

PH-AHS-197
1A-00135

**THE PARTICIPANT TRAINING PROGRAM:
AN EVALUATIVE SURVEY**

by

Albert E. Gollin
Research Associate

**BUREAU OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH, INC.
1424 Sixteenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036**

March 1965

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
<u>LIST OF TABLES</u>	iii
<u>Introduction</u>	22
<u>Programs and Participants: Facts and Views.</u>	26
<u>The Predeparture Period.</u>	30
Selection	
Orientation and Planning	
Program Planning	
<u>Evaluation of Program.</u>	36
Arrival	
The Core of the Program--Technical Aspects	
Context of the Program--Non-Technical Aspects	
Communications Skill	
<u>The Return Home: Careers and Utilization.</u>	47
Criteria of Effectiveness	
Work Situation and U. S. Follow-Up Contact	
<u>Utilization of Training.</u>	55
Participants and Program Characteristics	
The Predeparture Phase	
The Period of the Program	
The Return Home and After	

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Country, Participants Interviewed, and First Recorded Year of Departure.	74
2. Time in Specialty Prior to Selection by Occupational Status at Selection	75
3. Formal Education Prior to Selection by Age at Departure	76
4. Training Field by Year of Departure	77
5. Year of Departure and Training Sites.	78
6. Duration of Programs Including An Observation Tour. . .	79
7. Type of Training Program by Training Field.	80
8. Duration of Programs Including Time Spent at a University	81
9. Training Field and Duration of Training: By Periods and Median Lengths of Training	82
10. Participants' Views on Importance of Five Factors in their Selection.	83
11. Perceived Importance of Language Ability as Selection Factor by Confidence in Own English Language Skills .	84
12. Perceived Importance of Two Contrasting Factors in Being Selected, by Occupational Status	85
13. Per Cent Who Say 'Personal Contacts Were Important in My Selection' by Country	86
14A. Satisfaction with Prior Orientation: Information About Program Elements.	87
14B. Satisfaction with Prior Orientation: Information About Country of Training	87
15. Satisfaction with Program Prior to Departure by Participants' Views of Adequacy of Orientation About Details of Program	88
16. Satisfaction with Program Prior to Departure by Participants' Views of Adequacy of Orientation About Country of Training.	89

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table	Page
17. Extent of Participants' Role in Planning Their Programs by Occupational Status at Selection.	90
18. Organizational Plans for Use of Participant's Training by Prior Involvement of Supervisor in Program	91
19. Completeness of Program Arrangements in Training Country by Year of Departure.	92
20. Attendance at Orientation Sessions in Training Country by Year of Departure.	93
21. Satisfaction with Three Core Elements of Training Program	94
22. Evaluation of the Level of Their Training Programs by Training Site.	95
23. Length of Program Desired by Duration of Training	96
24. Index of Satisfaction with Core Elements of Program by Adequacy of Orientation About Details of Program	97
25. Satisfaction with Three Context Elements of Training Program	98
26. Evaluation of Visits to Private Homes by Training Site.	99
27. Adequacy of Per Diem Allowances by Occupational Status at Selection	100
28. Amount of Free Time Allowed on Program for Personal Interests, by Training Site.	101
29. Index of Satisfaction with Context Elements of Program by Adequacy of Orientation About Country of Training	102
30. Difficulty with English on Program by (A) Training English, and by (B) Confidence in Own Skills.	103
31. Attendance at Communications Seminars and Use of Seminar Content in Work by Year of Departure	104
32. Unemployment After Program by First Job After Program	105
33. First Job After Program by Age at Departure	106

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table	Page
34A. Plans for Future Use of Training by Time Back From Program.	107
34B. Plans for Future Use of Training by Past Use of Training	107
35. Overall Satisfaction with Training by Rating of the Importance of the Program.	108
36. The Supervisors' and U. S. Technicians' Views of the Importance of the Participants' Training by Duration of Training	109
37. Subjective Assessment of Career Value of Training by Age at Departure	110
38. Subjective Assessment of Career Value of Training by History of Job Mobility.	111
39. Supervisor Role in Utilizing Training by Current Work Context: Anyone Trained Abroad.	112
40. Contact with USOM Since Returning from Training by Current Occupational Status.	113
41. Utilization of Training by Selected Participant and Program Characteristics	114
42. Utilization of Training by Beliefs and Evaluations Concerning the Pre-Departure Phase.	117
43. Utilization of Training by Satisfaction with Core and Context Elements of Their Program	119
44. Utilization of Training by Conditions and Circumstances Related to the Post-Program Period. . .	120

Introduction

This is a report of a study designed to evaluate the conduct and effects of a U. S. program of technical assistance that has been in existence for almost two decades. A decision was made in 1959 to launch a comprehensive program of research on the Participant Training Program of I.C.A., the immediate predecessor agency of the Agency for International Development. The official paper in which this policy decision was described made these basic points:

. . . The Participant Training Program is a training and educational program of major magnitude. It is an integral component of the I.C.A.-host countries' economic development programs, whose broad objectives it is designed to serve. . . . Is [it] succeeding in its objectives? The great need is for a systematic evaluation employing standardized content and methodology in all countries.

It is the policy of I.C.A. to conduct systematic periodic evaluation studies of returned participants on a world-wide basis and to utilize information resulting from these studies to (1) determine the extent to which the program is meeting its objectives, and (2) improve future and current training programs.

After consultations and extensive pretests, a standard personal interview schedule of 146 items was constructed for use with participants in all countries where the program was of sufficient size to warrant systematic study. The interview was conducted in the language most appropriate to the former trainee's cultural context; in some countries this involved as many as three different versions of the basic interview schedule. Translations and re-translations of questions and responses, and the coding of the interview data, were done in accordance with carefully worked-out, highly detailed procedures in order to achieve maximum analytic comparability. Other special questionnaires were prepared for use with work supervisors and U. S.

technicians who were asked to give personal evaluations of the participants, and general assessments of the program as a whole.

The content of the questionnaires was shaped principally by the administrative needs of the agency for precise and detailed information on a wide variety of subjects, but also by the results of earlier studies of the program in a few countries, and the cumulative experiences of other programs of cross-national research. The surveys were conducted by a wide variety of local research organizations, specially-constituted survey teams, and contract consultants, each of whom was responsible for the preparation of a report based on the data from his particular country. A full set of the survey results was sent to Washington, in the form of IBM cards, for use in analysis on regional and world-wide bases, and for other special studies.

To date, studies have been made in 30 countries, with dates of completion ranging from mid-1960 to the present. The data from studies in 23 of the countries are combined for this analysis; the studies were completed mainly in 1961 and 1962, and the data had been sent to Washington by the fall of 1963. Initially, it had been hoped that a common cut-off date could be used in determining the eligibility status of returned participants in all countries, but this proved to be impossible. As it worked out, eligibility was separately established in each country after making a complete listing of all participants who had been back from training for at least six months. In about half the countries, because of the large numbers thus identified, systematic sampling was done to keep study costs at a manageable level.

From all reports, considerable ingenuity was shown by many of the study teams in meeting the design specifications, and in securing the necessary clearances and concurrences from U. S. and host country agencies. Most participants seemed genuinely pleased at the chance this survey afforded to discuss, examine, and, in a sense, to re-live their training programs. Although the exigencies of time and place, as well as language differences, have contributed to sources of variation in analysis of results on a comparative basis, the critical issue of personal acceptance of the research was uniformly judged not to have been problematic.

Broadly viewed, the survey was designed to provide comparative data of three types:

1. The nature and scope of the training program in each country, including information on participants from the earliest years.
2. Participants' evaluations of their preparation for training, and of various aspects of the course and conduct of their programs, including information on their professional and social adjustment.
3. Measures of the utilization of skills and knowledge gained from training, and of factors which are associated with varying levels of effectiveness.

The yield from the surveys in the 23 countries whose results are pooled in this analysis¹ was rich; some selectivity in reporting was required. Many of the factual items and almost all of the attitude and opinion items touch upon or bear directly on past or current agency policy. The patterning of many answers, therefore, provides evidence

¹The author gratefully acknowledges the assistance of Mr. G. Petersen, Mr. D. Potter, Mr. J. Kert and Miss J. Klein in the preparation of this report.

for judgments and inferences about the efficacy in operation of parts of the program, and the degrees to which the various goals and purposes of this complex mode of technical assistance are being achieved. Evaluative findings can be viewed from a diversity of perspectives, depending upon the scope of each reader's responsibility for policy or operations. One of the strengths of this method of evaluation is its capacity to serve such a variety of complementary needs and interests.

In this report we will present findings of all three types, both to exemplify the value of this strategy of evaluation, and to present a compact summary of the nature and conduct of the whole training program on a world-wide basis. Our selection from the array of findings, while guided by these two major purposes, was influenced also by certain necessary methodological limitations when pooling data from 23 separate country studies.

The interview schedule for former participants which was the primary tool for data-gathering was designed to follow the typical flow of experiences of the people selected for the training programs. It began with items of information about his status, background and prior training, then went on to details of the selection process, orientation and program planning prior to departure for training, including the participant's own role in these preliminary stages.

The largest number of questions was devoted to the varied aspects of the training phase itself, involving items which sought both factual

information and personal evaluations. Prior studies and administrative needs served as guides in deciding which aspects of the training experience could most usefully be put in the focus of attention.

Finally, the third major section of the interview dealt with the experiences of the participant upon his return home, and the role and value that his training has had in this whole subsequent period. Some items were included on aspects of his work situation and career, and on his contact with U. S. technical assistance programs and personnel, in order to assess the role of environmental supports for and barriers to the utilization of training.

We shall follow this flow of the interviews in presenting our analysis of results. Emphasis will be placed on both sources of variation and contrast in fact and opinion, and on interrelations among the findings, in the search for significant patterns and their explanation.

Programs and Participants: Facts and Views

In the years since its inception, in several countries the study was conducted with a sample of the participants, rather than with all who met the specified criteria, because of the large numbers involved. This has made it necessary to weight the results for each country in combining them, to ensure proper balance. (While variations in findings on some items among countries are sometimes sizable and often intriguing, we will, with rare exceptions, not pursue this line of comparative analysis here.) By this device, one gains greater analytic assurance in

the representativeness of the cited findings for the set of countries on whose participants' responses they are based. A total of 9,668 participants were interviewed, representing 19,025 returned participants in all (Table 1).²

The participants, 9 in 10 of whom were men, came primarily from jobs in governmental agencies (75%) or with nationalized industries. The remainder came from private industry (10%), the professions (3%), unions (2%), or were students (2%). Drawn largely from the upper and middle levels of government, they had been employed in their specialties for over five years on the average, with more than a third having over ten years of experience (Table 2). Consonant with these levels of occupational status, their educational achievements were exceptional: only 1 in 4 had not attended a university (more than half had not, among the under-25 age group), and most held degrees (Table 3).

In sum, the participants were, for the most part, mature and seasoned administrators, professionals and technicians, perhaps the key cadre for accomplishing the major tasks of development in their countries. They were chosen for advanced training in a great diversity of fields, the major groupings being (in order of frequency) Agriculture, Industry and Mining, Education, Health, and Public Administration. Programs have been devised according to individual need and administrative capability, and over the years some shifts in relative emphasis are

²All tables are printed in sequence at the end of the text.

observable (Table 4). More recently, the fields of Transportation, Communications, and Labor have experienced a relatively greater influx; in general, the top priority tasks for any developing country are suitably reflected in these figures on fields of training.

In line with other historically-specific changes, both in the demand and available opportunities for certain types of training programs, the choice of sites where training programs are conducted have also varied proportionately. While all programs were held in the United States in the early years, more recently the use of "third countries" as sites is increasing, as is the type of program combining^a U. S. visit with training in a third country (Table 5). The proportion of participants trained only in the U. S. has, thus, declined steadily.

Training programs may be broadly classified as being of three sorts: observation tours, on-the-job training, and periods of study at universities or colleges (either as part of a special group, or as regularly enrolled students). The single most frequently employed type of program is an observation tour, usually of less than four months duration, but slightly longer if it is the only type of program (Table 6). For, in fact, a majority of programs combine two types of training; the actual mixture varying sharply by the field in which training is given (Table 7). For example, Education programs are usually given at universities, alone or in combination with a (briefer) observation tour. The most diversified set of programs are in Atomic Energy, where more than a third have

combined all three major types of training. And some programs, such as those in Trade and Investment, consisted chiefly of observation tours alone.

As is true of observation tours, if only one type of program is given it tends to be of longer duration than if it is offered in some combination (Table 8). Almost two-thirds of the programs which involved only university study lasted a year or longer; this reflects the earlier-cited distinction between regular and special programs conducted in universities.

These varied types and combinations of programs, constructed to the requirements of the fields in which the participants are to be trained, lead to sizable variations in the duration of training. The fields which schedule university study more frequently, are also those with longer programs. For the sample as a whole, the median program was of nine months' duration, with the more advanced technical training typical in fields such as Health, Education, and Atomic Energy lasting far longer, and programs in some others, such as Labor or Trade and Investment being of decidedly briefer length (Table 9).

