

PN-AAS-886^{E7}

IN 40305

AN EVALUATION STUDY OF
U.S.A.I.D. SPONSORED
INDIAN EXTENSION PARTICIPANTS
AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI
1959-1967

by

Dr. Walter T. Wilkening
Assistant Professor
Extension Education
University of Missouri
Columbia, Missouri

April 1971

001759

MO 102

INDEX

Acknowledgements	-	-	-	-	i
Introduction	-	-	-	-	1
Summary	-	-	-	-	4
The study	-	-	-	-	10
Sketch of the Participants	-	-	-	-	13
Observations and Evaluations	-	-	-	-	14
The Objectives:					
1. Non-technical aspects	-	-	-	-	15
2. Technical and Field training	-	-	-	-	20
3. Degree vs. Non-degree training	-	-	-	-	30
4. Performance on return	-	-	-	-	32
5. How to make training more effective	-	-	-	-	35
6. Utilization of training on return	-	-	-	-	38
7. Factors that facilitate or hinder	-	-	-	-	42
8. Sharing of Training experience	-	-	-	-	47
Appendix A					
List of participants who participated.	-	-	-	-	49

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Just as a beach is made of many grains of sand, this study which involves several agencies and spans two continents is also the result of the efforts of many, not the least of which were the participants themselves.

The idea for this study grew from an evaluation session with Dr. Randal K. Price, Professor of Extension Education, Mr. F.E. Rogers, Professor of Extension Education and Technical Leader for most of the training programs, Mr. J.E. Crosly Jr., a retired U.M.C. Extension Worker with India experience, and the writer, who was at that time Coordinator of Foreign Visitors Program at the University of Missouri. It was felt that even though improvements had been made in the training programs that the time had come for a more critical evaluation.

A proposal was prepared and presented to Dr. Forrest E. Clements, Chief of Evaluation Branch USAID, Washington and Dr. W.E. Harvey, Director, Foreign Training Division, U.S.D.A. After consultation with these men and their staff the proposal was forwarded to Mr. Eugene Byrne, Chief, Participant Training Branch, USAID, India. The proposal was subsequently accepted and the arrangements made to undertake the study in conjunction with the writer's visit to India in his capacity as Campus Coordinator of the University of Missouri/USAID, India Contract programs in the spring of 1968.

The writer is indebted to all of the above mentioned for their suggestions and encouragement, and especially to Mr. Byrne and his staff for the help in planning and the support of the in-India travel and other related costs.

The participants were most cooperative in returning the questionnaire and in the interviews. They also helped resolve problems of travel and communications which arose during the course of the interview.

It is hoped that the report which follows will be a credit to all who participated and made the study possible.

INTRODUCTION

Participant training has been an integral part of nearly all U.S. Technical Assistance programs in the post W.W. II period beginning with the Marshall Plan and Point IV agreements. The training programs varied in length and nature but all had the common goal of helping train a cadre of individuals from the cooperating countries that would help make a significant contribution toward their development.

During the period of 1960 to 1966 the Evaluation and Follow-up staff of the office of International Training, USAID conducted studies in 30 countries; interviewing more than 12,000 former participants in an attempt to identify strengths and weaknesses of the training programs with the hope of improving subsequent programs. This was a general study covering all fields of training.

Many U.S. Universities have been involved in the various training programs since the early 1950s. Beginning in 1959 the University of Missouri became one of the major training centers for Indian participants in the field of Extension Education. From January 1, 1959 and July 1, 1967 the period covered by this study, 87 Indian Extension Workers received institutional training in Extension Education at the University of Missouri. This number represents about 30 percent of all Indian Extension Participants training in the U.S. during that period.

Because of the vital role these participants were expected to play in helping achieve self sufficiency in food production a study was proposed in order to give those responsible for the program and technical aspect of the training a basis for evaluating previous programs and to identify areas for strengthening future programs.

Where possible an attempt was made to relate the success and problems of this "micro" group of participants to the world-wide study conducted by Dr. Forrest E. Clements et. al.¹. An attempt has been made to identify both strengths and weaknesses in the training programs in order that these can be used to develop more relevant training programs in the future.

During the eight years covered by the study several changes in emphasis were made in the training programs. Part of the variations in the program were made as a result of administrative policy and some were made on the basis of the comments made by trainees in their departure evaluations. The staff involved in planning and executing the training programs at the University of Missouri felt that a follow up study should be made to determine the wisdom of changes which were made and to solicit any further suggestions

¹ Clements, Forrest E. et. al. World Wide Evaluation of Participant Training, Office of International Training, U.S. Dept. of State, A.I.D. Washington D.C. 1966.

for improving future training programs. The proposal for such an evaluation study was submitted to USAID and approval was received in February 1968. For the purpose of conducting the study the writer was assigned as a Consultant to Mr. Eugene A. Byrne, Chief of Participant Training Branch, USAID/India. The logistics for the study were provided by the Participant Training Office, USAID, U.S. Embassy, New Delhi.

SUMMARY

If one believes in the old Chinese proverb "Give a man a fish and he will eat for a day; but teach him how to catch a fish and he will eat forever", then there is a basis to believe that the Participant Training Program is the most significant part of the USAID technical assistance program. Those who receive the training will be active as "Fishermen" long after the grant-in-aid equipment is worn out, and the USAID technicians have returned home.

Between January 1, 1959 and July 1, 1967, 87 Indian Extension Workers received USAID sponsored training in Extension at the University of Missouri. In order to determine whether the training imparted was appropriate, and to see if there was scope for applying the new ideas on return, a study was conducted to evaluate the training programs which had been completed and to give some basis for planning future programs.

The findings from the 73 mail questionnaires and 54 interviews may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. These Extension participants experienced most of the same problems of personal adjustment as other participants and foreign students. Homesickness and family problems, money, food, health, and housing were listed as problems (in descending

order of severity), however these had relatively little effect on the over-all success of the training.

