	5.13	39	100.00
Clerical	1	100.00							1	100.00
Others			1	100.00						

Table 131.

PARTICIPANTS OPINION ON ADEQUACY OF MONEY MADE
AVAILABLE TO THEM BY USAID BY AGE AT TIME OF
SELECTION

Age at time of selection	Adequacy of money made available by USAID								Total	
	Too little		Just right		Too much		Not as- certained		No.	%
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Less than 25	2	66.67	1	33.33					3	100.00
25 - 29	13	50.00	13	50.00					26	100.00
30 - 34	28	49.13	27	47.37	1	1.75	1	1.75	57	100.00
35 - 39	23	45.90	31	50.82	1	1.64	1	1.64	61	100.00
40 - 44	18	51.43	17	48.57					35	100.00
45 - 49	10	52.63	9	47.37					19	100.00
50 - 54	8	61.54	4	30.77	1	7.69			13	100.00
55 and over	2	66.67	1	33.33					3	100.00

Table 132.

PERIOD OF TIME SINCE PARTICIPANTS RETURNED FROM
TRAINING PROGRAM

Period of time returned	No.	%
6 months to less than one year	25	11.52
1 year to less than 2 years	32	14.75
2 years to less than 3 years	14	6.45
3 years to less than 4 years	1	.46
4 years to less than 5 years	2	.92
5 years to less than 6 years	23	10.60
6 years to less than 7 years	53	24.42
7 years or more	67	30.88
Total	217	100.00

Table 133.

AREA OF RESIDENCE OF PARTICIPANTS AT TIME
OF SURVEY

Area of residence	No.	%
Capital city area	204	94.01
Provincial city area	3	1.38
Rural or village area	10	4.61
Total	217	100.00

Table 134.

AGE OF PARTICIPANTS AT TIME OF SURVEY

Age of participants	No.	%
25 - 29	10	4.61
30 - 34	18	8.29
35 - 39	56	25.81
40 - 44	53	24.42
45 - 49	38	17.51
50 - 54	19	8.76
55 and over	23	10.60
Total	217	100.00

Table 135.

PARTICIPANTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT TIME OF SURVEY

Employment status	No.	%
Employed	208	95.85
Unemployed	6	2.77
On pension	3	1.38
Total	217	100.00

Table 136.

EXTENT OF PARTICIPANTS UNEMPLOYMENT PERIODS SINCE
THEIR RETURN FROM TRAINING PROGRAM

Extent of unemployment	No.	%
Never had job since return	1	.46
Unemployed at given periods	4	1.84
Never unemployed	211	97.24
Not ascertained	1	.46
Total	217	100.00

Table 137.

JOB SHIFTS FOR PARTICIPANTS BETWEEN JOBS HELD BEFORE
DEPARTURE AND THOSE IMMEDIATELY ASSUMED UPON RETURN
FROM TRAINING PROGRAM BY TRAINING FIELD OF ACTIVITY

Training field of activity	Change in job status after return from training program					
	Same job as before departure		Different job as before departure		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Military	1	50.00	1	50.00	2	100.00
Agriculture	44	83.02	9	16.98	53	100.00
Industry and mining	15	65.22	8	34.78	23	100.00
Transportation	39	78.00	11	22.00	50	100.00
Labor	1	100.00			1	100.00
Sanitation	14	82.35	3	17.65	17	100.00
Education	4	50.00	4	50.00	8	100.00
Public administration	27	75.00	9	25.00	36	100.00
Community development	13	92.86	1	7.14	14	100.00
Miscellaneous	12	92.31	1	7.69	13	100.00
Total	170	78.34	47	21.66	217	100.00

115

Table 138.

CHANGE IN JOB STATUS BETWEEN JOBS HELD BEFORE DEPARTURE AND THOSE ASSUMED IMMEDIATELY UPON RETURN FROM TRAINING PROGRAM BY CHANGE IN JOB STATUS BETWEEN JOBS ASSUMED IMMEDIATELY UPON RETURN AND JOBS HELD AT TIME OF SURVEY

Change in job status between job held upon immediate return and as of time of survey	Change in job status between before departure and upon return				Total	
	Same job		Different job			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Same job	88	51.76	18	38.30	106	48.85
Different job	75	44.12	27	57.45	102	47.00
Not working at present (unemployed and on pension)	7	4.12	2	4.25	9	4.15
Total	170	100.00	47	100.00	217	100.00

Table 139.

LENGTH OF TIME PARTICIPANTS HAVE BEEN BACK FROM TRAINING PROGRAM BY CHANGE IN JOB STATUS BETWEEN JOBS HELD UPON IMMEDIATE RETURN AND JOBS HELD AT TIME OF SURVEY

Change in job	Length of time since return										Total							
	6 months to less than 12 months	1 year to less than 2 years	2 years to less than 3 years	3 years to less than 4 years	4 years to less than 5 years	5 years to less than 6 years	6 years to less than 7 years	7 years and over										
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%						
Same job	25	23.59	18	16.98	6	5.66	1	.94			13	12.27	16	15.09	27	25.47	106	100
Different job			13	12.75	7	6.86			2	1.96	9	8.82	34	33.33	37	36.28	102	100
Not working at present			1	11.11	1	11.11					1	11.11	3	33.33	3	33.34	9	100
Total	25	11.52	32	14.75	14	6.45	1	.46	2	.92	23	10.60	53	24.42	67	30.88	217	100

Table 140.

OCCUPATIONS OF TRAINEES BEFORE AND AFTER TRAINING

Occupational rank	Before training	After training
<u>Top policy makers, executives and administrators (national level and/or national impact)</u>		1
<u>Second level policy makers, executive and administrators:</u>	12	28
Regional or local government, agency directors and deputy directors, general director, division director	5	17
Presidents, vice-presidents, deans - colleges, technical institution.		1
Controller general, controller	7	10
<u>Program and administrative officials - subordinate management:</u>	76	82
Chief inspectors, head of training, research, administrative chiefs, section chiefs, program division chiefs, field office directors	26	41
Staff planners	2	2
Personnel and welfare officers, finance officers, property and supply officers, legal officers, administrative officers	11	12
Executive assistants, technical advisors, marketing specialists, public relation and press officers	11	9
School principals, inspectors of education, hospitals and clinic administrators, etc.	3	1
Other subordinate line and staff management program and administrative officials	23	17
<u>Professional engineers:</u>	41	26
Civil engineers	12	4
Chemical engineers	1	
Electronic engineers	10	7
Mechanical engineers	1	1
Metallurgical engineers	-	-
Agricultural engineers	12	11
Aeronautical engineers	5	3

Table 140 (cont'd.)

