

PARTICIPANT ASSESSMENT
OF
AID TRAINING PROGRAMS

SECOND ANNUAL REPORT

JULY 1970

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

RN-AAC-916

SECOND ANNUAL REPORT ON PARTICIPANT ASSESSMENT
OF AID TRAINING PROGRAMS
(A SHORT SUMMARY AND MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS)

I. Introduction

The attached Second Annual Report on Participant Assessment of AID Training Programs is part of a continuing effort to evaluate our participant training activities. Systematic standardized exit interviews with participants who have completed their training programs have been conducted for the past three years by the Development Education and Training Research Institute (DETRI) of American University, Washington, D. C. Although other special reports on this project have been issued, this is the second annual statistical and analytic report. The first report was based on data from interviews with 2420 participants departing through Washington, D. C., between July 1967 and August 1968. This second annual report includes data on 1887 participant trainees in academic and special programs, and members of observational training teams, who were interviewed the following year.

The purpose of the exit interview, of course, is to provide AID's Office of International Training with information on the participants' training experiences in the U. S. and their evaluative judgments about these experiences. The findings from these evaluation efforts give us "feed-back" for improvement in our management of the training programs. This report, like the one last year, tells us that by and large AID is doing a pretty good job. Participants, on the whole, are equally as satisfied as they were last year, and in some areas there has been decided progress over last year. This summary emphasizes some aspects where management might be improved even more.

II. Contents of the Report

The three-part report analyzes participants' responses in relation to training objectives. Part 1 describes the participants' degree of overall satisfaction with their training programs and lists the main characteristics of the entire group of 1887 persons interviewed. Part 2 gives detailed information of the views of 643 academic and 741 special program participants and their satisfaction with the program. This part makes recommendations pertinent only for these groups. Part 3 deals with reactions of 82 observation teams, comprised of 503 participants. Recommendations for this group only are included in this part.

III. Implications of the Report

While the findings, conclusions and recommendations contained in the report are those of the contractor and not necessarily those of the Agency for International Development, AID/W has no reason to doubt them. Earnest consideration of them should result in improved practices and programs.

The actions to follow the recommendations based on the findings in this report apply to various offices having responsibility for training. A goodly share of them rest squarely on OIT in AID/W. Some rest on OIT in conjunction with the Missions. Some can be carried out only by the USAIDs. A few are pertinent for participating agencies. There are several which are not under the control of U. S. government authorities and these will have to be dealt with through universities or authorities at various training facilities. A smoothly running

program will require action by everyone involved. The recommendations listed below are based on factors which analysis showed were substantially conclusive. There are, however, many other findings contained in the full report which suggest possible actions for improvements in specific aspects of the overall program. It is advisable, therefore, to give careful reading to the full report.

IV. Rationale of the Study

For the second year, the "yardsticks" for measuring outcomes of training were:

- (1) satisfaction with the technical aspects of training.
- (2) satisfaction with the social-personal aspects of their period of training in the States.
- (3) overall satisfaction with the participant training program.

This measure of the participant's satisfaction is used because it is known from prior studies that it is highly related to his eventual utilization of his skills after his return to his home country. Whether or not a participant uses his newly acquired knowledge and skill is, after all, the ultimate criterion of success of the training program. Statistical analysis of the data permits finding out just which factors lead to the increasing or decreasing of the participant's satisfactions. The logic underlying this study runs: Satisfactions with various aspects of a training program have long range effects. Therefore, if those factors which influence a person's satisfactions can be controlled, then his satisfactions can be increased; if his satisfactions can be increased, then the probability of his eventually using his skills back home can be increased.

V. Findings of the Study

The findings are given separately for the three types of participants--academic trainees, special trainees, and observation team members. Academic trainees are those participants who attend regular curriculum courses for one or more academic terms in an accredited institution which grants an academic degree (whether or not a degree is the objective, and whether or not courses are audited or taken for credit). Special trainees are those participants whose program includes courses, seminars, or other organized activities in a specialized field, and which may result in the award of a certificate or diploma. Observation team members are those participants who proceed together as a group during their training, and whose program of learning consists of visiting and observing at a number of facilities, usually in a number of cities, or a variety of geographic areas.

The findings reported here are those which were "statistically significant." They are not necessarily listed in the order of priority.

- a. For Academic Trainees, the four "factors" which most importantly affected satisfactions with the technical aspects of training were:

- (1) The extent to which the participant considered his course work to be relevant and at his level of understanding.
- (2) The degree to which American friendships were considered important.

- (3) The amount of difficulty in communicating with his Program Development Officer or Program Officer.
- (4) The extent of the participant's agreement with the content of his proposed and final training plan and whether requested changes were made.

For Special Trainees, the eight principal factors that were identified as affecting satisfactions were:

- (1) The extent of agreement between proposed and final training programs and whether requested changes were made.
- (2) The amount of difficulty in communicating with the Program Development Officer or Program Officer.
- (3) Problems with Special classroom training.
- (4) The extent of the participant's (and his supervisor's) involvement in developing the proposed training plan.
- (5) The degree to which American friendships were considered important.
- (6) The nationality of roommates and friends.
- (7) Problems with housing in the U.S.
- (8) Whether or not the Special participant met with his Program Development Officer or Program Officer before his training began.

For both Academic and Special participants a good deal of background information is gathered. None of the following background factors had any statistically significant influence (in increasing or decreasing the participant's satisfactions):

- English as the native language
- Age
- Education
- Sex
- Marital status
- Size of hometown
- Previous travel outside their home country
- Previous travel to the U.S.

For Observation Team Members, no analysis was made of those factors which might affect their satisfactions. However, almost two out of three rated their overall satisfaction with their entire training experience in the top two positions on the satisfaction rating scale. The majority of team members interviewed considered that their USAID briefing was useful in helping them prepare for their experiences in the U.S., but 75% of them had suggestions for improving those briefings. The most frequent suggestions along these lines concerned receiving copies of the objectives and content of the proposed program prior to the briefing; being given an opportunity to discuss the program at the briefing; and being given an opportunity to make suggestions about their proposed program. Other findings are suggestive of a certain amount of "hurry" in getting team members together and over to the U.S. without full attention being given to fairly important matters.

VI. Recommendations

The implications of these findings lead to a conclusion that what happens to a participant during the period of his training in the U.S. is much more important in determining his reactions than are any of his prior background experiences. They also lead to recommendations for action in areas where AID can actually do something (to increase or decrease these trainees' satisfactions). It would be highly advisable:

If USAID Training Officers (and/or Technical Advisors) would:

- meet with every participant and establish rapport prior to his training.
- ensure relevance of a trainee's program and make sure it is in accord with his level of understanding.
- improve communication between themselves and the trainee.
- try to accommodate the trainee's wishes and preferences when planning his program.
- modify his program in accordance with his request whenever feasible, and when this is consistent with employer requirements and program objectives.

If AID/W (PDO's) or participating agencies (Program Officers) would:

- assist in ironing out problems in Special classroom training when these become known.
- try to influence those authorities handling the placement of participants with roommates so that distracting features are removed, and more amenable companions are located.
- alleviate the housing problems when these become known.
- meet with every participant and establish rapport prior to his training.
- take any steps that are practicable to get the trainee involved with American hospitality.
- improve communication between the PDO or Program Officer and the trainee.