These factual data were derived from answers to a series of very detailed questions, making possible a set of comparisons that would otherwise be laborious or difficult, unless record-keeping is specially tailored to facilitate them, e. g. trends over time, or contrasts among fields of training. Such basic distinctions as these also, of necessity, form the backdrop for participants' evaluations of their programs,

favorable and otherwise. Having introduced them as the key characteristics of participants and their training programs, we can now turn to the expressed views on aspects of their experiences; the focus will be on their subjective assessments and the circumstances or conditions that give rise to them or that shape the magnitude of their expression.

The Predeparture Period

Selection

One of the most critical stages in the conduct of the program, from the perspective of ultimate use of training, is the selection process. Most participants are selected by others, rather than through any actions they initiated themselves. The factors that enter into such selection decisions have, therefore, direct bearing on the results that training can produce. The choice of people who are inadequately equipped through prior experience, to profit from such programs, or inappropriately motivated, for whatever reasons, almost certainly would set limits on the amount learned, and subsequently used.

The single most important actor in the process of selection was the work supervisor of the participant; just over half of the participants saw their supervisor as the chief decision-maker. About equal numbers (10%) saw either the U. S. agency office or their sponsoring Ministry as the locus of decision. The rest were widely scattered. The vital importance of the role played by the returned participant's supervisor, encountered here initially, will be a recurring theme at later points in the analysis.

What were the significant bases for selection, in the participants' views? They were asked to gauge the relevance of several factors for their own selection, two clearly more impersonal (professional qualifications, needs of the job), one bearing on motivation (personal ability), one relating to (English) language facility, and one--personal contacts--which presumably would represent a retrogressive basis for selection (Table 10).

For the three more "acceptable" bases, nine in ten thought each was an important factor in his selection: qualifications, job needs, personal ability. The perceived importance of the language factor hinged, of course, on whether the participant's program required English, and among those needing English, their confidence in their skills. The greater their skill, the more often language was seen as an important factor (Table 11). (It will be remembered that all these judgments are retrospective on the part of the participant. In this instance one's ease with English while on the program may have inflated his estimate of its importance at the (earlier) selection stage.)

The fifth, and less "legitimate" factor at first glance, personal contacts, was least often admitted as having been an important basis for one's selection; just over one-third of the participants saw it as having played some role, in contrast, for example with the more "acceptable" and impersonal factor of job needs (Table 12). But the contrast among people in different occupational statuses, with those at the top and bottom more often claiming personal contacts as important

in their case than the solid core of professionals, technicians and administrators, alerts us to another possible meaning of the term. For some of these people at the status extremes, personal contacts may simply mean "visibility": the opportunity to become known and considered by selectors, by virtue of their position, (for example, to U. S. agency personnel) thus enhancing their chances. (Those seeing U. S. agency personnel as their selectors were also much more likely to adjudge personal contacts important in their case.)

On the other hand, the very sizable differences among countries in the proportion judging personal contact important (Table 13) together with the increasing proportions asserting its importance with increasing age (31% among those under 35, but 58% among those over 55, with the middle age group intermediate) suggest that the more familiar meaning has some relevance too. A close look at these country differences will also lend some conviction to the claim that this method of evaluation can touch successfully on some quite sensitive issues, if properly prepared and executed.

Orientation and Planning

After selection, there remains a period of time of varying length for orienting the selected participant on aspects of his program and the country to which he will be sent. This process of information-giving is spotty, with less than half getting any information at their place of employment (usually by one's supervisor and chiefly on the content of his training) and just over a quarter being briefed at all by the

governmental Ministry which is formally sponsoring them (again, mainly on the content of the proposed training). The extent of possible U. S. agency involvement prior to the participant's departure can be gauged by the fact that 60% of all participants said they had no contact at all with the local U. S. office. (Prior contact was much more frequent among those at the top in occupational status and much less so among the lowest statuses than the figure for the group as a whole.)

More specifically, each participant was asked to evaluate the orientation he had received (from whatever source) in two areas: details on the program of training, and on the country of training. For each area, five elements were singled out (Tables 14A and B). Some gaps in program information seem, even from a charitable viewpoint, to be excessive: e. g. over one-fourth of the sample was not given "enough information on where (they) would be going," and the actual contents of their program was not adequately clarified prior to departure for two out of five.

These shortcomings had the consequence of starting the participant off on his program in a less than adequately satisfied frame of mind (Table 15). Among those least adequately briefed, only one in three remember leaving their home in a satisfied mood, while among those adequately briefed on all five points concerning their program almost three-fourths remember being "well satisfied." This initial mood of satisfaction, based so largely on fulfilling cognitive needs through the orientation process is of great influence in the subsequent reaction to the total program experience.

The orientation process seems to have worked more adequately in covering important details about the country (chiefly the United States) in which the participants would be trained (Table 14B). Almost 60 per cent had no complaints about the five major classes of information supplied to them. And, the proportion who remember their mood prior to departure as being 'well satisfied' is less affected by orientation of this type (Table 16). Their maturity and the relative sophistication associated with their position and educational background account in part for this finding. Those younger or of lower occupational status were both less adequately briefed on their country of training, and less satisfied before going abroad.

Satisfaction with the orientation on country of training varies sharply with the training site: those going to Japan or only to the United States for training were proportionately much more adequately briefed, and those going to Lebanon or Taiwan much less so than the over-all average. And the trend over the years as revealed in comparisons on the proportions satisfied is one of slight but steady improvement.

Program Planning

While not feasible for all programs, the active involvement of the participant in the planning of his program is another element in the short-run and long-range effectiveness of training. One of the more tested propositions in the research literature on people's reactions to a changing social context is that their sense of participating in the

decisions that shape such changes facilitates subsequent adjustment and leads to more effective performance. Thus, active participation is a powerful motivational support. Since over 60 per cent of our sample took no part at all in program planning, this potential is hardly being sufficiently exploited, the more so when we also observe that one in five of those who did play some active role still felt inadequately brought into the planning process.

There are patterns in the degree to which an active involvement in planning was possible, or at least achieved: those older, more experienced, and especially higher in occupational status, more often took some part (Table 17).

For those taking some part in planning, the resulting program of training clearly had a deeper personal significance. One-third of them felt their program was based mainly on their own ideas, and another half of the active participants saw the content of their program as the outcome of their ideas and those of others equally. By extension, those taking no part felt more acted upon than cooperatively engaged during their training. Another opportunity to help shape their program, with a resulting sense of greater involvement, occurred at a later point for some participants, and we shall return to this theme.

While program planning is a complex and time-consuming administrative process, its ultimate goal--building up the pool of skills relevant to development efforts--depends also upon a concurrent and crucial commitment made within the governmental structure of the

participant's home country. Development theory and practice presupposes, and recent agency policy requires the employing organization in the developing country to have a plan for the use of the training the participant is to receive. If subsequent use of training is dependent on many contingencies that cannot be foreseen, it is, minimally at least, dependent on the degree of commitment to use it represented by the existence of such a plan. For this item, we can turn to the results of the questionnaire given to the participants' supervisors, those in a position to have known of the existence of such a plan or commitment.

For seven out of eight of the participants whose supervisors we questioned about this matter, some prior plan was said to have existed. And here again, we observe the crucial role of the involvement of the supervisor in the total program (Table 18). Where the supervisor was minimally or noninvolved, neither recommending the man nor helping to plan his training, plans were far less likely to have been made. Among the most active supervisors almost all participants' training programs were integrated with some plan for subsequent use. The conclusion seems inescapable that both the participant and his superior need to be drawn actively into the planning process to the greatest extent possible.

Evaluation of the Program

Up to now we have been laying out the basic characteristics of participants and the major predeparture activities. In this section we

turn to the heart of an evaluation of the training experience: the views of the participants on key aspects of their programs. Training is generally considered within the agency to consist of two distinct though related segments: the "technical" or substantive aspects of the program, and the "nontechnical" aspects, having mainly to do with financial and social arrangements. This second segment is not inferior in importance in planning, since it covers all those factors which make for a satisfactory adjustment of the participant while away from home, work, and family. We will refer to the technical aspects as the "core" and the nontechnical aspects as the "context," for convenience in analysis.

Arrival

Upon arrival in the primary country of training the participant enters the second stage of his program, and sometimes encounters another opportunity to influence his fate.

For five in nine participants the program arrangements encountered upon arrival were complete and final. This degree of completeness has been on the increase since the early years of the program (Table 19), and is also greater for shorter programs, or for those less well educated or with briefer work experience in their specialties. The programs given in countries outside the U. S. were fully arranged for as many as 80 per cent of participants, while those going to universities encountered greater flexibility in arrangements.

Formal orientation sessions of more than one day's duration were received by about two-thirds of the participants upon arrival; this

proportion has not changed since the earliest period of the program (Table 20), although the actual locations of the sessions have shifted with the flow of trainees. This holds mainly for U. S. arrivals, 75 per cent of whom attended such orientation sessions; those going to other countries show much smaller proportions. Most who do attend respond favorably to the experience, and for some with the sort of informational needs analyzed earlier, the session must provide a welcome second chance. Another source of information, guidance and encouragement is one's program manager, whom almost all participants meet at this initial stage. Again, those countries used for shorter programs, which also place less emphasis on formal orientation, also have proportionally fewer participants who are assigned such liaison officials. In the United States, they tend to be located in the agency or office chiefly responsible for the major part of a participant's program.

The Core of the Program

Many detailed questions were asked about the substantive elements of training. Of these, three will be selected for analysis: the length, level, and the variety or complexity of the program as experienced by each of our respondents (Table 21). Their evaluations of each of these aspects vary, and the bases for these judgments seem to be equally diverse.

The level at which the training was pitched seemed to be appropriate for the great majority: four in five were satisfied and three-fourths of the rest thought the level to have been too simple rather than too

demanding. Judgments about the level of training seem often to be based on the sites of training, with the types of programs and facilities each has to offer (Table 22), to a slight extent on the participant's prior work experience (those less experienced being more satisfied), and on the length of the program, with those either on brief or very long (university) programs being more satisfied than those on programs of intermediate lengths. And those having received prior information about the level of training were also less dissatisfied.

Those with unfavorable evaluations of the length of their program were almost uniform in asserting that it was too short. More intensive analysis showed how patterned this degree of dissatisfaction was: about equal proportions were satisfied with their program's duration for every category of length, ranging from less than two months to more than twelve. (Table 23: The first part of the table, read across, reveals the proportions who wanted no changes in the length of their programs. In the lower section, the length of program that was desired is shown for participants grouped by the actual duration of their program.) The results of this analysis lend support to the generalization: (for those dissatisfied) the longer the actual program, the greater the additional time wanted.

This finding is also related to the general observation on the "degree-mindedness" of the visitor from underdeveloped countries, especially among those whose training encompasses university studies short of a degree. Among those attending university at all, just over

half of the regular students got degrees, but only 5 per cent of the others did so. Three-fourths of all those who didn't get a degree, whether regular or special students, believed a degree would have helped their career. (The proportions interested in a degree among those whose programs did not involve university study cannot be ascertained. Some inkling of their sentiment can be gotten from the finding that equal proportions of those both with and without prior degrees from universities believed that getting a degree while on training would have been an asset to their careers.)

While half the respondents were satisfied with the variety of the program, the remainder split about 5 to 3 on whether they had had too little or too much to see and do. No sharp differences in the relative balance among these unsatisfactory alternatives were discernable through further analysis, except for a slight tendency for more recently returned participants (who had been on shorter programs) to complain more about the excessive demands their program made in this regard.

As a summary measure of satisfaction with these three core elements of their programs, we built a "program satisfaction" index, classifying each person by how many of the three core elements he evaluated favorably. By this device, we find only a fourth who expressed their approval with all three aspects of their program, with another third judging two out of three as satisfactory (Table 24). Recalling our earlier discussion on the role of predeparture briefing about the details of the program we observe a slightly more favorable over-all view on their program among

those who were forearmed with fuller knowledge of what lay ahead. The proportion ranked "low" on satisfaction with these core elements rises from one-third among those who had been adequately briefed to almost one-half among those having had several questions unanswered before going abroad. But the chief sources of dissatisfaction with the program lay within the training phase of the program, as is evidenced by the strong intercorrelations among these three evaluative attitudes.

Context of the Program

Out of the varied questions in the survey dealing with the context of the program (the "nontechnical" aspects, as they are usually termed), we shall explore three more intensively, making briefer reference to one or two others. These three are the participants' satisfaction with the extent of social activities arranged for them, the amount of money allotted them for expenses, and the related question of whether adequate time was left them for their personal interests (Table 25). Unlike those relating to the core of the program, these were more generally judged satisfactory, but again the reasons for such evaluations varied with the issue, with one key exception: A consistent source of variations in judgments was the training site, or country to which the participant was sent. We will take up each item in turn.