OCCUPATIONS OF TRAINEES BEFORE AND AFTER TRAINING

Occupational rank	Before training	After training
<u>Professional occupations</u> (other than program and administrative officials and engineers):	47	35
Agricultural scientists	25	15
Sociological and life scientists	4	2
Medical scientists	1	1
Economists	1	1
Social Scientists (except Economists)	5	4
Physical scientists	3	2
Teachers, university level, sciences other than social sciences	7	7
Teachers, university level, social science and other		1
Teachers, instructors	1	2
<u>Sub-professional occupations:</u>	39	37
Laboratory testers	1	1
Nurses	1	1
Medical and public health technicians	2	1
Other sub-professional occupations	35	34
<u>Clerical workers:</u>	1	2

Table 140 A.

**ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES OF TRAINEES BEFORE AND AFTER
TRAINING**

Classification of economic activities	Before training	After training
<u>Services, government and non-government:</u> <u>(business, education, medical, legal,</u> <u>housing, public security):</u>	48	50
Business, and professional enter- prise (performing services by contract or fee)	5	6
Educational services (University and technical)	8	12
Educational services (primary, secondary and kindergarten)	4	2
Educational services, vocational and trade schools	2	1
Educational services, other	2	2
Medical services, general	8	7
Medical services, public health	8	8
Legal services	-	1
Welfare, social and employment social services	7	6
Community development	2	2
Public safety services	2	2
Housing and town planning services	-	1
<u>Government administrative and regulatory services</u>	24	20
<u>Specialized government technical services</u>	18	15
<u>Management services in government agencies</u>	8	6
<u>Agriculture, forestry and fisheries:</u>	40	36
Crop production	14	12
Livestock production and development	11	9
Land and water resources	9	8
Agriculture and home economics extension	3	4
Forestry and logging	1	1
Other agricultural services	2	2
<u>Mining and quarrying</u>	1	3

Table 140 A (cont'd)

ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES OF TRAINEES BEFORE AND AFTER
TRAINING

Classification of economic activities	Before training	After training
<u>Manufacturing, maintenance and repair:</u>	9	12
Tobacco manufactures	1	1
Textile mill products	3	4
Paper and allied products	1	2
Chemicals and allied products	1	-
Petroleum refining and related Industry	-	1
Stone, clay and glass products	-	1
Machinery, except electrical	1	1
Electrical machinery, equipment and supplies	1	1
Professional, scientific and controlling instruments, photographic, etc.	1	1
<u>Engineering and construction:</u>	15	16
General building	6	7
Highways and streets	7	6
Heavy construction	2	3
<u>Electricity, gas, water and sanitary services</u>	4	3
<u>Transport, storage and communication services:</u>	48	48
Air transportation and related services	30	31
Railway transport and related services	-	1
Postal system operations	1	1
Telephone, telegram and communications system	16	15
Other	1	-
<u>Commerce, banking and insurance:</u>	1	1
Wholesale and retail trade	1	1

Table 141.

RANK OR LEVEL OF PARTICIPANTS JOB AT TIME
OF SURVEY BY SEX

S e x	Rank or level of participants job								Total
	1st level policy	2nd level policy	Sub-mana- gement	Engi- neers	Pro- fession- al	Sub-pro- fessional	Cleri- cal	Unem- ployed	
Male	1	28	79	26	33	36	2	6	211
Female			3		2	1			6
Total	1	28	82	26	35	37	2	6	217

Table 142.

PARTICIPANTS OPINION ON IMPORTANCE
OF TRAINING PROGRAM IN CHANGING THEIR
JOB STATUS

Participants opinion on importance of training program on their job	No.	%
Without training job would be the same	150	69.12
Without training job would be better	7	3.23
Without training job would not have been as good	32	14.75
Not ascertained	19	8.76
Unemployed	6	2.76
On pension	3	1.38
Total	217	100.00

121

Table 143.

PARTICIPANTS OPINION ON IMPORTANCE OF TRAINING PROGRAM IN CHANGING THEIR JOB STATUS BY TOTAL AMOUNT OF TIME SPENT IN TRAINING

Total time spent in training	Participants opinion on importance of training program in changing job status											
	Without training job same		Without training job better		Without training job not as good		Not as-certain-ed		Unemployed and on pension		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1 less than 2 months	7	77.78					2	22.22			9	100.00
2 less than 4 months	13	56.52	1	4.35	4	17.39	1	4.35	4	17.39	23	100.00
4 less than 6 months	17	68.00	1	4.00	3	12.00	2	8.00	2	8.00	25	100.00
6 less than one year	94	74.02	5	3.94	18	14.17	8	6.30	2	1.57	127	100.00
One year and over	19	57.58			7	21.21	6	18.18	1	3.03	33	100.00

Table 144.

PARTICIPANTS ABILITIES TO UTILIZE SKILLS OR KNOWLEDGE ACQUIRED DURING TRAINING IN JOBS HELD AT TIME OF SURVEY

Abilities to utilize skills and knowledge acquired in training in jobs held at time of survey	No.	%
Have been able	182	83.87
Have not been able	28	12.90
Not ascertained	1	.46
Unemployed	6	2.77
Total	217	100.00

122

Table 145.

PARTICIPANTS ABILITY TO UTILIZE SKILLS OR KNOWLEDGE
ACQUIRED DURING TRAINING IN JOB HELD AT TIME OF SURVEY
BY RANK OR LEVEL OF JOB HELD AT TIME OF SELECTION

Rank or level of participants job at time of selection	Ability to utilize skills in job						Total	
	Were able		Were not able		Not as- certained ^m		No.	%
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
2nd level policy maker	8	66.67	3	25.00	1	8.33	12	100.00
Subordinate management	62	81.58	9	11.84	5	6.58	76	100.00
Engineers	37	90.24	4	9.76			41	100.00
Professionals	42	89.36	4	8.51	1	2.13	47	100.00
Sub-professionals	32	82.05	7	17.95			39	100.00
Clerical	1	100.00					1	100.00
Other			1	100.00			1	100.00
Total	182	83.87	28	12.90	7	3.23	217	100.00

^mIncluding 6 currently unemployed.