2. Ninety six percent of the respondents rated the training as moderately to very satisfactory. They strongly supported the appropriateness and relevance of the training they received. The recognition of Extension as education, rather than goods and services, was a major discovery for many. The teaching methods and interpersonal relationships, both taught and observed, made an impact on the attitudes and practices of the returned participants.
3. About three fifths of the participants obtained M.Sc. degrees in Extension Education while the remainder had 6 - 9 month non-degree programs. Those who received degrees expressed a higher level of satisfaction with their training than those on non-degree programs.

Opportunity for more coursework, added prestige and confidence, and the qualification for a wider range of jobs were the most frequent responses supporting a degree program.

4. All other criteria notwithstanding, performance on return is the real measure of the success of the training program. Confidence in ones own ability and understanding the job to be done are key prerequisites in doing a better job. All but two of the respondents felt they were now much more effective in carrying out their responsibilities. They expressed more confidence in themselves and their ability to do their work; the use of more effective methods of communication and teaching; their tolerance and understanding of others; and their ability for better working relationships with others.

The three Directors of Agriculture who were interviewed were very complimentary about the improved performance of the returned participants as compared to their peers who had not been trained.

5. As has already been pointed out, the participants were generally well pleased with their training experience. They did say that had they been asked to help plan their program they would have included: more practical field experience; more academic and seminar training in communications;

a better planned and coordinated orientation relative to the objectives of the training and where they would be going; and more involvement in planning the training program.

6. The common conception that the foreign trained either are not posted where they can effectively use their training, or that they are trying to migrate to take a job elsewhere was refuted by the respondents in this study. Seventy six percent were immediately posted to appropriate positions on their return and all but two of the remainder were placed within two months. At the time of the interview, 6 months to 7 years after their training, only four were found in positions where they did not have either a direct or indirect responsibility for farmer education. The training efforts were not completely lost, as these four men said they were using extension methods and techniques in their dealings with others even though they were not now directly engaged in Extension work.

Promotion and staff transfer policies in India are such that even these four are likely to be returned to Extension positions in their departments with in 2 to 3 years. Thus one can conclude that there was a very high degree of utilization of the returned Extension participants in this study.

7. In the attempt to identify factors which contribute to, or hinder, the utilization and communication of knowledge and skills learned it was found that norms or standards built into the administrative and social systems were the most significant deterrents. The negative attitudes of some superiors to the "foreign trained", the cumbersome bureaucratic system, lack of proper program guidance, scarcity of agricultural inputs, the traditional-illiterate farmers, poorly trained and motivated extension workers at the lower levels, and low status career opportunities were listed as the major problems with which they had to deal. These problems can only be overcome through the persistent efforts of those who "can see a better way". The professed changes in attitude of the participants who were interviewed is a good basis for hope for the future.
8. The participants opportunities to multiply their effectiveness through training others is largely a function of the jobs they hold. Those who were teaching in Colleges, or Extension Training Centers had regular opportunities to train others. Those who held other jobs were generally not given special training assignments. Where the group opportunities did not exist, daily personal contacts provided the main opportunities for training or influencing the actions of others.

One characteristic that was not easy to measure in such a study was enthusiasm. A few of those interviewed were frustrated because of their boss or personal problems but generally the attitudes were optimistic and they were almost without exception, both appreciative and enthusiastic about their training experience; especially in how it had helped their understanding of the meaning of Extension as an educational process, not merely services and supplies.

The desire and enthusiasm to teach farmers was exemplified by one participant whose superior officer apparently frustrated all attempts to introduce any "new ideas or procedures". When asked how he resolved this, he replied, "I work for the Government during the week and on Sundays and holidays I work with the farmers on my own". A visit to some of his projects indicated that he had been quite successful.

It is difficult to quantify the results of technical assistance projects. In many, as is the case in this study, the real benefit will only be known after several years. It is the opinion of the writer that this was a good program. It was well received, it was appreciated, and the farmers throughout India will surely benefit from the leadership provided by these participants. Many already hold important positions in Agricultural Departments both State and Central Governments and others will be promoted to these positions as time passes.

THE STUDY

Between January 1, 1959 and July 1, 1967 eighty seven Extension workers from India received training at the University of Missouri. About half received a Masters Degree and the remainder had six to nine month non-degree field oriented programs. The objectives of the study of particular interest to the University of Missouri were to:

1. To evaluate non-technical aspects of the training program (i.e. orientation, food, housing, etc.) that may have either had a positive or negative effect on the training program.
2. To determine whether the technical and/or field training was appropriate and relevant to the needs of the participants.
3. To determine the relative effectiveness of the two types of programs (degree and non-degree) in preparing participants for carrying out their assignments in India's agricultural extension programs.
4. To determine whether or not the participants performance upon return to India reflects benefits of the training received in the United States.

5. To secure participant reaction after resumption of assignment in India on how American training could be made more effective.

Objectives of interest to the University of Missouri, but perhaps of more concern to AID were:

6. To ascertain whether the extension participants:
(a) are being used in jobs for which they have been trained; and (b) are effectively utilizing their training.
7. To identify significant factors which contribute to or hinder utilization and communication of knowledge and skills learned.
8. To determine the extent to which trainees are sharing their training with extension workers generally.

The design of the study was an opinion survey. The total population was small, hence an attempt was made to contact all participants possible through both mail and personal interview questionnaires to obtain and verify as many opinions as possible.

Questionnaires were mailed to all participants by the Participant Training Branch of the USAID Mission in New Delhi on March 7, 1968. Seventy five percent of the questionnaires were returned. After the mail questionnaires were returned a schedule was set up to visit the

participants in their respective places of assignment for a personal interview. From March 31 to May 9, 1968 fifty four interviews were held in fourteen States.

Prior to scheduling the interviews the decision was made to attempt contacts with all participants who could be reached within the period available for the study. The sampling procedure for the personal interviews was dictated by time and resources available for the study. Thus, if any bias was introduced it was a function of forces beyond the control of the researcher.