The amount of planned social activities, whatever form they took, was deemed insufficient by a quarter of the sample. Few patterned differences in this level of satisfaction were discovered, although

those on briefer programs were slightly more dissatisfied, as were those of middle age, compared with younger or older men. But those trained in Lebanon, Taiwan and U. S. territories (e.g., Canal Zone, Hawaii) were more satisfied, and those trained in Japan or in any two countries less so than others, which includes the great bulk of U. S. trainees. Given the time span represented in this survey, and the changes that can have occurred in any or all of these sites, further specification of this relationship seems unwarranted.

One type of arranged social activity which is strongly promoted in international exchange programs is home visits. The stimulus to deeper understanding that such personal contacts are said to create have elevated this activity to the highest priority status. About five in six participants had such an opportunity, and almost all responded with enthusiasm to questions about its worth (Table 26). But again, there were sharp variations in the extent to which opportunities for such visits existed, when we compare the training sites. Only for those who went to the U. S. does the proportion rise above two-thirds, and in countries like Lebanon and others with small annual numbers of trainees, the proportion is closer to a half. Those on briefer tours (especially if traveling as part of a special group) and those with less formal education have had such visits slightly less often on their schedule.

Money was felt to have been adequate by 70 per cent of our sample. Judgments on the adequacy of the money supplied them for expenses are

clearly linked with all manner of personal status considerations. For example, those who were at the top in occupational status when selected expressed dissatisfaction much more often (and students much less often) than others (Table 27). Then, those who lived abroad or were living in their capital cities at selection were less satisfied than those residing in the provinces and rural areas of their countries. Older trainees, and especially those who were married were more often dissatisfied. Variations by country of training existed too, with Japan and Puerto Rican-trained participants more often satisfied, and those trained in two countries less so than others. In general, the longer the period of training, the greater was the satisfaction. This correlates also with the type of training: those on observation tours (which involve a great deal of travel and short stays) had more complaints than those whose programs permitted them to stay in one place. As one would expect, the cost of living abroad, of living apart from one's family and outside a familiar routine of life, led inevitably to some disgruntlement.

The time for one's personal interests was deemed inadequate by about 40 per cent of the sample, almost all speaking of too little time. Here too, the type of training and the country in which it was received made for variations in participants' evaluations (Table 28). Again, status, age and the duration of one's program affected judgments about the adequacy of free time: those who were older, higher in status, or on briefer programs were all less satisfied than their counterparts.

An index was constructed, classifying the participants by satisfaction with each of the three items relating to the context of their program. A third of them felt all three elements were satisfactory, while just over one-fourth were satisfied with only one or none of them. Prior orientation about their country of training (which influenced attitudes on all three issues, as we have seen) served to alter the general balance of satisfaction somewhat (Table 29). Those more adequately briefed were classified as proportionally more often satisfied than those who hadn't been given much information about the country where they would receive their training. But attitudes concerning these issues, more central to the participants' social adjustment, were less influenced by the rational process of information-giving.

The problems of loneliness, of communications in a language not one's own, of achieving constructive social relationships while in a transitory status are too profound to admit of ready or simple administrative solutions. The central issue that can be faced in evaluating this program, with participants of greater maturity and prior achievement than some other exchange and training programs, is: assuming one does what is feasible in easing the path toward a successful learning experience, what differences do attitudes on program aspects outside the core of the training process make? Clearly, a happy and satisfying personal experience for each trainee can be an ideal to aim for in program planning, but realistically one can expect at best to achieve a good proportion of successful outcomes of this kind. We shall make an assessment of this sort in the next section, dealing with utilization of training.

Communications Skill

As a final piece of data on the participants' experiences with their program, we shall briefly touch on the problem of language ability and on the ability to communicate their new-found skills and knowledge. Most of the training given so far has been in the United States, and all but about 15 per cent of the participants, wherever trained, required a knowledge of English. In recognition of the crucial importance of an adequate grasp of the language if anything approaching the program's potential is to be realized, language training has been made widely available. Of those whose programs required English, 37 per cent elected (or were offered) such training. But this type of training is less powerful an influence on the extent of problems with language encountered on the program than one's prior knowledge of English (Tables 30A and B). Those who took training still encountered some sort of difficulty with English far more often than those who did not. The general picture of about half experiencing some difficulty is sharpened when related to a felt need for training. The only group that experienced a relatively easy time was the (numerically largest) group who neither had training nor wanted any (Table 30B). Clearly, there is a limit to the degree of fluency that can be achieved by such ad hoc training; equally, the problems associated with language inadequacies of this type remain serious and difficult of short-run solutions.

In recent years an attempt has been made to overcome another kind of communications problem: the art of transmitting one's new

skills and insights once back in his home environment. The mechanism that has been increasingly used is a "communications seminar," a week-long series of group discussions based on applied social science practices. Attendance at such sessions was confined almost wholly to U.S.-trained participants, more often those on programs of an intermediate length (4 - 12 months); between a fourth and a third attended these seminars held at a few locations around the country.

It is difficult to gauge the value of such a program by this mode of evaluation, since much depends on one's expectations about it. A clear majority of those who have gone to one of the seminars (70%) assert they have used some ideas or materials derived from it (Table 31). But there is a hint that its perceived value grows after some time has elapsed since one's return home, whatever its more immediate functions for those who take part in it. One such function may be as a "decompression tank"--a chance to exchange views in congenial circumstances with a group of people who underwent a similar experience, often after a period of rather complete isolation on foreign soil.

The communications seminar, for those who go, is the final element in the training process. The next section will deal with some consequences of the program, its uses and its effects, once the participant returns home.

The Return Home: Careers and Utilization

Many programs of international exchange, education and training have used survey techniques in exploring participants' beliefs, attitudes and evaluations. Few have followed the trainee home and sought to document the long-term effects of their programs; this present survey is unusual in that its primary focus is on what has taken place after training. An effective training program is one whose results are realized in the participants' home countries. All the facets of the program discussed so far are, in a sense, preconditions and precursors, serving to define the nature of the training program as it was actually experienced. The ultimate test of the program's worth, apart from more personal satisfactions with it, is its usefulness for former participants when working on the development-related projects which were the main vehicles for their selection.

Criteria of Effectiveness

We have incorporated a series of direct and indirect measures of effectiveness and utilization, based on a variety of criteria. Briefly put, the ideally effective program recipient must have completed a (satisfactory) program, returned to be placed in the right job, used his training and/or have plans for use, give concrete examples of its value in action, pass on some of the new-found skills and knowledge (the "multiplier effect"), and subjectively view the program as having

been an asset for his career, satisfactory and important to him. We will touch upon each of these elements, and then explore their interrelations with those analyzed earlier.

Almost all (96%) who leave for training see the program through to completion, and the reasons given for breaking off training show little personal or official disenchantment; most were because of circumstances that did not reflect critically on the program. A second factual criteria for an effective program is the subsequent employment patterns of the participants. Periods of unemployment, especially if they are in some sense related to their having gone on training, represent a wasteful and even harmful sequel to training, both for the (presumably) more valuably skilled individual and for his country, with its critically short supply of such people.

The unemployment experienced by our respondents should ideally be compared with the general unemployment situation obtaining in their countries over the relevant time periods, and such data are not available. Just over 3 per cent of all former participants have experienced any unemployment, most of them only for brief periods. A number of these men explicitly linked their jobless periods with their training (perhaps a fourth, in all), and this link can be clearly seen when comparing those returning to the same job held prior to training with those who were relocated upon their return (Table 32). The proportions experiencing unemployment vary sharply, with those who returned to an unexpectedly different job having an unemployment rate almost four

times the average for the sample. Much of this job-changing is, of course, related to the career changes that are normal with changes in age. Younger participants, particularly those whose status on the program was that of a full-time degree candidate show less job stability, and correspondingly more unexpected placement in new jobs than older trainees (Table 33). At the time of interview only a fourth of those under age 30 at selection were in the same job as the one held prior to training, compared with almost twice as many (40 - 50%) of their older colleagues. At a later point another influence of such career patterns on participants' evaluations of the value of their training will be shown. As a brief summary on the matter of adequate job placement, we can say that 85 to 90 per cent of all trainees, whatever their age, returned to an expected position, one which afforded some scope for putting their training into practice. Thus, one of the key objective conditions for effective use was realized in a heavy preponderance of cases.

The participants were asked directly about the extent to which they have used and transmitted the substance of their training. Later, they were asked to describe some work accomplishments of which they were proud, and probed for the role that training may have played. The answers to the first two questions, on use and transmission, will be analyzed more fully below, when the results of an index based on them will be presented. Seven out of eight participants reported having made some constructive use of their training, about two-thirds of whom felt

they had made optimum use (either quite a bit or almost everything) of what they had learned. Equal proportions reported having conveyed at least some aspects of their training to others, mainly in informal discussion, but quite often also through formally arranged lectures or training sessions.

Whether they had further plans for putting their training to some use (other than they had already done) depended in part on how long they had been back from their programs, and on the extent to which they had already made use of some aspects of training. From one perspective, training might be conceived to be a wasting asset, most valuable in the early posttraining period; again, greater or lesser application of the substance of training might either stimulate new plans for use or exhaust the perceived potential of the training.

Five in nine participants still had some plans or intention to put their training to use. This intention wanes over the years, and with past inability to have made use of their training (Tables 34A and B). But those who have made some use conserve their intentions to a greater degree than those who have not. Plans for subsequent use declines steadily among the latter group with the passage of time, while for the former group, the proportion still having some plans never falls below 50 per cent. These plans were usually not vague or just good intentions. Most participants were able to supply definite examples, and some stipulated the concrete conditions that would need to be changed in order for their intentions to be realized.

The level of satisfaction with which the participant now views his training is high: More than nine in ten rated themselves as either "very satisfied" (47%) or "moderately satisfied" (44%), with a slight tendency for satisfaction to grow with the passage of time, and to be somewhat greater in proportion the longer the training program had lasted. Appraisals of the importance of training by each participant, by their supervisors and by a competent U. S. observer (usually a technical adviser) were couched in slightly different terms, but showed a high level of agreement.

For the participants, a characterization of the program as "one of the most important things" they had ever done won the assent of about two-thirds; a greater proportion among those more satisfied (80%) and a much smaller proportion (32%) among those least satisfied viewed their program's importance, in retrospect, in such impressive terms (Table 35).

Supervisors and U. S. technicians were also asked to judge the importance of the participant's training for his current job. Each group rated the programs of about three-fourths of the participants as having been highly important. These judgments were strongly influenced by the duration of the training programs being judged: the longer the participants' programs the more likely were they to be termed "essential" or "major" in importance (Tables 36A and B). These parallel findings are most impressive, since they were wholly independently determined.

At the heart of the issue of the personal significance of training for each of the returned participants is the assessment of its career

value. There must be some minimum of personal advantage to be gained from the whole training process if the motivation to make good use of it is to be assured. Development projects require a steady commitment on the part of those engaged in their execution, and some prospect of improving one's lot or conditions can supply some of the fuel necessary for innovation and perseverance.

The participants were asked to make a personal assessment of how training has influenced their careers. Sixty per cent felt that the experience made no material difference in this connection, while a fourth saw their program as actually having led to an improvement in their job situation. This finding, like those relating to the actual career patterns of the participants discussed earlier, are sizably affected by the age of the person doing the assessing (Table 37). Younger men, who have been more mobile, more often viewed the program as a career enhancement (and less often unrelated to their job situation) than their older colleagues.

This relationship can be further clarified by looking at the mobility that has objectively taken place as an influence upon the subjective assessment of the program's career value (Table 38). It is apparent that those who have not moved at all since the time of their selection attach the least career significance to their training: four-fifths say their job would have been about the same without it (as indeed it seems to have been, even after training); the remainder are split about two-to-one between those seeing it as having helped and

those who thought it hurt (or couldn't say). By contrast, those who had moved into a new and unexpected job upon their return contained a greater proportion who thought the program had actually harmed their careers; as noted earlier, unexpected changes were associated with higher rates of posttraining unemployment. Those who changed jobs upon their return, and expected the change, also had the most favorable view of the career-relevance of their program; on balance, nine times as many felt they had profited as had been hurt by the experience.

Work Situation and U. S. Follow-up Contact

In earlier sections, we have had occasion more than once to note the strategic role that one's supervisor plays in the whole training process, and in evaluations of its aspects. His role in facilitating the use of training is no less significant, as we will show. The supervisor's own training, and that of other co-workers seems to act as an indirect influence on his willingness to facilitate the use of training (Table 39). If the supervisor was trained abroad (and/or other co-workers) the participant was more likely to adjudge his supervisor helpful than if the participant was the only one at his place of employment with a period of overseas training. The subtle influence at work here might be termed the "community of innovators": a participant in such a milieu does not have to bear alone the task of translating new ideas and skills into useful practices. He is perhaps less likely to face hostility or jealousy, and in turn, the general

outlook of supervisors and co-workers will be supportive of efforts toward realizing the values of one's training. The significance of this relationship between a participant's utilization of his training, his supervisor's facilitating role, and the overseas training experiences of supervisor and colleagues will be explored further in the last section of the report.