Table 146.

PARTICIPANTS ABILITY TO UTILIZE SKILLS OR KNOWLEDGE
ACQUIRED DURING TRAINING IN JOB HELD AT TIME OF SURVEY
BY RANK OR LEVEL OF JOB HELD AT TIME OF SURVEY

Rank or level of participants job at time of survey	Ability to utilize skills in job						Total	
	Were able		Were not able		Not ascer- tained ^m		No.	%
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
1st level policy maker					1	100.00	1	100.00
2nd level policy maker	23	82.14	5	17.86			28	100.00
Subordinate management	71	86.59	11	13.41			82	100.00
Engineers	24	92.31	2	7.69			26	100.00
Professionals	32	91.43	3	8.57			35	100.00
Sub-professionals	31	83.78	6	16.22			37	100.00
Clerical	1	50.00	1	50.00			2	100.00
Unemployed					6	100.00		
Total	182	83.87	28	12.90	7	100.00	217	100.00

^m Including 6 currently unemployed.

Table 147.

PARTICIPANTS ABILITY TO UTILIZE SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE
ACQUIRED DURING TRAINING IN JOBS HELD AT TIME OF
SURVEY BY TRAINING FIELD OF ACTIVITY

Training field of activity	Ability to utilize skills in job						Total	
	Were able		Were not able		Not ascer- tained [■]		No.	%
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Military	1	50.00	1	50.00			2	100.00
Agriculture	44	83.02	7	13.21	2	3.77	53	100.00
Industry and mining	19	82.61	4	17.39			23	100.00
Transportation	46	92.00	4	8.00			50	100.00
Labor					1	100.00	1	100.00
Sanitation	13	76.47	3	17.65	1	5.88	17	100.00
Education	8	100.00					8	100.00
Public adminis- tration	28	77.78	6	16.67	2	5.55	36	100.00
Community deve- lopment	11	78.57	2	14.29	1	7.14	14	100.00
Miscellaneous	12	92.31	1	7.69			13	100.00
Total	182	83.87	28	12.90	7	3.23	217	100.00

■ Including 6 currently unemployed.

Table 148.

DEGREE OF PARTICIPANTS ABILITY TO UTILIZE SKILLS
AND KNOWLEDGE ACQUIRED DURING TRAINING IN JOBS
HELD AT TIME OF SURVEY

Degree of participants ability to utilize skills and knowledge	No.	%
Practically none	3	1.38
Only a little	15	6.91
Some	45	20.74
Quite a bit	73	33.64
Almost everything, everything	46	21.20
Not been able	28	12.90
Unemployed	6	2.77
Not ascertained	1	.46
Total	217	100.00

124

Table 149.

PARTICIPANTS EVALUATION OF CURRENT SUPERVISORS
ATTITUDE TOWARDS HELPING THEM UTILIZE THEIR
TRAINING (Total 186)

Supervisors attitude	No.	%
Very helpful	95	51.08
Somewhat helpful	22	11.83
Not helpful	42	22.58
Neither helpful nor unhelpful	26	13.98
Not ascertained	1	.53
Total	186^M	100.00

■ 31 respondents indicated they do not have supervisors;
of these 6 are currently unemployed.

Table 150.

PARTICIPANTS EVALUATION OF CURRENT SUPERVISORS
ATTITUDE TOWARDS HELPING THEM UTILIZE THEIR
TRAINING BY RANK OR LEVEL OF PARTICIPANTS JOB AT
TIME OF SURVEY (Total 186)

Rank or level of participants job	Supervisors attitude towards participants utilizing training										Total			
	Very helpful		Somewhat helpful		Not helpful		Neither helpful nor un- helpful		Not as- certain- ed		No.	%		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%				
First level policy maker											1	100.00	1	100.00
2nd level policy maker	13	61.91	2	9.52	4	19.05	2	9.52					21	100.00
Subordinate	32	45.07	8	11.27	16	22.54	15	21.12					71	100.00
Engineers	6	25.00	7	29.17	5	20.83	6	25.00					24	100.00
Professionals	24	75.00			5	15.63	3	9.37					32	100.00
Sub-pro- fessionals	20	57.14	5	14.29	10	28.57							35	100.00
Clerical					2	100.00							2	100.00
Total	95	51.08	22	11.83	42	22.58	26	13.98	1	100.00	186^M	100.00	186^M	100.00

■ 31 respondents indicated they do not have supervisors;
of these 6 are currently unemployed.

125

Table 151.

PARTICIPANTS EVALUATION OF CURRENT SUPERVISORS
ATTITUDE TOWARDS HELPING THEM UTILIZE TRAINING
BY TRAINING FIELD OF ACTIVITY (Total 186)[■]

Training field of activity	Supervisors attitude towards utilizing training					Total
	Very helpful	Somewhat helpful	Not helpful	Neither helpful nor unhelpful	Not as- certained	
Military	1	..	1			2
Agriculture	23	5	14	5	1	48
Industry and mining	10	2	4	4		20
Transportation	22	7	9	8		46
Sanitation	8	2	2	2		14
Education	4	1	1			6
Public ad- ministration	18	3	5	4		30
Community development	4	2	4	1		11
Miscellaneous	5		2	2		9

■ 31 respondents indicated they did not have a supervisor; of these 6 are currently unemployed.

Table 152.

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS WORKING WITH PEOPLE WHO
HAVE RECEIVED TRAINING ABROAD

Number of participants working with people who have been trained abroad	No.	%
Work with people who have been trained abroad	155	71.43
Do not work with people who have been trained abroad	55	25.35
Not ascertained ^{***}	7	3.22

Total 217 100.00

=====

*** Of these 6 are currently unemployed.

Table 153.

EXTENT OF PARTICIPANTS ABILITY TO CONVEY TO OTHER.
PEOPLE WHAT THEY LEARNED IN THE TRAINING PROGRAM

Extent of participants ability to convey	No.	%
Were able to convey	183	84.33
Were not able to convey	30	13.82
Not ascertained	4	1.85
Total	217	100.00

Table 153.A.

