

PARTICIPANT ASSESSMENT

OF

AID TRAINING PROGRAMS

STATUS REPORT 5

SEPTEMBER 1972

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

PN AAS-793

PARTICIPANT ASSESSMENT
OF
A.I.D. TRAINING PROGRAMS

Status Report 5

September 1972

INTRODUCTION

The Intellectual debt owed by A.I.D. to the Development Education and Training Research Institute of the American University, Washington, D.C. is an exceptionally large one. The management of training programs has steadily improved -- as this report testifies -- and this is directly attributable to the high-quality "feed-back" information provided to management by DETRI through its exit interviewing system. Since the contract (AID/csd-2865) with the American University is expiring, this final DETRI report shows, in a comparative way, data from participants' exit interviews from the past fiscal year with data from the three prior fiscal years. As such, the trends over the past four years are seen most clearly in the statistical tables provided.

AID's Office of International Training has recently revised its mode of evaluating training. Techniques are now being applied to obtain more representative samples of departing participants; exit interviews are being given by our own appraisal staff; more emphasis is being given to special groups with individually tailored interviews focussing on particular training problems. This DETRI Status Report 5 will, therefore, be the last of the series reporting on the status of participant training at four month intervals. As it has turned out, this status report contains information similar to an annual report. As a document for the record it stands as admirable testimony to the importance of evaluation of training in foreign assistance programs.



Arthur A. Kimball
Director
Office of International Training
Agency for International Development

September 1972
Washington, D.C.

PREFACE

The DETRI Status Report series is intended primarily for government officials in Washington who need reliable and valid information to monitor general changes and trends in A.I.D. participants' perceptions and evaluations of their training experiences. The information in these reports is presented for all participants who received Exit Interviews during specified time periods. The only subdivision of this information is on the basis of type of training program (Academic, Special or Team). Other types of reports ("Profiles" and Special Reports) present other subdivisions of the data which will be of greater relevance to other audiences, such as USAIDs, participating agencies, and major training institutions.

Status Report 5 will be the last of this particular series, as Exit Interviews with A.I.D. participants were discontinued in April 1972. Status Report 5 contains the same questionnaire and interview items in the same tabular format as Status Reports 3 and 4 (April and September 1971).

The items presented in the Status Reports are those that were found to be important measures of participants' satisfaction or which were found to be associated with this satisfaction in DETRI's First and Second Annual Analytic Reports to A.I.D. The rationale for choosing these items is as follows:

1. The ultimate goal of participant training is the utilization of skills and knowledge on return to home country;
2. It is not possible at this time to measure actual utilization in the home countries;

3. Prior studies have shown that utilization is closely associated with participant satisfaction with A.I.D. experiences;

4. Participant satisfaction with A.I.D. experiences is being reliably measured by the DETRI Exit Interview;

5. DETRI analyses have shown that general satisfactions of participants (overall reactions) are highly related to certain events that take place during the training program and evaluations of these events (contributing factors).

In choosing from the total list of questionnaire and interview items which measure these overall reactions, contributing factors, and associated events, the authors have selected those over which A.I.D. has some measure of administrative control. In addition, a few items were chosen because of their obvious importance for monitoring on-going A.I.D. programs for participants, such as the Midwinter Leadership Programs and the MSU Communications Workshops.

The information in this Status Report is presented for 4 time periods to indicate whether there has been positive or negative change on these items. The assumption is that if participant satisfactions are increasing (positive change) home country utilization of knowledge and skills will be enhanced; if participant satisfactions are decreasing (negative change) utilization will be hampered. The major changes from Fiscal 1971 to Fiscal 1972 (July-March) are summarized in Part VII, "Change Highlights."

Status Report 5 contains information from 5501 Academic and Special participants interviewed from July 1968 through March 1971. The data in the report are presented for 4 different time periods:

The FY '69 group includes participants interviewed from November 1968 through June 1969. These data come from 975 Academic and Special participants.

The FY '70 group includes participants interviewed from July 1969 through June 1970. These data come from 1713 Academic and Special participants.

The FY '71 group includes participants interviewed from July 1970 through June 1971. These data come from 1700 Academic and Special participants.

The FY '72 (July-March) group includes participants interviewed from July 1971 through March 1972. These data come from 1113 Academic and Special participants.

This report also includes information from Observation Training Teams. Between September 1968 and December 1971, 222 Teams with a total of 1580 A.I.D. participants received Exit Interviews at DETRI.

The FY '69 data includes team members interviewed from September 1968 through June 1969. These data come from 379 participants in 62 Observation Training Teams.

The FY '70 data includes team members interviewed from July 1969 through June 1970. These data come from 595 participants in 84 Observation Training Teams.

The FY '71 data includes team members interviewed from July 1970 through June 1971. These data come from 449 participants in 59 Observation Training Teams.

The FY '72 data includes team members interviewed from July 1971 through December 1971. These data come from 157 participants in 17 Observation Training teams.

In this report the emphasis will be on the information provided by the most recent group of participants (Fiscal 1972 July-March). Whenever the information given by these participants differs significantly* from the information given by the participants interviewed in Fiscal 1971 on the same items, these

* "Significantly" means statistically significant. The test used was one at the "5% level of confidence." This means that the differences between the data from participants in the two groups that were compared could have occurred by chance alone less than 5 out of 100 times. It is unlikely that such obtained differences are a result of chance. It is probable (95 out of 100 times) that the differences obtained are attributable to causal factors--although the causes are not directly measured.

differences will be discussed and interpretive statements from participants will be presented to illustrate and explain the statistical information. Many of these statements are based on comments made by a number of participants during their individual interviews with DETRI Cultural Communication Specialists.* Not all participants would agree with any one of these statements, but they do illustrate points of view held by a sufficient number of participants to explain major changes in the findings from Fiscal 1971 to Fiscal 1972. Where appropriate, findings and recommendations from earlier reports are cited to support explanations of findings in this Status Report.

This Status Report has been organized into 7 parts. Part I presents information on the characteristics of the participants. This information is necessary so that the reader will have a picture of the backgrounds of the participants giving the information in the other parts of the report. Part II presents information from measures of the participants' general satisfaction (overall reactions). Part III includes information from measures of contributing factors and associated events that have been found to be related to general satisfaction for all individual (Academic and Special) participants. Part IV includes information from measures of contributing factors and events that are only related to general satisfaction for participants in Academic training programs. Part V includes analogous information for participants who were in non-academic training programs. Part VI presents information from Observation Training Team members, including items on descriptive characteristics, overall reactions, and contributing outcomes to and determinants of their overall reactions. Part VII summarizes the change highlights.

*The identity of the participants who are quoted will not be revealed, to protect the confidentiality of the individual interview data.

For ease of access, the percentages of responses given by participants to each of the items discussed in the report are presented in consecutively numbered tables at the end of each subsection of the report.

This report was prepared by Paul R. Kimmel and William C. Ockey of The American University, Development Education and Training Research Institute, under contract AID/csd-2865. The authors were ably assisted by Herman J. Sander, Ann Fenderson, Robert McCarthy, and Pamela Nash, also of the DETRI staff.

CONTENTS

<u>Part</u>	<u>Page</u>
Preface	i
I. Characteristics of Academic and Special Participants	1
II. Overall Reactions of Academic and Special Participants	6
III. Contributing Factors and Associated Events for Academic and Special Participants	
A. Planning and Orientation	15
B. Administrative Arrangements	23
C. Personal and Social Activities	34
D. Communications Workshop and Exit Interview	44
IV. Contributing Factors and Associated Events for Academic Participants	
A. Training Programs	47
B. Special Programs	58
V. Contributing Factors and Associated Events for Special Participants	63
VI. Descriptive Characteristics, Overall Reactions, Contributing Factors and Associated Events for Observation Training Team Members	
A. Team Characteristics	77
B. Overall Reactions	81
C. Contributing Factors and Associated Events	

<u>Part</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Planning and Orientation	86
2. Administrative Arrangements	94
3. Training Program	98
4. Personal and Social Activities	106
VI. Change Highlights	108
Appendix I--DETRI Procedures and Reliability of Data	A-1
Appendix II--Glossary	A-2
Appendix III--References	A-3

PART I

CHARACTERISTICS OF ACADEMIC AND SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS

The first 6 tables of this report present descriptive data on the 1,113 Academic and Special participants who were interviewed at The American University DETRI between July 1971 and March 1972. These data will give the reader a picture of the group of participants who provided the most recent information presented in the other tables in this report. The reader should keep in mind any significant differences in characteristics between this group of participants and the participants interviewed at DETRI between July 1970 and June 1971. It is possible that other differences in the information provided by these two groups of participants can best be explained by differences in their backgrounds and experiences, as seen in Tables 1 through 6.

For instance, a larger proportion of the participants interviewed in Fiscal 1971 were in the fields of transportation or public administration, while more of the participants interviewed in Fiscal 1972 were studying agriculture or education (Table 3). Significantly more of the Fiscal 1972 group were programmed by A.I.D. or the Department of Agriculture, while significantly fewer were programmed by the Office of Education or the Public Health Service (Table 4).

There were no other significant differences between the background characteristics of the Fiscal 1971 and the Fiscal 1972 participants (see Tables 1, 2, 5, and 6).

Table 1

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

REGION	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Near East- South Asia	29.2	283	28.9	495	28.1	478	26.1	291
Far East	32.9	319	33.1	567	38.6	655	39.3	437
Latin America	11.4	110	14.1	241	12.4	210	13.5	150
Africa	26.5	256	23.9	408	20.9	355	21.1	235
TOTALS	100.0	968	100.0	1711	100.0	1698	100.0	1113

Table 2

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

TYPE OF PROGRAM	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Academic	44.8	437	47.2	808	44.7	760	47.2	525
Special	55.2	538	52.8	905	55.3	940	52.8	588
TOTALS	100.0	975	100.0	1713	100.0	1700	100.0	1113

Table 3

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

FIELD OF TRAINING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Agriculture	25.0	223	25.9	393	26.1	419	29.9	317
Industry and Mining	7.4	66	7.7	116	8.6	138	9.0	96
Transportation	9.3	83	5.9	90	8.0	129	5.7	60
Health and Sanitation	12.2	109	12.3	186	17.7	285	15.7	167
Education	21.2	189	26.7	404	22.5	361	26.5	281
Public Administration	24.9	222	21.5	327	17.1	274	13.2	140
TOTALS	100.0	892	100.0	1516	100.0	1606	100.0	1061

Table 4

Q. What government agencies participated in the training programs?

AGENCY	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
A.I.D.	55.3	539	52.0	890	40.8	693	44.9	500
Agriculture	18.3	178	17.6	301	21.4	363	25.7	286
Office of Education	6.0	58	7.3	125	10.2	173	7.3	81
Public Health Service	4.2	41	5.9	101	9.4	160	6.7	75
Federal Aviation Administration	4.0	39	2.9	50	4.6	79	5.0	55
Other	12.2	119	14.3	246	13.6	232	10.4	116
TOTALS	100.0	974	100.0	1713	100.0	1700	100.0	1113

Table 5

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

LENGTH OF SOJOURN (Weeks)	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 - 17	1.2	5	1.1	9	0.1	1	0.8	4
18 - 26	3.5	15	1.4	11	1.6	12	2.9	15
27 - 51	14.5	62	13.5	108	10.4	79	11.4	60
52 - 65	10.5	45	15.4	124	15.3	116	18.5	97
66 - 104	36.3	156	35.7	287	37.6	285	31.0	163
105 and over	34.0	146	32.9	264	35.0	266	35.4	186
TOTALS	100.0	429	100.0	803	100.0	759	100.0	525

Table 6

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

LENGTH OF SOJOURN (Weeks)	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 - 17	33.3	174	40.4	363	43.4	408	38.6	227
18 - 26	32.1	168	26.7	240	23.8	224	29.9	176
27 - 51	28.1	147	26.3	237	25.1	236	25.0	147
52 - 65	3.6	19	5.1	46	5.6	52	5.3	31
66 - 104	2.5	13	1.3	12	1.6	15	0.7	4
105 and over	0.4	2	0.2	2	0.5	5	0.5	3
TOTALS	100.0	523	100.0	900	100.0	940	100.0	588

PART II

OVERALL REACTIONS OF
ACADEMIC AND SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS

In this section of the report there are 8 ratings which represent the most extensive measures of Academic and Special participants' satisfaction with their A.I.D. experiences. All of these ratings are used as "yardstick" criterion measures in DETRI's analyses of the Exit Interview data. Three of these ratings (Tables 7-9) are made by the participants themselves (in the DETRI questionnaire). The other 5 (Tables 10-14) are made by the DETRI interviewers after their individual conversations with the participants.