One final postprogram source of influence on subsequent utilization is the extent of U. S. follow-up contact or assistance which the participant has experienced. The encouragement, moral and material, that these contacts can supply are, potentially, a powerful form of leverage for modernizing efforts, building as they can upon prior acquaintance, and on the shared outlook on goals and means that is, to an extent, fostered by the training experience itself.

About one-fourth of the sample has worked on a U. S. assistance project, and another third has had at least some contact with the agency operations since returning. Two related factors are influential in determining the extent of follow-up contact: the current occupational status of the participant, and the extent of predeparture contact (which was in turn influenced by their occupational status at selection) (Table 40). Top level people more often have had some recent contact than others, especially those in the lowest category. And, with respect to prior contact, while three-fourths of all who said they had been in touch with the U. S. agency before going abroad have had some subsequent contact, only 46 per cent of those who had none before their training

have been in contact since coming home. Again, as we will show, both prior and subsequent contact with U. S. assistance operations and personnel heavily influence the ultimate utilization of training.

Utilization of Training

The variables and relationships we have discussed so far were selected for two reasons. First, they had independent significance as program dimensions or facets, and as sources of influence on reactions to them. But second, most of them are also strategic in the analysis of the study's central question: What are the discernible factors which affect the utilization of training? In the preceding part of this section we explored the key elements of the "effective program," both objective and subjective in character. Now we wish to focus solely on utilization of training and single out some of the main factors associated with higher and lower usage.

We constructed an index of utilization, based on the combination of answers to two questions already briefly discussed: how much each participant indicated he has used his skills on the job, and how much each indicated he has conveyed (transmitted) the substance of his training to others. We have divided the sample into four categories of utilization by this classificatory scheme:

- Very high: (37.7%): Those who have done both a great deal
- High: (30.2%): Those who have done both somewhat less
- Moderate: (21.1%): Those who have done either one a great deal (or somewhat less), but the other hardly at all
- Low: (11.0%): Those who have done little or none or both.

No absolute significance can be given to the resulting distribution of cases; a different set of distinctions would have led to slightly different categories, resulting in another frequency distribution. The resulting categories do, however, permit one to differentiate the participants in terms of the greater and lesser degree and modes of utilization reflected in their labels. The value of the index lies in its blending of the two major ways in which it is hoped that each man's training will contribute to development: through direct application and by indirect diffusion of the substance of the training.

For convenience, we have grouped the independent variables by the same pattern used in earlier sections: characteristics of participants and programs, the predeparture phase, the period of the program, and finally the postprogram phase. In each case, we will briefly state the relations among its principal aspects and utilization, and then try to draw these disparate findings together in a retrospective summary. (In the sections that follow we will employ phrases such as "higher utilizers" or "lower utilizers" as reporting conveniences, for example: "Those on shorter programs are lower utilizers." The full finding on which this statement is based would more properly be put: "When the sample is divided into groups according to the length of their training programs, the grouping whose programs were of shorter length contained a larger proportion of people classified by our index as 'low' utilizers and/or a smaller proportion classified as 'very high' or 'high' utilizers than the grouping whose programs were of comparatively longer duration."

The value that accrues in avoiding this ponderous formulation each time we document a finding seemed to us to outweigh the dangers of overstating the relationships or misleading the reader by the reportorial strategy we have chosen to employ.)

Participants and Program Characteristics

1. Age is related to subsequent use of training: excluding those 50 and older at selection, the older the participant the higher the utilization (Table 41A). Younger men, it will be recalled, more often experienced unexpected job mobility and higher rates of unemployment than their more senior co-participants.

2. Training fields show sizable variations in use. Those trained in the (more technical and substantive) fields of Health, Education, and Agriculture are higher utilizers and those in Labor and Public Administration lower utilizers than the patterning of utilization for the sample as a whole (Table 41B). This finding can be thought of as a capsule summary or composite of all the more detailed ways in which programs vary, since the training fields differ, on the average, in the length, level, complexity etc., of the programs each offered. (Some of the relations between these aspects and utilization are given below.)

3. The locations in which training was given, or training sites, seem also to show significant contrasts in patterns of training usage. Those trained mainly or wholly outside the United States, especially in Lebanon or in two countries are lower utilizers than those trained

chiefly in the U. S. (Table 41C). This finding requires caution in interpreting, since all countries send participants to the U. S., but only a few, mainly contiguous countries also send participants to each of the chief "third country" sites. More intensive analysis would be required to reveal the degree to which the site is implicated, in terms of the nature of the participants sent there, the types of programs offered, and the reactions to them. For the present, it seems safe to say that at least some "third countries" are inferior in their end-results than others (or the U. S.) as sites for training.

4. University training, the more preferred type as we saw earlier, and programs combining two or more types of training (usually observation tours and university or on-job-training) produced higher utilization than other specific types of programs, especially those which consisted of (briefer) observation tours alone (Table 41D). Earlier comments on the issue of "degree-getting," on a more settled rather than transitory existence while in training are apposite here. Perhaps the extent of the planning agency's (AID) control is relevant here, since programs at universities and colleges are more readily subject to planning and review than others, especially where training is given more as a courtesy or contribution than as a professional task.

5. Implicit in the prior discussion, the greater the duration of training the higher the subsequent utilization (Table 41E). This relationship is intertwined with other factors e. g., longer programs are more characteristic of "higher utilizing" training fields such as

Education or Health. Nonetheless, there is no question that program duration alone is a powerful influence on the ultimate value of the training experience, from the perspective of subsequent (technical) usage, and perhaps also from social and political points of view.

The Predeparture Phase

1. The choice of participants based on work-related criteria is strongly related to subsequent use of training. Utilization was greater among participants for whom the needs of the job was an important selection criterion (as it was for seven-eighths of the cases) than among those for whom it was not (Table 42A). On the other hand, the importance of one's personal contacts in being chosen is far less crucial; in fact, those for whom it played some role were, if anything, slightly but insignificantly higher in utilization (Table 42B). One implication of this finding is that selection on this basis need not be fatal to the goals of the program as long as personal contacts are not the sole or most significant criterion in a majority of cases.

2. The supervisor's scope of involvement in the total program process is an extremely important determinant of ultimate use of training. Participants whose supervisors were broadly involved were higher utilizers than was the case where supervisors were less so, or wholly detached in their role (Table 42C). This finding is in logical succession with the earlier-shown empirical results documenting the supervisor's crucial part in the success of the training program. He

has a "gatekeeper" role in the process, influencing its course at every turn: selecting able participants, helping to determine the most relevant training, controlling subsequent work assignments and job placements, and assisting or impeding (actively or by inertia) the process of applying lessons learned in training.

3. Training that was integrated with pre-existing plans for use resulted in greater utilization (Table 42D). Presumably this is a by-product of the broader process of committing a variety of resources according to some prior plan. In so doing, an organizational investment in innovation is developed, and conditions are created or fostered which facilitate the use of training. This empirical relationship lends strong support to the thesis of the importance of incorporating participant training in a more broadly-conceived schedule of plans and projects rather than on an ad hoc basis. As we will show below, organizational factors in the work environment of the returned participants are among the more influential forces shaping the use of his training.

4. As with supervisors' involvement, the scope of personal involvement by the participant at this early stage is related to subsequent utilization (Table 42E). Those who felt they had taken sufficient part in determining the nature of their program were higher utilizers upon returning home. In part, this was because greater involvement resulted in a more positive reaction to details of the program, but it may also have been related to the building up of a stronger motivational

support for utilization. Greater activity at the initial stages can lead to greater mastery of the details of the training and higher motivation to bring the lessons of one's past training into fuller realization.

5. Finally, as could be expected, the greater the satisfaction felt prior to departure, the higher the utilization (Table 42F). A mood of satisfaction with one's program prior to departure is dependent mainly on the extent of his personal involvement, coloring some reactions to details of the program. It is less strongly associated with ultimate use than conditions or circumstances which also affect it in turn, presumably because such a generalized evaluative judgment is quite subject to change under the pressure of new and concrete experiences.

The crucial points to be kept in mind about the influence of pre-departure factors upon the ultimate effectiveness of training are (a) the structural conditions represented by the scope and extent of supervisory activities, and the integration of training into some larger plan for resource mobilization, and (b) the degree of personal involvement of the participant in his future training, with its implications for motivation and learning.

The Period of the Program

Because of the space allotted previously to the analysis of evaluations of core and contextual aspects of the program, one might conclude that they are strongly associated with ultimate use. This

has not proved to be the case. It is necessary to distinguish among elements of the training program (its length, the level and scope of its content, etc.) evaluative responses to these elements, and the ultimate use of the training experience. In earlier sections, we have analyzed the interrelations of the first and the second, and the first with the third. Now in taking up the relations of the subjective evaluations of the program elements with utilization we find only traces of an important degree of carry-over between such evaluative judgments and the effectiveness of the training, as gauged by our utilization measure.

First, there is a small association between satisfaction with the core elements of the program and subsequent use (Table 42A). Those (26% of the sample) satisfied with all three core elements of the program (length, level, variety) are higher utilizers than others less satisfied. The differences are small, however, when compared with most of those we have previously documented, and smaller than some expectations about how prior attitudes affect subsequent behavior would have led one to predict.

When we turn to levels of satisfaction with context ("nontechnical") aspects of the program we are confronted with an even slighter relationship with ultimate utilization of training (Table 43B). These two findings, taken together and in comparison with those presented earlier and to be documented shortly, serve to indicate the greater importance of predeparture and postprogram phases for effective utilization, in

contrast to subjective reactions linked to the period of sojourn abroad, including the type of social adjustment implied by these data on satisfactions.

We can now tentatively answer the questions raised earlier in connection with the role of "nontechnical" factors and their consequences, at least within the limits imposed by these data. By the criterion of program effectiveness (in the sense of the use of new techniques and the "multiplier" effect) the context factors are not crucial. They contribute to a more pleasant period of training, and doubtless have other desirable effects not tapped by the methodology of this study. But they have demonstrably little significance for utilization of training, by themselves and especially when compared with other objective conditions and circumstances, or personal evaluations documented in this section of our analysis.

Why this is so, in view of the existence of much conventional wisdom pointing to the opposite conclusion would require further study and other types of research. One can suggest, however, that for a mature group of people from such diverse cultures and social systems, any attitudinal effects of this kind of program are likely to be grafted onto a rather stable system of personal and social values. In turn, the longer-range use of training is more likely to be shaped by aspects of the participants' (prior) personality and sociocultural context, and the changed or changing conditions he finds upon returning home. We turn now to this latter class of variables.

The Return Home and After

In this section we will use data from the three sources of evaluation data tapped by the survey: participants, their supervisors and knowledgeable U. S. technical assistance personnel. We have data from the supervisors of only 58 per cent of the participants, and from U. S. technicians for only 28 per cent of the participants. In fact, the overlap in comparative data from the three sources is small: for only 18 per cent of participants do we have data from all three sources, while we have data only from the participant himself in 33 per cent of the cases. For the rest, we have data either from participant and his supervisor (39%), or participant and some U. S. technician (9%).

Findings based on data from supervisors or technicians concerning participants are not, therefore, readily generalized to the sample of participants as a whole. We have looked for evidence of some sources of systematic bias, which could in part account for the presence or absence of evaluation data from participants' supervisors and/or U. S. technicians, and some minor ones were discovered. For example, higher status participants and those in their capital cities or rural areas when interviewed were also slightly more likely to have had some U. S. technicians who were asked for ratings. And, participants who have experienced little or no job mobility since they were selected for the program are somewhat more likely to have had their supervisors questioned about them. (All participants had to agree to have their supervisors interviewed even before an approach was made.)

Because of these known biases (and others not tested, or untestable), and the reduced proportions of participants with supervisory and U. S. technician ratings, findings based on these latter two sources cannot be generalized to the sample as a whole. They are often of sufficient strength as to warrant inclusion here, subject to these cautions, as relevant (but not conclusive) data on the importance of such factors.

1. Time back since completing the program is related to ultimate use. Those back more than four years (when interviewed) are higher utilizers than more recently returned participants; the relationship is linear and strong (Table 44A). A few factors may be operating here; some minimum time may be necessary to reorient oneself prior to making efforts at using training. And some period of time may be necessary before one can form a judgment about the success of one's efforts. In another sense, time is a limiting factor on the opportunity to use training, being related to career mobility or immobility, with its effects on utilization.

2. The particular pattern or history of job-changing since the program, which was in part influenced by training, also is related to contrasting patterns of utilization (Table 44B). Those who have never changed jobs (who less often saw their training as career-enhancing, as we showed earlier) are average in utilization of training. Those who returned home to an expected new job are significantly higher utilizers;

these are people whose training has materially enhanced their careers. Conversely, those who came home to an unexpectedly new job (who have experienced more unemployment, too) show the lowest rates of utilization of all. These findings document the complex ways in which training, personal career achievement, organizational responsiveness and ultimate utilization are all interrelated. The contours of a man's subsequent career are partly shaped by his training, and in turn influence the scope of opportunities and motivations to use the skills and techniques that training supplied.