MEDIA OF TRANSMISSAL USED BY PARTICIPANTS TO CONVEY
TO OTHER PEOPLE WHAT THEY LEARNED IN TRAINING
(Multiple answers)

Media of transmission	No.	%
Gave formal training program, lectures	108	32.24
Informal discussions	80	23.88
On-the job teaching and training	72	21.49
Wrote articles, other publications	42	12.54
Organization and reorganization	2	.60
Orientation for persons going abroad	1	.30
Other activities	1	.30
Not applicable	29	8.65
Total	335	100.00

Table 154.

PARTICIPANTS ABILITY TO CONVEY WHAT THEY LEARNED
IN TRAINING PROGRAM TO OTHERS BY RANK OR LEVEL
OF THEIR JOBS AT TIME OF SELECTION

Rank or level of participants job at time of selection	Participants ability to convey						Total	
	Were able		Were not able		Not ascertained			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
2nd level policy maker	8	66.67	4	33.33			12	100.00
Sub-management	66	86.84	7	9.21	3	3.95	76	100.00
Engineers	37	90.24	4	9.76			41	100.00
Professionals	42	89.36	4	8.51	1	2.13	47	100.00
Sub-professionals	29	74.36	10	25.64			39	100.00
Clerical	1	100.00					1	100.00
Other			1	100.00			1	100.00
Total	183	84.33	30	13.83	4	1.84	217	100.00

Table 155.

PARTICIPANTS ABILITY TO CONVEY TO OTHERS WHAT THEY LEARNED
IN TRAINING PROGRAM BY RANK OR LEVEL OF THEIR
JOBS AT TIME OF SURVEY

Rank or level of participants job at time of survey	Ability to convey						Total	
	Were able		Were not able		Not ascertained			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1st level policy maker					1	100.00	1	100.00
2nd level policy maker	23	82.14	5	17.86			28	100.00
Sub-management	75	91.46	7	8.54			82	100.00
Engineers	23	88.46	3	11.54			26	100.00
Professionals	30	85.71	5	14.29			35	100.00
Sub-professionals	28	75.68	9	24.32			37	100.00
Clerical	1	50.00	1	50.00			2	100.00
	3	50.00			3	100.00	6	100.00
Total	183	84.33	30	13.83	4	1.84	217	100.00

Table 156.

PARTICIPANTS ABILITY TO CONVEY TO OTHERS WHAT
THEY LEARNED IN TRAINING PROGRAM BY PREVIOUS
UNIVERSITY ATTENDANCE

University attendance	Ability to convey to others						Total	
	Were able		Were not able		Not ascertained			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Attended	153	85.00	23	12.78	4	2.22	180	100.00
Did not attend	30	81.08	7	18.92			37	100.00
Total	183	84.33	30	13.83	4	1.84	217	100.00

Table 157.

PARTICIPANTS PLANS TO UTILIZE TRAINING THEY HAVE AS
YET NOT BEEN ABLE TO CARRY OUT

Participants plans	No.	%
Intend to utilize training	157	72.35
Do not intend to utilize training	58	26.73
Not ascertained	2	.92
Total	217	100.00

**PARTICIPANTS PLANS TO UTILIZE TRAINING THEY HAVE
AS YET NOT BEEN ABLE TO CARRY OUT BY RANK OR LEVEL
OF THEIR JOB AT TIME OF SURVEY**

Rank or level of participants job at time of survey	Plans to utilize training						Total	
	Intend to utilize training		Do not intend to utilize training		Not ascertained			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1st level policy maker			1	100.00			1	100.00
2nd level policy maker	16	57.14	12	42.86			28	100.00
Subordinate mana- gement	61	74.39	20	24.39	1	1.22	82	100.00
Engineers	21	80.77	5	19.23			26	100.00
Professionals	29	82.86	5	14.28	1	2.86	35	100.00
Sub-professionals	26	70.27	11	29.73			37	100.00
Clerical			2	100.00			2	100.00
Not ascertained	4	66.67	2	33.33			6	100.00

Table 159.

**MAJOR DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED BY PARTICIPANTS IN USING
SKILLS LEARNED OR IN CONVEYING THEM TO OTHER PEOPLE
(Multiple answers)**

Kinds of difficulties encountered	No.
<u>Difficulties related to conditions of country:</u>	68
Lack of funds	8
Lack of equipment	38
Other administrative difficulties	22
<u>Difficulties related to other people:</u>	31
Employers uncooperative	12
Employees do not cooperate	7
Lack of help from superiors	5
Lack of trained staff	4
Lack of educational facilities	2
USAID does not help ex participants	1
<u>Difficulties related to participants job:</u>	8
Not sufficient authority	1
Job not enabling transmissal training	5
Lack of time to transmit	2
<u>Difficulties related to training program:</u>	7
<u>Other difficulties</u>	8
<u>Not ascertained</u>	1
Total	123

Table 160.

EXTENT OF PARTICIPANTS UTILIZATION OF TRAINING IN
FIRST ACTIVITY PERFORMED SINCE RETURN
(Total 182)

Extent of utilizing training	No.	%
Participants used training	172	94.50
Participants did not use training	6	3.30
Not ascertained	4	2.20
Total	182	100.00

Table 161.

DEGREE OF INITIATIVE DISPLAYED BY PARTICIPANT
IN FIRST ACTIVITY PERFORMED SINCE RETURN
(Total 182)

Degree of initiative displayed	No.	%
Activity initiated by participant himself	149	81.87
Activity initiated by others	18	9.89
Not clear who initiated activity	15	8.24
Total	182	100.00

Table 162.