Participants' satisfaction with their total experience as A.I.D. participants (Table 7), with their technical training program (Table 8), and with feeling welcome and accepted in the United States (Table 9) remained high from Fiscal 1971 to Fiscal 1972. About 3 out of 4 participants checked one of the top two scale positions on all three of these measures of their A.I.D. experience.*

The downward trend in the DETRI interviewers' ratings of the participants' feelings about: the U.S. society (Table 10), the American people (Table 11), and their personal and social experiences (Table 13), seen in previous Status Reports, has leveled off in Fiscal 1972. In all three of these tables, the

* Past results of DETRI studies show that A.I.D. participants much more often use the top three positions on the 7-point evaluation scales than they do "4" through "7." Thus, in interpreting these ratings, "1" and "2" are considered high evaluations, "3" medium, and "4" to "7" low evaluations of what is being rated.

interviewers rated both the Fiscal 1971 group and the Fiscal 1972 group very similarly.

There are no other significant differences between the Fiscal 1971 and the Fiscal 1972 participants in this section of the report.

Table 7

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

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	27.8	271	28.0	480	28.2	479	30.3	337
2	42.8	417	44.1	756	44.1	749	45.8	510
3	22.4	218	19.0	325	19.9	338	18.8	209
4	4.6	45	6.4	110	5.5	94	3.7	41
5	1.7	16	1.6	27	1.5	25	0.8	9
6	0.6	6	0.5	9	0.7	11	0.3	3
7 (Not at all satisfied)	0.1	1	0.4	6	0.1	2	0.3	3
TOTALS	100.0	974	100.0	1713	100.0	1698	100.0	1112

1
8
1

Table 8

Q. How satisfied were the participants with their technical training programs?
(Items A84 & S81)

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	24.0	233	26.0	443	27.0	459	27.4	305
2	38.2	371	40.0	683	39.6	671	42.8	476
3	23.4	227	21.3	364	20.9	354	19.1	212
4	8.4	82	7.2	123	7.8	133	7.0	77
5	3.4	33	2.9	49	3.4	57	2.2	25
6	1.5	15	1.3	22	0.9	15	1.0	11
7 (Not at all satisfied)	1.0	10	1.3	22	0.4	7	0.5	6
TOTALS	100.0	971	100.0	1706	100.0	1696	100.0	1112

Table 9

Q. How welcome and accepted did the participants feel in the United States?
(Item 143)

WELCOME/ACCEPTED RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely welcome)	37.7	363	41.0	700	39.3	666	40.5	449
2	33.9	327	30.5	520	31.9	541	35.0	388
3	16.8	162	16.6	284	17.0	289	15.4	171
4	7.7	74	7.8	133	7.4	125	6.3	70
5	2.3	22	2.0	35	2.7	46	2.0	23
6	1.1	11	1.3	22	1.3	22	0.6	7
7 (Not at all welcome)	0.5	5	0.8	13	0.4	7	0.2	2
TOTALS	100.0	964	100.0	1707	100.0	1696	100.0	1110

Table 10

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

FEELINGS ABOUT U.S. SOCIETY	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Became more positive	58.8	398	52.7	723	40.6	485	41.9	272
Stayed the same	23.9	162	30.4	416	36.6	438	38.2	248
Became more negative	17.3	117	16.9	232	22.8	272	19.9	129
TOTALS	100.0	677	100.0	1371	100.0	1195	100.0	649

Table 11

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

FEELINGS ABOUT AMERICAN PEOPLE	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Became more positive	66.1	513	58.7	843	51.9	673	50.0	334
Stayed the same	21.4	166	28.1	403	32.6	422	36.1	241
Became more negative	12.5	97	13.2	189	15.5	201	13.9	93
TOTALS	100.0	776	100.0	1435	100.0	1296	100.0	668

Table 12

Q. How did the interviewers rate the participants' evaluation of A.I.D.?

EVALUATION OF A.I.D.	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Excellent	13.7	87	15.4	231	9.6	128	10.3	72
Good	38.4	244	39.3	589	37.5	499	37.9	265
Adequate	31.8	202	28.4	425	37.4	498	37.2	260
Poor	14.5	92	14.1	211	12.9	172	13.3	93
Terrible	1.6	10	2.7	41	2.6	34	1.3	9
TOTALS	100.0	635	100.0	1497	100.0	1331	100.0	699

Table 13

Q. How did the interviewers rate the participants' appreciation for their personal and social experiences?

PERSONAL/SOCIAL APPRECIATION	FY '69*		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
More appreciative than unappreciative	-	-	62.4	938	62.0	912	61.8	535
About equally appreciative and not appreciative	-	-	26.8	403	19.8	291	16.3	141
More unappreciative than appreciative	-	-	5.8	87	7.7	113	8.3	72
Not relevant	-	-	5.0	76	10.5	155	13.6	118
TOTALS	-	-	100.0	1504	100.0	1471	100.0	866

* Rating added 24 September 1969.

Table 14

Q. How did the interviewers rate the participants' appreciation for their technical experiences?

TECHNICAL APPRECIATION	FY '69*		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
More appreciative than unappreciative	-	-	67.0	1038	74.0	1063	70.4	621
About equally appreciative and not appreciative	-	-	26.5	411	18.3	263	20.3	179
More unappreciative than appreciative	-	-	6.5	100	7.7	111	9.3	82
TOTALS	-	-	100.0	1549	100.0	1437	100.0	882

*Rating added 24 September 1969.

PART III

CONTRIBUTING FACTORS AND ASSOCIATED EVENTS FOR ACADEMIC AND SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS

The 35 tables included in this part of the report present information on events that are associated with the criterion "yardsticks" presented in Part II. The participants' ratings of satisfaction with these events have been found to be directly related to their overall reactions, and are therefore considered "contributing factors." The other items represent experiences that have been found to affect these "contributing factors" or are included because of their obvious importance for monitoring on-going OIT programs for participants.

This part of the report is divided into four sections: Planning and Orientation; Administrative Arrangements; Personal and Social Activities; and the Communications Workshop and Exit Interview.

A. Planning and Orientation

While there was no appreciable change from Fiscal 1971 to Fiscal 1972 in the participants' ratings of their planning and orientation experiences in their home countries (Tables 15, 17, and 19), there was a significant increase in their satisfaction with the planning of their training programs in the United States (Table 16). In Fiscal 1971 about 59% of the participants indicated that they were satisfied with the planning of their training programs in the United States by checking a "1" or "2" on the 7-point scale. In Fiscal 1972, about 63% of the participants gave ratings of "1" or "2."

Since there are no other significant changes in the items directly associated with planning and orientation in the United States (Tables 18, 20, 21, and 22), it is necessary to look elsewhere (see p. 23) for participants' reactions which might explain this increase in their satisfaction with the planning of their programs in the United States.

Table 15

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

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	20.6	179	24.3	339	24.0	332	21.5	198
2	28.3	246	25.8	360	23.6	327	28.8	265
3	24.0	209	22.0	307	25.3	351	23.4	215
4	13.0	113	14.7	204	14.8	204	14.1	130
5	7.5	65	7.5	105	6.6	91	6.7	62
6	3.6	31	3.1	43	3.0	41	3.2	29
7 (Not at all satisfied)	3.0	26	2.6	36	2.7	37	2.3	21
TOTALS	100.0	869	100.0	1394	100.0	1383	100.0	920

Table 16

Q. How satisfied were the participants with the planning of their training programs in the United States? (Item 49)

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	24.2	227	25.4	412	26.3	419	25.4	269
2	31.9	300	35.0	567	33.1	528	37.7	400
3	22.3	209	20.4	331	21.5	343	21.6	229
4	11.9	112	11.3	184	10.3	164	9.9	105
5	6.2	58	4.7	77	4.8	77	3.4	36
6	2.3	22	1.8	29	2.4	39	0.8	8
7 (Not at all satisfied)	1.2	11	1.4	22	1.6	25	1.2	13
TOTALS	100.0	939	100.0	1622	100.0	1595	100.0	1060

Table 17

Q. At the time the participants left their home country were there any aspects of their proposed plan that they disagreed with or were unclear? (Item 26)

DISAGREED WITH PROPOSED PLAN	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	33.3	319	31.4	535	31.4	532	29.6	327
No	66.7	640	68.6	1169	68.6	1163	70.4	776
TOTALS	100.0	959	100.0	1704	100.0	1695	100.0	1103

Table 18

Q. At the time the final plan was discussed in the United States, were there any aspects that the participants disagreed with or were unclear? (Item 37)

DISAGREED WITH FINAL PLAN	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	32.2	309	30.4	518	30.7	521	28.1	311
No	67.8	651	69.6	1187	69.3	1174	71.9	795
TOTALS	100.0	960	100.0	1704	100.0	1695	100.0	1106

Table 19

Q. How satisfied were the participants with the orientations they had in their home country? (Item 51)

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	20.1	162	23.0	312	23.7	323	19.6	177
2	24.9	200	24.7	336	26.5	361	28.3	255
3	23.0	185	22.4	305	20.6	280	22.4	202
4	15.0	121	16.1	218	14.4	196	15.2	137
5	9.2	74	7.7	105	7.8	106	7.2	65
6	4.6	37	3.9	53	4.1	56	4.8	43
7 (Not at all satisfied)	3.1	25	2.2	30	2.9	39	2.5	23
TOTALS	100.0	804	100.0	1359	100.0	1361	100.0	902

Table 20

Q. How satisfied were the participants with the orientations they had in the United States? (Item 51)

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	22.8	206	25.5	403	26.8	417	26.2	266
2	35.6	322	33.0	521	35.0	544	35.1	356
3	23.3	211	22.7	359	21.7	338	22.6	229
4	11.4	103	12.7	200	10.7	166	10.5	106
5	4.2	38	3.6	56	3.9	61	3.4	35
6	1.4	13	1.5	24	1.1	17	1.1	11
7 (Not at all satisfied)	1.3	12	1.0	16	0.8	13	1.1	11
TOTALS	100.0	905	100.0	1579	100.0	1556	100.0	1014

Table 21

Q. How did the interviewers rate the participants' comments about receiving or not receiving a U.S. degree?

COMMENTS ABOUT U.S. DEGREE	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
No comments *	-	-	58.3	999	59.9	1018	63.9	712
Positive comments *	-	-	29.8	511	28.5	485	25.9	288
Negative comments	6.8	66	11.9	203	11.6	197	10.2	113
TOTALS			100.0	1713	100.0	1700	100.0	1113

*Ratings added 24 September 1969.