For members of Observation Training Teams, the recommendations are even more specific (and probably should be attended to by USAID technicians and others in addition to USAID Training Officers or "local" training specialists):

- (1) Discuss the objectives and content of the proposed and final training program for the team at the USAID briefing. Team members should be given an outline of the proposed program before the briefing. They should have an opportunity to indicate their training interests to USAID in advance of the briefing, and to offer specific suggestions concerning the proposed training program during the briefing. If their suggestions cannot be accepted, they should be given an explanation.
- (2) Hold the USAID briefing sufficiently in advance of the team members' departure date so that time is available for discussion of the major subjects specified in M.O. 1382.4. Briefings held on the day of departure are frequently hurried, and the team members are too excited about leaving to pay full attention.

- (3) Try to compose the membership of observation training teams so that they are relatively homogeneous in terms of educational and professional background, job responsibilities, and training interests. This may not always be possible, but keep in mind that lack of homogeneity in a team frequently results in lowered satisfaction, and sometimes leads to lack of interest by individual members in parts of the training program.
- (4) Plan programs so that an opportunity for in-depth observation of training activities is provided during training visits. This might be accomplished by scheduling fewer visits during a training program and allowing more time for each.
- (5) Adapt the level of briefings and presentations in accordance with the make-up of the audience. Officials in USAIDs, in AID/W, in participating agencies, and at training sites who conduct orientations, briefings, and training programs for observation teams should be aware of the educational and professional backgrounds of the team members, and avoid "talking-down" to them.
- (6) Allow time for cultural, social, and personal activities in the program itinerary. These activities should be arranged as part of the scheduled program. Team members should be afforded an opportunity to gain an understanding of the United States both through their technical training and their non-training activities.
- (7) Give some training in basic English before the departure of observation training team members to the extent practicable. At least one member of observation training teams should have sufficient knowledge of English to help the team make known its needs and wishes in situations when the interpreter is not present.

VII. Summary

A finding uncovered this year, but which was not clear in earlier reports, points to the significance of the treatment of the participant by USAID personnel, by the OIT Program Development Officer, or by the participating agency's program officer. Participants are sensitive to this treatment to the extent that it pervades a great many other areas of their training experience in the U.S. Rapport with the participant is of paramount importance. This is a problem of which Training Officers have always been aware, but the great percentage of participants reporting some degree of dissatisfaction with "communication" with these key personnel can only mean a redoubling of efforts in this critical human relations area. In this highly important activity:

- provide more lead time to prepare for travel to the U.S.
- take more time to go over the training plan with the individual participant.
- listen to his objections and suggestions and those of his supervisor.
- try to accommodate the participant's wishes if it is feasible, and not inconsistent with program objectives.
- remember that the U.S. government has a large investment in this person and that the return on that investment may be largely dependent on the USAID technician's, the Training Officer's or the Program Development Officer's actions and behavior with him.

Participant Assessment

Of

AID Training Programs

July 1970

000257

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

000175

5

6

INTRODUCTION

This Second Annual Report on Participant Assessment of A.I.D. Training Programs was prepared by the Development Education and Training Research Institute, American University Washington, D. C. under Contract No. AID/CSD-1839. The findings, conclusions and recommendations contained in the report are those of the contractor and not necessarily those of the Agency for International Development.

Systematic standardized exit interviews with participants who have completed their training programs have been conducted for the past three years. Not all participants departing the U.S. after the completion of their training are given this exit interview, but a large proportion of those returning to their home countries through East coast ports come to Washington, D. C. for the opportunity offered by this interview. The group is large enough and representative enough to give us a feel for "how things are going". And it is detailed enough to allow us to improve things where and when they matter.

The first annual report of May 1969 was based on data from interviews of 2420 participants who left this country between July 1967 and August 1968. This second annual report includes data on 1887 participant trainees who were given exit interviews between September 1968 and September 1969. It focuses separately on those 1384 who were placed in academic and special programs, and another 503 participants who were members of observational ^{and} ~~training~~ training teams.

There are many ways for the A.I.D. Office of International Training to obtain information about the quality of the training which each participant has received under our auspices. The participants' assessment is only one of these ways. We honor and respect their evaluative judgments, for we know that their thoughts and feelings about their training can be directly related to the goals and objectives of the entire program.



Robert E. Matteson
Director
Office of International
Training

July 1970

FOREWORD

This report was prepared by Paul R. Kimmel, William A. Lybrand, and William C. Ockey of the American University's Development Education and Training Research Institute, under Contract AID/csd-1839.

The authors were ably assisted by Mary Ann Edsall, Ann Fenderson, Robert Griffith, and Eugene B. Kassman, also of the staff of the American University's Development Education and Training Research Institute (DETRI).

The authors wish to express their appreciation to Mr. John Lippmann and particularly to Dr. Forrest Clements, the project monitor, both of the Agency for International Development, Office of International Training, Planning and Evaluation Staff, for their helpful and professional advice and guidance. The continued support of Dr. Martin McLaughlin, Deputy Director, and the significance given to evaluation in general and the Exit Interview in particular by Mr. Robert Matteson, Director, Office of International Training, have given an increased relevance to the work of the project staff.

The instruments, procedures, and analytic approach for this project were developed with the advice and counsel of: Mr. Lloyd Free, Institute for International Social Research; Dr. Eugene Jacobson, Michigan State University; Dr. Daniel Lerner, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Dr. Harley Preston, American Psychological Association; and Dr. Bryant Wedge, Tufts University. Dr. Antanas Suziedelis, Catholic University, has provided invaluable assistance with the data analysis, and Mr. Edmund Glenn, University of Delaware, has contributed both to the training of interviewers and the refinement of the research

approach. These men make up the Technical Advisory Committee for the Exit Interview Project. The technical quality of the document reflects the suggestions of these consultants, but, of course, they cannot be held responsible for any inadequacies which may still exist.

PREFACE

This second annual analytic report on exit interviews conducted with participants of the Agency for International Development, Office of International Training Programs has been prepared in three parts. Each part has been prepared so that it is "self-contained" and can be read independently, depending upon the reader's interests.

Part 1 includes aggregate data for all 1887 participants included in the report.

Part 2 includes aggregate data for the 643 Academic and the 741 Special program participants interviewed between November 20, 1968 and August 31, 1969. These data are obtained by 2 complementary techniques. The first is a printed, standardized, structured questionnaire that is filled out by the participants under the supervision of a questionnaire administrator. The second technique is an oral, unstructured interview conducted with each participant on a private, anonymous basis.

Part 3 is a report on the 82 observational training teams interviewed between September 24, 1968, and September 2, 1969. These data are obtained by a standardized, structured questionnaire that is administered orally to the team members as a group.

More detailed information on the instruments and procedures used to collect the exit interview data are included in the Final Report on the AID Participant Training Exit-Interview Development Study, December, 1967.

The function of the exit interview system is to provide A.I.D.'s Office of International Training (AID/OIT) with reliable and valid information on the participants' training experiences and their evaluative judgments about these experiences. This report provides an overview of the participants'

reactions to the various aspects of their entire A.I.D. experience, and examines the key participant responses analytically in terms of their relationships to training program characteristics.

These responses and relationships, in turn, were analyzed further to determine if they varied in terms of the participants': (1) world region, (2) type of training program, (3) field of training, and (4) participating agency (if any). All relationships were examined for statistical significance.¹

A special, intensive analysis of the principal satisfactions of Academic and Special participants was carried out. The results of this analysis are presented in Chapter I of Part 2. A special Technical Supplement, at the end of the report, describes this analysis.