DEGREE OF INITIATIVE DISPLAYED BY PARTICIPANTS
IN FIRST ACTIVITY PERFORMED SINCE RETURN BY
THEIR TRAINING FIELD OF ACTIVITY

Field of training activity	Degree of initiative displayed by participant								Total	
	Activity initiated by participant		Activity initiated by others		Not clear		Do not have activity			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Military	1	50.00					1	50.00	2	100.00
Agriculture	40	75.47	2	3.77	4	7.55	7	13.21	53	100.00
Industry and mining	17	73.90	2	8.70	2	8.70	2	8.70	23	100.00
Transportation	28	56.00	6	12.00	4	8.00	12	24.00	50	100.00
Labor	1	100.00							1	100.00
Sanitation	11	64.71	3	17.65	2	11.76	1	5.88	17	100.00
Education	7	87.50					1	12.50	8	100.00
Public administration	25	69.44	5	13.89			6	16.67	36	100.00
Community development	10	71.42			2	14.29	2	14.29	14	100.00
Miscellaneous	9	69.23			1	7.69	3	23.08	13	100.00

Table 163.

DEGREE OF INITIATIVE DISPLAYED BY PARTICIPANTS
IN FIRST ACTIVITY PERFORMED SINCE RETURN BY
RANK OR LEVEL OF THEIR JOBS AT TIME OF SURVEY

Rank or level of participants job at time of survey	Degree of initiative displayed by participant								Total	
	Activity initiated by participant		Activity initiated by others		Not clear		Do not have activity			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1st level policy maker							1	100.00	1	100.00
2nd level policy maker	19	67.86	4	14.29	2	7.14	3	10.71	28	100.00
Sub-management	62	75.61	6	7.32	3	3.66	11	13.41	82	100.00
Engineers	16	61.54	3	11.54	2	7.69	5	19.23	26	100.00
Professionals	25	71.43	2	5.71	5	14.29	3	8.57	35	100.00
Sub-professionals	21	56.75	3	8.11	2	5.41	11	29.73	37	100.00
Clerical	1	50.00					1	50.00	2	100.00
Not employed	5	83.33			1	16.67			6	100.00

Table 164.

DEGREE OF INITIATIVE DISPLAYED BY PARTICIPANT
IN SECOND ACTIVITY PERFORMED SINCE RETURN

Degree of initiative displayed	No.	%
Activity initiated by participant	100	46.08
Activity initiated by others	4	1.84
Not clear	6	2.77
Do not have second activity	107	49.31
Total	217	100.00

Table 165.

NATURE OF SECOND ACTIVITY PERFORMED BY PARTICIPANTS
SINCE RETURN
(Total 110)

Nature of activity	No.
Changed or improved procedures	56
Performed job in a superior way	13
Did research	9
Wrote books	8
Instituted new organizations	6
Made formal plans for future development	5
Taught others	5
Constructed something	4
Other	3
Not ascertained	1
Total	110

Table 166.

FIELD OF ECONOMIC ENDEAVOUR OF SECOND ACTIVITY
PERFORMED BY PARTICIPANTS SINCE RETURN
(Total 110)

Field of economic endeavour	No.
Agriculture	25
Transportation	18
Public administration	17
Industry and mining	12
Sanitation	11
Education	11
Community development	8
Labor	2
Other	5
Not ascertained	1
Total	110

Table 167.

EXTENT OF PARTICIPANTS UTILIZATION OF TRAINING
IN SECOND ACTIVITY PERFORMED SINCE RETURN
(Total 110)

Extent of utilizing training	No.	%
Participants used training	107	97.27
Participants did not use training	1	.91
Not ascertained	2	1.82
Total	110	100.00

Table 168.

DEGREE OF INITIATIVE DISPLAYED BY PARTICIPANTS IN SECOND ACTIVITY PERFORMED SINCE RETURN BY THEIR TRAINING FIELD OF ACTIVITY

Training field of activity	Degree of initiative displayed by participant								Total	
	Initiative displayed by participant		Initiative displayed by others		Not as-certained		Do not have 2nd activity			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Military							2	100.00	2	100.00
Agriculture	29	54.72			1	1.89	23	43.39	53	100.00
Industry and mining	12	52.17					11	47.83	23	100.00
Transportation	17	34.00			4	8.00	29	58.00	50	100.00
Labor			1	100.00					1	100.00
Sanitation	8	47.06	2	11.76			7	41.18	17	100.00
Education	4	50.00					4	50.00	8	100.00
Public administration	17	47.22	1	2.78			18	50.00	36	100.00
Community development	8	57.14			1	7.14	5	35.72	14	100.00
Miscellaneous	5	38.46					8	61.54	13	100.00

Table 169.

DEGREE OF INITIATIVE DISPLAYED BY PARTICIPANT IN PERFORMANCE OF SECOND ACTIVITY SINCE RETURN BY RANK OR LEVEL OF THEIR JOB AT TIME OF SURVEY

Rank or level of participant job	Degree of initiative displayed by participant								Total	
	Initiative displayed by participant		Initiative displayed by others		Not as-certained		Do not have 2nd activity			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1st level policy							1	100.00	1	100.00
2nd level policy	15	53.57	1	3.57	1	3.57	11	39.29	28	100.00
Sub-management	41	50.00	2	2.44	1	1.22	38	46.34	82	100.00
Engineers	9	34.61			1	3.85	16	61.54	26	100.00
Professionals	16	45.71			1	2.86	18	51.43	35	100.00
Sub-professionals	15	40.54			2	5.41	20	54.05	37	100.00
Clericals							2	100.00	2	100.00
Not applicable	4	66.67	1	16.66			1	16.67	6	100.00

Table 170.

TOTAL UTILIZATION SCORE OF PARTICIPANTS BY
THEIR TRAINING FIELD OF ACTIVITY

Training field of activity	Categories of utilization score							
	Highest 75 +		Second Highest 50 - 74		No. utilization score		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Military	1	50.00			1	50.00	2	100.00
Agriculture	35	66.04	6	11.32	12	22.64	53	100.00
Industry and mining	15	65.22			8	34.78	23	100.00
Transportation	30	60.00	11	22.00	9	18.00	50	100.00
Labor					1	100.00	1	100.00
Sanitation	7	41.18	6	35.29	4	23.53	17	100.00
Education	7	87.50	1	12.50			8	100.00
Public administration	20	55.56	5	13.89	11	30.55	36	100.00
Community development	7	50.00	3	21.43	4	28.57	14	100.00
Miscellaneous	8	61.54	1	7.69	4	30.77	13	100.00
Total	130	59.91	33	15.21	54	24.88	217	100.00

Table 171.