Due to distance or lack of transport it was not possible to reach some of the participants in the time which was available. Because of this no attempt was made to interview 22 of the 87 possible respondents. Ten participants were not interviewed because of illness, their being on leave, or having official business which conflicted with the scheduled visit in their area. One was deceased.

All of the participants interviewed were very cooperative and expressed interest in the follow-up study. This was the first contact many had had from a member of the University of Missouri or USAID staff since returning from their U.S. Training.

Plans were to interview the supervisors of the participants to get their reactions to their improvement in productivity since return. This part of the study did not meet expectations due to conflict with the end of the financial year rush, and tour and leave schedules of the state officials with the timing of the interview schedule. A brief mention is made of these opinions which were collected.

The data are presented in tabular form and are discussed in terms of whole numbers and percentage as the study dealt with a total population with a rather small N. Consequently, the data and conclusions drawn should be used to reflect on the University of Missouri training program, and on the opinions of the participants there of. It is hoped that these findings can be used to support findings of other participant studies or perhaps point to differences which could be used to help improve subsequent training programs.

Sketch of the Participants

Seventy three of the possible 87 USAID sponsored respondents from 14 States returned the mail questionnaires. (See Appendix A for list). Fifty four were subsequently interviewed.

These Indian Extension Participants averaged a little over 38 years of age and had a median of 9.5 years experience prior to their training. Ninety seven percent were married. Thus these participants were on the average 3 years older and had had about 18 months more service prior to training than was the case for the participants in the "World Wide Study".¹

A majority of the respondents (68%) held "middle-management" or higher posts as was indicated by their being posted in district or state level positions. Twelve percent (9) held posts in central government. Ninety seven percent of the respondents were college graduates, and 23 percent held M.Sc. degrees before departing for training.

Thus this group of participants could be characterized as being reasonably mature, well educated, and experienced in the field before their selection and training.

Observations and Evaluations

The data, and observations which follow are subjective in nature as they represent the expressed opinions of the returned participants. Unfortunately resources did not permit a detailed follow up with the supervisors or clientele of the respondents to verify the responses, however several factors combine to lend credence to the

¹ Ibid p.3

responses. The training experience had been a highlight in the lives of most of the participants; they were glad to have a representative of their host training institution to visit them, in fact this represented the first post-return contact from any USAID source for most of them. In addition to the "psychology" of some one showing an interest in them, most were pleased to tell what they had been doing and to participate in a study aimed at improving the training of others; they were being asked to give suggestions.

Responses from both the mail, and interview questionnaires will be presented as appropriate in support of each of the objectives outlined earlier.

Objective 1 - To evaluate non-technical aspects of the training program (i.e. orientation, food, housing, etc.) that may have either had a positive or negative effect on the training program.

Problems of a personal nature frequently cause minor disruptions in participant training programs and occasionally become severe enough to require termination of a program. The participants in this study experienced relatively few problems. The fact that these men were more mature, well established in their jobs, were on relatively short programs (6-14 months), and had had previous college training all helped.

The following responses help substantiate these statements and point to other factors which made personal adjustment relatively easy.

After selection, orientation in preparation for the training program gave the first opportunity to prepare the trainee for a successful program. Eighty six percent of the participants had some predeparture orientation either by their own government, USAID, or both. This orientation was rated adequate by 83% of the respondents. However, about one fourth of the respondents indicated they would have liked more information on when and where they were going, manners and customs in the U.S., the use of money, and restaurants and other public facilities. All but 10 percent received some additional orientation in the U.S. This was also considered helpful by most, however, six of the respondents said they felt that this U.S. orientation time could have been better used for their training.

Ninety four percent of the participants were entertained in urban homes and a like percent also spent one or more days with farm families. Responses in the interview generally rated these family living experiences very useful in helping understand about Americans, farming in the U.S., and the Extension programs. Only 4 percent rated these visits of little use.

The responses to the question "Did your program allow enough time for your personal interest?" (Table 1), indicate that perhaps more time should have been allowed for social activities and other visits that would have given a better understanding of the people in the U.S. In terms of satisfying personal interests this was a valid response. In terms of meeting the objectives of the training program perhaps this expressed desire for more personal time could be questioned. Even so 71 percent of respondents in this study as compared to 40 percent in the world wide summary¹ felt their schedules were too tight.

Table 1

Did your program allow enough time
for your personal interest?

	<u>Responses</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Too little time	52	71
Too much time	0	0
About right	21	29
	<u>73</u>	<u>100</u>

The language barrier has been a major hurdle for foreign students from all countries. Fortunately, because most of these men had English as a second language and had English as a medium of college instruction, little trouble was experienced, especially after the first few weeks. (Table 2).

¹ Ibid. p. 8

Table 2

Did you have any trouble with "American" English while in the U.S.?

	<u>Responses</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
None at all	31	43
Not after 1st week	27	37
Not after 1st month	12	16
Longer than 1 month	3	4
	<u>73</u>	<u>100</u>

Those who did have problems expressed more difficulty in understanding others than in making themselves understood.

Personal problems such as homesickness, food, housing, finances, health, and status loss have been identified in previous foreign student studies as interfering with study programs. A question was asked during the interview as how frequently this was a problem for these participants. The weighted¹ results show in Table 3 that homesickness and worry about family matters was the biggest problem. A death or serious illness in the family were listed by several respondents as the reason for concern or worry. It was the only one checked as being a problem "frequently" and was the one most checked as a problem "occasionally". Even then the

¹ In this and subsequent tables in which multiple response questions were asked, weightings of 4, 3, 2, 1 (3, 2, 1 in 3 answer questions etc.) were given the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, & 4th responses respectively to determine the most significant response.

total of these two only accounted for 11 percent of the responses. Problems of money matters, food, health, housing, and social customs and status loss followed in that order. The money problem arose in several cases because the participants were not drawing their salary at home and their families were suffering. The other money problems were apparently more a function of expensive tastes or habits rather than the stipend being too low.