The first chapter in Parts 2 and 3 of the report presents overall impressions gained from a review of the data and the data analyses contained in that part of the report. Within each section of most of the other chapters, statistical results are presented in the following standard manner: First, a question is posed; second, a table of percentages² reflecting the answers to that question is presented; third, a brief description of the percentages in the table is given; and fourth, important differences among characteristics of

¹Only those relationships which were found to be significant at the .05 level are presented in this report. This means that the obtained relationship (between the two variables involved) could have occurred by chance alone less than once in 20 times. Thus, we believe that the obtained relationship is "real" and not a result of chance alone.

²The percentages are presented to one decimal place to avoid confusion due to rounding errors and to provide the interested reader with exact information on the number of participants giving each response. This extra decimal place is not intended to convey vital statistical information.

the participants answering the question are listed.

The tables presented in this report have been carefully selected to be of relevance to potential users. A presentation of all descriptive and analytic tables compiled would be encyclopedic. Therefore, the authors have chosen the items which are necessary to give the reader a clear and comprehensive picture of the participants' experiences and evaluations, and the analytic factors which are most directly and meaningfully related to this picture. Emphasis has been placed on those factors over which the Office of International Training has some measure of administrative control. This is not to imply that all the information in this report will be of immediate use to all readers, but it is relevant and necessary to an understanding of the conclusions presented in the report.

It is vital that the reader remember that these conclusions are based exclusively upon the experiences and evaluations of the participants who pass through Washington, D.C., on their return to their home countries, between the dates indicated in the first paragraph, and who appeared at the American University's Development Education and Training Research Institute for an exit interview. During this time period, approximately 2650 A.I.D. participants left the

³The reader will notice differences in the number of participants answering the questions presented in this report. When these differences are small, they are likely to be due to the normal procedural discrepancies that occur in the Exit Interview (see Descriptive Statistical Report, May, 1968, pp. i-vi-vii). Larger differences can be attributed to the fact that the questionnaire for the First Annual Report underwent 2 revisions prior to the printing of the questionnaire which appears in this report. Some questions that are in this questionnaire were not asked in the 2 revisions. Therefore, some participants did not have the opportunity to answer questions that are presented in this report.

United States. Almost 2/3 of these reported to DETRI for an exit interview. More specifically, about 85% of the departing Near East-South Asian participants; 75% of the departing African participants; 70% of the departing Far Eastern participants; and 45% of the departing Latin American participants were interviewed and are the basis for this report. Participants who departed from Miami, New Orleans, and San Francisco probably account for some of the losses in participants interviewed, especially in the case of Latin America.

There is ample evidence that the information in this report is both reliable and valid for the participants interviewed. The tests of (1) the internal consistency of participants' responses to the questionnaires, (2) interviewers' estimates of participants' validity, and (3) comparisons with results of other studies which were made for the First Annual Report were repeated on these data. The results of all these analyses show the data to be technically acceptable relative to research findings from comparable studies (see First Annual Report, Preface, pp. iv-v).

There has been no attempt in this report to compare the responses of this year's participants with those given in the First Annual Report. These comparisons would be quite tenuous, as the questionnaires on which the 2 reports are based are different,⁴ and there are significant differences between the participants in the 2 reports in terms of their background and program characteristics (see page xi).

Following is a glossary which presents the acronyms used throughout this report.

⁴The first questionnaire was discontinued on November 20, 1968. The responses of 243 participants who filled out this version of the questionnaire between September 1, 1968, and this date are not included in either of these reports.

GLOSSARY

- ACAD: Academic program participant; a student who had a training program for one or more academic terms in regular curriculum courses in an accredited institution which grants an academic degree, whether or not a degree is the objective and whether or not courses are audited or taken for credit.
- AID/W: Agency headquarters in Washington, D.C.
- AID/OIT: A.I.D. Office of International Training.
- DETRI: Development Education and Training Research Institute, The American University, Washington, D.C.
- H.C.: home country; the participant's country of residence.
- Host government: the participant's home country government.
- OJT: on-the-job training.
- TEAM: Observation training team participants; trainees who have training programs of short duration, who usually are higher level people, and who learn primarily through observation at a number of facilities usually in a number of cities or other geographic areas.
- SPEC: Special program participant; a participant whose training included one or more of the following types of training: (1) courses, seminars, or other organized programs in a specialized field which may result in the award of a certificate or diploma; (2) intensive briefings and instruction on a specific job or group of related jobs with an opportunity for close observation of the work activities, actual work experience, or both; (3) brief visits to offices, businesses, factories, government agencies, or other organizations to observe work processes and activities.
- USAID: A.I.D. Mission overseas.
- WIC: Washington International Center.

SUMMARY

MAJOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

For the second year, the A.I.D. participants who took part in DETRI's exit interviews report a generally high level of satisfaction with both their technical training and the social-personal aspects of their sojourns in the United States. In addition to being consistent with the data included in DETRI's First Annual Report to A.I.D.'s Office of International Training, the general results in this report are comparable to those of other studies of foreign students in the United States (see First Annual Report, May, 1969).

Although the A.I.D. participants continue to be generally satisfied with their programs in the United States, a majority of the 1887 participants interviewed reported some degree of dissatisfaction and specific difficulties with aspects of their total experience. Statistical analyses were used to determine which events and reactions were most consistently related to the satisfaction ratings given on the technical training, social-personal, and overall rating scales. Those factors which clearly differentiated between the highly satisfied participants and the less satisfied on these scales are discussed below and compared with the findings and recommendations in the First Annual Report (May, 1969).

New Findings (Not in the First Annual Report)

1. Relationships with OIT Program Development Officer or Participating Agency Program Officer: A major finding which was made possible by the revision of the DETRI questionnaire was that participants who reported difficulties in communicating with their Program Development Officer or Program Officer and who were dissatisfied with that communication were also likely

to be dissatisfied with their overall experience, their technical training, and their personal-social experiences in the United States. This, of course, is a problem with which Program Officers have long been familiar. The significance of this factor in accounting for participants' satisfactions with all aspects of their A.I.D. experience suggests that a redoubling of efforts is needed in this critical area of human relations.

Other results of the statistical analyses indicate that Program Officers whom participants perceive as meeting with them and explaining training plans so that they understand and agree with them, respecting their requests, having no difficulties in communicating with them, and attending to their backgrounds and problems tend to have satisfied participants.

On the other hand, those Program Officers whom participants perceive as not having enough time to meet with them or to explain plans as necessary, not giving adequate attention to their objections and suggestions, not dealing with them as individuals, and not being familiar with their backgrounds and problems are much more likely to have dissatisfied participants.

It is realized that the variety of programs and participants make it difficult for Program Officers with large numbers of trainees to treat each one as individually as they would like. However, such treatment is vital to the success of the average participant's training program. The results of the data analyses strongly suggest that there is no substitute for a Program Officer whom the participant regards as his friend rather than his supervisor.

2. & 3. American friendships and home hospitality: Participants who formed important friendships with Americans in the United States were more likely to be satisfied with their overall experience, their technical training, and their personal-social experiences during their sojourns than participants who did not form such friendships. In the First Annual Report the friendship item was only one of several

which related to satisfaction with personal and social experiences in the United States. However, in this report, this factor has taken on an increased significance and relates to all areas of participant satisfaction.