TOTAL UTILIZATION SCORE OF PARTICIPANTS BY RANK OR
LEVEL OF JOB AT TIME OF SELECTION

Rank or level of job at time of selection	Categories of utilization score					
	Highest 75+		Second Highest 50 - 74		No. utilization score	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
2nd level policy maker	4	3.08	2	6.06	6	11.11
Sub-management	46	35.38	11	33.33	19	35.19
Engineers	29	22.31	4	12.12	8	14.82
Professionals	33	25.38	6	18.18	8	14.81
Sub-professionals	17	13.08	10	30.31	12	22.22
Clericals	1	.77				
Other					1	1.85
Total	130	100.00	33	100.00	54	100.00

136

Table 172.

PARTICIPANTS OPINION ON LEVEL OF PROGRAM BY
THEIR TOTAL UTILIZATION SCORE

Categories of total utilization score	Opinion on level of program								Total	
	Too simple		Just right		Too advanced		Not as-certained			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Highest 75 +	26	20.00	95	73.08	8	6.15	1	.77	130	100
Second highest 50 - 74	11	33.33	20	60.61	2	6.06			33	100
No utilization score	9	16.67	39	72.22	2	3.70	4	7.41	54	100

Table 173.

TOTAL UTILIZATION SCORE OF PARTICIPANTS BY THEIR
AGE AT TIME OF SELECTION

Age of participants at time of selection	Categories of utilization score								Total	
	Highest 75 +		Second highest 50 - 74		No utilization score					
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Less than 25	1	.77	1	3.03	1	1.85	3	1.38		
25 - 29	19	14.61	1	3.03	6	11.11	26	11.98		
30 - 34	31	23.85	9	27.27	17	31.48	57	26.27		
35 - 39	40	30.77	11	33.34	10	18.52	61	28.11		
40 - 44	22	16.92	6	18.18	7	12.96	35	16.13		
45 - 49	12	9.23	3	9.09	4	7.41	19	8.76		
50 - 54	4	3.08	2	6.06	7	12.96	13	5.99		
55 and over	1	.77			2	3.71	3	1.38		
Total	130	100.00	33	100.00	54	100.00	217	100.00		

Table 174.

LENGTH OF TIME PARTICIPANTS SPENT IN TRAINING BY THEIR TOTAL UTILIZATION SCORE

Categories of utilization score	Length of time spent in training										Total	
	1 to less than 2 months		2 to less than 4 months		4 to less than 6 months		6 to less than one year		One year and more			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Highest 75 +	4	3.08	8	6.15	16	12.31	78	60.00	24	18.46	130	100.0
Second highest 50 - 74	2	6.06	3	9.09	4	12.12	19	57.58	5	15.15	33	100.0
No utilization score	3	5.55	12	22.22	5	9.26	30	55.56	4	7.41	54	100.0

Table 175.

DEGREE OF ADEQUATE INFORMATION RECEIVED BY PARTICIPANTS ON TRAINING PROGRAM BEFORE DEPARTURE BY THEIR TOTAL UTILIZATION SCORE

Categories of utilization score	No. of questions received adequate information										Total			
	One question		Two questions		Three questions		Four questions		All questions				Not ascertained	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Highest 75 +	5	3.85	9	6.92	13	10.00	17	13.08	85	65.38	1	.77	130	100
Second highest 50 - 74			2	6.06	4	12.12	6	18.18	21	63.64			33	100
No utilization score	1	1.85	3	5.55	9	16.67	10	18.52	31	57.41			54	100
Total	6	2.76	14	6.45	26	11.98	33	15.21	137	63.14	1	.46	217	100

Table 176.

EXTENT OF PARTICIPANTS PARTICIPATION IN PLANNING THEIR PROGRAM BY THEIR TOTAL UTILIZATION SCORE

Categories of utilization score	Extent of participants participation								Total	
	Participated		Did not participate		Don't re-member		Not as-certained			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Highest 75 +	49	37.69	78	60.00	2	1.54	1	.77	130	100.00
Second highest 50 - 74	13	39.39	20	60.61					33	100.00
No. utilization score	14	25.93	39	72.22	1	1.85			54	100.00

Table 177.

EXTENT OF PROGRAM COMPLETION AS FOUND BY PARTICIPANTS UPON ARRIVAL BY THEIR TOTAL UTILIZATION SCORE

Categories of utilization score	Extent of program upon completion						Total	
	Complete detail		Partial detail		Not set up at all			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Highest 75 +	78	60.00	37	28.46	15	11.54	130	100.00
Second highest 50 - 74	23	69.70	6	18.18	4	12.12	33	100.00
No. utilization score	28	51.95	20	37.04	6	11.11	54	100.00

Table 178.

PARTICIPANTS OPINION ON EXTENT OF ATTENTION AND GUIDANCE RECEIVED DURING COURSE OF PROGRAM BY PERSONS MEETING THEM UPON ARRIVAL BY TOTAL UTILIZATION SCORE

Categories of utilization score	Extent of attention and guidance received				Total
	Enough	Not enough	Don't know	Were not met	
Highest 75 +	108	9		13	130
Second highest 50 - 74	29		1	3	33
No. utilization score	39	2		13	54
Total	176	11	1	29	217

Table 179.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED BY PARTICIPANTS DURING PROGRAM BY TOTAL UTILIZATION SCORE

Categories of utilization score	English language difficulties encountered												
	No diffi- culties		Being under- stood		Not being understood		Both		Don't re- member		Not appli- cable		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Highest 75 +	100	76.92	11	8.46	10	7.69	6	4.62			3	2.31	130
Second highest 50 - 74	26	78.79	4	12.12	1	3.03	2	6.06					33
No. utilization score	36	66.67	5	9.26	4	7.41	7	12.96	1	1.85	1	1.85	54

Table 180.

PARTICIPANTS RECEIVING DEGREES OR DIPLOMAS DURING TRAINING PROGRAM BY THEIR TOTAL UTILIZATION SCORE

Categories of utilization score	Participants receiving degrees or diplomas								Total	
	Received degrees		Received Certificates		Did not receive		Not applicable			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Highest 75 +	14	10.77	14	10.77	30	23.07	72	55.39	130	100.00
Second highest 50 - 74	3	9.09	1	3.03	7	21.21	22	66.67	33	100.00
No. utilization score	2	3.71	7	12.96	7	12.96	38	70.37	54	100.00

Table 181.