Table 3

How frequently did you have problems in the following areas?

	Frequently	Occasionally	Seldom	Never	Weighted Score
a. Homesickness - worry about family.	2	6	14	32	72
b. Money	0	4	5	45	67
c. Food	0	1	8	45	64
d. Health	0	3	3	48	63
e. Housing	0	0	3	51	57
f. Cultural and/or social customs	0	0	2	52	56
g. Status loss	0	0	2	52	56

In a concluding question on personal problems during the interview 11 (20 percent) of the respondents indicated that these concerns kept them from getting maximum benefit from the program. Eleven percent also stated that they

experienced problems of family relations in getting resettled on their return. Sixteen percent indicated some to very much problem with their health upon return.

In summary it can be said that this group of participants had most of the same difficulties expressed by participants and students in other studies. Twenty percent of those interviewed said this kept them from getting the maximum benefit from their study, however, the responses to individual question indicated that personal problems had relatively little effect on the overall success of the training.

Objective 2 - To determine whether the technical and/or field training was appropriate and relevant to the needs of the participants.

The question of whether or not the training is relevant to the needs of the trainee is significant to the trainee, the training institution, the sponsor, and the trainees own government. Thus a major portion of both questionnaires dealt with questions that would help determine the answer to this question. General objectives for the training program were set forth in the program agreement between the Government of India and USAID. This finally had to be interpreted into the actual training program, and be carried out by the technical leader in charge of the group on the University of Missouri Campus.

In this study, as Clements also pointed out in the "World Wide Study Summary"¹, only about 40 percent of the participants were involved in establishing objectives and planning their study program. About half of the respondents in this study said the objectives of the program were not made clear to them until they reached Washington D.C. or even the University Campus.

Even so 96 percent of the respondents answered "Yes" to the question "Were the objectives of the program in agreement with your personal needs and objectives?".

The response in Table 4 shows the very high level of satisfaction expressed in the mail questionnaire.

Table 4

How satisfactory was your program from all points of view?

	<u>Responses</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Very Satisfactory	29	40
Moderately satisfactory	41	56
Not too satisfactory	3	4
Not satisfactory at all	0	0
	<u>73</u>	<u>100</u>

A similar question on the interview drew a response of 74 percent and 24 percent (98% total) respectively on a "very much" and "some" help answer to the helpfulness of the program in terms of their job requirements since returning.

¹ Ibid p. 5 & 6

All trainees were complimentary of the counseling and guidance received from their advisors and technical leader. Eighty six percent rated the Extension subject matter part of the program as very useful and 8 out of 10 felt that the level of the instruction was about right. Almost one third did say, however, that the amount of field training and observation was "not sufficient, more time was needed".

Table 5 which was taken from the interview schedule substantiates the generally favorable reaction to the training received and the amount of emphasis placed on each area.

Table 5

Indicate whether or not you received training and then indicate the desired level of emphasis.

	Received training		Emphasis should have been		
	Yes	No	More	Less	Same
a. Methods of work and teaching in Extension.	54		13	1	40
b. Technical subject matter.	24	30	15	3	36
c. Social or behavioral science subject matter.	53	1	25		29
d. Principles of administration and supervision	39	5	26		28
e. Program planning and implementation	54		9	1	44

	Received training		Emphasis should have been		
	Yes	No	More	Less	Same
f. Youth work	44	10	25	1	28
g. County experience and work with county Extension Agents.	52	2	25	2	27
h. Preparation and use of visuals.	43	11	31	1	22
i. Development and training of voluntary leaders	48	4	27		27
j. Role of in-service training.	44	10	21	1	32
k. Methods of program evaluation	51	3	16		38
l. Philosophy of the Land-Grant College system (teaching, research, and examination)	53	1	0		54
m. Function of the District Extension Supervisor	46	8	20		34
n. Role of Extension Subject Matter Specialist.	50	4	7		45

Except for area "Preparation and use of visuals", the majority felt that about the right amount of emphasis was placed on the various aspects of the training.

The responses to a question on the most popular part of the training are shown in Table 6.

Table 6

What did you like most about your Training?

	<u>Responses</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Social science course work	17	31
Extension course work	14	26
County experience	12	22
Teaching methods and organization	9	17
Integrity of the County Extension staff	2	4
	<u>54</u>	<u>100</u>

It is interesting to note that the majority placed the Social Science and Extension course work at the top of the list. Statements such as "This was the first time I knew what Extension work was really meant to do", or "Before I never thought of Extension as education", were typical statements made during the interviews. From the interview responses it was clear that prior to training Extension meant "supplies and services" to most of the participants. The introduction to the concept that Extension was education, interpersonal relations, and development of human resources did not exist previously.

In a follow-up question to "What did you like most?", the respondents ranked the Extension subject matter as the most useful part of their training, followed by new

teaching methods, and teacher pupil relation, and county experience and social science courses tied for third position.

Over 40 percent felt that the course work and observations had helped them most in "improving their teaching methods and communications". Improved planning and evaluation, and improved inter-personal relations were listed by the remainder as significant areas of improvement in their performance.

Emphasis on the Land Grant College Philosophy, some Extension subject matter courses, technical subject matter courses, youth work emphasis, and audio visual training were listed, in descending order, as those things found least useful. A number of the respondents were reluctant to identify anything as "least useful" as they felt that all parts of the program had some benefit.

While the "Michigan State Communication Seminar" was not singled out as a "most significant" part of the program, it should be pointed out that 19 of the 29 who attended this seminar rated it as "Very Valuable" and the remainder rated it as good. This seminar was mentioned by several respondents in the interview as a very good part of the training which should be continued.

As was pointed out earlier almost all of the respondents had had some opportunity to visit with and observe county Extension personnel in their work. The weighted summary of the open end, multiple responses to the things which impressed the respondents most on these county experiences are shown in Table 7.

Table 7

What impressed you most about the Missouri Extension program?