Table 22

Q. After the participants reached their first training site, did they request any changes in their training programs that were not made? (Items A81 & S75)

REQUESTED CHANGES DENIED	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
No	72.5	518	78.2	1323	76.3	1281	79.5	871
Yes	27.5	196	21.8	369	23.7	397	20.5	225
TOTALS	100.0	714	100.0	1692	100.0	1678	100.0	1096

B. Administrative Arrangements

The Fiscal 1972 participants gave higher ratings of satisfaction to their communication with the government official in Washington responsible for their training, and less often reported difficulties in actually reaching this official during their training program, than did the Fiscal 1971 participants (Tables 23 and 24). These data suggest that Development Training Specialists at A.I.D. and Program Officers in participating agencies are more often in communication with their participants than they had been in the past. Several Fiscal 1972 participants mentioned in their individual interviews that they were quite pleased with the cooperation they received regarding program arrangements during their U.S. sojourns. As one participant said, he could call his Program Officer or his DTS on the phone during his program and "get action right away." Another participant commented that his Program Officer "wanted me to call collect any time I felt I should talk to him. I only did this once, but he called me many times just to find out how things were going. He was very interested in his participants."

It is likely that there is a correlation between the increase in participant satisfaction with DTS-PO communication and the increase in satisfaction with program planning in the United States (Tables 23 and 16). Previous data analyses (First and Second Annual Reports, May 1969 and July 1970) have shown that participants who perceive their Program Officers or Development Training Specialists as being interested in them, respecting their requests, and attending to their problems tend to be more satisfied both with their technical training and their personal and social experiences than participants whose Program Officers appeared not to give adequate attention to their suggestions, not to deal with them as individuals, and not to spend time communicating with them.

Participant satisfaction with travel arrangements in the United States also increased from Fiscal 1971 to Fiscal 1972 (Table 25). About 72% of the Fiscal 1971 participants rated their travel arrangements at one of the top two positions on the 7-point scale, while about 78% of the Fiscal 1972 participants gave such ratings. Since problems with poor public transportation at training sites increased over this same time period (Table 29), it is likely that this increase in satisfaction with travel arrangements can best be related to travel between training sites.

Several participants made positive comments in their individual interviews about their transportation arrangements. One said that representatives of his participating government agency "picked us up when we arrived, made hotel and motel arrangements, and took us on sightseeing tours" at each training site. Another participant who was with a group of trainees said, "There was always a staff car or bus available to us." Participants especially appreciated opportunities to take automobile and bus rides across the United States. As one commented, "I made friends, met farmers, saw farms, and had discussions with people. It was all very instructive. That trip contained everything."

Many participants have suggested that their transportation arrangements between training sites be changed from air to ground travel. Although they appreciated the convenience of air travel, they preferred to see more of our country and to meet its people. As one participant who had such ground transportation said, "The travel was sometimes tiring, but it was generally good. If you want to learn things, you must be prepared to do this. It is much better than learning from books."

The only other item in this section of the report on which there was a significant change from Fiscal 1971 to Fiscal 1972

was problems with poor public transportation. More participants in Fiscal 1972 said that they had had a great deal of difficulty with poor public transportation where they lived than did participants in Fiscal 1971 (Table 29). This problem occurred most often for participants who were living in small college towns where bus service was either unavailable or inadequate. Many of these participants did not mind walking to classes in the daytime in good weather. However, they did not always find these ideal situations. To quote one participant, "Travel arrangements were extremely inadequate. Classes were scheduled at night even during poor weather. I didn't mind the 25 minute walk during good weather, but walking through rain or snow at night was too much." Some participants bought bicycles or thumbed rides to avoid walking under such conditions, and stayed on campus all day to avoid making the round trip more than once. Many Academic participants still complained in their interviews about not being allowed to have or being able to afford an automobile in the United States (see Status Report 4, pp. 20-21).

Table 23

Q. How satisfied were the participants with their communication during their sojourn with the government official in Washington responsible for their training? (Item 57)

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	46.6	450	50.1	852	51.1	863	49.4	548
2	29.5	285	26.0	443	26.2	442	30.9	343
3	12.8	123	11.9	203	11.3	190	10.6	117
4	6.4	62	6.8	115	5.1	86	5.7	63
5	2.6	25	2.1	36	2.4	41	1.5	17
6	1.1	11	1.5	26	2.3	39	1.1	12
7 (Not at all satisfied)	1.0	10	1.6	27	1.6	27	0.8	9
TOTALS	100.0	966	100.0	1702	100.0	1688	100.0	1109

Table 24

Q. Did the participants experience any difficulties, during their training, in communicating with the U.S. government official in Washington responsible for their training? (Item 55)

HAD DIFFICULTY	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
No	87.8	851	88.8	1517	87.3	1478	90.7	1009
Yes	12.2	118	11.2	192	12.7	215	9.3	103
TOTALS	100.0	969	100.0	1709	100.0	1693	100.0	1112

Table 25

Q. How satisfied were the participants with their travel arrangements in the United States? (Item 145)

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	36.2	217	39.0	666	36.8	624	38.0	422
2	34.9	209	34.7	593	35.7	608	39.5	439
3	17.4	104	17.2	293	16.7	284	15.9	176
4	7.5	45	5.9	100	7.0	118	4.3	48
5	2.8	17	2.2	37	2.3	39	1.4	15
6	0.5	3	0.8	14	0.8	13	0.6	7
7 (Not at all satisfied)	0.7	4	0.2	4	0.7	11	0.3	3
TOTALS	100.0	599	100.0	1707	100.0	1697	100.0	1110

Table 26

Q. Did the participants have a problem with inadequate advance arrangements for traveling? (Item 144d)

PROBLEM WITH INADEQUATE ADVANCE TRAVEL ARRANGEMENTS	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	82.0	487	83.5	1419	83.2	1401	83.1	921
Some	14.6	87	12.9	219	12.9	217	14.2	157
Much	3.4	20	3.6	61	3.9	67	2.7	30
TOTALS	100.0	594	100.0	1699	100.0	1685	100.0	1108

Table 27

Q. How satisfied were the participants with their housing in the United States?
(Item 112)

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	26.0	248	27.3	467	27.9	474	25.3	282
2	33.3	317	30.7	526	34.4	584	37.0	412
3	22.5	214	21.9	376	20.1	341	22.3	248
4	10.5	100	11.6	198	10.4	176	9.1	101
5	3.3	31	4.0	69	3.5	60	3.3	37
6	2.5	24	2.7	46	2.3	39	2.0	22
7 (Not at all satisfied)	1.9	18	1.8	31	1.4	25	1.0	11
TOTALS	100.0	952	100.0	1713	100.0	1699	100.0	1113

Table 28

Q. Did the participants have a problem with their housing being too far from their training facility? (Item 111a)

PROBLEM WITH HOUSING TOO FAR FROM TRAINING FACILITY	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	75.0	726	77.2	1319	78.3	1327	78.5	870
Some	17.8	172	15.6	267	15.6	265	15.0	167
Much	7.2	70	7.2	123	6.1	103	6.5	72
TOTALS	100.0	968	100.0	1709	100.0	1695	100.0	1109

Table 29

Q. Did the participants have a problem with poor public transportation services from where they lived? (Item 111c)

PROBLEM WITH POOR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	63.6	612	61.9	1057	64.5	1089	59.4	657
Some	19.2	185	20.3	347	17.8	301	18.8	208
Much	17.2	165	17.8	303	17.7	300	21.8	242
TOTALS	100.0	962	100.0	1707	100.0	1690	100.0	1107

Table 30

Q. Did the participants have a problem with living in an undesirable neighborhood? (Item 111d)

PROBLEM WITH UNDESIRABLE NEIGHBORHOOD	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	85.1	817	84.1	1436	84.7	1432	82.8	912
Some	10.4	100	12.2	206	11.4	193	12.6	139
Much	4.5	43	3.7	64	3.9	65	4.6	51
TOTALS	100.0	960	100.0	1706	100.0	1690	100.0	1102

Table 31

Q. Did the participants have a problem with inadequate facilities and equipment with their housing? (Item 111f)

PROBLEM WITH INADEQUATE FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	73.8	709	75.7	1293	78.2	1323	77.9	858
Some	21.8	210	20.0	341	17.3	292	18.3	202
Much	4.4	42	4.3	73	4.5	76	3.8	42
TOTALS	100.0	961	100.0	1707	100.0	1691	100.0	1102

Table 32

Q. How adequate were the participants' daily living allowances at the training location where they stayed the longest? (Item 148)

ADEQUACY OF LIVING ALLOWANCE	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Adequate	31.0	268	33.5	491	41.0	595	40.6	391
Barely Adequate	47.4	409	44.4	652	41.6	603	39.4	379
Not Adequate	21.6	187	22.1	324	17.4	252	20.0	193
TOTALS	100.0	864	100.0	1467	100.0	1450	100.0	963

Table 33

Q. How adequate was the money provided for books, training materials, and other incidental technical training program expenses? (Item 151)

ADEQUACY OF TRAINING ALLOWANCE	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Adequate	38.0	366	38.6	658	37.6	635	40.3	447
Barely Adequate	32.4	312	29.5	503	29.9	506	27.4	304
Not Adequate	29.6	285	31.9	543	32.5	549	32.3	359
TOTALS	100.0	963	100.0	1704	100.0	1690	100.0	1110

C. Personal and Social Activities

There was an increase in the number of American families visited and the number of visits made by participants in Fiscal 1972 (Tables 38 and 39). About 4% less of the Fiscal 1972 participants said that they had had no host family visits in the United States, while 9% more said they had visited 6 or more host families in the United States. Previous data analyses have shown that participants who visit more American families and who make more visits tend to be more satisfied with their personal and social experiences in the United States (see First and Second Annual Reports, May 1969 and July 1970). Such visits also provide participants with more information about living in the United States. As one participant said, "I visited many homes and feel I gained much more than I was able to contribute." It is hoped that even more participants will take advantage of the host family programs in the future.

One participant noted that many of his fellow countrymen have "gringo-phobia." He felt that there was among many foreign visitors a "tendency to find other people from their country." He had moved into a dormitory where he could live with Americans and often went to various social events with them. "There were always plenty of Americans to go out with and talk with, and I never felt lonely." However, Tables 36 and 41 show that only a minority of the Fiscal 1972 participants engaged in social activities with Americans (22%) or shared their living quarters with U.S. citizens (16%). More should be encouraged to do so.

The participant ratings of the importance of personal friendships with Americans (Table 34), enjoyment of visits to American homes (Table 37), enjoyment of informal activities (Table 40), and the percentages reporting difficulties with

lack of time for social activities (Table 43), lack of information about U.S. social customs (Table 44), or homesickness (Table 45) have remained relatively stable from Fiscal 1971 to Fiscal 1972. There has been a continuation of the decrease in the percentage of participants who the DETRI interviewers rated as having experienced discrimination during their U.S. sojourn (Table 46).