PARTICIPANTS EVALUATION OF CURRENT SUPERVISORS ATTITUDE TOWARDS HELPING THEM UTILIZE THEIR TRAINING BY THEIR TOTAL UTILIZATION SCORE (Total 186)

Categories of utilization score	Supervisors attitude towards utilizing training								Total	
	Very helpful		Somewhat helpful		Not helpful		Neither helpful nor unhelpful			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Highest 75 +	64	56.64	13	11.50	19	16.81	17	15.05		
Second highest 50 - 74	18	64.29	3	10.71	4	14.29	3	10.71		
No. utilization score	13	28.89	6	13.33	19	42.22	6	13.33	1	2.23
Total	95	51.08	22	11.83	42	22.58	26	13.98	1	.53

[#]31 respondents indicated they did not have supervisors; of these 6 are currently unemployed.

Table 182.

DEGREE OF PARTICIPANTS SATISFACTION WITH TRAINING PROGRAM UPON COMPLETION BY THEIR TOTAL UTILIZATION SCORE

Categories of total utilization score	Degree of satisfaction with training program											
	Very satisfied		Moderately satisfied		Not too satisfied		Not satisfied at all		Not ascertained		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Highest 75 +	81	62.31	38	29.23	9	6.92	1	.77	1	.77	130	100
Second highest 50 - 74	16	48.49	9	27.27	5	15.15	2	6.06	1	3.03	33	100
No. utilization score	30	55.56	13	24.07	6	11.11	4	7.41	1	1.85	54	100

Table 183.

EXTENT OF PARTICIPANTS EMPLOYMENT WITH USAID OR IN A JOINT PROJECT WITH USAID BY YEAR DEPARTING FOR TRAINING

Year participants departed for training	Type of employment with USAID					Total
	Full-time	Part-time	Occasional	Don't re-member	Not working with USAID	
1951					11	11
1952	2			1	13	16
1953	6				16	22
1954	2		1		11	14
1955	12	3			45	60
1956	12	1			16	29
1959	6	1			8	15
1960	6				24	30
1961	8				12	20
Total	54	5	1	1	156	217

142

Table 184.

EXTENT OF CONTACT MAINTAINED BY PARTICIPANTS WITH
USAID SINCE THEIR RETURN

Contact maintained with USAID	No.	%
Had contact	67	30.88
Did not have contact	150	69.12
Total	217	100.00

Table 185.

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS EMPLOYED WITH USAID OR IN
A JOINT PROJECT WITH USAID

Participants employment with USAID	No.	%
Employed with USAID	24	11.06
Not employed with USAID	43	19.82
Had not contact with USAID	150	69.12
Total	217	100.00

Table 186.

EXTENT OF CONTACT MAINTAINED BY PARTICIPANTS WITH USAID
SINCE THEIR RETURN BY TRAINING FIELD OF ACTIVITY

Training field of activity	Extent of contact maintained with USAID				Total	
	Had contact		Had no contact		No.	%
Military	No. 1	% 50.00	No. 1	% 50.00	2	100.00
Agriculture	12	22.64	41	77.36	53	100.00
Industry and mining	9	39.13	14	60.87	23	100.00
Transportation	20	40.00	30	60.00	50	100.00
Labor			1	100.00	1	100.00
Sanitation	4	23.53	13	76.47	17	100.00
Education	2	25.00	6	75.00	8	100.00
Public adminis- tration	11	30.56	25	69.44	36	100.00
Community deve- lopment	7	50.00	7	50.00	14	100.00
Miscellaneous	1	7.69	12	92.31	13	100.00
Total	67	30.88	150	69.12	217	100.00

Table 187.

RANK OR LEVEL OF PARTICIPANTS' JOB AT TIME OF SELECTION
BY CONTACT MAINTAINED WITH USAID SINCE THEIR RETURN

Participants contact with USAID	Rank or level of participants job at time of selection												Total			
	2nd level policy maker		Subordi- nate		Engineers		Pro- fessional		Sub-pro- fessional		Clerical		Other		No.	%
Had contact	No. 4	% 33.33	No. 16	% 21.05	No. 10	% 24.39	No. 17	% 36.17	No. 19	% 48.72	No. 1	% 100.00	No. 1	% 100.00	67	30.88
Had no contact	8	66.67	60	78.95	31	75.61	30	63.83	20	51.28			1	100	150	69.12
Total	12	100.00	76	100.00	41	100.00	47	100.00	39	100.00	1	100.00	1	100	217	100.00

Table 188.

RANK OR LEVEL OF PARTICIPANTS JOB AT TIME OF SURVEY
BY CONTACT MAINTAINED BY PARTICIPANTS WITH USAID
SINCE THEIR RETURN

Participants contact with USAID	Rank or level of participants job at time of survey															
	First level policy maker	Second level policy maker	Sub-ordinate management	Engineers	Profession-als	Sub-pro-fession-als	Clerical	Not employed								
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%				
Had contact	1	100.00	10	35.71	17	20.73	7	26.92	12	34.29	17	45.95	1	50.00	2	33.33
Had no contact			18	64.29	65	79.27	19	73.08	23	65.71	20	54.05	1	50.00	4	66.67
Total	1	100.00	28	100.00	82	100.00	26	100.00	35	100.00	37	100.00	2	100.00	6	100.00

Table 189.

EXTENT OF USAID TECHNICIANS AVAILABLE TO PARTICIPANTS

Availability of USAID technicians	No.	%
Participants have technicians available	66	30.41
Participants do not have technicians available	132	60.83
Don't know if technicians are available	19	8.76
Total	217	100.00

145

Table 190.

FREQUENCY OF CONTACT MAINTAINED BY PARTICIPANTS WHO HAVE USAID TECHNICIANS AVAILABLE TO THEM (Total 66)

Frequency of contact maintained	No.	%
Met USAID technicians frequently	26	39.39
Met USAID technicians occasionally	35	53.03
Never met USAID technicians	5	7.58
Total	66	100.00

Table 191.