Another factor which has become more relevant and more broadly significant in this report than in the First Annual Report is that of home hospitality. Participants who took part in more visits to more American families gave higher ratings of satisfaction on the social-personal scale than those who experienced less home hospitality.

These two findings suggest that participants who meet and get to know Americans are more likely to be satisfied with both their personal and training activities. It may be that this satisfaction is due to the information Americans can provide, as well as their hospitality and companionship. For example, friendships with Americans may sensitize participants to aspects of the American educational system that otherwise seem arbitrary and incomprehensible. It is likely that those participants who were able to meet and become acquainted with American host families, students, and other personnel at training sites spent less time in fruitless or irrelevant activities and quests for information and thus benefitted more from their sojourns.

Thus, it is recommended that increased efforts be made to promote friendships and home visits with Americans. In doing this, it will be necessary to discourage trainees from rooming and going to social events only with people from their own home countries. The data in both this report and in the First Annual Report strongly suggest that participants who restrict their friendships and living arrangements to other foreign nationals--especially those from their own country--tend to be less satisfied with all aspects of their U.S. experience than participants who meet and become friendly with American citizens. This is not to suggest that the participant be

entirely isolated from fellow countrymen, as it is also important to share languages, customs, and other amenities when in a foreign country. However, those participants who would not move beyond the circle of their own countrymen without some prodding, should be given special attention to involve them in American life.

Findings Similar to Those in The First Annual Report

1. Participants' understanding, agreement, and suggestions for training programs: A factor which again relates strongly to the participant's satisfaction with his overall experience as an A.I.D. participant and with his technical training program is the extent to which he understands the content of his proposed and final training program plan, agrees with that content, and feels that his requests for changes were honored. Participants who disagreed with either their proposed or final training plans or who felt that their suggestions were disregarded, were less satisfied than participants who understood and agreed with their training plans.

It is vital that both participants and their supervisors feel that their suggestions are welcome and given careful consideration in the planning of their training program. In most cases, it is more important that the participant fully understands why decisions are made as they are and that his suggestions are given a fair hearing, than it is that his requests are met. This recommendation applies most strongly to participants in Special training programs and on Observation training teams where the more concrete nature of the training program and the extent of expertise felt by the participant and his supervisor are most clearly defined.

2. Level and relevance of classroom training: Participants who felt that the classroom training they received was not at their level of understanding, or who felt that the

work was not related to their training objectives, tended to be more dissatisfied with their technical training than participants who felt their course work was relevant. This finding replicates one of the results in the First Annual Report (see page x, May, 1969), and suggests a continuing need to clarify for the participant the relevance of his program.

The difficulties encountered by those participants who do not have such clarification vary somewhat for Academic and Special participants. The Academic participants who were more dissatisfied were those who reported that their course work was too simple, unrelated to their major field, and contained a great amount of duplication. Participants in Special training programs who tended to be less satisfied with their technical training reported that their class work was too simple, too general, had too much duplication of subject matter, or did not include enough lecturing and discussion.

It is suggested that more thorough and detailed discussions of course schedules and curricula be held with participants as appropriate, at USAIDs, in Washington, D.C., and at training sites. Academic participants should be informed of University requirements, while Special participants need some information on teaching techniques. Those personnel involved in these discussions must be familiar with both the course requirements at the training institutions and the participant's background to insure a complete understanding and acceptance of the course work involved in the training program.

3. Housing arrangements: A.I.D. participants who report housing difficulties in the U.S. continue to show lower levels of satisfaction with their overall experience as participants and their personal-social relationships. Those participants in Special training programs who have housing difficulties also tend to be less satisfied with their technical training. This finding does not hold for the Academic participants' satisfaction with their technical training.

Since the items which make up this factor are very similar to those which comprised the factor in the First Annual Report, the DETRI recommendation remains the same. Participants should be informed about and helped with housing arrangements in advance of and after their arrival at their training sites as suggested on page xii of the First Annual Report (May, 1969).

4. Discrimination: Participants who report being discriminated against in the United States and who are rated by DETRI's interviewers as suffering discrimination were more likely to be dissatisfied with their personal-social experiences than participants who did not experience discrimination. Although this finding reinforces a similar result in the 1969 Report, the relationship is not as strong as it was for the earlier participants. However, it is sufficiently significant to merit repeating the recommendation of preparing participants for the common types of discrimination they may encounter during their training sojourn in the United States (see page xii, First Annual Report, May, 1969).

Findings Not Replicated from The First Annual Report

The analyses undertaken for the Second Annual Report indicate that the factors of difficulty with the English language, participation in Pre-University workshops, and difficulties with money allowances are not related to participant satisfactions and dissatisfactions as they were in the First Annual Report (see page xiii, May, 1969). Although it is possible that changes in the selection and briefing of participants may account for these differences (particularly in the first 2 of these factors), it is difficult to determine exactly why these factors no longer predict satisfaction as they did in the earlier report.

It may well be that the differences in the backgrounds of the participants in the two different reports are sufficient to

account for these changes. There are proportionately more participants from the Far East and less from Africa in the Second Annual Report. The participants in this report are on the average younger, and more likely to be married and have more years of education than those in the First Annual Report. The participants in the Second Annual Report who are in the field of Agriculture more often are Special training participants from the Near East-South Asia and the Far East, than Academic program participants from Africa, as they were in the First Annual Report. There are also proportionately more Far Eastern participants in the field of Education and in Academic training programs than there were in the First Annual Report. The participants from Latin America are less often in Special training programs and in the field of Education than they were in the First Annual Report, and the participants from the Near East-South Asia are less often in Public Administration.

The only one of the remaining recommendations from the First Annual Report which is still valid in light of the findings of this report is that Observation Training Teams should have at least one member with sufficient fluency in English to enable the team members to cope with social situations that confront them when interpreters or other escort officers are not available.

FINAL NOTES

As in the First Annual Report there are no simple, easily identified patterns of responses given by participants from different world regions, in different fields of training, or programmed by different agencies about experiences which were found to be related to participant satisfaction. In addition, one of the three criterion outcomes (technical training) was not significantly related to any of the participants' background experiences. The other two both related moderately to marital status; and participants' satisfaction related to age

and previous travel, while overall satisfaction related to education. The lack of consistent patterns and the weakness of relationships between background variables and satisfaction suggest that what happens to a participant during his U.S. sojourn is much more important in determining his reactions than any of his earlier personal or social background experiences, including: (1) English the native language, (2) age, (3) education (number of years), (4) sex, (5) marital status, (6) size of home town (rural-urban), (7) previous travel outside home country, (8) previous travel to the United States, (9) region, and (10) field of training.

In those areas where A.I.D. has program and policy opportunities, suggested changes are likely to have maximum impact on participant evaluation of their overall experiences, their personal-social activities, and their technical training program since background factors are not as relevant. However, the effectiveness of these recommendations in influencing participant satisfaction is dependent upon maintaining (or improving) present standards of performance in all other areas. If these standards are not maintained, the recommendations will not be as effective in promoting satisfaction as they otherwise might. The high overall level of satisfaction of A.I.D. participants indicates that a generally effective job is being done throughout OIT. Implementation of the recommendations and improvement of these standards should produce even higher levels of participant satisfaction.