	Rank of Response				Weighted Score
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	
1. Efficiency & Organization of office staff	13	9	10	7	106
2. Approach or methods used by Agents.	11	8	9	6	92
3. Relationship & improvement with farm people	8	13	10	6	84
4. How programs were planned & executed	9	8	3	0	66
5. Personal characteristics of staff & people	2	4	7	0	34
6. Planning of program & organizing work.	3	3	3	6	33
7. Relationship & involvement of agri. business	1	3	5	7	30
8. Democratic relationships & conduct.	2	2	1	4	20
9. Communication facilities.	2	1	1	1	14

Sixty three percent of the respondents said that they had tried to use the techniques and methods in their own work. Nineteen percent listed improved interpersonal relations with their staff and students as the major characteristic they had tried to use.

In addition to contacts with County Extension personnel the respondents listed, (in order of frequency), farm families; organized Extension groups such as county councils, committees, youth, and Home Economics clubs; businessmen; and other government employees as useful contacts in helping understand the rural community and the role of the county extension education program.

One frequently hears questions raised relative to the cost of sending groups of trainees to the U.S. vs sending a few trainers to the host country, especially since conditions are "so different" in the U.S. Several questions were asked to obtain the participants views in this regard.

Less than 10 percent felt they could have gotten as much from an equivalent amount of training here in India. Table 3 gives the weighted responses to the reasons given in favour of U.S. training.

Table 8

Why do you feel training in the U.S. is better?

	Rank of Responses			Weighted Score
	1st	2nd	3rd	
1. Must see practical application of Extension theory to believe and appreciate	26	7	4	93
2. Library and research facilities not available in India	10	6	1	43
3. Extension Education as a technique not well understood or developed in India	10	2	1	35
4. Difficult to see new methods of teaching and problem solving in practice	2	8	0	22
5. Foreign travel is broadening	4	1	1	15
6. Could not have been Extension in relation to the people	0	6	2	14

A further question was asked to see if the participants felt that, in spite of the differences which exist, the principles and methods used successfully by U.S. Extension workers could be used in India. Ninety three percent answered "Yes". Nine out of ten of these felt that farmers in the U.S. and India were basically the same even though there were great differences in the levels of education, and methods of farming. When this position was pursued further, 94 percent of the respondents said in one way or other that the principles and

methods could be used but that the approach would have to be modified and adjusted to the educational level, and to local conditions. They also recognized that it would be necessary to use more demonstrations and personal contacts to convince the farmers in India¹.

In summary, the participants responses strongly support the appropriateness and relevance of the training they received. Their attitudes toward training could have possibly been improved by more involvement in setting objectives and planning of these programs. They especially indicated that they would have liked to know more about the program, and when and where they were going before they left India.

Learning about the theories and principles of working with people in an educational program and seeing this applied in the County Extension programs seemed to be the most impressive parts of the training. The recognition of Extension as education was a major discovery for many. The teaching methods and interpersonal relationships, both taught and observed, also made an impact on the attitudes and practices of the returned participants.

¹ In the opinion of the writer this was one of the most significant perceptions of the participants as it indicates the recognition that Extension is education, and with modification to fit the local situation the basic principles and methods can be successfully used in India as well as the U.S.

Objective 3 - To determine the relative effectiveness of the two types of programs, degree vs. non-degree, in meeting participants needs.

As mentioned earlier in this report, the training format for the first 5 years covered by this study provided for a 12 month training period which was usually just barely enough to allow the participant to earn a masters degree. Frequently this was done at the expense of a minimal or reduced practical exposure to county extension work. This low level of practical training was not acceptable to USAID and the Government of India and the pressures of finishing degrees in a very minimal time was not acceptable to those responsible for the program at the University of Missouri. The result was a reduced period of training of 6 to 9 months with no more than one semester of academic training during the last three years covered in the study.

Because of a number of uncontrolled variables such as, length of time back on the job since training, level of college training prior to the U.S. training, type of job held, and the relatively small N no attempt was made to make a detailed comparison between the two types of training. The following observations were made, however.

In a response on the mail questionnaire two thirds of the participants said that obtaining a degree should have been a major objective of the training program. Actually less than 45 percent were enrolled for a degree.

As shown in Table 9, those who had degree programs expressed a higher level of satisfaction, 80 percent vs 65. percent on the "very much" response, on the usefulness of their training than those who were on non-degree programs.

Table 9

In terms of the requirements of your positions since returning, how helpful do you feel that this type of training has been?

	Degree		Non-degree	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Very much	25	80	15	65
Same	5	16	8	35
Little	1	4		
No help	0	0		
	31	100	23	100

Opportunity for more coursework, the prestige and confidence of having a degree, and qualification for a wider range jobs were the most frequent answers given in support of the degree programs. All but one of the 23 who were on non-degree programs said they would like to have had a degree. Only 5 of the 31 on degree programs said that non-degree training would have been satisfactory.

Thus, 48 (90 percent) of those interviewed favored degree training. About one fourth said that a degree was required for the job they were now holding and a like number mentioned holding a degree as a pre-requisite for advancement.

These responses point out that this is probably the area of widest disagreement between the opinion of the participant and the authorities who administer the program. Generally the authorities, both Indian and U.S., are concerned with training that will result in the participant being more productive or efficient in his work. This, at least for the short run, could be accomplished in a non-degree program. The participant, on the other hand, is probably more concerned about his future than his ability to do the job immediately at hand. In a system that requires degrees for certain levels of advancement it is only natural that the participant would like to earn a degree if at all possible.¹

Objective 4 - To determine whether or not the participants performance upon return to India reflects the benefits of the training received in the United States.

Responses in this section are largely the participants own evaluation of their performance since returning.

¹ The writer agrees with the participants in this matter. These men are going to be moving into positions of responsibility and leadership in their respective States and can have considerable influence on policies and programs in the future. The cost of 3 to 6 months more training is small in comparison to the possible gains.