FREQUENCY OF CONTACT MAINTAINED BY PARTICIPANTS WHO HAVE USAID TECHNICIANS AVAILABLE TO THEM BY RANK OR LEVEL OF THEIR JOB AT TIME OF SELECTION (Total 66)

Frequency of contact maintained with USAID technicians	Rank or level of job at time of selection											
	2nd level policy maker		Sub-ordinate management		Engineers		Pro-fession-als		Sub-pro-fession-als		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Frequent contact			5	31.25	6	50.00	5	41.67	10	41.67	26	39.39
Occasional contact	2	100.00	8	50.00	5	41.67	7	58.33	13	54.17	35	53.03
Never met			3	18.75	1	8.33			1	4.16	5	7.58
Total	2	100.00	16	100.00	12	100.00	12	100.00	24	100.00	66	100.00

Table 192.

FREQUENCY OF CONTACT MAINTAINED BY PARTICIPANTS WHO
HAVE USAID TECHNICIANS AVAILABLE TO THEM BY RANK OR
LEVEL OF THEIR JOB AT TIME OF SURVEY
(Total 66)

Frequency of contact maintained with USAID technicians	Rank or level of participants job												Total			
	1st level policy maker		2nd level policy maker		Subordinate management		Engineers		Professionals		Sub-professionals			Unemployed		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		No.	%	
Frequent contact					9	47.37	5	55.56	3	37.50	9	39.13			26	39.39
Occasional contact	1	100.00	3	75.00	9	47.37	3	33.33	5	62.50	13	56.52	1	50.00	35	53.03
Have never met			1	25.00	1	5.26	1	11.11			1	4.35	1	50.00	5	7.58
Total	1	100.00	4	100.00	19	100.00	9	100.00	8	100.00	23	100.00	2	100.00	66	100.00

Table 193.

EXTENT OF HELP REQUESTED BY PARTICIPANTS FROM USAID

Help requested by participants from USAID	No.	%
Have requested help	30	13.82
Have not requested help	187	86.18
Total	217	100.00

Table 194.

KIND OF HELP REQUESTED BY PARTICIPANTS FROM USAID
(Total 30)

Kind of help requested from USAID	No.
Printed material	12
Technical advice	8
Equipment	3
Additional training grant for himself	2
Assistance in training staff members	1
Training grant for others	1
Audio-visual aids	1
Financial assistance for project	1
Others	1
Total	30

Table 195.

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS RECEIVING HELP REQUESTED
FROM USAID

Number of participants receiving help requested	No.	%
Received help	18	8.29
Did not receive help	10	4.61
Not ascertained	2	.92
Did not request help	187	86.18
Total	217	100.00

Table 196.

RANK OR LEVEL OF PARTICIPANTS JOB AT TIME OF SURVEY BY PARTICIPANTS REQUESTING HELP FROM USAID

Participants requesting help from USAID	Rank or level of participant job at time of survey																	
	1st level policy maker		2nd level policy maker		Subordinate management		Engineers		Professionals		Sub-professionals		Clerical		Not assigned			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Requested help	1	100.00	1	3.57	9	10.98	2	7.69	9	25.71	6	16.22					2	33.33
Did not request help			27	96.43	73	89.02	24	92.31	26	74.29	31	83.78	2	100.00	4	66.67		
Total	1	100.00	28	100.00	82	100.00	26	100.00	35	100.00	37	100.00	2	100.00	6	100.00		

Table 197.

RANK OR LEVEL OF PARTICIPANTS JOB AT TIME OF SELECTION BY PARTICIPANTS REQUESTING HELP FROM USAID

Help requested from USAID	Rank or level of participants job at time of selection													
	2nd level policy maker		Subordinate management		Engineers		Professionals		Sub-professionals		Clerical Other			
Requested help	1	8.33	6	7.89	4	9.76	12	25.53	7	17.95				
Did not request help	11	91.67	70	92.11	37	90.24	35	74.47	32	82.05	1	100.00	1	100
Total	12	100.00	76	100.00	41	100.00	47	100.00	39	100.00	1	100.00	1	100.

Table 198.

PARTICIPANTS REQUESTING HELP FROM USAID BY THEIR TRAINING FIELD OF ACTIVITY

Training field of activity	Extent of help requested from USAID				Total	
	Have requested help		Have not requested help		No.	%
	No.	%	No.	%		
Military			2	100.00	2	100.00
Agriculture	10	18.87	43	81.13	53	100.00
Industry	2	8.70	21	91.30	23	100.00
Transportation	9	18.00	41	82.00	50	100.00
Labor			1	100.00	1	100.00
Sanitation	1	5.88	16	94.12	17	100.00
Education			8	100.00	8	100.00
Public administration	3	8.33	33	91.67	36	100.00
Community development	4	28.57	10	71.43	14	100.00
Miscellaneous	1	7.69	12	92.31	13	100.00

Table 199.

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS RECEIVING NEWS-LETTERS SINCE RETURN (Applicable to 175 participants)

Participants receiving newsletter	No.	%
Receiving newsletter	91	52.00
Do not receive newsletter	83	47.43
Not ascertained	1	.57
Total	175	100.00

Table 200.

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS JOINING U.S. PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES

Participants joining professional societies	No.	%
Joined professional societies	50	23.04
Did not join professional societies	167	76.96
Total	217	100.00

Table 201.

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS MEMBERS OF U.S. PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES

Membership in U.S. professional societies	No.	%
Participants are members	35	16.13
Participants are not members	181	83.41
Not ascertained	1	.46
Total	217	100.00

Table 202.

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS RECEIVING U.S. PROFESSIONAL PUBLICATIONS

Participants receiving U.S. professional publications	No.	%
Receive U.S. professional publications	92	42.40
Do not receive U.S. professional publications	125	57.60
Total	217	100.00

Table 203.

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS WHO COMPLETED THEIR TRAINING PROGRAM

Participants completing training program	No.	%
Completed program	204	94.01
Did not complete program	10	4.61
Not ascertained	3	1.38
Total	217	100.00

Table 204.

REASONS GIVEN BY PARTICIPANTS FOR NOT COMPLETING TRAINING PROGRAM

Reasons for not completing training program	No.
Recalled by government	3
Business reasons	2
Personal reasons	2
Other reasons	3
Not ascertained	3
Total	13