PART 1

OVERVIEW OF ALL PARTICIPANTS

CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page</u>
I	Overall Satisfaction of All Participants	
	A. Overall Satisfaction of All Participants	1
	B. Overall Satisfaction of Participants In Different Types of Training Programs	2
	C. Overall Satisfaction of Participants In Different Fields of Training	3
	D. Overall Satisfaction of Participants Programmed by Different Government Agencies	4
	E. Overall Satisfaction of Participants From Different Regions	5
II	Important Characteristics of Participants Interviewed	
	A. Length of Stay in the United States	6
	B. Age	7
	C. Marital Status and Sex	8
	D. Years of Prior Education	9

CHAPTER I
OVERALL SATISFACTION OF ALL PARTICIPANTS

Section A

Overall Satisfaction of All Participants

Q. How satisfied were the participants with their training program as a whole?

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely satisfied)	25.0
2	44.3
3	22.4
4	5.6
5	1.7
6	.7
7 (Not at all satisfied)	.3
TOTAL N *	
	(1883)

*Ratings given by 4 participants were not made according to instructions and could not be included in the total.

About 7 out of 10 participants (69.3%) checked one of the top 2 points on the scale to indicate their overall satisfaction with their training programs. A rating of "1" indicates that the participant was "extremely satisfied" and his "training program could not have been better." Only 2.7% of the participants rated their overall satisfaction below the middle of the scale.

Section B

Overall Satisfaction of Participants In Different Types of Training Programs

Q. Did participants in different training programs vary in assessing their satisfaction with the program as a whole?

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE (%) IN TYPE OF PROGRAM			TOTAL N
	Acad	Spec	Team	
1	27.6	26.9	18.8	(470)
2	44.1	43.6	45.8	(835)
3	20.9	22.0	24.8	(421)
4	5.6	4.6	7.0	(105)
5-7	1.9	3.0	3.6	(52)
TOTAL N*	(642)	(741)	(500)	(1883)

*Ratings given by 4 participants were not made according to instructions and could not be included in the total.

34% of the participants interviewed at DETRI were in Academic training programs, 39% were in Special training programs, and 27% were in Observation training.

While the distribution of ratings given by Academic and Special participants are quite similar, the Observation Team participants less often gave "1" ratings and slightly more often gave ratings at or below the middle of the scale. This may be due, in part, to the fact that Observation Team participants express their overall satisfaction ratings anonymously and thus feel freer to be critical.

27

Section C

Overall Satisfaction of Participants
In Different Fields of Training

Q. Did participants in different fields of training vary in assessing their satisfaction with the program as a whole?

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE (%) IN FIELD OF TRAINING							TOTAL N
	Ag	I&M	Tr	H&S	Ed	PA	Other	
1	26.0	21.0	30.0	24.0	31.5	22.4	19.4	(470)
2	46.2	45.2	40.0	43.4	43.8	44.7	43.4	(835)
3	20.5	27.4	20.8	23.5	19.2	22.1	27.1	(421)
4	5.5	4.0	3.3	4.5	5.1	6.7	7.4	(105)
5-7	1.8	2.4	5.8	4.5	.3	4.1	2.7	(52)
TOTAL N*	(439)	(124)	(120)	(221)	(333)	(389)	(257)	(1883)

*Ratings given by 4 participants were not made according to instructions and could not be included in the total.

More than 20% of the participants were in each of the fields of Agriculture (23.3%) and Public Administration (20.6%). Education was third among the fields with 17.6% of the participants. 11.7% of the participants were in the field of Health and Sanitation, while Industry and Mining and the field of Transportation each had about 6% of the participants. Over half the participants in the "Other" category were in the field of Labor.

Participants in the fields of Education (31.5%) and Transportation (30.0%) more often gave "1" ratings while those in the "Other" fields least often gave this rating to their satisfaction with their total program (19.4%). Participants in the field of Education least often gave ratings below the middle point of the scale (.3%).

Section D

Overall Satisfaction of Participants Programmed
by Different Government Agencies

Q. Did participants programmed by different agencies vary in rating their satisfaction with their training programs as a whole?

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE (%) BY AGENCY					TOTAL N
	AID	Ag	OE	PHS	Other	
1	22.9	24.6	34.6	18.3	27.4	(470)
2	43.9	46.7	43.8	47.7	42.7	(835)
3	24.1	21.8	15.0	21.1	22.5	(421)
4	6.3	4.6	5.2	5.5	5.2	(105)
5-7	2.9	2.3	1.3	7.3	2.2	(52)
TOTAL N*	(827)	(349)	(153)	(109)	(445)	(1883)

*Ratings given by 4 participants were not made according to instructions and could not be included in the total.

Participants programmed directly by A.I.D. composed 43.9% of the total number of participants. The only other agency that programmed over 10% of the total was the Department of Agriculture with 18.9% of the total.

Participants programmed by the Office of Education most often gave "1" ratings for their satisfaction with their training program (34.6%), while those programmed by the Public Health Service least often (18.3%) gave "1" ratings. Conversely, those participants programmed by the Office of Education least often gave ratings below the middle point of the scale while participants programmed by the Public Health Service most often gave such ratings.

Section E
Overall Satisfaction of Participants
From Different Regions

Q. Did participants from different regions vary in assessing their satisfaction with their training program as a whole?

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION				TOTAL N
	NESA	FE	LA	Afr	
1	21.2	24.2	25.9	31.4	(464)
2	43.4	45.2	45.5	42.3	(806)
3	23.7	25.1	19.8	19.1	(401)
4	7.2	4.1	5.2	6.0	(103)
5-7	4.5	1.1	3.7	1.2	(49)
TOTAL N*	(486)	(459)	(464)	(414)	(1823)

*58 participants were members of multi-region training teams, whose satisfaction ratings, given anonymously, could not be included in the totals for individual regions. Ratings given by 4 participants were not made according to instructions and could not be included in the total.

Participants from the Near East-South Asia least often gave "1" ratings (21.2%) and most often gave ratings at or below the middle point of the scale (11.7%). Far Eastern participants least often gave ratings at or below the middle point of the scale (5.2%), while participants from Africa most often gave "1" ratings (31.4%).

CHAPTER II
 IMPORTANT CHARACTERISTICS OF
 PARTICIPANTS INTERVIEWED

Section A

Length of Stay in the United States

Q. How long were the participants' sojourns in the United States?

LENGTH OF PROGRAM (Months)	PERCENTAGE (%)		
	Total	Acad & Spec	Team
1	2.4	.2	8.2
2	16.6	2.4	54.9
3	15.3	9.6	30.6
4	5.6	6.6	2.8
5 - 7	15.7	20.2	3.6
8 - 11	11.6	15.8	0.0
12 - 15	10.0	13.8	0.0
16 - 24	12.8	17.5	0.0
25 or more	10.2	13.9	0.0
TOTAL N	(1861)	(1358)	(503)

Academic and Special participants have been combined in this table for the purpose of comparison with Observation Training Team participants. Data for Academic and Special participants separately are presented in Part II.

More than 1/3 of the participants (34.3%) had training

programs lasting 3 months or less. More than half of the participants (55.6%) remained in this country for 7 months or less, the median stay being between 6 and 7 months. Most of the Observation Training Team participants (63.1%) had programs lasting 2 months or less, whereas 61% of the Academic and Special participants had programs of 8 or more months duration.

Section B

Age

Q. What were the participants' ages?

AGE	PERCENTAGE %
27 and under	15.8
28 - 30	16.8
31 - 34	19.5
35 - 39	21.4
40 - 45	16.1
46 and over	10.4

TOTAL N	(1870)

The participants ranged in age from 20 years to 59 years. Over half were under 35. The median age of the participants interviewed at DETRI was 34 years, 7 months.