Table 34

Q. How important were personal friendships with Americans to the participants' total experience in the United States? (Item 133)

IMPORTANCE OF FRIENDSHIPS	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely important)	44.0	396	45.6	719	44.3	689	45.7	472
2	33.3	299	31.8	501	32.8	511	33.9	350
3	15.5	139	16.1	254	16.8	261	14.2	147
4	5.1	46	4.9	77	5.1	79	4.6	48
5	1.3	12	0.6	10	0.6	9	0.7	7
6	0.3	3	0.6	10	0.0	0	0.6	6
7 (Not at all important)	0.5	4	0.4	7	0.4	6	0.4	4
TOTAL	100.0	899	100.0	1578	100.0	1555	100.0	1034

Table 35

Q. Did the participants, where they lived the longest, share their living quarters with fellow countrymen? (Item 110b)

LIVED WITH FELLOW COUNTRYMEN	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	44.8	437	41.6	713	39.2	667	40.4	450
No	55.2	538	58.4	1000	60.8	1033	59.6	663
TOTALS	100.0	975	100.0	1713	100.0	1700	100.0	1113

Table 36

Q. Did the participants, where they lived the longest, share their living quarters with U.S. citizens? (Item 110c)

LIVED WITH U.S. CITIZENS	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	23.9	233	15.4	264	15.6	266	15.5	173
No	76.1	742	84.6	1449	84.4	1434	84.5	940
TOTALS	100.0	975	100.0	1713	100.0	1700	100.0	1113

Table 37

Q. How enjoyable were the participants' visits to American homes? (Item 123)

ENJOYMENT RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely enjoyable)	45.0	305	50.4	795	50.1	774	47.8	502
2	35.4	240	28.5	449	29.8	460	34.2	359
3	14.2	96	14.1	223	13.7	212	13.5	142
4	4.4	30	5.1	80	4.8	75	3.5	37
5	0.7	5	1.3	21	0.8	13	0.8	8
6	0.3	2	0.3	4	0.7	11	0.1	1
7 (Not at all enjoyable)	0.0	0	0.3	4	0.1	1	0.1	1
TOTALS	100.0	678	100.0	1576	100.0	1546	100.0	1050

Table 38

Q. Approximately how many different American families did the participants visit? (Item 120)

NUMBER OF FAMILIES	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	44.8	437	10.4	179	10.6	180	6.7	75
1	9.8	95	9.5	162	9.5	162	4.9	54
2	8.5	83	14.1	242	13.5	230	12.9	144
3-5	20.2	197	33.6	575	38.0	646	38.1	424
6 or more	16.7	163	32.4	555	28.4	482	37.4	416
TOTALS	100.0	975	100.0	1713	100.0	1700	100.0	1113

Table 39

Q. Approximately how many times did the participants visit American homes? (Item 121)

NUMBER OF VISITS	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	44.4	433	10.3	176	10.4	176	6.8	76
1	6.3	61	4.4	75	4.6	79	4.2	47
2	5.3	52	8.0	137	7.8	133	6.7	75
3-5	14.4	140	25.1	430	26.4	448	26.2	291
6 or more	29.6	289	52.2	895	50.8	864	56.1	624
TOTALS	100.0	975	100.0	1713	100.0	1700	100.0	1113

Table 40

Q. How enjoyable were the informal activities the participants took part in?
(Item 126)

ENJOYMENT RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely enjoyable)	35.3	264	38.9	659	38.5	642	37.8	413
2	40.4	302	34.7	588	37.7	628	40.2	439
3	17.9	134	18.3	311	16.8	280	16.6	181
4	4.0	30	5.7	96	5.5	92	4.0	44
5	2.0	15	1.7	29	1.1	18	1.0	11
6	0.4	3	0.5	8	0.2	4	0.3	3
7 (Not at all enjoyable)	0.0	0	0.2	4	0.2	4	0.1	1
TOTALS	100.0	748	100.0	1695	100.0	1668	100.0	1092

Table 41

Q. With whom did the participants most often go to informal activities? (Item 125)

PERSON MOST OFTEN WENT WITH	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
No one, went alone	16.0	153	8.9	148	8.4	139	8.0	87
Americans	25.3	241	24.1	399	21.6	356	22.4	244
Home countrymen	24.2	231	26.4	437	28.1	465	22.0	240
Other foreign nationals	6.7	64	7.6	126	6.4	105	6.1	67
Mixed groups	27.8	265	33.0	548	35.5	586	41.5	452
TOTALS	100.0	954	100.0	1658	100.0	1651	100.0	1090

Table 42

Q. Did the participants make any kind of presentation about their home country or culture to an American audience? (Item 129)

MADE PRESENTATION	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	60.5	575	57.7	980	53.7	907	55.7	615
No	39.5	375	42.3	717	46.3	783	44.3	490
TOTALS	100.0	950	100.0	1697	100.0	1690	100.0	1105

Table 43

Q. Did the participants have a problem with lacking sufficient time for social and recreational activities? (Item 142k)

PROBLEM WITH INSUFFICIENT TIME FOR SOCIAL ACTIVITIES	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	52.4	504	51.4	872	53.0	893	51.9	572
Some	37.8	364	37.5	635	35.4	596	37.5	414
Much	9.8	94	11.1	188	11.6	196	10.6	117
TOTALS	100.0	962	100.0	1695	100.0	1685	100.0	1103

Table 44

Q. Did the participants have a problem with having too little information about U.S. social customs? (Item 142g)

PROBLEM WITH TOO LITTLE INFORMATION ABOUT SOCIAL CUSTOMS	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	72.9	703	71.3	1216	72.9	1235	70.5	779
Some	22.8	220	24.8	422	24.1	410	25.3	280
Much	4.3	41	3.9	66	3.0	50	4.2	46
TOTALS	100.0	964	100.0	1704	100.0	1695	100.0	1105

Table 45

Q. Did the participants have a problem with feeling homesick?
(Item 142d)

PROBLEM WITH FEELING HOMESICK	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	34.8	335	37.1	633	36.3	615	36.5	404
Some	48.6	469	47.2	805	47.8	810	49.1	543
Much	16.6	160	15.7	268	15.9	270	14.4	159
TOTALS	100.0	964	100.0	1706	100.0	1695	100.0	1106

Table 46

Q. Did the interviewers rate any of the participants' experiences as showing discrimination?

DISCRIMINATED AGAINST	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
No	80.7	593	84.0	1390	89.9	1517	91.0	955
Yes	19.3	142	16.0	265	10.1	171	9.0	94
TOTALS	100.0	735	100.0	1655	100.0	1688	100.0	1049

D. Communications Workshop and Exit Interview

There have been no major changes in the Academic and Special participants' ratings from Fiscal 1971 to Fiscal 1972 regarding the helpfulness of their Communications Workshops (Table 47) or the usefulness or pleasantness of their Exit Interviews at DETRI (Tables 48 and 49). About 21% of the participants rated their Communications Workshop as "extremely helpful." About 45% rated the Exit Interview as "extremely useful" for getting their evaluations of their A.I.D. training programs; and about 56% rated the Exit Interview as "extremely pleasant."

Table 47

Q. How helpful did the participants think the ideas they got from the Communications Workshop will be in using their training when they return home? (Item 103)

HELPFULNESS RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely helpful)	24.4	146	22.4	236	23.8	246	21.0	144
2	29.0	174	27.8	294	23.7	245	30.4	208
3	22.5	135	22.7	240	23.0	238	24.5	168
4	10.4	62	14.1	149	14.4	149	12.7	87
5	6.2	37	5.9	62	6.8	70	4.1	28
6	5.3	32	4.5	48	4.9	51	5.3	36
7 (Not at all helpful)	2.2	13	2.6	27	3.4	35	2.0	14
TOTALS	100.0	599	100.0	1056	100.0	1034	100.0	685

Table 48

Q. How useful did the participants think the Exit Interview was for getting their evaluations of their A.I.D. training program?

USEFULNESS RATING	FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely useful)	44.1	824	43.2	697	45.2	482
2	33.4	624	34.7	561	33.0	352
3	15.9	298	15.4	249	15.5	165
4	5.3	100	5.3	85	4.9	52
5	0.9	17	0.9	14	0.9	10
6	0.3	6	0.3	5	0.4	4
7 (Not at all useful)	0.1	2	0.2	3	0.1	1
TOTALS	100.0	1871	100.0	1614	100.0	1066

Table 49

Q. How pleasant did the participants find the Exit Interview?

PLEASANTNESS RATING	FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely pleasant)	53.4	987	54.2	873	55.6	593
2	29.4	542	30.8	496	30.9	330
3	12.6	233	10.6	170	10.6	113
4	3.7	68	3.3	54	2.2	24
5	0.3	6	0.6	10	0.6	6
6	0.4	8	0.2	3	0.0	0
7 (Not at all pleasant)	0.2	3	0.3	4	0.1	1
TOTALS	100.0	1847	100.0	1610	100.0	1067

PART IV
CONTRIBUTING FACTORS AND ASSOCIATED EVENTS
FOR ACADEMIC PARTICIPANTS

The 16 tables in this part of the report include information that has been found to be related to overall reactions for participants in Academic training programs only. (Part V will include analogous information for participants in non-academic training programs.) This part is divided into two sections: Training Programs and Special Programs.

A. Training Programs

The only item in this section of the report which showed a significant change from Fiscal 1971 to Fiscal 1972 was the suitability of the technical training program to the Academic participants' previous training and experience (Table 51). About 69% of the Fiscal 1971 participants rated their technical training at "1" or "2" on the 7-point scale, while about 74% of the Fiscal 1972 participants gave ratings this high. The factors that Academic participants most often cited in expressing satisfaction with the suitability of their training programs to their backgrounds were participation in the planning of the program and flexibility on the part of program managers in Washington and at their training sites. As one participant said, "My program was very flexible. My plans were set only after discussion with A.I.D. and my university. Later, even after I was staying at the university, my program was adapted and changed from time to time." In the words of another participant, "I am old enough to plan my own program, and there has been sufficient opportunity to do this."

It is our impression that participants in the field of agriculture and contract participants were most often pleased with the suitability of their training programs to their previous training and experience. They often praised individual Program Officers and faculty members at their universities for their assistance and willingness to work out programs that fit their needs. The contract participants frequently had program advisors whom they had worked with in their home countries and who were very knowledgeable about them.

On all of the other measures of training program experiences and difficulties, the high ratings given by previous Academic participants are maintained by the Fiscal 1972 group. On all of these items, 60% or more of the Academic participants in Fiscal 1972 indicated that they were highly satisfied or had no problems.

Table 50

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

SUITABILITY RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely suitable)	23.2	93	28.5	228	26.3	198	27.5	144
2	31.0	124	31.4	251	30.7	231	31.7	166
3	26.0	104	23.5	188	23.9	180	22.6	118
4	10.8	43	9.7	78	11.2	84	11.1	58
5	4.5	18	3.9	31	4.7	35	4.0	21
6	4.0	16	2.1	17	2.3	18	2.3	12
7 (Not at all suitable)	0.5	2	0.9	7	0.9	7	0.8	4
TOTALS	100.0	400	100.0	800	100.0	753	100.0	523

Table 51

Q. How suitable did the Academic participants feel their technical training program was to their previous training and experience? (Item 83a)

SUITABILITY RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely suitable)	30.7	123	35.5	285	32.1	243	33.2	174
2	41.9	168	38.1	306	36.8	278	40.4	212
3	15.7	63	16.7	134	18.9	143	16.6	87
4	7.0	28	6.2	50	6.8	51	6.9	36
5	3.0	12	2.1	17	4.0	30	1.0	5
6	1.0	4	0.4	3	0.9	7	1.3	7
7 (Not at all suitable)	0.7	3	1.0	8	0.5	4	0.6	3
TOTALS	100.0	401	100.0	803	100.0	756	100.0	524

Table 52

Q. How suitable did the Academic participants feel their technical training program was to their personal career plans? (Item 83c)

SUITABILITY RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely suitable)	30.5	122	35.1	281	33.0	250	35.6	186
2	31.8	127	34.8	279	36.4	276	32.9	172
3	19.5	78	16.4	131	16.3	123	16.6	87
4	8.8	35	7.0	56	7.5	57	8.2	43
5	4.7	19	4.1	33	4.2	32	2.7	14
6	2.5	10	1.2	10	1.7	13	2.7	14
7 (Not at all suitable)	2.2	9	1.4	11	0.9	7	1.3	7
TOTALS	100.0	400	100.0	801	100.0	758	100.0	523