One could suspect that they would tend to be liberal in these evaluations, however, the sincerity and enthusiasm expressed during the interviews and the comments of the three Directors of Agriculture who were interviewed indicated that there was a real, as well as ascribed improvement, in performance.

As shown in Table 10 all but two of the respondents to the mail questionnaire felt that they were more effective in their work.

Table 10

In terms of accomplishments achieved, and your personal satisfaction with your work now as compared before you went to the U.S., would you say that you are:

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Much more effective in your work	37	51
Somewhat more effective	34	46
About the same	2	3
Loss effective	0	

Further responses indicated that a large majority (66 to 88 percent on the various questions) felt that they had "definitely improved" in (a) their self confidence and ability to do Extension work, (b) being better able to communicate ideas to others, (c) having better working relations with others, (d) being more able in solving problems, and (e) having a better understanding

of India and its development. Only one or two individuals listed "no change", and never more than 5 (7 percent) answered "about the same". From these responses it would seem that most of the participants were more confident in what they were doing and consequently felt they were more productive.

Open end responses during the interview reaffirmed their confidence in their ability to do a better job. Improvement in their teaching methods and ability to communicate to others was mentioned most often in response to seven different types of questions as the biggest area of improvement. The statement by one respondent that "I now behave in a better manner with my students. In involve them in discussion and try to understand their problems" was expressive of the impact that the theory and observation of teaching methods used in the training, had on performance upon return. This matter of improved interpersonal relations with students and staff was mentioned next after teaching methods and communications. Learning to understand the educational aspect of Extension and seeing how this was applied by U.S. Extension workers also had an effect on how they planned and organized their work.¹ One participant said "Most of the workers

¹ It was interesting to note how often a respondent would mention that "Now I have confidence in myself" or "before I did not know what my job was meant for". There can be no doubt that for these individuals the training program did make a significant impact on post-training performance.

just run about attending to current problems. No thought of planning in advance is done. I now recognise the value of planning first".

All of the Directors of Agriculture (3) who were interviewed were very complimentary about the work of the trainees since their return. One was particularly impressed by the improvement in the ability to plan and organize their work and said that those officers who had training were much more dependable and productive than those who had not been trained. The responses relative to productivity on return from training all indicate a marked improvement over pre-training performance. Improved teaching skills, improved relationships with others, self confidence, and a clearer understanding of what Extension education is all about were the major expressed areas of improvement.

Objective 5 - To secure participant reaction after resumption of assignment in India on how the American training could be made more effective.

The participants opinions with regard to degree vs non-degree training have already been discussed under Objective 3 and will not be repeated here except to re-emphasize their rather strong preference for a degree program.

Likewise, the participants suggestions on the amount of emphasis to be placed on the various aspects of the training program as shown in Table 5 on page 22 of this report. Those responses will not be repeated here as reference can be made to the table and comments made under Objective 2.

During the interview the participants were asked for specific suggestions. Their answers to the open-end multiple response question are shown in Table 11.

Table 11

If you had been asked to help plan your training program, in terms of your experience and your job responsibilities before you left India, what changes or additions would you have suggested?

	Rank of Responses				Weighted Score
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	
1. Arrange for more practical field experience	7	13	6	2	81
2. More academic or seminar training in communication	10	10	2	0	74
3. Improvements in Orientation	10	6	0	0	58
4. More involvement in planning the program	7	4	1	0	42
5. No comment. Satisfied as it was.	9	1	0	0	39
6. Program should be for degree	6	2	0	0	30
7. Time too short or too long	2	1	0	0	11
8. Changes in selection	1	2	0	0	10
9. Less field experience	2	0	0	0	8

The desire for an increase in the amount of time spent in practical field experience was again emphasized as was the desire for learning more communication skills. The displeasure with the orientation and lack of involvement in planning was also re-emphasized.

Fifty three of the participants said they would participate in another training program if given a chance. The only one to say no did so because he said that age and personal family problems would make it unwise for him to do so. When asked "What they would do differently next time", 37 percent said they would like more field experience, 30 percent said they would like more academic courses, 15 percent stressed a degree program, 7 percent wanted research experience and the remainder listed miscellaneous reasons.

These suggestions for improving the training are good ones and on the surface do not appear to be too difficult to implement. Certainly the deficiencies in the orientation and planning could be corrected. It would also appear rather easy to provide more field training opportunities. However, with the changes in the roles of U.S. County Extension Agents and the increasing trend toward highly specialized farming, care will have to be taken to see that the field training is in fact practical training.

Objective 6 - To ascertain whether the Extension participants: (a) are being used in jobs for which they have been trained; (b) are effectively using their training.

Among the misconceptions that many people have about participant and foreign student programs are that: (a) only those who have money or friends in high places are selected, (b) that most of those who go for training have more interest in migration than education; and (c) that the skills learned by foreign trained are not made good use of on return. These are legitimate concerns for those who sponsor training, for those who give the training, and for those who expect increased productivity from the participant on his return. For this reason an attempt was made to determine the extent of involvement of the returned participants and how well they were performing in the Extension programs on their return.

Anyone who has dealt with personnel management can appreciate the problems of holding position open or being able to place a returned participant in exactly the right position on return from training. The responses in Table 12 show a very low loss of time between return and posting for most of the participants. It should be pointed out here that all of those who were selected and sent for training under this program had returned to

their jobs and were in place at the time of the study. Not one mentioned returning to the U.S. to work.

Table 12

Time span between returning to India and joining a post.

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
No time lost	55	76
1 - 2 months	16	22
3 - 6 months	1	1
More than 6 months	1	1
	<u>73</u>	<u>100</u>

In a similar question during the interview 74 percent said they were posted to a job for which they were trained immediately on return, thus supporting the percentage shown in mail questionnaire.

In response to a question on how long it took them to get settled in their new post a bit more difficulty was expressed with 15 percent saying that it took 3 months or longer.

As shown in Table 13 most of the participants returned to the same level post, 9 percent moved up and only one was posted at a lower level.