Section C

Marital Status and Sex

Q. What was the marital status of participants?

STATUS	PERCENTAGE %
Single	29.6
Married	69.6
Other	.8

TOTAL N	(1857)

About 7 out of 10 participants were married.

Q. What sex were the participants?

SEX	PERCENTAGE %
Male	87.6
Female	12.4

TOTAL N	(1887)

7 out of 8 participants were male.

27

Section D

Years of Prior Education

Q. How much education did the participants have prior to their participant training?

YEARS OF EDUCATION	PERCENTAGE %
6 and under	2.6
7 - 11	7.0
12	7.8
13 - 15	25.7
16	21.3
17-18	23.3
19 and over	12.4

TOTAL N	(1845)

90.4% of the participants had at least the equivalent of a U.S. high school education (12 years or more of schooling). 57% of the participants had at least the equivalent of a U.S. college education (16 years or more of schooling). 1 participant out of 8 reported 19 or more years of formal education. The median number of years of education was 16.3 years.

34

PART 2

PARTICIPANTS IN ACADEMIC AND SPECIAL/OJT PROGRAMS

PREFACE

Part 2 of the Annual Report is based on data from 1384 Academic and Special program participants who were interviewed at DETRI between November 20, 1968, and August 31, 1969.

Throughout this part of the report, significant differences between participants are presented as narrative statements below the tables. The differences presented are those which are highly reliable and meaningful. Statistical analyses similar to those run for the First Annual report were conducted to account for the principal satisfactions and dissatisfactions of the 1384 Academic and Special participants. (These statistical analyses are described in the Technical Supplement which concludes this part of the report.) The results of these analyses are presented in Chapter I, Principal Findings and Conclusions.

CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
Preface	i
I Principal Findings and Conclusion	
A. Technical and Social-Personal Criteria	1
B. Academic and Special Participants' Satisfaction with Their Technical Training Programs	3
C. Academic and Special Participants' Satisfactions with Social-Personal Aspects of Their U.S. Sojourns	8
D. Academic and Special Participants' Overall Satisfaction as A.I.D. Participants	10
E. General Conclusions	12
II Academic and Special Participants' Backgrounds and Training Programs	
A. The Regions the Participants Came From and the Kinds of Training They Received	17
B. The Education, Age, Marital Status, and Sex of the Participants	24
III Participants' Views on Planning and Anticipation about Utilization of Their Training	
A. Participants' Experiences with and Evaluations of Program Planning in Their Home Countries	28
B. Participants' Experiences with and Evaluations of Program Planning in the United States	37
C. Participants' Ideas about Utilization of Training and USAID Assistance	44

37

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
IV	Participants' Reactions to Non-Substantive Aspects of Study in Their Field of Training
	A. Reactions of Participants in Academic Programs to Non-Substantive Aspects of Study in Their Field of Training 50
	B. Reactions of Participants in Special Programs to Non-Substantive Aspects of Study in Their Field of Training 63
V	Participants' Personal and Social Experiences in the United States
	A. Participants' Social Activities and Friendships in the United States 78
	B. Participants' Personal and Social Problems in the United States and Sources of Help 91
VI	Participants' Views on English Language Training, Orientation Programs, and Special Programs
	A. Participants' Use and Evaluation of English Language Training 97
	B. Participants' Experience with and Evaluation of Orientation Programs 104
	C. Academic Participants' Experience with and Evaluation of Pre-Academic Workshops 118
	D. Academic Participants' Experience with and Evaluation of Leadership Training Programs 121
	E. Participants' Experience with and Evaluation of Special Communication Seminars 126
VII	Participants' Views on Administrative Arrangements Associated with Their Training Programs
	A. Participants' Experiences Prior to Departure for the United States 131

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
B. Participants' Experiences after Arrival in the United States	133
C. Participants' Problems With and Evaluation of Travel Arrangements	140
D. Participants' Experiences, Problems and Evaluations in Regard to Living Arrangements	144
E. Participants' Experiences with Money Allowances	152
 VIII INDIVIDUAL, ORAL INTERVIEWS	
A. Description of Individual Interviews, Objectives, and Procedures	156
B. Quality of Exit Interview Process	158
C. Validity of Exit Interview Information	161
D. Pervasive Concerns	163
E. Interviewer Ratings of Participant Characteristics, Activities, Experiences, and Attitudes	166
F. Interviewer Assessments of Participants' Feelings of Appreciation for Their Personal-Social Experiences and Technical Experiences	180

CHAPTER I
PRINCIPAL FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Section A

Technical and Social-Personal Criteria

Past research has demonstrated that the division of foreign participants' U.S. experiences into technical training aspects and social-personal aspects is a meaningful conceptualization for the participants themselves, as well as for A.I.D. program planners.¹ Therefore, the Academic and Special participant satisfactions, as measured by their responses on the structured questionnaires, and in the conversational interviews, were analyzed statistically to establish a technical training criterion and a social-personal criterion. These criteria may be thought of as yardsticks which measure the outcomes of participant training.

Four evaluative scales were found to cluster together to form the technical training criterion of satisfactions (see Figure 1). Three other scales grouped together statistically to form the social-personal criterion of satisfaction (see Figure 2). An additional 3 factors grouped together to form a criterion of overall satisfaction as an A.I.D. participant (see Figure 3). Other evaluative ratings and scales analyzed were not included in the criterion measures because the data did not consistently group with the above 3 criteria or into other meaningful categories.

1. A. E. Gollin, The transfer and use of development skills: An evaluation study of U.S. technical training programs for participants from underdeveloped areas. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Social Science Research, 1966. Contract AIDc-1891, Agency for International Development, U.S. Department of State.

Figure 1

CRITERION — TECHNICAL

1. Suitability of training program to participants' training and experience
2. Suitability of training program to participants' home country conditions
3. Suitability of training program to participants' personal career plans.
4. Overall satisfaction with total technical training

Figure 2

CRITERION — SOCIAL-PERSONAL

1. Enjoyment of visits to American homes.
2. Enjoyment of informal activities.
3. Sense of acceptance and welcome in the United States

Figure 3

CRITERION — OVERALL EXPERIENCE

1. Satisfaction with planning in home country
2. Satisfaction with planning in the United States
3. Satisfaction with total experience as an A.I.D. participant

Section B

Academic and Special Participants' Satisfaction
With Their Technical Training Programs

Since Academic and Special program participants have different training experiences, the analyses of factors which might account for their satisfaction with technical training were done separately for these 2 groups.

Table 1

How satisfied were the participants in Academic training programs with their total technical training? (Item 84)

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely satisfied)	25.6
2	38.2
3	22.6
4	7.3
5	3.6
6	1.4
7 (Not at all satisfied)	1.2
TOTAL N	(643)

About 1/4 of the Academic participants (25.6%) indicated they were "extremely satisfied" with their technical training program, and that it "could not have been better." Only 6.2% of the Academic participants rated their satisfaction with the technical training below the middle point on the rating scale.

112

There was not a statistically significant relationship between the Academics' fields of training, world regions, or participating agencies and their satisfaction with the technical training they received.

In the analyses of factors possibly related to technical training satisfaction, a group of 14 factors for the participants in Academic training programs (see Figure 2 in the Technical Supplement) were statistically examined. It was found that 4 of these 14 factors were significantly related to participants' satisfaction with their technical training programs. When used together these 4 factors correlated +.52 with the criterion.² Basically, this means that, other things being equal, participants' satisfactions with their technical training can be increased if their "scores" on these 4 factors can be improved.