Table 53

Q. How did the interviewers rate the Academic participants' feelings about their principal training institution?

TRAINING INSTITUTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Excellent	32.9	110	32.8	253	28.5	212	30.5	154
Good	42.8	143	45.7	352	49.7	370	45.9	232
Adequate	19.2	64	13.6	105	14.4	107	16.2	82
Poor	4.2	14	6.6	51	6.5	48	6.4	32
Terrible	0.9	3	1.3	10	0.9	7	1.0	5
TOTALS	100.0	334	100.0	771	100.0	744	100.0	505

Table 54

Q. How useful to the objectives of their technical training programs did the Academic participants find the on-the-job training they received? (Item 73)

USEFULNESS RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely useful)	42.6	55	46.2	104	39.4	85	39.9	63
2	38.8	50	28.4	64	31.0	67	32.9	52
3	12.4	16	12.9	29	17.1	37	19.0	30
4	4.7	6	5.8	13	8.3	18	6.3	10
5	1.5	2	4.0	9	1.9	4	0.6	1
6	0.0	0	1.8	4	2.3	5	1.3	2
7 (Not at all useful)	0.0	0	0.9	2	0.0	0	0.0	0
TOTALS	100.0	129	100.0	225	100.0	216	100.0	158

Table 55

Q. How useful to the objectives of their technical training programs did the Academic participants find the observation training they received? (Item 76)

USEFULNESS RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely useful)	33.3	86	37.3	157	38.1	160	39.2	123
2	36.4	94	28.7	121	26.9	113	32.5	102
3	20.6	53	20.0	84	22.1	93	18.1	57
4	6.6	17	10.7	45	7.1	30	6.1	19
5	2.3	6	1.9	8	3.6	15	2.8	9
6	0.4	1	0.9	4	1.9	8	1.0	3
7 (Not at all useful)	0.4	1	0.5	2	0.3	1	0.3	1
TOTALS	100.0	258	100.0	421	100.0	420	100.0	314

Table 56

Q. How useful to the objectives of their technical training programs did the Academic participants find the courses at their principal institutions? (Item 70)

USEFULNESS RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely useful)	29.1	127	31.5	253	30.3	230	31.1	163
2	40.6	177	38.9	312	39.1	297	38.7	203
3	19.3	84	17.6	141	19.2	146	20.2	106
4	7.1	31	7.5	60	6.9	52	5.9	31
5	2.3	10	2.1	17	3.0	23	2.7	14
6	1.4	6	1.9	15	1.1	8	0.7	4
7 (Not at all useful)	0.2	1	0.5	4	0.4	3	0.7	4
TOTALS	100.0	436	100.0	802	100.0	759	100.0	525

Table 57

Q. Did the Academic participants have problems with courses being too simple? (Item 68a)

PROBLEM WITH COURSES TOO SIMPLE	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	78.7	336	80.4	643	74.7	566	73.4	383
Some	18.3	78	18.2	146	22.5	171	24.1	126
Much	3.0	13	1.4	11	2.8	21	2.5	13
TOTALS	100.0	427	100.0	800	100.0	758	100.0	522

Table 58

Q. Did the Academic participants have problems with too many courses unrelated to their major field? (Item 68k)

PROBLEM WITH UNRELATED COURSES	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	68.4	292	74.6	596	72.1	545	72.4	377
Some	21.8	93	18.6	149	19.7	149	18.0	94
Much	9.8	42	6.8	54	8.2	62	9.6	50
TOTALS	100.0	427	100.0	799	100.0	756	100.0	521

Table 59

Q. Did the Academic participants have a problem with too much duplication of subject matter in different courses? (Item 681)

PROBLEMS WITH TOO MUCH DUPLICATION	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	70.3	301	71.1	569	71.0	533	68.0	351
Some	26.6	114	24.1	193	24.6	185	27.5	142
Much	3.1	13	4.8	38	4.4	33	4.5	23
TOTALS	100.0	428	100.0	800	100.0	751	100.0	516

Table 60

Q. Did the Academic participants have problems with understanding teachers' or supervisors' speech? (Item 17e)

PROBLEM WITH TEACHERS' SPEECH	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	64.8	280	66.7	540	61.8	469	63.0	330
Some	31.3	135	30.7	248	36.4	276	35.5	186
Much	3.9	17	2.6	21	1.8	14	1.5	8
TOTALS	100.0	432	100.0	809	100.0	759	100.0	524

B. Special Programs

There were no appreciable changes in the ratings given by the Academic participants to their Leadership Training Programs (54% gave "1" or "2" ratings) (Table 61), their Pre-Academic Workshops (48% gave "1" or "2" ratings) (Table 62), or their English language training in the United States (56% gave "1" or "2" ratings) (Table 63) from Fiscal 1971 to Fiscal 1972. There was also no significant change in the percentages of Academic participants who reported having problems making themselves understood in English or reading in English (Tables 64 and 65) from Fiscal 1971 to Fiscal 1972.

Table 61

Q. How satisfied were the Academic participants with the Leadership Training Program(s) they attended? (Item 98)

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	16.8	46	19.2	93	17.4	82	21.9	75
2	35.4	97	27.7	134	30.7	145	32.2	110
3	27.0	74	30.6	148	26.7	126	21.6	74
4	12.4	34	13.0	63	15.0	71	14.9	51
5	5.1	14	5.2	25	6.2	29	4.7	16
6	2.2	6	2.7	13	2.3	11	3.5	12
7 (Not at all satisfied)	1.1	3	1.6	8	1.7	8	1.2	4
TOTALS	100.0	274	100.0	484	100.0	472	100.0	342

Table 62

Q. How useful was the Pre-Academic Workshop in preparing the Academic participants for their technical training programs? (Item 93)

USEFULNESS RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely useful)	18.9	31	16.7	44	14.1	34	18.1	25
2	34.1	56	23.1	61	20.8	50	30.4	42
3	23.2	38	25.8	68	24.2	58	18.1	25
4	11.0	18	15.9	42	16.7	40	16.6	23
5	4.9	8	8.3	22	11.3	27	8.0	11
6	6.1	10	5.3	14	7.5	18	4.4	6
7 (Not at all useful)	1.8	3	4.9	13	5.4	13	4.4	6
TOTALS	100.0	164	100.0	264	100.0	240	100.0	138

Table 63

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

USEFULNESS RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely useful)	30.5	62	24.8	82	26.6	90	28.3	65
2	21.7	44	27.3	90	22.1	75	27.8	64
3	15.7	32	16.4	54	20.1	68	20.9	48
4	15.3	31	12.4	41	15.3	52	10.4	24
5	6.9	14	8.8	29	9.4	32	7.0	16
6	7.4	15	6.4	21	4.4	15	3.0	7
7 (Not at all useful)	2.5	5	3.9	13	2.1	7	2.6	6
TOTALS	100.0	203	100.0	330	100.0	339	100.0	230

Table 64

Q. Did the Academic participants have a problem with making themselves understood in English? (Item 17f)

PROBLEM WITH SPEAKING ENGLISH	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	52.2	225	56.4	455	54.5	414	57.6	302
Some	43.9	189	39.4	318	40.8	310	39.3	206
Much	3.9	17	4.2	34	4.7	36	3.1	16
TOTALS	100.0	431	100.0	807	100.0	760	100.0	524

Table 65

Q. Did the Academic participants have a problem with reading English? (Item 17h)

PROBLEM WITH READING ENGLISH	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	77.5	331	83.0	671	80.9	613	81.3	426
Some	19.9	85	16.0	129	18.5	140	18.1	95
Much	2.6	11	1.0	8	0.6	5	0.6	3
TOTALS	100.0	427	100.0	808	100.0	758	100.0	524

PART V

CONTRIBUTING FACTORS AND ASSOCIATED EVENTS
FOR SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS

The 14 tables in this part of the report present information that has been found to be significantly correlated with the overall reactions of participants in non-academic training programs. (Analogous items for Academic participants were presented in Part IV.)

The Special participants did not show any significant changes from Fiscal 1971 to Fiscal 1972 in rating the suitability of their technical training programs to: (1) their home country conditions (Table 66), (2) their previous training and experience (Table 67), or (3) their personal career plans (Table 68). As in the past, the Special participants less often gave high ratings to suitability of their training programs to their home country conditions than they did to their previous training or their personal career plans. Other measures of the usefulness of on-the-job, observation, and classroom training show between 66% and 73% of the Fiscal 1972 Special participants as being highly satisfied (Tables 70, 71, and 74). There has been a significant increase in the participants' ratings of the usefulness of their on-the-job training from Fiscal 1971 to Fiscal 1972. In Fiscal 1971, about 64% of the participants rated their on-the-job training at one of the top two scale positions, while in Fiscal 1972 about 73% gave ratings this high (Table 70).

The participants in Special training programs continue to stress the importance of on-the-job training for meeting their training objectives. Those who have had such practical

training tend to be more satisfied with their training programs. Those who expected this type of training, but did not receive it tend to give lower ratings. As one such participant said, "After 3 years in the United States, I still don't feel prepared to go right to work and be an expert in my field. I am disappointed that I did not receive on-the-job training here. Too much time was wasted with courses taught by poor teachers." Another participant stressed several times that, "I needed more practical experience, observation training. The school was all right, but too theoretical. In our situation we need more flexibility and more practical knowledge."

There has been a significant increase in the percentage of Special participants who found their courses or classroom presentations to be "too simple." In Fiscal 1971 about 26% of the participants reported this difficulty, while in Fiscal 1972 about 36% reported that their courses were too simple (Table 75). As one participant said about his classroom work in a special short course, "There were too many useless requirements and lecture courses. I learned a lot of theory, but what I needed was application. On-the-job training!" It may be that this increasing dissatisfaction with classroom and theoretical training is reflected in the significantly lower ratings that the DETRI interviewers gave to the Special participants' feelings about their principal training institutions. In Fiscal 1971, about 30% of the participants were rated as seeing their training institution as "excellent." In Fiscal 1972, this percentage dropped to 22% (Table 69).

The percentages of Special participants reported having difficulties with too much repetition in their training programs (Table 72), observing inappropriate activities (Table 73), too little discussion during classroom training (Table 76), too much duplication in subject matter (Table 77), inadequate

participation in the planning of their proposed training programs (Table 78), or no meetings with government officials in Washington prior to the beginning of their training programs (Table 79) remained relatively stable from Fiscal 1971 to Fiscal 1972.