3. At time of interview the participants were characterized by an occupational status, either (roughly) the same, or different than the one held at selection. One's current occupational status is less an influence on utilization than a shorthand way of delineating the levels of current (at interview) utilization, and some salient differences are visible (Table 44C). Those classed as professionals, who have, as part of their continuing responsibilities, the highest proportion of technology-related activities, are also the highest utilizers. Administrators, managers and policy-makers are next in line, above the average in utilization. Slightly below average we find the subordinate professionals and technicians, occupational statuses with much less autonomy in work-activities than those already mentioned. The lowest utilizers are those also lowest in status; they were primarily older men who had briefer programs, and also tended to have had little preprogram involvement, as well as having less autonomy on the job.

The association of current occupational status with utilization is weaker than most documented in this section, but one would expect this pattern of relationship from such an analytically mixed categorization. We have included it to give some empirical background to estimations of how one might expect utilization to be linked with occupational status at a later point in the participants' careers than at selection (when it served, if at all, as a basis for selection).

4. We constructed an index of "general satisfaction" with training, classifying each participant by his views, in retrospect, on the extent of his satisfaction together with the importance he ascribed to the program. Those termed "high" on this measure were both "very satisfied" with their training in retrospect, and thought it "one of the most important things (he'd) ever done." By contrast, all who adjudged training "a waste of time," when asked about its importance, were classified "low" on the index, no matter how they had answered the other component, the item on satisfaction.³

Participant satisfaction is strongly associated with utilization (Table 44D); those high on either tend to be high on both, while those low on either tend, correspondingly, to be low on both. It would be interesting to go beyond the significant degree of association of the two, to ascertain their causal linkage. A plausible argument could be constructed asserting the causal priority of either. For example,

³A discussion of the two components of the index may be found on page 51. Table 35 shows their empirical pattern of relationship.

"satisfaction" can be thought of as a capsule indicator of the level of motivation produced by the program; usage of training would, therefore, be partly the resultant of this antecedent motivational state. Or, the use of one's training may generate its own set or sense of rewards, making for a mellowed and, in retrospect, more favorable view of the training program. The data do not permit us to resolve the issue in favor of either alternative. To do so, a special study with a longitudinal research design would be necessary, allowing one to sort out the causal priority, over a period of time, of the subjective evaluations ("satisfaction") and the behavioral manifestations ("utilization").

5. The assessment of a training program's career value, its effects on current job placement or promotion, is strongly related to utilization (Table 44E). Those whose program was seen as having an enhancing effect on their career were far higher utilizers than those whose programs were judged irrelevant, or (in particular) those whose training was actually felt to have been detrimental. Assessments of the program in terms of its career effects are also related to the level of general satisfaction with the experience as measured by the index mentioned above. This lends support to the notion that subsequent events and conditions have more to do with utilization rates than those linked to preprogram or program phases; the perceived career value of training is, by definition, a judgment that can only be made after

time has passed since one's return home. The more training proves to have helped, the greater the satisfaction, and (correlatively) the higher the utilization. This finding, together with earlier ones on factors affecting the perception of training as career-enhancing, gives firm support to the conception of personal gain or commitment as crucial elements in the determination of an "effective" training program. Establishing a direct and specific linkage between one's present and future status and ultimate utilization would, from this viewpoint, provide a good deal of the necessary motivational basis for persistent efforts to make good use of one's training. National development and personal development are, in this sense, compatible goals for returned participants to pursue; to an extent, they can be mutually reinforcing. The potential value of the training experience might best be conceptualized in terms of the dual elements it serves: the national interest and enlightened self-interest.

6. At many points in the preceding analysis, attention has been drawn to the significance of the supervisor's role in the total program process. Perhaps his greatest influence is upon the critical matter of utilization. Participants who characterize their supervisors as "very helpful" in efforts to utilize training are higher utilizers than those whose supervisors are characterized as being less helpful, indifferent or, in some cases, even hostile (Table 44F). The supervisor's attitudes and actions concerning utilization are key aspects of the work

environment of the returned participant. As "gatekeepers" of organizational resources and response, the supervisor's role can prove decisive for the success or failure of his subordinates' attempts to introduce new techniques, institute new procedures and impart renewed vitality to the performance of their work tasks.

A complementary finding, confirming a perspective which places stress on the supervisor's part in the process, involves his own evaluations of the training received by his subordinates. Participants whose training was deemed "essential" or "very important" for their current work assignments by their supervisor were higher utilizers than others whose programs were more unfavorably viewed by their supervisors, (Table 44G). Thus, we have an empirical basis, involving both participants and supervisors for our assertion that a key element in ultimate utilization is the supervisor's prevailing attitudes and consequent actions. And, as we have amply documented, the wider his scope of involvement in program processes, the more favorable are the supervisor's attitudes. "Involvement" is no magic key, especially if it is more procedural than substantive, but it would seem to be a vital link in the chain of events and attitudes we have termed the "effective" program.

7. Another influential set of postprogram circumstances concerns the returned participants' contacts with U. S. Mission activities. These can arise in the context of collaboration on work-projects,

through requests by participants for assistance of some kind, or by U. S. technicians offering help as part of their "follow-up" responsibilities. However it comes about, contact is related to utilization (Table 44H). Where contact is related to cooperative development projects, utilization is higher. And, from evidence supplied by both participants and U. S. technicians, the more frequent and presumably intensive the degree of personal contact, the higher the utilization. Participants who see the technician available to them frequently are far more likely to be high utilizers than those who have never met him. Interestingly, the participant who has a technician available, but has never had any contact with him is lower in utilization than one who does not even have one available (Table 44I). The reasons for this disparity lie presumably, in the conditions relating to the assignment of technicians and how they come to be seen as "available" to participants: for example, technicians are more often seen as "available" by participants in capital cities or rural areas than provincial centers.

We find corroboration for this relationship in replies to a similar question put to U. S. technicians. Participants whom technicians say they are in contact with on a regular basis are higher utilizers than those seen less often, especially those whom the technician says he never met at all (Table 44J). This relationship is an expected one, since participants and technicians are in high agreement in characterizing the extent of their contacts.

The link between U. S. contacts and participant's utilization is further elaborated, when we recall that the Mission can also influence the supervisor's activities related to the program process, and thus multiply the environmental supports for personal efforts to use one's training. By its policies and practices the U. S. Mission can act directly and in diverse ways to help returned participants derive a greater measure of value from their training. The participant (in background and status), the home country environment (especially the supervisor's role) and the U. S. Mission form a trinity of elements interacting with one another to affect the outcome of training--its usefulness to self and nation.

We have sought to document the interplay of facts, values and events relating to each of the phases of the program; to uncover sources of significant variation and points of leverage for future planning and activities aimed at magnifying the human resources potentialities necessary for national development, the over-riding goal of this form of technical cooperation.

From the standpoint of utilization, the data support the thesis that the substance of programs, the character of the participants, and a supportive home country environment are far more important than a set of satisfying personal experiences while on training. The image of the program as a professional rather than a personal experience is the controlling one: what was the quality of the training, how relevant to work and career, how integrated with broader development projects in

the home country. By comparison, the "nontechnical" aspects are of far less significance. And, of the factors affecting utilization, considered in terms of the phases with which they are linked, those relating to postprogram conditions and circumstances are, as a group, the most powerful set of determinants of all. This generalization can serve to underline the value of projecting the goals of training as far into this latter period as is feasible, and to stress the importance of maintaining liaison with the participants, through personal contacts if possible, as they seek to apply the lessons of their training. The continuous involvement of participant, supervisor and U. S. program personnel, throughout the course of the program and subsequently, is the indispensable prerequisite for the effective program.

TABLE 1
COUNTRY, PARTICIPANTS INTERVIEWED, AND FIRST RECORDED YEAR OF DEPARTURE

Country	Program Began	Participants:	
		Actual Number	Weighted Per Cent
India	1951	1449	8.4
Turkey	1949	1207	8.2
Pakistan	1951	611	6.7
Greece	1950	372	4.1
Jordan	1951	254	2.7
Israel	1951	369	2.3
Egypt	1951	217	2.3
Ethiopia	1951	197	1.7
Morocco	1958	147	1.0
Philippines	1951	510	9.1
Thailand	1951	512	8.9
China (Taiwan)	1951	618	8.4
Korea	1955	524	6.1
Viet Nam	1954	402	4.2
Brazil	1940's	538	10.7
Chile	1940's	431	6.1
Ecuador	1940's	391	2.7
Costa Rica	1952	390	2.7
Nicaragua	1952	182	1.6
Jamaica	1953	122	.6
British Guiana	1954	81	.5
British Honduras	1953	78	.5
Surinam	1954	73	.4
Total		9,668	100.0 (19,025)

TABLE 2
 TIME IN SPECIALTY PRIOR TO SELECTION BY
 OCCUPATIONAL STATUS AT SELECTION

Occupational Status	Time in Specialty (Per Cent)				Total	
	Less than 2 years	2 to 5 years	5 to 10 years	More than 10 years	Per Cent	Number ^a
Policy Makers Top and Second Level	7.8	15.8	18.4	57.9	100.0	(1402)
Administrative Officials Sub-Management	12.1	20.1	25.2	42.6	100.0	(5378)
Professionals: Scientists, Engineers & Teachers	13.4	23.4	28.4	34.7	100.0	(8538)
Sub-Professionals, Technicians	23.0	28.9	23.1	25.0	100.0	(1673)
Foremen, Craftsmen and Other Workers	14.5	20.8	23.1	41.5	100.0	(1126)
Total	14.9	21.9 21.9	25.5	37.7	100.0	(18117)

^aExcludes those cases without information of either type and "students": (N=908)

TABLE 3
 FORMAL EDUCATION PRIOR TO SELECTION BY
 AGE AT DEPARTURE

Age Groups	Attended University		No University Attended	Total	
	Received Degree	No Degree		Per Cent	Number ^a
Under 25 Years	31.3	11.0	57.7	100.0	(1510)
25-29 Years	65.3	7.9	26.8	100.0	(3558)
30-39 Years	69.5	6.5	22.0	100.0	(8026)
40-49 Years	67.5	8.0	24.4	100.0	(4551)
50 Years and Over	64.2	10.3	24.0	100.0	(1163)
Total	64.8	8.6	26.6	100.0	(18808)

^aExcluding those cases without information: (N=217)

TABLE 4
 TRAINING FIELD BY YEAR OF DEPARTURE
 (In Percentages)

Training Field and Number	Year of Departure			
	1942 - 50	1951 - 54	1955 - 58	1959 - 61
Agriculture (5043)	17.3	33.0	25.3	24.4
Industry (2811)	6.2	14.6	13.1	20.7
Education (2692)	1.2	11.1	16.7	11.5
Health (2320)	56.3	15.7	11.3	6.5
Public Admin. (2093)	1.3	9.3	11.8	11.6
Transportation & Communication (1847)	14.2	8.9	9.8	10.0
Labor (1040)	2.0	4.4	5.1	7.8
Community Development (432)	.3	1.3	2.3	3.4
Other (747)	1.0	1.5	4.7	4.5
Total Per Cent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total N (19008) ^a	(410)	(3887)	(10,813)	(3898)

^aExcludes those not ascertained (N=17)

TABLE 5
YEAR OF DEPARTURE AND TRAINING SITES

Training Site- Per Cent Trained in:	Year of Departure				Total
	1942-50	1951-54	1955-58	1959-61	All Years
U. S. Primary	100	91.6	82.0	75.6	83.0
U. S. Territories ^a	-	2.4	4.1	4.6	3.8
Lebanon	-	2.2	4.1	3.4	3.5
Asian Trio ^b	-	1.7	4.9	6.7	4.5
All Others	-	2.1	5.0	9.7	5.3
Total Per Cent	100	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number ^c	(406)	(3,879)	(10,797)	(3,894)	(18,976)

^aFor example, Puerto Rico, Canal Zone, Hawaii

^bJapan, Philippines, Taiwan

^cExcludes those with no information; N=49

TABLE 6

DURATION OF PROGRAMS INCLUDING AN OBSERVATION TOUR

Per Cent Whose Programs Were	Program Type		Total Programs Incorporating Observation
	Only Observation Tour	Mixed Programs Including Observation	
Less than 2 Months	34.7	46.0	42.5
2 to 4 Months	37.7	37.9	37.8
More than 4 Months	27.6	16.1	19.6
Total Per Cent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total N ^a	(4160)	(9199)	(13359)

^aExcluding cases where duration was not ascertained (less than 1%)

TABLE 7

TYPE OF TRAINING PROGRAM^a BY TRAINING FIELD

Training Field and Number	Per Cent Whose Program Included:			Per Cent ^b Multiple Programs
	Any Obs.	Any Univ.	Any OJT	
Trade and Investment (59)	85	25	24	32
Community Development (432)	84	55	31	57
Labor (1,040)	83	50	17	47
Agriculture (5,043)	78	57	42	63
Public Admin. (2,093)	72	58	43	59
Industry (2,811)	71	28	51	45
Atomic Energy (259)	67	73	72	80
Health (2,320)	64	63	48	60
Education (2,692)	63	78	23	52
Transportation & Communication (1,847)	63	21	63	46
All others	56	39	55	42
Total (19,025)	71	52	42	55