The factors in order of their statistical significance are: (1) the extent to which the Academic participant considered his course work to be relevant to his training objectives and at his level of understanding, (2) the importance of American friendships to the Academic participant, (3) the Academic participant's satisfaction with his communication with his Program Officer in the United States, (4) the extent of agreement by the Academic participant with the content of his proposed and final training plans and whether requested changes were made. A fifth factor--the nationality of the Academic participants' roommates and friends--was suggestively related to the criterion of satisfaction with technical training.

2. A perfect correlation would be one in which the participants' scores on the factors account for their outcome scores in every case. In this situation, the correlation between the factor scores and the outcome scores would be 1.0. A situation in which the scores of the participants on the factors never are related to their outcome scores is one in which the correlation is zero.

Table 2

How satisfied were the participants in Special training programs with their total technical training? (Item 81)

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely satisfied)	23.4
2	39.0
3	23.3
4	8.5
5	3.0
6	1.6
7 (Not at all satisfied)	1.2

TOTAL N	(741)

Over 90% of the Special participants rated their satisfaction with their total technical training at or above the middle point on the scale, while nearly 1 out of 4 rated their total training as "1" ("could not have been better").

Near East-South Asian Special participants less often gave "1" ratings to their total technical training, with almost 1 out of 5 rating it at or below the middle of the scale. At least 2 out of 3 Special participants from the other world regions gave "1" or "2" ratings to their total training.

Special participants in the fields of Agriculture and Industry and Mining less often gave ratings at or below the middle of the satisfaction scale for their total technical training than did participants in other fields.

The Special participants programmed directly by A.I.D. less often gave "1" or "2" ratings to their total technical training than did participants programmed by other government agencies.

44

A group of 13 factors were statistically examined for correlation with the Special program participants' satisfaction with their technical training (see Figure 3 in the Technical Supplement). It was found that 8 of these 13 factors were significantly related to this criterion. Taken together, these 8 factors correlated +.59 with the criterion. They were, in order of statistical significance: (1) the extent of agreement by the Special participant with the content of his proposed and final training plans and whether requested changes were made, (2) the Special participant's satisfaction with his communication with his Program Officer in the United States, (3) the extent of problems with Special classroom training, (4) the extent of involvement of the Special participant and his supervisor in the development of his proposed training program, (5) the importance of American friendships to the Special participant, (6) the nationality of the participant's roommates and friends, (7) the extent of problems with housing in the United States, (8) whether or not the Special participant met with his Program Officer before his training program began.

One other factor was shown to have an impact in predicting the satisfaction of Special training program participants with their technical training. Those participants in Special programs who experienced discrimination in the United States were more likely to have their satisfaction with their technical training accurately predicted by the 8 factors listed above than those Special program participants who did not experience any discrimination in the United States.

The reader will notice that of the factors which were used to predict technical training satisfaction, 3 were found to be significantly related to these satisfactions for both Academic and Special program participants: (1) agreement with content of proposed and final training plans, and whether

requested changes were made, (2) satisfaction with communication with Program Officer in the United States, and (3) the importance of American friendships.

Eight background variables that other studies have shown to be important in accounting for foreign student satisfactions and dissatisfactions with U.S. training were examined for systematic relations to the criterion measures. As in the First Annual Report a low order ($R = +.10$) relationship was determined, with none of the 8 factors being significantly related to the criterion. Thus, it is unlikely that these factors (presented as Figure 4) have any impact on the satisfaction of participants with their technical training.

Figure 4

BACKGROUND FACTORS

1. English the native language
2. Age
3. Education
4. Sex
5. Marital status
6. Size of hometown
7. Previous travel outside of home country
8. Previous travel to the United States

These background variables were also examined in terms of the influence which they had on the relationships between the technical training satisfactions scores of the Academic and Special participants and significant predictors identified above. It was found that none of these background variables had a significant influence (see Technical Supplement, Control Analyses).

Section C

Academic and Special Participants' Satisfactions
with Social-Personal Aspects of Their
U.S. Sojourns

Table 3

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

WELCOME/ACCEPTED RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely welcome)	37.9
2	32.5
3	18.1
4	8.0
5	1.9
6	1.2
7 (Not at all welcome)	.4

TOTAL N	(1384)

Three out of 8 participants indicated that they felt extremely welcome and always accepted in the United States ("1" on the scale). More than 7 out of 8 rated their welcome above the mid-point on the scale.

Over 80% of the Latin American participants gave high welcome ratings ("1" or "2" on the scale) as opposed to only 59.5% of the participants from Africa who did so. Nearly 1/5 of the African participants gave ratings at or below the mid-point of the scale.

45% of the Special participants said they felt extremely welcome and accepted, compared with only 29.6% of the Academic participants. 15.5% of the Academic participants gave ratings at or below the mid-point of the scale.

Ten factors (see Figure 4 in Technical Supplement) were examined for all of the participants in Academic and Special training programs for statistical significance in relation to feeling welcome and accepted in the United States. Eight of these factors were found to be significantly related to the participants' ratings on the social-personal criterion (see Figure 2). These 8 factors correlated +.63 with the criterion. The factors in order of statistical significance are: (1) the importance of American friendships, (2) the extent of problems with housing in the United States, (3) satisfaction with communication with Program Officer in the United States, (4) the extent of being discriminated against in the United States, (5) the amount of home hospitality in the United States, (6) the extent of problems with travel arrangements in the United States, (7) the nationality of participants' roommates and friends, (8) the extent of accommodation to life in the United States.

It was found that the 8 background variables (see Figure 4) related more strongly to the participants' ratings on the social-personal criterion than they did on the technical training criterion ($R = +.19$). However, again, the relationship between the background factors and the social-personal criterion was significantly weaker than the relationship of the 8 significant factors listed above with that criterion. Control analyses results suggest that participants for whom improvements on the 8 experiential factors will be most important are those who are older and in Special training programs.

Section D
 Academic and Special Participants'
 Overall Satisfaction as A.I.D. Participants

Table 4

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

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely satisfied)	27.2
2	43.8
3	21.5
4	5.1
5	1.6
6	.6
7 (Not at all satisfied)	.3

TOTAL N	(1383)

Seven out of 10 Academic and Special participants expressed a high degree of satisfaction with their total experience as A.I.D. participants, rating it at "1" or "2" on the scale. Only 2.5% of these participants rated their total experience satisfaction below the middle point on the scale.

Higher percentages of participants from Latin America and lower percentages of those from the Near East-South Asia than participants from the other world regions rated their satisfaction with their total A.I.D. experience at "1" or "2" on this scale.

Proportionately more participants in the fields of Agriculture, Health and Sanitation, and Education expressed a high degree of satisfaction with their total experience in the United States ("1" or "2" ratings) than did participants in other fields of training. None of the participants in Education rated their overall satisfaction below the middle point on the scale. On the other hand, the participants in Transportation gave the highest percentage (6.8%) of ratings below the middle point on the scale of satisfaction with their total experience as A.I.D. participants.

There was not a statistically significant relationship between the participants' type of program or programming agencies and their satisfaction with their total experience as A.I.D. participants.