Table 66

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

SUITABILITY RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely suitable)	21.1	76	27.3	247	29.2	273	26.2	154
2	28.6	103	30.8	278	28.0	262	33.9	199
3	25.3	91	23.9	216	26.0	244	24.7	145
4	13.3	48	10.9	98	9.9	93	9.2	54
5	7.8	28	4.2	38	3.9	36	3.8	22
6	3.3	12	1.7	15	2.1	20	1.9	11
7 (Not at all suitable)	0.6	2	1.2	11	0.9	8	0.3	2
TOTALS	100.0	360	100.0	903	100.0	936	100.0	587

Table 67

Q. How suitable did the Special participants feel their technical training program was to their previous training and experience? (Item 80a)

SUITABILITY RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely suitable)	29.6	106	35.1	316	35.7	333	34.8	204
2	32.1	115	36.4	327	37.0	345	39.2	230
3	20.9	75	16.7	150	17.0	159	17.2	101
4	9.8	35	7.6	68	6.4	60	5.5	32
5	3.4	12	2.1	19	2.0	19	2.3	14
6	3.1	11	1.3	12	1.8	17	0.9	5
7 (Not at all suitable)	1.1	4	0.8	7	0.1	1	0.1	1
TOTALS	100.0	358	100.0	899	100.0	934	100.0	587

Table 68

Q. How suitable did the Special participants feel their technical training program was to their personal career plans? (Item 80c)

SUITABILITY RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely suitable)	31.1	110	35.9	321	34.7	322	35.2	205
2	30.5	108	32.0	286	32.8	305	35.6	207
3	21.5	76	18.2	163	17.2	160	16.1	94
4	9.6	34	7.6	68	9.0	84	7.9	46
5	2.0	7	4.1	37	3.4	31	2.8	16
6	3.9	14	1.4	13	1.9	18	1.0	6
7 (Not at all suitable)	1.4	5	0.8	7	1.0	9	1.4	8
TOTALS	100.0	354	100.0	895	100.0	929	100.0	582

Table 69

Q. How did the interviewers rate the Special participants' feeling about their principal training institution?

TRAINING INSTITUTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Excellent	23.5	60	33.4	226	30.1	232	22.1	100
Good	42.0	107	39.3	266	48.1	370	50.9	230
Adequate	18.4	47	17.5	118	14.3	110	20.4	92
Poor	13.3	34	8.0	54	6.5	50	5.8	26
Terrible	2.8	7	1.8	12	1.0	8	0.8	4
TOTALS	100.0	255	100.0	676	100.0	770	100.0	452

Table 70

Q. How useful to the objectives of their technical training program was the on-the-job training the Special participants received at their principal training facility? (Item 66)

USEFULNESS RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely useful)	38.0	109	33.1	167	34.2	189	33.8	122
2	32.4	93	31.7	160	30.0	166	39.4	142
3	14.3	41	20.6	104	21.3	118	14.4	52
4	6.3	18	9.1	46	8.9	49	8.0	29
5	5.6	16	3.5	18	3.3	18	3.3	12
6	1.7	5	1.2	6	1.8	10	0.8	3
7 (Not at all useful)	1.7	5	0.8	4	0.5	3	0.3	1
TOTALS	100.0	287	100.0	505	100.0	553	100.0	361

Table 71

Q. How useful were the observation visits the Special participants made?
(Item 71)

USEFULNESS RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely useful)	26.5	127	31.0	233	30.2	243	30.1	147
2	37.5	180	32.6	245	36.0	290	36.4	178
3	22.7	109	22.4	169	21.7	175	23.9	117
4	8.1	39	9.6	72	7.9	64	6.3	31
5	2.7	13	2.8	21	3.3	27	2.7	13
6	1.9	9	1.2	9	0.6	5	0.6	3
7 (Not at all useful)	0.6	3	0.4	3	0.3	2	0.0	0
TOTALS	100.0	480	100.0	752	100.0	806	100.0	489

Table 72

Q. Did Special participants have a problem with activities at places visited too similar; too much repetition? (Item 70b)

PROBLEM WITH OBSERVATION VISITS REPETITIOUS	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	53.1	251	56.2	420	61.3	493	59.8	289
Some	37.8	179	30.3	226	29.8	240	32.3	156
Much	9.1	43	13.5	101	8.9	72	7.9	38
TOTALS	100.0	473	100.0	747	100.0	805	100.0	483

Table 73

Q. Did Special participants have a problem with observing insignificant or inappropriate activities? (Item 70d)

PROBLEM WITH INAPPROPRIATE ACTIVITIES	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	67.9	317	73.5	546	75.5	609	75.2	362
Some	26.3	123	21.1	157	20.2	163	20.4	98
Much	5.8	27	5.4	40	4.3	35	4.4	21
TOTALS	100.0	467	100.0	743	100.0	807	100.0	481

Table 74

Q. How useful to the objectives of their technical training programs was the classroom and related training the Special participants received at their principal institution? (Item 62)

USEFULNESS RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely useful)	27.9	121	31.3	216	31.8	231	28.0	137
2	32.0	139	34.4	238	35.4	257	40.0	196
3	20.7	90	19.8	137	21.7	158	19.4	95
4	11.1	48	9.4	65	6.2	45	9.4	46
5	4.6	20	3.3	23	4.0	29	1.8	9
6	3.0	13	1.2	8	0.8	6	0.8	4
7 (Not at all useful)	0.7	3	0.6	4	0.1	1	0.6	3
TOTALS	100.0	434	100.0	691	100.0	727	100.0	490

Table 75

Q. Did the Special participants have a problem with their courses or presentations too simple? (Item 61a)

PROBLEM WITH PRESENTATIONS TOO SIMPLE	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	65.3	280	70.4	485	74.1	539	64.4	311
Some	27.0	116	24.2	167	22.3	162	29.6	143
Much	7.7	33	5.4	37	3.6	26	6.0	29
TOTALS	100.0	429	100.0	689	100.0	727	100.0	483

Table 76

Q. Did the Special participants have a problem with too little discussion during their classroom training? (Item 61f)

PROBLEM WITH TOO LITTLE DISCUSSION	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	75.0	318	73.5	506	76.7	557	77.2	373
Some	17.9	76	19.2	132	17.9	130	18.6	90
Much	7.1	30	7.3	50	5.4	39	4.2	20
TOTALS	100.0	424	100.0	688	100.0	726	100.0	483

Table 77

Q. Did the Special participants have a problem with too much duplication in subject matter during their classroom training?
(Item 61h)

PROBLEM WITH TOO MUCH DUPLICATION	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	66.9	283	70.4	480	73.0	526	69.1	334
Some	26.7	113	22.0	150	23.1	167	25.9	125
Much	6.4	27	7.6	52	3.9	28	5.0	24
TOTALS	100.0	423	100.0	682	100.0	721	100.0	483

Table 78

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

ADEQUACY OF PARTICIPATION	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Very inadequate	21.4	59	14.8	133	15.7	146	17.0	98
Somewhat inadequate	29.3	81	25.2	227	28.0	261	29.7	171
Adequate	49.3	136	60.0	540	56.3	524	53.3	307
TOTALS	100.0	276	100.0	900	100.0	931	100.0	576

Table 79

Q. Before their technical training program began, did the Special participants have a personal meeting, or meetings, with the government official in Washington responsible for their training? (Item 30)

HAD MEETING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
No	6.1	33	5.3	48	5.2	49	6.8	40
Yes	93.9	505	94.7	856	94.8	891	93.2	548
TOTALS	100.0	538	100.0	904	100.0	940	100.0	588

PART VI

DESCRIPTIVE CHARACTERISTICS, OVERALL REACTIONS, CONTRIBUTING FACTORS AND ASSOCIATED EVENTS FOR OBSERVATION TRAINING TEAM MEMBERS

A. Team Characteristics

While no statistically significant differences occurred in comparisons of the data for Fiscal 1971 and Fiscal 1972 shown in Tables 80, 81, 82, and 83, the following characteristics of the 17 teams interviewed in Fiscal 1972¹ are of interest: (1) all but 2 teams were from Latin America (Table 80); (2) 41% of the teams (with 52% of the total participants) had programs in tax administration conducted by the Internal Revenue Service (Table 82); and (3) nearly 30% of the teams had 13 or more members (Table 83), reflecting the typically larger size of IRS teams.

¹ Although the Fiscal 1972 column shows July through March for continuity with the earlier part of this report, no observation training teams came to DETRI for Exit Interviews after December 2, 1971.

Table 80

Q. What regions of the world were the observation training teams from?

REGION	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	Teams	%	Teams	%	Teams	%	Teams
Africa	6.5	4	2.4	2	7.0	4	0.0	0
Far East	3.2	2	10.7	9	5.0	3	5.9	1
Latin America	64.5	40	53.5	45	64.4	38	88.2	15
Near East- South Asia	22.6	14	29.8	25	20.3	12	0.0	0
Multi- Region	3.2	2	3.6	3	3.3	2	5.9	1
TOTALS	100.0	62	100.0	84	100.0	59	100.0	17

Table 81

Q. In what fields of training did the observation training teams have their training?

FIELD OF TRAINING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul.-Mar	
	%	Teams	%	Teams	%	Teams	%	Teams
Labor	22.6	14	32.1	27	22.2	13	17.6	3
Agriculture	21.0	13	16.7	14	28.8	17	23.5	4
Public Administration	16.1	10	16.7	14	20.3	12	41.2	7
Education	14.5	9	17.8	15	18.6	11	5.9	1
Industry & Mining	8.1	5	8.3	7	1.8	1	0.0	0
Health & Sanitation	8.1	5	1.2	1	3.3	2	0.0	0
Transportation	3.2	2	1.2	1	0.0	0	11.8	2
Other	6.4	4	6.0	5	5.0	3	0.0	0
TOTALS	100.0	62	100.0	84	100.0	59	100.0	17

Table 82

Q. What government agencies participated in the training programs?

AGENCY	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	Teams	%	Teams	%	Teams	%	Teams
Labor	22.6	14	33.3	28	24.0	14	17.6	3
Agriculture	24.2	15	13.1	11	25.5	15	17.6	3
Office of Education	16.1	10	8.3	7	7.0	4	5.9	1
Internal Reve- nue Service	8.1	5	10.7	9	13.3	8	41.2	7
Public Health Service	6.4	4	1.2	1	3.3	2	5.9	1
U.S. Geological Survey	3.2	2	3.6	3	0.0	0	0.0	0
A.I.D.	9.7	6	16.7	14	8.3	5	0.0	0
Other	9.7	6	13.1	11	18.6	11	11.8	2
TOTALS	100.0	62	100.0	84	100.0	59	100.0	17

Table 83

Q. What was the size of the observation training teams?

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	Teams	%	Teams	%	Teams	%	Teams
1-3	37.1	23	22.6	19	15.1	9	23.5	4
4-6	22.6	14	44.0	37	46.2	27	23.5	4
7-9	21.0	13	13.1	11	15.1	9	11.8	2
10-12	11.3	7	7.2	6	10.3	6	11.8	2
13 and over	8.0	5	13.1	11	13.3	8	29.4	5
TOTALS	100.0	62	100.0	84	100.0	59	100.0	17

B. Overall Reactions

The Fiscal 1972 observation training team members gave higher ratings of satisfaction to their technical training programs (Table 85), and to their personal and social experiences (Table 86), than did team members in Fiscal 1971. This was due principally to the ratings given by teams having programs in tax administration. Tax administration team members gave higher ratings of satisfaction to their technical training programs and to their personal and social experiences in both fiscal years than did members of other teams. Since more than 50% of the team members in Fiscal 1972 had programs in tax administration compared to about 19% in Fiscal 1971, their influence on the combined ratings of all team members was much greater in Fiscal 1972.

Among the reasons given by tax administration team members for their satisfaction with their technical training program were the following: (1) the team members were quite homogeneous in professional interests; (2) many of the team members received an outline of the program, in their language, before they left their countries; (3) officials at the training sites were acquainted with their backgrounds and training objectives and were prepared for the visits of the teams; and (4) the program was directly related to the work they are engaged in in their countries.

They were highly satisfied with their personal and social experiences because: (1) the program schedule allowed enough time for social and recreational activities; (2) personnel at the training sites arranged home visits, sightseeing, and other recreational activities for the team members so that their free time was occupied; and (3) arrangements were made, when possible, for them to meet fellow countrymen living in the United States.

Previous DETRI reports have mentioned the factors which the tax administration teams cited, as those which usually contribute to the satisfaction of observation training team members with their technical training programs and their personal and social activities. (Descriptive Statistical Report, May 1968 pp. 3-1 ff.; and Second Annual Report, July 1970 pp. 3-1 ff.)