^a
 Obs.: Observation Tours
 Univ: University Studies
 OJT : On-the-job Training

^b Per Cent who received two or more types of training

TABLE 8

DURATION OF PROGRAMS INCLUDING TIME SPENT AT A UNIVERSITY

Per Cent Whose Programs Were	Program Type		Total Programs Incorporating University Training
	University Only	Mixed Programs (Univ. plus other)	
Less than 6 Months	14.7	47.4	39.1
6 to 12 Months	22.0	46.6	40.3
More than 12 Months	63.3	6.0	20.6
Total Per Cent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number ^a	(2519)	(7410)	(9929)

^aExcluding cases where duration was not ascertained (less than 1%)

TABLE 9

TRAINING FIELD AND DURATION OF TRAINING: BY PERIODS AND MEDIAN LENGTHS OF TRAINING

Training Field and Number	Duration of Training			Total ^a Per Cent	Median Length (Months)
	Up to 6 Mos.	6 Mos. 1 Year	Over 1 Year		
Education (2,683)	19	22	59	100.0	14
Health (2,312)	19	27	54	100.0	13
Atomic Energy (257)	9	43	48	100.0	11
Public Admin. (2,076)	28	41	31	100.0	9 1/4
Agriculture (4,987)	38	28	34	100.0	8 1/2
Transportation & Communication (1,835)	35	46	19	100.0	8
Industry (2,769)	37	39	24	100.0	8
Community Development (432)	43	39	18	100.0	7
Trade & Investment (59)	70	18	12	100.0	4 1/2
Labor (1,037)	74	20	6	100.0	4 1/2
All Others (412)	49	36	15	100.0	6 1/4
Total (18,859)	33	32	34	100.0	9

^aExcludes not ascertained (N=166)

TABLE 10

PARTICIPANTS' VIEWS ON IMPORTANCE OF
FIVE FACTORS IN THEIR SELECTION
(In Percentage)

Selection Factors	Rating of Importance			Total Per Cent ^b
	"Very Important"	"Not Very Important"	"Don't Know" ^a	
Professional and Educational Qualifications	88.5	8.2	3.2	100.0
Needs of Job	88.0	9.7	2.3	100.0
Personal Abilities	87.3	7.2	5.0	100.0
Language Abilities	64.4	32.0	3.6	100.0
Personal Contacts	35.5	58.5	6.0	100.0

^aIncludes those not ascertained (less than 1%)

^bBased on total sample (N=19,025) for each factor.

TABLE 11

PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF LANGUAGE ABILITY AS
SELECTION FACTOR BY CONFIDENCE
IN OWN ENGLISH LANGUAGE SKILLS
(In Percentage)

Confidence in Skills	Importance of Language Ability As Factor in Selection			Total	
	"Very Important"	"Not Very Important"	Don't Know ^a	Per Cent	Number
High	77.0	18.7	4.3	100.0	(6,868)
Moderately High	72.2	26.3	1.4	100.0	(1,301)
Moderately Low	66.6	31.1	2.4	100.0	(2,973)
Low	61.2	37.0	1.8	100.0	(4,609)
All Whose Programs Required English	70.1	27.0	2.9	100.0	(15,751)
Participants Whose Programs Did Not Require English	37.4	56.1	6.5	100.0	(3,274)
All Participants	64.4	32.0	3.6	100.0	(19,025)

^aIncludes not ascertained, less than 1% of all whose programs required English.

TABLE 12

PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF TWO CONTRASTING FACTORS
IN BEING SELECTED, BY OCCUPATIONAL STATUS
(In Percentage)

Occupational Status	Needs of Job "Very Important"	Personal Contacts "Very Important"	Number ^a
Policy Makers Top and Second Level	89.7	47.2	(1452)
Administrative Officials Sub-Management	89.3	38.2	(5461)
Professionals: Scientists Engineers & Teachers	89.0	31.2	(8684)
Sub-Professionals Technicians	87.7	31.7	(1710)
Foremen, Craftsmen and other workers	83.3	45.9	(1187)
All Occupations	88.7	35.5	(18494) ^a

^aExcludes those whose occupational status was not ascertained and "students" (N=531).

TABLE 13

PER CENT WHO SAY 'PERSONAL CONTACTS WERE IMPORTANT
IN MY SELECTION' BY COUNTRY

Country	Per Cent "Important"
Morocco	74.1
Ecuador	67.9
British Guiana	61.9
British Honduras	61.8
Philippines	57.1
Ethiopia	56.2
Jordan	56.2
Brazil	54.8
Chile	53.8
Greece	52.9
Costa Rica	50.1
Egypt	44.7
Viet Nam	42.5
Jamaica	41.7
Surinam	35.6
Turkey	32.7
Pakistan	26.3
Nicaragua	25.6
India	25.2
Israel	22.3
Korea	17.2
China	13.9
Thailand	11.9
All Countries	35.5

TABLE 14A

SATISFACTION WITH PRIOR ORIENTATION:
INFORMATION ABOUT PROGRAM ELEMENTS

Type of Data	Per Cent Satisfied ^a
Length of Program	93.8
Timing of Departure	84.8
Site of Program	72.1
Content of Program	61.4
Other Relevant Data	73.7
	(N=19025)

^a"Did you get enough information about _____ before you left?"

TABLE 14B

SATISFACTION WITH PRIOR ORIENTATION:
INFORMATION ABOUT COUNTRY OF TRAINING

Type of Data	Per Cent Satisfied ^a
Usages of Money	87.0
Manners and Customs	81.5
Use of Restaurants, Public Facilities	80.1
Religious Practices	79.2
Colloquial Speech, Idioms	72.5
	(N=19025)

^a"Did you get enough information about _____ in the country of training before you left?"

TABLE 15

SATISFACTION WITH PROGRAM PRIOR TO DEPARTURE
BY PARTICIPANTS' VIEWS OF ADEQUACY OF
ORIENTATION ABOUT DETAILS OF PROGRAM

Satisfaction Prior to Departure	Adequacy of Orientation ^a			Total Per Cent
	Adequate	One or Two Gaps	Three or More Gaps	
Per Cent Who Were:				
'Well Satisfied'	72.2	45.6	32.3	54.8
'Not Very Well Satisfied'	11.8	16.2	14.0	14.0
Don't Know, Can't Remember ^b	15.9	38.2	53.7	31.2
Total Per Cent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	8082	7903	3013	(18,998)

^aCategories based on answers showing satisfaction with information on five specific points covered in orientation.

^bIncluded cases where no answer was obtained (less than 1%).

TABLE 16

SATISFACTION WITH PROGRAM PRIOR TO DEPARTURE
BY PARTICIPANTS' VIEWS OF ADEQUACY OF
ORIENTATION ABOUT COUNTRY OF TRAINING

Satisfaction Prior to Departure	Adequacy of Orientation ^a			Total Per Cent
	Adequate	One or Two Gaps	Three or More Gaps	
Per Cent Who Were:				
"Well Satisfied"	58.8	52.0	44.5	54.8
"Not Very Well Satisfied"	13.9	14.7	13.1	14.0
Don't Know, Can't Remember ^b	27.3	33.3	42.4	31.2
Total Per Cent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(10907)	(5130)	(2951)	(18,988)

^a Categories based on answers showing satisfaction with information on five specific points covered in orientation.

^b Includes cases where no answer was obtained (less than 1%).

TABLE 17

EXTENT OF PARTICIPANTS' ROLE IN PLANNING THEIR PROGRAMS^a
BY OCCUPATIONAL STATUS AT SELECTION

Occupational Status	Took Part in Planning		Took No Part	Total Per Cent	Number ^b
	"Enough"	"Not Enough"			
Policy Makers Top and Second Levels	37.0	5.7	57.3	100.0	(1449)
Administrative Officials Sub-Management	32.4	7.8	59.7	100.0	(5442)
Professionals: Scientists Engineers & Teachers	31.5	8.2	60.2	100.0	(8659)
Sub-Professionals Technicians	20.5	5.1	74.3	100.0	(1708)
Foremen, Craftsmen and other workers	20.5	7.2	72.2	100.0	(1187)
Total	30.5	7.5	61.9	100.0	(18445)

^a("Did you . . . take part in planning your program?" If Yes: ". . . To the extent you wanted?")

^bExcept for cases where information was not ascertained (N=580)

TABLE 18

ORGANIZATIONAL PLANS FOR USE OF PARTICIPANT'S TRAINING
BY PRIOR INVOLVEMENT OF SUPERVISOR IN PROGRAM
(Supervisor Evaluation)

Existence of Prior Organizational Plans for Use of Training: Percentage said:	Degree of Supervisor's Involvement ^a			Total ^b
	Recommended & Helped Plan	Did Either	Did Neither	
"Yes"	97.1	85.4	65.2	87.4
"No"	2.4	12.3	22.6	9.4
"Don't Know"	0.5	2.3	12.2	3.2
Total Per Cent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(1,263)	(921)	(474)	(2,658)

^aBased on replies to two questions: "Did you recommend this participant?" "Did you help in planning his program?"

^bIncludes only those who were also supervising participant at the time he left for training.

TABLE 19
 COMPLETENESS OF PROGRAM ARRANGEMENTS
 IN TRAINING COUNTRY BY YEAR
 OF DEPARTURE

Per Cent Saying Their Program Was:	Year of Departure				All Years
	1942-50	1951-54	1955-58	1959-61	
Arranged in Complete Detail	53.5	51.0	56.5	63.0	56.7
Partially Arranged	32.5	35.2	34.6	29.9	33.7
Not Arranged At All	13.3	12.3	7.8	6.2	8.5
Don't Know ^a	0.6	1.4	1.1	0.9	1.1
Total Per Cent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number ^b	(410)	(3,887)	(10,814)	(3,898)	(19,009)

^aIncludes not ascertained (less than .5%)

^bExcludes those for whom year of departure is not ascertained (N=16)

TABLE 20

ATTENDANCE AT ORIENTATION SESSIONS IN TRAINING COUNTRY
BY YEAR OF DEPARTURE

Per Cent Who:	Year of Departure				All Years
	1942-50	1951-54	1955-58	1959-61	
Attended Sessions:					
Washington International Center	9.8	50.1	52.7	45.1	49.6
Other Locations in U. S.	24.4	15.3	12.2	15.0	13.7
Outside U. S.	-	1.2	4.6	6.6	4.2
Did Not Attend	65.8	33.4	30.5	33.3	32.4
Total Per Cent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(410)	(3,887)	(10,814)	(3,898)	(19,009)

^aExcludes those whose year of departure was not ascertained (N=16).

TABLE 21
 SATISFACTION WITH THREE CORE ELEMENTS
 OF TRAINING PROGRAM

Per Cent Rating Each Element as:	Core Program Elements		
	Level of Training	Variety of Experiences ^a	Length of Program
Satisfactory	79.0	50.8	47.2
"Insufficient" (Too Simple/Few/Short)	14.4	29.4	48.2
"Excessive" (Too Advanced/Many/Long)	5.5	18.8	4.3
Don't Know ^b	1.0	1.0	0.3
Total Per Cent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(19,025)	(19,025)	(19,025)

^a("Did the program require you to do or see too many things?")

^bIncludes not ascertained (less than 0.5% for each item).

TABLE 22
EVALUATION OF THE LEVEL OF THEIR
TRAINING PROGRAMS BY TRAINING SITE

Training Site	Level of Training Program			Total Per Cent	Number ^a
	"Too Simple"	"About Right"	"Too Advanced"		
United States	14.1	80.3	5.6	100.0	(15590)
Other U. S. Territories	25.6	71.4	3.0	100.0	(500)
Lebanon	14.1	76.1	9.8	100.0	(653)
Taiwan, Japan & Philippines	11.0	85.5	3.5	100.0	(909)
All Others	18.1	76.9	5.1	100.0	(1201)
Total	14.5	79.9	5.5	100.0	(18853)

^aExcluding those cases where no answer was obtained.

TABLE 23
 LENGTH OF PROGRAM DESIRED BY
 DURATION OF TRAINING

Length of Program Desired (Months)	Actual Duration of Training (Months)				
	Less than 2	2 to 4	4 to 6	6 to 12	Over 12
"No Change" Desired	43.2	48.3	48.2	46.5	48.7
Total (N) ^a	(1481)	(3030)	(1714)	(5998)	(6485)
<hr/>					
Desired Length of (Longer) Programs ^b (Months)					
Less than 2	23.8	5.2	2.4	0.7	0.4
2 to 4	56.2	16.1	8.2	3.4	0.8
4 to 6	6.4	18.5	5.7	2.2	0.5
6 to 12	10.0	44.6	43.0	12.8	4.0
Over 12	3.8	15.7	40.6	81.0 ^c	94.4 ^d
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) ^a	(811)	(1565)	(888)	(3210)	(3329)

^a Excluding those whose duration was not ascertained.

^b "Longer" programs were desired by all but 8% of those dissatisfied with the actual duration of training.

^c 71% of this group wanted an additional year of training and the rest wanted more.