Table 13

Your first post after returning was:

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
At the same level	65	90
At a higher level	7	9
At a lower level	1	1
	<u>73</u>	<u>100</u>

In another question on the mail questionnaire concerning utilization of training (Table 14) the respondents indicated a high level of opportunity for utilization of training.

Table 14

Do you feel that your posting has enabled you to use information from your training?

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
All of the time	24	33
Most of the time	27	37
Part of the time	19	26
Not at all	3	4
	<u>73</u>	<u>100</u>

One would have to agree that a 70 percent high level utilization is very good. Another 26 percent were making some use. Actually this should be considered an excellent level of utilization when one recognizes that the system generally places more emphasis on seniority than on qualifications in filling positions.

Of the 54 respondents interviewed only four were in positions not closely related to Extension Education. Two had been recently placed in charge of state-wide crop development schemes, one cotton and the other sugarcane, the third was in charge of a government cattle farm, and the fourth was a special officer of a municipality. The first two men were in mostly administrative type posts, however, they were probably in unique positions to have an influence on extension workers as they organized resources to speed introduction of these crops throughout the State.

The participant on the cattle farm had been in an Extension Training Institute but his Director had placed him in charge of the farm because of his ability to organize and manage. Even so this was only a temporary loss as his next post will probably give him an opportunity to teach or work with farmers.

All would agree that the fourth case, a Special Officer of a Municipality, is quite far removed from Extension Education. This man, as was the case with the third person above, had been selected by his government to do a job. In this case it was to help a floundering municipality reorganize so they could handle their own administration of taxes and essential services. This

sounds far removed from Extension Education but this participant's attitude and perception indicated that the training efforts were not lost on him. When asked if he could use any of his training, his response was, "Definitely, I have found that the Extension methods of persuasion, demonstration, planning, and developing good personal relations, help me in convincing the people of the need to change. The concept of involving them in decision making and carrying out the work is also used." The training efforts in this case were only temporarily diverted, not lost, as this individual is very likely to fill a useful role in his own department again after a period of a couple years as a special officer.

The record of utilization has to be ranked very high on these trainees. With very few exceptions the participants were employed in the positions for which they were trained. A second very favorable factor was the speed with which they were reassigned on their return, little or no time was lost. These two findings have to be the most gratifying of the observations of the study.

Objective 7 - To identify significant factors which contribute to or hinder utilization and communication of knowledge and skills learned.

A number of factors combine to determine the effectiveness of the returned participant. Among them are his position in the hierarchy, the appropriateness

of the training, his ability to relate to his peers and superiors, the supporting facilities and of course his being posted in the right job. The training and posting aspects have been dealt with in previous sections so it is perhaps sufficient to pass the judgement here that the training was generally adequate and that most of the participants were properly posted on return.

Before a returned participant can be effective he must either have acceptability through authority, or acceptability through knowledge or ability. As has already been pointed out most of these men were in "middle-management" positions. Thus there were possible limitations fixed by reluctant supervisors, as well as the prospect of isolation by peers who had been passed over in selection process.

Two thirds of the respondents to the mail questionnaire said their superior officer had been trained abroad. Twenty seven percent (7 persons) of those whose superiors had not been trained abroad indicated expressions of resentment from these superiors; nearly half of these (3 persons) said this occurred very often.

As shown in Table 15 most of the participants felt that their superiors attitude influenced their opportunities to use their training.

Table 15

Do you feel that your superiors training (or lack of training) influences your opportunity to use the training received abroad?

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Very much	14	19
Some	27	38
Not at all	31	43
	<u>73</u>	<u>100</u>

Responses to an open-end question in the interview express a great deal of difficulty at first in getting their superiors to understand or tolerate their new ideas and suggestions. Most of those that expressed this as a problem indicated that they had been able to resolve this through persuasion, compromise, or demonstration. About one third of those that had a problem with their superior said that this was still unresolved. Two said their problem was resolved by a transfer and subsequently a new boss.

The responses in Table 16 indicate a relatively low level problem of co-worker relations due to training.

Table 16

Have there been occasion when a co-worker or equal have expressed resentment toward you because you have had a foreign experience and he has not?

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Very often	0	0
Sometimes	9	12
Seldom	15	20
Never	49	68
	<u>73</u>	<u>100</u>

This would indicate an acceptance of the selection process along with apparently good relations among the staff at this level.

In an attempt to identify other problems that might hamper progress a question was asked during the interview to see what the respondents considered as a major problem for the extension worker in India. These weighted multiple responses are given in Table 17.

Table 17

What do you consider to be the major problems of the Extension Worker in India?

	Rank of Response				Weighted Score
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	
1. Organizational problems paper work & Red tape	11	10	7	1	89
2. Lack of proper program guidance	7	14	2	0	74
3. Scarce Inputs (As of March 1968)	8	10	3	1	69
4. Farmers illiterate & traditional	11	4	2	1	61
5. Lower level workers poorly trained & motivated.	9	5	4	0	59
6. Low status & limited career.	6	4	4	0	44
7. Lack of technical facilities	2	2	0	0	14

About three fourths of respondents said they felt they were now more effective in dealing with these

problems due to the better understanding of Extension teaching methods. New knowledge of how to work with people to get action and cooperation, and better planning and evaluation had also helped. Many of the remaining one fourth expressed a helpless feeling for making any major change in the problems listed.

Maintaining professional contacts is a final area to be discussed under this section. About half the respondents in the mail questionnaire said that they had occasional or frequent contacts with Americans. The remainder had few, if any, contacts. Eighty six percent joined a Professional Society before leaving the U.S., a little over 50 percent are still members. Almost 60 percent said they used their books, notes and pamphlets very often. Only one said he never used them. The use being made of the printed material certainly seemed to justify the problems and cost of transporting these back to India.