Table 84

Q. How satisfied were the participants with their total experience as A.I.D participants?

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	19.0	72	23.7	140	14.3	64	15.9	25
2	45.0	174	41.0	243	53.6	239	50.3	79
3	24.0	91	23.7	140	23.7	106	26.8	42
4	7.9	30	8.4	50	5.6	25	5.1	8
5	2.4	9	2.2	13	2.7	12	0.6	1
6	0.7	3	0.5	3	0.1	1	1.3	2
7 (Not at all satisfied)	0.0	0	0.5	3	0.0	0	0.0	0
TOTALS	100.0	379	100.0	592	100.0	447	100.0	157

Table 85

Q. How satisfied were the participants with their technical training programs?

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	32.0	39	26.4	157	15.9	73	15.9	25
2	39.4	48	32.8	195	43.3	193	59.9	94
3	18.0	22	22.9	136	26.5	119	15.3	24
4	4.1	5	11.8	70	9.8	44	3.8	6
5	4.9	6	3.9	23	3.8	17	5.1	8
6	1.6	2	2.0	12	0.7	3	0.0	0
7 (Not at all satisfied)	0.0	0	0.2	2	0.0	0	0.0	0
TOTALS	100.0	122	100.0	595	100.0	449	100.0	157

Table 86

Q. How satisfied were the participants with their personal and social experiences in the United States?

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '69*		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	-	-	24.0	82	32.2	140	45.2	71
2	-	-	31.4	107	34.4	159	26.8	42
3	-	-	19.9	68	14.0	63	19.7	31
4	-	-	13.2	45	8.2	37	4.4	7
5	-	-	7.1	24	7.6	34	2.5	4
6	-	-	4.4	15	3.1	14	1.3	2
7 (Not at all satisfied)	-	-	0.0	0	0.5	2	0.0	0
TOTALS	-	-	100.0	341	100.0	449	100.0	157

* Question not asked until November 5, 1969.

C. Contributing Factors and Associated Events

1. Planning and Orientation

Observation training team members in Fiscal 1972 more frequently indicated that they had had adequate time to make necessary arrangements prior to their departure than did team members in Fiscal 1971 (Table 87). While these team members had had varying lengths of notice of their selection and time of departure, the majority agreed with the comment that "Team members should have from 6 to 8 weeks time to make all arrangements to leave on their training programs."

The team members in Fiscal 1972 gave slightly lower average ratings to the usefulness of their USAID briefing than did members of observation training teams in Fiscal 1971 (Table 89). The suggestion most frequently offered by team members for improving the USAID briefing was "give more detailed information about the content of the proposed training program." They also suggested that the briefing "should not be held on the day of departure," and that "enough time should be allowed for the briefing so that the subject matter can be presented fully, and participants can ask questions."

About 1 out of 6 team members in Fiscal 1972 felt they had had an opportunity to offer suggestions about their proposed training programs (Table 90). This was a significantly smaller proportion than in Fiscal 1971. While a much higher percentage of team members in Fiscal 1972 had an opportunity to make suggestions about the final plan for their training program than about the proposed plan (64%), this percentage was also significantly smaller than in Fiscal 1971 (Table 92). The large majority of observation training team members have suggested in their Exit Interview that participants should be given an opportunity

to offer suggestions about their training programs while the programs are being developed. In the words of one team member, "We should have an opportunity to make suggestions before leaving our country. To do so in the United States at the start of the program is too late to make changes."

Table 87

Q. Did the participants have adequate time to make departure arrangements?

HAD ADEQUATE TIME	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	34.4	32	62.6	308	51.0	229	65.1	99
No	65.6	61	37.4	184	49.0	220	34.9	53
TOTALS	100.0	93	100.0	492	100.0	449	100.0	152

Table 88

Q. Were the participants satisfied with the timing of their USAID briefings?

SATISFIED WITH TIMING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	52.6	30	49.6	168	52.5	213	54.1	73
No	47.4	27	50.4	171	47.5	193	45.9	62
TOTALS	100.0	57	100.0	339	100.0	406	100.0	135

Table 89

Q. How useful did the participants find the USAID briefing?

USEFULNESS RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely useful)	41.3	45	20.4	102	11.3	46	23.5	32
2	16.5	18	22.8	114	27.3	111	22.1	30
3	23.9	26	22.0	110	33.7	137	19.8	27
4	10.1	11	17.4	87	17.7	72	11.0	15
5	4.6	5	13.2	66	6.2	25	11.8	16
6	0.9	1	3.4	17	2.5	10	10.3	14
7 (Not at all useful)	2.8	3	0.8	4	1.3	5	1.5	2
TOTALS	100.0	109	100.0	500	100.0	406	100.0	136

Table 90

Q. Did the participants have an opportunity to offer suggestions about their proposed training programs?

OPPORTUNITY TO OFFER SUGGESTIONS	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	23.5	89	35.6	212	25.4	114	16.2	25
No	76.5	290	64.4	383	74.6	335	83.8	129
TOTALS	100.0	379	100.0	595	100.0	449	100.0	154

Table 91

Q. How satisfied were the participants with their discussion of the final plan of their training programs?

SATISFACTION RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely satisfied)	59.8	70	41.8	193	32.0	116	25.9	30
2	16.2	19	24.5	113	31.8	115	42.3	49
3	11.1	13	14.3	66	18.5	67	17.2	20
4	5.1	6	10.8	50	7.2	26	4.3	5
5	0.9	1	3.2	15	5.0	18	1.7	2
6	3.4	4	2.6	12	2.3	8	5.2	6
7 (Not at all satisfied)	3.4	4	2.8	13	3.2	12	3.4	4
TOTALS	100.0	117	100.0	462	100.0	362	100.0	116

Table 92

Q. Did the participants have an opportunity to offer suggestions about the final plan of their training programs?

OPPORTUNITY TO OFFER SUGGESTIONS	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	55.9	212	61.7	367	72.6	310	64.3	101
No	44.1	167	38.3	228	27.4	117	35.7	56
TOTALS	100.0	379	100.0	595	100.0	427	100.0	157

Table 93

Q. How useful did the participants find the Washington International Center Orientation?

USEFULNESS RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely useful)	28.9	26	38.8	141	30.4	84	35.5	43
2	42.2	38	31.7	115	34.0	94	33.1	40
3	15.6	14	13.8	50	18.1	50	16.5	20
4	3.3	3	5.5	20	8.7	24	9.1	11
5	7.8	7	6.6	24	7.2	20	2.5	3
6	2.2	2	1.9	7	1.2	3	2.5	3
7 (Not at all useful)	0.0	0	1.7	6	0.4	1	0.8	1
TOTALS	100.0	90	100.0	363	100.0	276	100.0	121

2. Administrative Arrangements

Observation training team members in Fiscal 1972 much less frequently indicated that they had had difficulties with housing during their stay in the United States than team members in Fiscal 1971 (Table 96). When they reported any difficulty at all, it concerned the location of the motel or hotel in which they stayed and not the quality of the accommodations. The following remarks of one team illustrate this point: "In St. Louis we stayed at the Hilton Inn near the airport. This motel was **comfortable**, but was 18 miles from the downtown area, and there was no transportation. When we went to Madison, Wisconsin, they had the same arrangement for us, but we changed to a downtown hotel, and were very happy." Observation training team members in previous fiscal years much more often complained of the quality of their housing, e.g., cleanliness, noise, services, facilities, clientele, etc.

A significantly lower proportion of team members in Fiscal 1972 characterized their per diem as being "not adequate" than in Fiscal 1971 (Table 97). This continued the trend of decreasing inadequacy of per diem over the four fiscal years shown. A much larger proportion in Fiscal 1972, however, indicated that their per diem was "barely adequate" than in Fiscal 1971. The reason for this shift appears in a comment subscribed to by many, "the per diem is not adequate if you have a single room in a hotel; if two stay in a room and you eat in cafeterias, the per diem is barely adequate."

Table 94

Q. How useful was the help provided by the participants' team escort officers?

USEFULNESS RATING	FY '69 *		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely useful)	-	-	77.4	254	72.9	207	84.5	71
2	-	-	13.7	45	14.4	41	10.7	9
3	-	-	3.7	12	6.8	19	3.6	3
4	-	-	2.4	8	2.1	6	1.2	1
5	-	-	0.6	2	1.1	3	0.0	0
6	-	-	0.6	2	2.1	6	0.0	0
7 (Not at all useful)	-	-	1.5	5	0.6	2	0.0	0
TOTALS	-	-	100.0	328	100.0	284	100.0	84

* Question not asked until August 14, 1969.

Table 95

Q. What was the quality of the interpreting in the exit interviews?

QUALITY OF INTERPRETING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Exceptional	3.5	2	6.7	6	16.7	9	13.3	2
Above average	36.8	21	40.0	36	37.0	20	26.7	4
Average	45.6	26	31.1	28	38.9	21	53.3	8
Below average	12.3	7	18.9	17	7.4	4	6.7	1
Unsatisfactory	1.8	1	3.3	3	0.0	0	0.0	0
TOTALS	100.0	57	100.0	90	100.0	54	100.0	15

Table 96

Q. Did the participants have any difficulties with housing?

HAD HOUSING DIFFICULTIES	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	49.6	188	66.3	394	32.0	143	13.4	21
No	50.4	191	33.7	201	68.0	304	86.6	136
TOTALS	100.0	379	100.0	595	100.0	447	100.0	157

Table 97

Q. How adequate was the participants' per diem while in the United States?

ADEQUACY OF PER DIEM	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Adequate	30.1	114	40.0	237	55.2	245	54.1	85
Barely adequate	31.4	119	34.0	201	30.0	133	42.7	67
Not adequate	38.5	146	26.0	154	14.8	66	3.2	5
TOTALS	100.0	379	100.0	592	100.0	444	100.0	157

3. Training Program

Although Fiscal 1972 observation training team members generally thought the oral presentations they had had in Washington, D.C., were useful in achieving their program objectives, their combined average ratings of the usefulness of these presentations were lower than those of team members in Fiscal 1971 (Table 98). Some reasons for these lower ratings are found in the following comments of team members: "There was too much talk, and not enough demonstration." "They should use more visual aids, and provide briefing outlines, preferably in our language." "The speakers may have been experts in their subject, but some of them were not expert in teaching others about it."

Also observation training team members in Fiscal 1972 more frequently felt that some of the subject matter in the oral presentations they had had in Washington, D.C., was not related to their training interests than did team members in Fiscal 1971 (Table 99). Many Fiscal 1972 members agreed with one who commented that "some lectures described only the final product, but did not give the background so we could not make the application to our own situation." Another member amplified this point by remarking, "They should discuss the methodology in sufficient detail so we would understand how to make the application in our countries."

Observation training team members in Fiscal 1972 believed that the oral presentations they had had in the field had been very useful in achieving their training objectives. They gave higher ratings to this part of their technical training program than team members in Fiscal 1971 (Table 100). A source of gratification to some team members in Fiscal 1972 was the effort made by officials at the field training sites to discuss the topics and problems in which they were most interested. As one

team member put it, "They always asked us what we wanted to hear." Other members found particularly useful the opportunity afforded in the oral presentations to discuss and ask questions. "Our schedule was flexible and not too crowded so we had enough time for questions and discussion throughout our program."

Observation training team members in Fiscal 1972 more often felt that they had had about the right number of observation visits in their training programs than did team members in Fiscal 1971 (Table 103). The attitude of a majority of the team members in Fiscal 1972 can be summarized in the remarks of one member, "Our itinerary was well arranged to allow adequate time for what we wanted to see, and we did not feel tired or rushed." A lower percentage felt there were "not enough" observation visits than in any of the previous fiscal years.

Table 98

Q. How useful were the oral presentations the participants had in Washington, D.C.?

USEFULNESS RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely useful)	51.9	55	25.4	104	32.7	89	13.6	12
2	34.0	36	32.2	132	29.4	80	38.7	34
3	11.3	12	24.4	100	22.4	61	34.1	30
4	0.9	1	12.7	52	8.5	23	10.2	9
5	1.9	2	4.6	19	1.5	4	3.4	3
6	0.0	0	0.7	3	4.8	13	0.0	0
7 (Not at all useful)	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.7	2	0.0	0
TOTALS	100.0	106	100.0	410	100.0	272	100.0	88

Table 99

Q. Did the participants find all the subject matter in their Washington, D.C. presentations related to their training interests?