^d Two-thirds (68.2%) of this group wanted at least one more year of training.

TABLE 24

INDEX OF SATISFACTION WITH CORE ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM
BY ADEQUACY OF ORIENTATION ABOUT
DETAILS OF PROGRAM

"Program Satisfaction" Index ^b	Adequacy of Orientation ^a			All Participants
	Adequate	One or Two Gaps	Three or More Gaps	
Percent classified:				
High (3)	32.1	23.1	20.7	26.5
Medium (2)	34.0	33.0	31.2	33.1
Low (1,0)	33.9	43.9	48.1	40.3
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) ^c	(8,082)	(7,902)	(3,012)	(18,996)

^a Categories based on answers showing satisfaction with information on five specific points covered in orientation.

^b Index based on number of 'satisfactory' responses to questions on program length, level and variety by each participant: High (all three), Medium (any two), Low (one or none).

^c Excludes those for whom adequacy of orientation information was not ascertained (N = 29).

TABLE 25
 SATISFACTION WITH THREE CONTEXT
 ELEMENTS OF TRAINING PROGRAM

Per Cent Rating Each Element as:	Context Elements of Program		
	Planned Social Activities ^a	Funds for Travel & Maintenance ^b	Free Time ^c
Satisfactory	70.8	69.8	58.1
Insufficient	25.7	28.7	39.3
Excessive	2.8	1.0	2.3
Don't Know ^d	0.7	0.5	0.3
Total Per Cent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(19,025)	(19,025)	(19,025)

^a("...Do you think there were too many social activities arranged for you, or not enough?")

^b("Was the money ICA made available to you for living costs and travel during the training program too little or about right, or more than needed?")

^c("Do you think that the program left you time for your personal interests...?")

^dIncludes not ascertained (less than 1%)

TABLE 26
EVALUATION OF VISITS TO PRIVATE HOMES
BY TRAINING SITE

Visits to Private Homes Per Cent Saying:	Training Site					Total
	U. S. Primary	Other U.S. ^a Territories	Lebanon	Asian Trio ^b	All Others	
Yes	88.2	67.6	53.0	69.7	56.2	83.5
. . . Liked Greatly	83.3	85.2	81.3	74.3	86.9	83.1
. . . Liked Somewhat	15.3	14.8	18.0	21.8	12.6	15.4
. . . Did Not Like	1.4	-	1.0	3.9	.4	1.4
Sub-Total Per Cent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
No, no home visit	11.8	32.4	47.0	30.3	43.8	16.5
Total Per Cent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(15,724)	(500)	(656)	(848)	(1210)	(18943)

^a Puerto Rico, Guam, Canal Zone

^b Taiwan, Japan, Philippines

TABLE 27

ADEQUACY OF PER DIEM ALLOWANCES BY
OCCUPATIONAL STATUS AT SELECTION

Occupational Status	Adequacy of Per Diem Per Cent Saying:			Total Per Cent	Number ^a
	'Too Little'	'About Right'	'Too Much'		
Policy Makers Top and Second Level	39.4	59.8	0.8	100.0	(1439)
Administrative Officials Sub-Management	30.6	68.4	1.0	100.0	(5444)
Professionals: Scientists Engineers & Teachers	27.2	71.6	1.1	100.0	(8639)
Sub-Professionals, Technicians	26.6	72.8	1.0	100.0	(1706)
Foremen, Craftsmen and other workers	26.6	72.8	0.5	100.0	(1183)
Total	29.0	70.0	1.0	100.0	(18411)

^aExcluding those cases where no answer was obtained.

TABLE 28

AMOUNT OF FREE TIME ALLOWED ON PROGRAM FOR PERSONAL INTERESTS, BY TRAINING SITE

Training Site	Amount of Free Time Per Cent Saying:			Total Per Cent	Number ^a
	"Too Much"	"Enough"	"Too Little"		
United States	2.4	57.6	39.9	100.0	(15719)
U. S. Territories	2.4	77.0	20.5	100.0	(499)
Lebanon	1.5	70.5	27.9	100.0	(659)
Taiwan, Japan & Philippines	1.1	44.6	54.2	100.0	(848)
All Others	1.6	61.2	37.2	100.0	(1210)
Total	2.3	58.2	39.5	100.0	(18935)

^aExcluding those cases where no answer was obtained.

TABLE 29

INDEX OF SATISFACTION WITH CONTEXT ELEMENTS
OF PROGRAM BY ADEQUACY OF ORIENTATION
ABOUT COUNTRY OF TRAINING

Index of Satisfaction ^b with Context	Adequacy of Orientation ^a			Total All Participants
	Adequate	One or Two Gaps	Three or More Gaps	
Per Cent Classified:				
High (3)	37.9	29.6	26.1	33.8
Medium (2)	36.6	40.2	35.5	37.4
Low (1,0)	25.5	30.1	38.4	28.8
Total Per Cent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number ^c	(10,907)	(5130)	(2950)	(18,986)

^aCategories based on answers showing satisfaction with information on five specific points covered in orientation.

^bIndex based on number of 'satisfactory' responses to questions on funds for travel and maintenance, free time, and planned social activities by each participant: High (all three), Medium (any two), Low (one or none).

^cExcludes those for whom adequacy of orientation was not ascertained. (N=39)

TABLE 30

DIFFICULTY WITH ENGLISH ON PROGRAM^a BY
 (A) TRAINING IN ENGLISH, AND BY
 (B) CONFIDENCE IN OWN SKILLS

Per Cent Experiencing English Language Difficulty:	A. Received Training Before Program		B. Confidence in Own Skills ^b				Total
	Yes	No	Low	Mod. Low	Mod. High	High ^c	
None	30.0	71.2	22.9	30.7	55.2	88.7	55.7
Some ^d	70.0	28.8	77.1	69.3	44.8	11.3	44.3
Total Per Cent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(5910)	(9840)	(4609)	(2973)	(1301)	(6867)	(15750)

^aThese tables omit all whose program did not require English, and not ascertained; (N=3275).

^bBased on desire for training (if none was received) or for more (if some was received).

^cThis group consists of those who had no special training and wanted none.

^dEither being understood, understanding others, or both.

TABLE 31

ATTENDANCE AT COMMUNICATIONS SEMINARS AND USE
OF SEMINAR CONTENT IN WORK
BY YEAR OF DEPARTURE

	Year of Departure				All Years ^a
	1942-50	1951-54	1955-58	1959-61	
Per Cent Attending Communications Seminar	8.6	9.8	17.6	29.5	18.2
Total Number	(405)	(3,871)	(10,796)	(3,882)	(18,954)
Use of Materials From Communications Seminar					
Used	81.1	77.7	72.0	65.8	70.7
Did Not Use	18.9	22.3	28.0	34.2	29.3
Total Attending Per Cent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number	(35)	(382)	(1,896)	(1,147)	(3,460)

^aExcludes those for whom information on year of departure or attendance at communications seminar was not ascertained (N=71).

TABLE 32
 UNEMPLOYMENT AFTER PROGRAM BY
 FIRST JOB AFTER PROGRAM

Percent Experiencing Unemployment Since Program	First Job After Program			Total ^a
	Same as Prior To Program	Different, but Expected	Different, and Unexpected	
Yes	1.4	5.2	12.3	3.2
No	98.6	94.8	87.7	96.8
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(14193)	(2534)	(1725)	(18510)

^a Includes 58 Participants who have been continuously unemployed since their return.

TABLE 33
 FIRST JOB AFTER PROGRAM BY
 AGE AT DEPARTURE

Job Upon Return	Age at Departure				Total
	Up to 29	30 - 39	40 - 49	50 and over	
Same as Prior to Program	63.7	76.8	81.9	80.1	74.7
Different but <u>Expected</u> Change	21.3	12.7	7.8	4.5	13.3
Different, and <u>Unexpected</u> Change	12.2	8.7	7.9	2.4	9.1
Not Classifiable (Unemployed, retired, etc.)	2.8	1.8	2.4	13.1	2.9
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(5069)	(8027)	(4551)	(1164)	(18811)

TABLE 34 A

PLANS FOR FUTURE USE OF TRAINING BY
TIME BACK FROM PROGRAM

Time Back from Program (In Years)	Per Cent Saying:		Total Per Cent	Number ^a
	"Have Plans"	"Have No Plans"		
Less than 2	65.9	34.1	100.0	(3764)
2 to 5	58.9	41.1	100.0	(8064)
5 to 7	49.7	50.3	100.0	(3702)
Over 7	41.5	58.5	100.0	(2825)
Total	55.8	44.2	100.0	(18356)

^aExcluding those cases where no answer was obtained.

TABLE 34 B

PLANS FOR FUTURE USE OF TRAINING
BY PAST USE OF TRAINING

Participants' Past Use of Skills	Per Cent Saying:		Total Per Cent	Number ^a
	"Have Plans"	"Have No Plans"		
"Some" (or more than some)	58.2	41.8	100.0	(15548)
"Practically None" or "None"	42.2	57.8	100.0	(2751)
Total	55.9	44.1	100.0	(18299)

^aExcluding those cases where no answer was obtained.

TABLE 35
 OVERALL SATISFACTION WITH TRAINING BY RATING
 OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE PROGRAM

Importance of Program ^a	Satisfaction			Total
	"Very Satisfied"	"Moderately Satisfied"	"Not too" or "Not very well satisfied"	
"Most Important"	80.3	56.4	32.4	65.9
"In Between"	19.4	42.8	60.1	33.0
"A Waste of Time"	0.4	0.8	7.4	1.1
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) ^b	(9031)	(8423)	(1475)	(18929)

^a Rating of program as "one of the most important things ever done, a waste of time, or something in between".

^b Excludes those not ascertained (N = 96).

TABLE 36

THE SUPERVISORS' AND U. S. TECHNICIANS' VIEWS OF THE
IMPORTANCE OF THE PARTICIPANTS' TRAINING
BY DURATION OF TRAINING

Importance of Training	Duration of Training Program (In Months)				Total
	Less Than 2	2 to just under 6	6 to just under 24	24 and Over	
A. Supervisors' Views:					
Percent of Participants for Whom Program Was:					
Essential, Very Important	63.4	70.9	79.4	89.0	77.3
Somewhat Helpful	30.0	24.8	17.8	10.4	19.7
Not Useful (Harmful)	6.6	4.3	2.6	0.6	3.1
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(273)	(1111)	(3797)	(173)	(5354) ^a
B. U. S. Technicians' Views:					
Percent of Participants for Whom Program Was of:					
Major Importance	54.2	57.0	80.6	85.1	73.0
Minor Importance	36.1	34.9	14.4	10.6	20.8
Unimportant (Harmful)	9.7	7.9	5.0	4.0	6.1
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(216)	(480)	(1423)	(75)	(2194) ^b

^a Based only on participants whose supervisors were able to evaluate their individual programs.

^b Based only on participants whose U. S. technicians were in a position to evaluate their individual programs.

TABLE 37
 SUBJECTIVE ASSESSMENT OF CAREER VALUE OF
 TRAINING BY AGE AT DEPARTURE

"If Never Went On Program Current Job Would Be:" (Percent)	Age at Departure				All Ages ^a
	Under 30 Years	30 - 39 Years	40 - 49 Years	50 Years and Older	
Employed:					
"Worse"	34.7	25.0	20.2	12.6	25.7
"Same"	49.0	61.8	68.1	66.8	60.2
"Better"	5.8	4.7	4.2	3.3	4.8
"Can't Say"	7.8	7.0	5.5	4.3	6.7
Currently Unemployed	2.7	1.5	2.0	13.0	2.7
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(5,040)	(7,958)	(4,532)	(1,154)	(18,684)

^a Excludes those for whom age at departure or career evaluations were not ascertained (N = 341).

TABLE 38

SUBJECTIVE ASSESSMENT OF CAREER VALUE OF
TRAINING BY HISTORY OF JOB MOBILITY

"If Never Went On Program Current Job Would Be:" ^d (Percent)	History of Job Mobility				Total ^a
	Stable, No Job Changes ^b	Post-Program Job Different (Expected)	Post-Program Job Different (Unexpected)	One More Recent Job Change ^c	
"Worse"	12.2	48.2	30.3	31.9	26.4
"About the Same"	80.7	37.2	45.6	55.8	61.8
"Better"	3.5	5.3	11.4	4.5	4.8
"Can't Say"	3.6	9.3	12.6	7.8	6.9
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(7,024)	(2,526)	(1,720)	(7,096)	(18,366)

^a Excludes those who were unemployed or whose career evaluations were not ascertained (N = 659).

^b Current job is the same job as was held upon return from program, and prior to selection.

^c Current job is different from the one held upon return from program, which was the same held prior to selection.

^d ("Suppose you had not gone on this training program. What kind of job do you think you would have now?")