Certain problems preventing full utilization of the training were brought out in this section. Most of these are inherent in the prevalent administrative and social systems of India. Solutions will therefore be slow in coming but until someone demonstrates a better way no change will occur. The writer feels that the professed change in attitude on the part of these participants is

an indication of the changes to come. Some time may be required, and some promotions may be needed before this happens.

Objective 8 - To determine the extent to which trainees are sharing their training with extension workers generally.

In the end, if a participant has not shared his new ideas and concepts with others the benefits of his training will be quite limited. An effort was made to see to what extent the returned participants were used to train others. Those respondents posted at Training Centers or in the Colleges had a ready-made opportunity for training others. This was a part of their regular work.

Just over half of the mail respondents said their superior had asked them to conduct special programs in which to teach others some of the skills and concepts they had learned. The remainder had no special opportunities other than by example in their day to day work. All felt that they had been able to convey some new knowledge to others. Most said this was done through informal personal contacts and through their regular training and teaching jobs. The special training sessions mentioned above, printed material and demonstration were the other methods used.

Most felt that perhaps their best and most subtle method of influencing and training others was through the better teaching methods which they were using. They also felt that the increased confidence which they had in themselves helped them do a more convincing job of teaching others.

About one fourth felt they had been effective in getting others to adopt some of the ideas and methods, another 40 percent felt they were making some progress and the remainder about 35 percent felt they were making little or no progress in this regard. Actually the type of position held had a great influence on their feeling for progress. Those that were teaching had a captive audience while those that had field assignments or administrative type jobs had a more limited opportunity.

This section could be summarized by saying that good progress is being made in sharing new ideas. The opportunity for this is governed largely by the type of post held. Since nearly all of these men held a Class II or higher post each one had some subordinate staff on which he could have some influence. Frequent frustrations were faced in trying to influence those at higher levels but this was improving and should continue to do so.

Refer to Page 4 for the summary of the report.

APPENDIX - A

Name	Respondent to	
	Mail Questionnaire	Interview

Andhra Pradesh:

KUMARASWAMY, Putchala	x	
NAIR, P.S. Damodaran	x	x
NARASIMHA RAO, Inavolu Lakshmi	x	
REDDY, A. Adivi	x	x
REDDY, Danda Rami	x	x

Assam:

BHUYAN, Indra Nath	x	x
BROGOHA IN, Tailendranath	x	x
CHOU DHURY, Rajendra K	x	x
DUARAH, Amulya Narayan	x	
PHOOKHAN, Paresh C	x	x
SARMA, Murali Dhar	x	x

Bihar:

HAMID, Mohammad	x	x
SINHA, Maheshwar	x	x

Gujarat:

BHATT, Balwantray Hiralal	x	
DESAI, Bhaskerra M	x	x
MEHTA, Manubhai K	x	x
PATEL, Chunilal C	x	

Name	Respondent to	
	Mail Questionnaire	Interview
<u>Kerala:</u>		
KELATH, Rama Krishnan	x	x
MANOMOHAN, V.G.	x	x
SATHYA DAS, Kunjukrishnapillai	x	
TAMPI, Arumanna Muralidharan	x	x
THOMAS, C.V.	x	x
<u>Madhya Pradesh:</u>		
KAUSHAL, Hakim Singh	x	
<u>Madras:</u>		
NARASIMHULU, Kilarai	x	
SIVASUBRAMANIAN, Payathancheri Kumarasamy	x	
SRINIVASAN, Srinivasalu	x	x
VENKETARAMAN, Arjunna Murty		x
<u>Maharashtra:</u>		
BURANDE, Dattatraya Ramachandra	x	x
KALOKHE, Jagannath Vithal	x	x
SATHE, Venkatrao B	x	x
SHENDE, Rambhau Maturam	x	
THAKUR, Prabhakar S.	x	
<u>Manipur:</u>		
SINGH, Thokchom Tomba	x	

Name	Respondent to	
	Mail Questionnaire	Interview

Mysore:

CHANNABASAI AH, H.S.M.	x	x
DURAI SWAMY, K.N.	x	x
HANUMAPPA, Pillappa	x	x
HIREMATH, Namasaya Bassawantayya	x	x
KATTI, Satyabhodh V	x	x
RAO, Dattatreya	x	x
RAO, Ranganatha Bungley	x	x
SETHURAO, M.K.	x	x
TALUR, Channaveerappa Veerabhadrapa	x	x

New Delhi

BALASUBRAHMANYA, Kumbakenam R.	x	x
CHAUHAN, Mam Chand	x	x
CHAWLA, Sant Singh	x	x
SINGH, Bal Dev	x	x

Orissa:

DAS, Dwarika C	x	
MALLICK, Bikram	x	x
MISRA, Brundaban		x
PANDA, Kishor Chandra	x	
PARIDA, Arnand C	x	
RAJAGURU, Gopeswar	x	x
ROUT, Kashinath	x	x
SAHOO, Madan Sundar	x	x

Name	Respondent to	
	Mail Questionnaire	Interview
<u>Punjab:</u>		
GUPTA, Chaman Lal	x	x
KAUSHIK, Rameshwar Datt	x	x
SINGH, Badri	x	x
SODHI, Mool Singh	x	x
<u>Rajasthan:</u>		
BHURAT, Nemi Chand	x	x
RAO, Purushottam Vaman	x	x
<u>Uttar Pradesh:</u>		
BHADORIA, S.S.	x	x
DUBE, K.C.	x	
GUPTA, Rameshwar Prassad	x	x
MISRA, Om Shankar		x
SINGH, Pratap Narain	x	
SINGH, Sheo Murat	x	
SINGH, Surendra Pratap	x	x
YADAV, Ram Sewak	x	
<u>West Bengal:</u>		
BOSE, Biney Krishna	x	x
DE, Santosh Kumar	x	
DUTTA, Biman Kumar	x	
GUHA, Prodosh K	x	x
NAGBISWAS, Sudhir Chandra	x	x
PAL, Bhabatosh	x	x
PAUL, Dhiresk Kumar	x	
SARKER, Dakshina Rajan	x	x