SUBJECT MATTER RELATED TO TRAINING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	82.1	32	80.5	293	90.8	227	79.2	57
No	17.9	7	19.5	71	9.2	23	20.8	15
TOTALS	100.0	39	100.0	364	100.0	250	100.0	72

Table 100

Q. How useful did the participants find the oral presentations they had in the field?

USEFULNESS RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely useful)	23.5	19	22.4	89	18.8	64	36.6	46
2	46.9	38	30.7	122	36.2	123	31.7	40
3	19.8	16	26.2	104	28.5	97	20.6	26
4	0.0	0	14.4	57	8.8	30	7.9	10
5	7.4	6	4.0	16	5.3	18	3.2	4
6	2.5	2	2.0	8	2.4	8	0.0	0
7 (Not at all useful)	0.0	0	0.3	1	0.0	0	0.0	0
TOTALS	100.0	81	100.0	397	100.0	340	100.0	126

Table 101

Q. Did the participants find all the subject matter in their field presentations related to training interests?

SUBJECT MATTER RELATED TO TRAINING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	78.9	15	73.5	255	78.9	276	85.7	108
No	21.1	4	26.5	92	21.1	74	14.3	18
TOTALS	100.0	19	100.0	347	100.0	350	100.0	126

Table 102

Q. How useful did the participants find their observation visits?

USEFULNESS RATING	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely useful)	37.6	38	28.2	156	32.0	139	36.2	46
2	38.6	39	33.2	184	40.7	177	33.1	42
3	9.9	10	19.9	110	13.8	60	21.2	27
4	3.0	3	11.6	64	8.5	37	3.1	4
5	8.9	9	5.4	30	3.6	16	3.1	4
6	2.0	2	1.4	8	0.7	3	1.6	2
7 (Not at all useful)	0.0	0	0.4	2	0.7	3	1.6	2
TOTALS	100.0	101	100.0	554	100.0	435	100.0	127

Table 103

Q. How adequate was the number of observation visits the participants made?

ADEQUACY OF OBSERVATION VISITS	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Right number	64.8	57	49.8	276	61.6	263	69.9	65
Too many	2.3	2	26.5	147	7.5	32	17.2	16
Not enough	32.9	29	23.6	131	30.9	132	12.9	12
TOTALS	100.0	88	100.0	554	100.0	427	100.0	93

4. Personal and Social Activities

No statistically significant differences between Fiscal 1971 and Fiscal 1972 appear in the data given in Tables 104 and 105. As in Fiscal 1971, 4 out of 5 observation team members in Fiscal 1972 indicated that they had had 3 or more visits to American homes during their training sojourn (Table 104). Also, about 2 out of 3 team members in each fiscal year felt that they had taken part in as many personal and social activities as they desired (Table 105).

Table 104

Q. How many visits to American homes did the participants make?

NUMBER OF VISITS	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1	13.4	15	12.8	70	7.7	32	6.4	10
2	7.1	8	19.5	107	11.5	48	14.0	22
3-5	61.6	69	53.0	291	52.5	219	56.0	88
6 or more	17.9	20	14.8	81	28.3	118	23.6	37
TOTALS	100.0	112	100.0	549	100.0	417	100.0	157

Table 105

Q. Did the participants take part in as many personal and social activities as they wanted?

TOOK PART IN SUFFICIENT ACTIVITIES	FY '69		FY '70		FY '71		FY '72 Jul-Mar	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	41.8	158	27.9	166	64.4	289	66.9	105
No	58.2	220	72.1	429	35.6	160	33.1	52
TOTALS	100.0	378	100.0	595	100.0	449	100.0	157

PART VII

CHANGE HIGHLIGHTS FROM FISCAL 1971 TO FISCAL 1972 (JULY-MARCH)

Positive Changes

- A. Academic and Special program participants interviewed in Fiscal 1972 (Jul-Mar):
1. More often gave higher ratings of satisfaction to the planning of their training programs in the United States (Table 16)
 2. More often gave higher ratings of satisfaction to their communication with the Washington government official responsible for their training (Table 23)
 3. Less often had difficulties in communicating with this government official (Table 24)
 4. More often gave higher ratings of satisfaction to their travel arrangements in the United States (Table 25)
 5. Visited more different American families (Table 38)
 6. Made more visits to American homes (Table 39)
 7. More often went to informal activities with groups including Americans, fellow countrymen, and other nationals (Table 41)

- B. Academic program participants interviewed in Fiscal 1972 (Jul-Mar)
 - 1. More often gave higher ratings to the suitability of their training programs to their previous training and experience (Table 51)
- C. Special program participants interviewed in Fiscal 1972 (Jul-Mar):
 - 1. More often gave higher ratings to the utility of their on-the-job training to the objectives of their training programs (Table 70)
- D. Observation Training Team members interviewed in Fiscal 1972 (Jul-Dec):
 - 1. More often gave higher ratings of satisfaction with their technical training program (Table 85)
 - 2. More often gave higher ratings of satisfaction with their personal and social experiences (Table 86)
 - 3. More often had adequate time to make departure arrangements (Table 87)
 - 4. Less often had difficulties with housing (Table 96)
 - 5. Less often found their per diem to be not adequate (Table 97)
 - 6. More often gave higher ratings of usefulness to their oral presentations in the field (Table 100)
 - 7. More often felt they had had the right amount of observation visits (Table 103)

Negative Changes

- A. Academic and Special program participants interviewed in Fiscal 1972 (Jul-Mar):
 - 1. More often had difficulties with poor public transportation services where they lived (Table 29)
- B. Special program participants interviewed in Fiscal 1972 (Jul-Mar):
 - 1. More often were rated by DETRI interviewers as feeling their principal training institution was "adequate" (and less often was "excellent") (Table 69)
- C. Observation Training Team members interviewed in Fiscal 1972 (Jul-Dec):
 - 1. More often gave lower ratings of usefulness to their USAID briefing (Table 89)
 - 2. Less often had an opportunity to offer suggestions about the proposed plan of their training program (Table 90)
 - 3. Less often had an opportunity to offer suggestions about the final plan of their training program (Table 92)
 - 4. More often gave lower ratings to the usefulness of the oral presentations in Washington, D.C. (Table 98)
 - 5. More often found some of the subject matter in the oral presentations in Washington, D.C., not related to their training interests (Table 99)

APPENDIX I

DETRI PROCEDURES AND RELIABILITY OF DATA

The data in the Status Reports were collected in the same manner as the data presented in the First and Second Annual Reports from DETRI to A.I.D. (May 1969 and July 1970). Academic and Special program participants fill out a printed standardized, structured questionnaire under the supervision of a person trained in its administration. They also receive an oral, unstructured interview conducted by cultural communication specialists on a private, anonymous basis. (Definitions of categories of participant trainees are given in the Glossary.) More detailed information on the instruments and procedures used to collect the exit interview data are included in the Final Report on A.I.D. Participant Training Exit Interview Development Study, December 1967, and the Guide for Users of the DETRI Exit Interview, November 1970.

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

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

APPENDIX II

GLOSSARY

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

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

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

APPENDIX III

REFERENCES

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

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

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

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

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

Descriptive and analytic findings from Exit Interviews conducted with 1810 Academic and Special participants and 610 Observation Training Team members between July 1967 and September

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Descriptive findings on selected items from Exit Interviews conducted with Academic and Special participants and Observation Training Team members. Comparisons between most recent participants' perceptions and reactions and those of participants interviewed during previous fiscal years are presented and summarized.

Participant Assessment of Factors Related to Selected USAIDs:
Profile Report Series. Washington, D.C., Office of International Training, Agency for International Development, U.S. Department of State.

Descriptive findings from Exit Interviews conducted with participants from countries which had 125 or more Academic and Special participants and/or 3 Observation Training Teams or more at DETRI. Prepared as separate reports for each USAID. Comparisons between perceptions and opinions of participants from the country being reported on and those of participants from other countries in the same region are made. Overall reactions are analyzed by fiscal year. (Out of print)

Participant Assessment of Factors Related to Selected PASAs:
Profile Report Series. Washington, D.C., Office of International Training, Agency for International Development, ARC Catalog Nos. 374.013, A 512f-m, U.S. Department of State.

Descriptive findings from Exit Interviews conducted with participants programmed by agencies which had 170 or more Academic and Special participants and/or 10 Observation Training Teams or more at DETRI. Prepared as separate reports for each PASA. Comparisons between perceptions and opinions of participants from the agency being reported on and those of participants from other agencies are made. Overall reactions are analyzed by fiscal year. (Out of print)

Participant Assessment of Special Programs: Profile Report Series. Washington, D.C., Office of International Training, Agency for International Development, ARC Catalog Nos. 374.013, A 512n-q, U.S. Department of State.

Descriptive findings from Exit Interviews conducted with Academic participants who took part in Pre-Academic Workshops or Mid-Winter Community Seminars, and with Academic and Special participants who had English language training, orientations at the Washington International Center, or Communications Workshop Program. Comparisons among perceptions and opinions of participants at different training sites in the Pre-Academic Workshop

and Communications Workshop reports. Comparisons between the reactions of participants at each of the 15 cities reported on (minimum of 30 participants) and of those participants at all other cities in the Mid-Winter Community Seminar reports. Comparisons among the reactions of participants from the four major world regions, and between participants who had training only in their home countries and only in the United States, in the English language training report. Comparisons among perceptions and opinions of participants who attended programs at the Washington International Center during: (1) 1966-1968, (2) 1969, and (3) 1970-Sept. 1971, in the Washington International Center Orientation Program report. (Out of print)

Training Institution Profile Reports. Academic Participants.

Washington, D.C., Development Education and Training Research Institute, The American University, June 1972. Reports on California State Polytechnic College, Colorado State University at Fort Collins, Colorado State University at Greeley, Columbia University, Harvard University, Indiana University, Kansas State University, Michigan State University, University of Michigan, University of Missouri, New Mexico State University, North Carolina State University, University of North Carolina, Ohio State University, Ohio University, Oklahoma State University, University of Pittsburgh, University of Southern California at Los Angeles, Southern Illinois University, Syracuse University, Tulane University, University of West Virginia, Williams College, and University of Wisconsin.

Descriptive findings from Exit Interviews conducted with Academic participants who attended U.S. universities which had 30 or more Academic participants completing their training programs between July 17, 1967, and February 29, 1972. Prepared as separate reports for each of the training institutions. Comparisons are made between the experiences of participants attending the institutions being reported on and those of participants at all Academic training institutions. (Three Appendices.)

Training Institution Profile Reports. Special Participants.

Washington, D.C., Development Education and Training Research Institute, The American University, June 1972. Reports on American University, Bureau of the Census, University of Chicago Summer Workshop on Family Planning, Columbia University, Development Administrators Training Program at the University of Connecticut, Federal Aviation Administration National Training Center, Harvard University, Johns Hopkins University, Indiana University, International Cooperative Training Center in Madison, Wisconsin, University of Missouri, National Rural Electric Cooperative Administration, University of Pittsburgh, Soil Conservation Service in Portland, Oregon, Syracuse University, and the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Descriptive findings from Exit Interviews conducted with Special participants who attended U.S. institutions which had 30 or more Special participants completing their training programs between July 17, 1967, and February 29, 1972. Prepared as separate reports for each of the training institutions. Comparisons are made between the experiences of participants attending the institutions being reported on and those of participants at all Special training institutions. (Three Appendices.)