TABLE 39

SUPERVISOR ROLE IN UTILIZING TRAINING
BY CURRENT WORK CONTEXT:
ANYONE TRAINED ABROAD

Supervisor Helpfulness ^a	Work Context: Training Abroad			Total ^b
	Supervisor Trained Abroad	Others Trained Abroad	Participant Only One Trained Abroad	
"Very"	54.3	44.0	33.8	46.6
"Somewhat" or "Indifferent"	35.8	38.9	43.5	38.5
"Not Helpful"	9.8	17.0	22.7	14.8
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) ^c	(7661)	(3576)	(3883)	(15,119)

^a Participant's rating of help supervisor gives in utilizing his training.

^b Cases where participants had supervisors.

^c Excluding cases where answers were not obtained; question was not asked of those whose training was in fields in which they were not employed (Form B respondents).

TABLE 40
 CONTACT WITH USOM SINCE RETURNING FROM TRAINING
 BY CURRENT OCCUPATIONAL STATUS

Occupational Status	Contact with USOM (Percent)			Total Percent	(N)
	Has Worked for or with USOM	Had Other Contact	No Contact		
Policy Makers Top and Second Level	23.2	38.9	37.9	100.0	(2082)
Administrative Officials, Sub-Management	26.4	35.0	38.5	100.0	(6,286)
Professionals: Scientists, Engineers & Teachers	21.3	32.3	46.4	100.0	(7,695)
Sub-Professionals, Technicians	29.1	25.3	45.6	100.0	(1,428)
Foremen, Craftsmen and Other Workers	12.5	34.3	53.2	100.0	(988)
All Levels ^a	23.4	33.5	43.1	100.0	(18,479)

^a Excludes those who were unemployed or whose occupational status or contact with USOM were not ascertained (N = 546).

TABLE 41

UTILIZATION OF TRAINING BY SELECTED PARTICIPANT
AND PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS
(Use and Transmission)

	Utilization Index (In Percentages)				Total Percent
	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	
Total:	37.7	30.2	21.2	10.9	100.0
A. Age at Departure					
Under 25	26.4	29.3	27.6	16.7	100.0
25 - 39	37.6	31.3	20.2	10.9	100.0
40 - 49	42.0	28.7	20.2	9.1	100.0
50 and Over	36.4	26.5	26.5	10.6	100.0
B. Training Field					
Health	46.5	30.8	16.0	6.7	100.0
Education	43.0	31.2	17.5	8.4	100.0
Agriculture	38.1	30.3	20.8	10.8	100.0
Atomic Energy	36.5	24.0	20.3	19.2	100.0
Industry & Mining	35.9	32.9	21.0	10.3	100.0
Transportation & Communications	35.9	30.3	22.2	11.7	100.0
Community Development	34.2	29.8	24.3	11.6	100.0
Public Admin.	29.8	28.0	23.8	18.4	100.0
Labor	28.6	23.1	36.8	11.5	100.0
Trade & Invest.	27.3	57.8	11.6	3.4	100.0
All Others	38.9	29.5	18.7	12.8	100.0

TABLE 41 (Con't.)

UTILIZATION OF TRAINING BY SELECTED PARTICIPANT
AND PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS
(Use and Transmission)

Utilization Index (In Percentages)					
	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Total Percent
Total:	37.7	30.2	21.2	10.9	100.0
C. Training Site					
U.S. Primary	39.3	30.1	20.3	10.3	100.0
Taiwan, Japan Philippines	33.5	35.9	20.5	10.2	100.0
Other U.S. Territories	33.9	30.3	29.9	14.9	100.0
Lebanon	18.3	32.1	32.3	17.3	100.0
All Others	32.6	25.4	26.1	15.9	100.0
D. Types of Training Programs					
Only University Studies	41.2	30.2	18.5	10.1	100.0
Only On-the-Job Training	36.1	27.9	23.0	13.0	100.0
Only Observation Tours	31.0	30.8	25.5	12.7	100.0
Multiple Programs (2 or more)	40.5	29.9	19.5	10.1	100.0

TABLE 41 (Con't.)

UTILIZATION OF TRAINING BY SELECTED PARTICIPANT
AND PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS
(Use and Transmission)

	Utilization Index (In Percentages)				Total Percent
	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	
Total:	37.7	30.2	21.2	10.9	100.0
E. Duration of Training					
Less than 2 Months	27.4	30.6	26.9	15.0	100.0
2 to 6 Months	32.7	29.4	25.6	12.3	100.0
6 Months to One Year	38.9	30.5	19.4	11.2	100.0
One Year and Over	42.4	30.4	18.2	9.0	100.0

TABLE 42

UTILIZATION OF TRAINING BY BELIEFS AND EVALUATIONS
 CONCERNING THE PRE-DEPARTURE PHASE
 (Use and Transmission)

Utilization Index (In Percentages)					
	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Total Percent
A. Needs of the Job as a Factor in Own Selection					
Needs of the Job Were:					
Very Important	39.5	30.3	20.2	10.0	100.0
Not Very Important	24.7	30.4	26.4	18.6	100.0
B. Personal Contacts as a Factor in Own Selection					
Personal Contacts Were:					
Very Important	39.7	27.5	22.4	10.5	100.0
Not Very Important	36.9	31.6	20.2	11.3	100.0
C. Supervisor's Active Role in Participant's Selection and Program Planning					
Supervisor:					
Recommended and Helped Plan	41.2	38.8	13.3	6.7	100.0
Did Either	36.6	33.3	20.2	10.2	100.0
Did Neither	33.5	34.3	20.4	11.7	100.0
Total:	37.7	30.2	21.2	10.9	100.0

TABLE 42 (Con't.)

UTILIZATION OF TRAINING BY BELIEFS AND EVALUATIONS
 CONCERNING THE PRE-DEPARTURE PHASE
 (Use and Transmission)

	Utilization Index (In Percentages)				Total %
	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	
D. Prior Organizational Plans for Using Participant's Training					
Supervisor States:					
Plans Existed	40.5	35.8	16.1	7.6	100.0
No Plans Existed	28.6	32.1	24.5	14.6	100.0
E. Adequacy of Participant's Own Role in Planning Program					
"Took Sufficient Part"	45.9	30.2	17.5	6.3	100.0
"Took Insufficient Part"	36.4	35.6	18.1	9.6	100.0
"Took No Part"	33.9	29.6	23.2	13.4	100.0
F. Participant's Satisfaction Prior to His Departure					
"Was Well Satisfied"	41.3	30.5	19.4	8.8	100.0
"Was Not Satisfied"	34.7	30.0	22.3	13.0	100.0
"Don't Know, or Remember"	32.8	29.7	23.6	13.9	100.0
Total:	37.7	30.2	21.2	10.9	100.0

TABLE 43

UTILIZATION OF TRAINING BY SATISFACTION WITH
CORE AND CONTEXT ELEMENTS OF THEIR PROGRAM
(Use and Transmission)

Utilization Index (In Percentages)					
	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Total Percent
A. Index of Satisfaction with Core (Technical) Elements of Program (Length, Level, Variety)					
High (All 3 "Satisfactory")	39.5	31.4	20.6	8.5	100.0
Medium (Any 2 "Satisfactory")	38.2	31.0	20.0	10.8	100.0
Low (One or None "Satisfactory")	36.2	30.0	21.0	12.8	100.0
B. Index of Satisfaction with Context (Non-Technical) Elements of Program (Money, Free Time, Social Activities)					
High (All 3 "Satisfactory")	36.7	32.3	21.6	9.4	100.0
Medium (Any 2 "Satisfactory")	38.7	29.5	20.7	11.1	100.0
Low (One or None "Satisfactory")	37.5	28.4	21.4	12.7	100.0
Total:	37.7	30.2	21.2	10.9	100.0

TABLE 44

UTILIZATION OF TRAINING BY CONDITIONS AND CIRCUMSTANCES
RELATED TO THE POST-PROGRAM PERIOD
(Use and Transmission)

Utilization Index (In Percentages)					
	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Total Per Cent
Total:	37.7	30.2	21.2	10.9	100.0
A. Time Back (Since Completion of Program)					
6 Months to 2 Years	26.4	35.8	24.1	13.7	100.0
2 Years to 4 Years	35.6	32.2	21.1	11.1	100.0
4 Years and Longer	44.4	26.4	19.6	9.6	100.0
B. Index of Career Mobility: Job Changing Since Selection for Program:					
Stable: No Job Changes	35.8	32.7	20.4	11.2	100.0
Post-Program Job Different (Expected)	46.3	29.3	18.1	6.3	100.0
Post-Program Job Different (Unexpected)	31.0	29.1	23.0	16.9	100.0
One More Recent Job Change	41.1	30.7	18.5	9.7	100.0

TABLE 44 (Con't.)

UTILIZATION OF TRAINING BY CONDITIONS AND CIRCUMSTANCES
RELATED TO THE POST-PROGRAM PERIOD
(Use and Transmission)

	Utilization Index (In Percentages)				Total Percent
	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	
C. Current Occupational Status					
Policy Makers Top and Second Levels	37.0	27.6	25.0	10.4	100.0
Administrative Officials Sub-Management	36.9	31.7	21.4	10.0	100.0
Professionals: Scientists Engineers & Teachers	41.2	30.3	17.9	10.6	100.0
Sub-Professionals Technicians	34.0	29.6	23.1	13.3	100.0
Foremen, Craftsmen and Other Workers	28.4	27.8	30.5	13.2	100.0
Total:	37.7	30.2	21.2	10.9	100.0

TABLE 44 (Con't.)

UTILIZATION OF TRAINING BY CONDITIONS AND CIRCUMSTANCES
RELATED TO THE POST-PROGRAM PERIOD
(Use and Transmission)

	Utilization Index (In Percentages)				Total Percent
	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	
D. Index of General Satisfaction with Training (Satisfaction with and Importance of Program)					
High	49.1	26.1	18.8	5.9	100.0
Moderate	37.0	34.0	19.8	9.1	100.0
Low	23.0	31.0	25.6	20.3	100.0
E. <u>Career Value of Training:</u> "If No Training Current Job Would Be:"					
"Worse"	51.9	28.3	15.3	4.5	100.0
"About the Same"	33.7	32.7	21.3	12.3	100.0
"Better"	30.0	26.6	24.0	19.4	100.0
Total:	37.7	30.2	21.2	10.9	100.0

TABLE 44 (Cont.)

UTILIZATION OF TRAINING BY CONDITIONS AND CIRCUMSTANCES
RELATED TO THE POST-PROGRAM PERIOD
(Use and Transmission)

Utilization Index (In Percentages)					
	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Total Per Cent
Total:	37.7	30.2	21.2	10.9	100.0
F. Helpfulness of Supervisor in Utilizing Skills:					
<u>(Participant Rates Him as:)</u>					
"Very helpful"	53.9	30.0	12.8	3.3	100.0
"Somewhat helpful"	31.8	41.2	18.3	8.7	100.0
"Indifferent"	24.8	27.2	28.8	19.2	100.0
"Not helpful"	21.3	23.7	28.0	27.0	100.0
G. Supervisors' Views on Value of Participant's Training for His Job					
"Essential"	42.1	33.1	17.1	7.7	100.0
"Very Important"	39.0	33.4	18.0	9.6	100.0
"Somewhat helpful"	27.1	32.6	23.1	17.2	100.0
"Not helpful"	25.3	26.1	28.7	19.9	100.0

TABLE 44 (Con't.)

UTILIZATION OF TRAINING BY CONDITIONS AND CIRCUMSTANCES
RELATED TO THE POST-PROGRAM PERIOD
(Use and Transmission)

Utilization Index (In Percentages)					
	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Total Percent
H. <u>Role of U.S. Mission</u>					
<u>"Follow-Up":</u>					
Since Return					
Participant Has:					
Worked on/with U.S. Project	47.4	31.0	15.9	5.7	100.0
Had Other Contacts	39.7	30.9	19.9	9.5	100.0
Had No Contacts	31.1	29.2	24.8	14.9	100.0
I. <u>Frequency of Contacts</u>					
<u>with U.S. Technicians:</u>					
<u>Participant Says:</u>					
<u>"Technician Available:</u>					
Sees Frequently	50.9	28.3	16.2	4.6	100.0
Sees Occasionally	39.5	32.8	19.5	8.2	100.0
Never Met Him	26.7	31.1	29.5	12.9	100.0
<u>"No Technician</u>					
<u>Available:"</u>					
	34.0	30.0	22.6	13.4	100.0
Total:	37.7	30.2	21.2	10.9	100.0

TABLE 44 (Con't.)

UTILIZATION OF TRAINING BY CONDITIONS AND CIRCUMSTANCES
RELATED TO THE POST-PROGRAM PERIOD
(Use and Transmission)

	Utilization Index (In Percentages)				Total Percent
	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	
J. <u>Frequency of "Follow- Up" by U. S. Technician: Technician Says:</u>					
"Sees Participant Regularly"	46.3	29.1	18.1	6.5	100.0
"Sees Participant Frequently"	44.8	30.3	14.9	10.0	100.0
"Sees Participant Occasionally"	39.4	29.5	18.6	12.5	100.0
"Sees Participant Rarely"	31.0	31.6	22.1	15.3	100.0
"Never Met Participant"	22.8	34.2	31.6	11.4	100.0
Total:	37.7	30.2	21.2	10.9	100.0