A group of 9 factors (see Figure 5 in Technical Supplement) were examined for all of the participants in Academic and Special training programs for statistical significance in relation to their overall satisfaction as A.I.D. trainees. Six of these factors were found to be significantly related to the participants' ratings on the overall experience criterion (see Figure 3). These 6 factors correlated $+0.57$ with the criterion. The factors in order of statistical significance are: (1) satisfaction with communication with Program Officer in the United States, (2) the extent of agreement by participant with the content of the proposed and final plans and whether requested changes were made, (3) the importance of American friendships, (4) the extent of problems with housing arrangements in the United States, (5) whether or not the participants had an opportunity to make suggestions about the content of proposed and final plans, (6) the nationality of participants' roommates and friends.

The 8 background variables related more strongly to the third criterion than they did to the first criterion ($R = +0.16$), but as in the case of the second criterion (social-personal)

the relationship between the background factors and overall satisfaction as an A.I.D. participant was significantly weaker than the relationship of the 6 significant factors listed above that criterion. Control analyses results suggest that participants for whom improvements on the 6 experiential factors will be most important are those in Special training programs.

Section E

General Conclusions

The results of the analyses of factors related to the 3 criterion outcomes which have been discussed in this chapter suggest the following general conclusions:

1. The satisfactions of both Academic and Special program participants are consistently related to 2 factors: the extent of their satisfaction with their communications with their Program Officer (either in A.I.D.'s Office of International Training or in a participating agency) and the importance they attach to the American friendships which they formed during their training sojourn in the United States. These findings hold regardless of the yardstick being used; that is, whether focusing on the technical training criterion, the social-personal criterion, or on the overall experience criterion, participants who were satisfied with their communication with their Program Officer and who felt their American friendships were important to their U.S. experience gave the highest ratings.

The first factor, which is measured by items asking about the participant's communication with his Program Officer, probably reflects the quality of his overall relationship with his Program Officer--either in a participating agency or in the Office of International Training--not just his communication with that Program Officer. This interpretation is supported by the

fact that this factor related significantly to the social-personal criterion. All of the other factors which related to the social-personal criterion constitute immediate events surrounding the actual social and personal experiences of the participant at his training site(s). Thus, it is difficult to explain the importance of this factor in terms of a strict communications interpretation. When interpreted in the context of reflecting an overall relationship with the Program Officer, however, it becomes understandable. Participants who enjoy a good overall relationship are more likely to feel secure during their training; those with a poor overall relationship are more likely to have uncertainties and anxieties that permeate all their experiences, including their social-personal activities.

This interpretation of the meaning of this factor--that is, the quality of the overall relationship of the participant and his Program Officer--is clearly consistent with the other generalized finding; namely, the importance that the participant attaches to his American friendships. The fact that the importance of American friendships relates to satisfactions on all 3 criterion outcomes, suggests that these friendships with Americans do more than merely provide a feeling of being accepted and welcome. Rather, these friendships may sensitize participants to more subtle aspects of their educational and training experience. This might be thought of as a "knowing the ropes" phenomenon, in which the participant with American friends spends less time "spinning his wheels" and getting used to the system. At a more sophisticated level, it may mean that American friends explain some implicit assumptions and underlying mores of the culture. This may make more palatable those aspects of educational and training programs which otherwise seem arbitrary and incomprehensible to the foreign participant.

2. A significant factor for both Academic and Special program participants for technical training criterion outcomes is the extent of the participant's understanding of and agreement

with his proposed and final training plan, including how well he felt his requested changes (if any) were reflected in those plans. There are 3 aspects of the planning process reflected in this factor. One is the element of understanding; that is, whether or not the participant has a full knowledge of what it is that he is getting into. Another is the extent to which the planned program is one with which the participant is fully in accord. The third is whether or not the participant's suggestions were respected.

For Academic participants, the factor of relevance and level of course work reinforces a finding of the First Annual Report in that technical training criterion outcomes are related to the participant's perceptions of the relevance of his course training to his training objectives and the suitability of the courses to his level of understanding. This factor is quite consistent with the interpretation made above of the planning agreement factor for both Academic and Special program participants. If a participant feels he is taking courses whose relevance is not readily apparent, then his dissatisfaction can spread and affect his satisfaction with other courses or parts of his training which are actually more relevant. As noted under 1. above, it may be that it helps to have American friends to explain the concepts of core curriculum or foundation and tool courses, that otherwise might seem incomprehensible as a requirement for a degree in a specialized academic discipline.

For Special program participants, an important factor related to technical training criterion outcomes is the involvement which the participant perceives that he and his supervisor had in the development of his proposed training program. This finding, which reinforces a similar finding in the First Annual Report, probably can be best interpreted in the context of the more concrete nature of the typical Special training program, and the extent of the expertise felt by the participant and his supervisor regarding the kinds of training experiences

relevant to their needs. In this regard, it follows that Special program participants who reported a number of problems with specialized classroom training are more dissatisfied with their total technical training.

Also consistent with this interpretation is the fact that this factor is not significantly related to the technical training criterion for Academic participants. The Academic participant and his supervisor probably feel less qualified to specify the educational experiences, particularly at the course level, which they consider directly related to meeting the academic training requirement.

3. The other factors which are significantly related to social-personal criterion outcomes were the same ones determined to be important in the first year's analysis. These are: the extent of housing problems; the extent of being discriminated against; the amount of home hospitality received; and accommodation to living in the United States. These are in addition to the importance of the American friendships the participant formed, and his satisfaction with his communication with his Program Officer (discussed above).

Participants report less satisfaction with their social-personal experiences and their overall experiences, and Special participants with their technical training program, when facilities, neighborhood, noise, location relative to training institution and business areas, and availability of public transportation are perceived as problems with their housing arrangements. Whether in the form of a single traumatic event, or in more subtle patterns, participants who feel they are discriminated against while in the United States--whether for the color of their skin, their religion, or their national origin--feel less welcome and accepted, as one would expect. Such experiences may override the positive benefits of another factor, namely, the amount of home hospitality. Generally speaking, the more home hospitality visits a participant has in the United States, and the more different homes visited, the

more favorable the social-personal criterion outcome. This is consistent with the earlier discussion of the importance of American friendships, as many friendships are formed through home hospitality.

The analyses show that participants who restrict their friendships and living companionships to other foreign nationals, particularly from their home country, tend to be less satisfied with their social-personal life, their technical training program and their overall experiences in the United States. This empirical evidence supports the attempts of many involved in international education to encourage foreign students to associate with visitors from other countries, as well as citizens of the country they are studying in. American friendships can help to overcome homesickness, loneliness and unfamiliarity with U.S. customs; items which account for lack of accommodation to living in the United States.

4. Finally, it should be noted that the 3 criterion outcomes are not as significantly related to biographical type background factors as they are to experiences the individual has had as an A.I.D. participant. Nor do these background factors modify relationships between criterion outcomes and predictor factors. Thus, what happens to a participant during his program apparently is much more important in determining his satisfactions than are any of his prior background experiences.

CHAPTER II
ACADEMIC AND SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS' BACKGROUNDS
AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

Section A

The Regions the Participants Came From
and the Kinds of Training They Received

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

REGION	PERCENTAGE %
NESA	28.4
FE	31.9
LA	11.9
AFR	27.7
TOTAL N	(1384)

About one-third (31.9%) of the Academic and Special participants came from the Far East. The Near East-South Asia and Africa each contributed about 30% and Latin America contributed about 12% of the individual participants interviewed between 1 September 1968 and 31 August 1969. (Latin America contributed a majority of the Observation Training Teams; see page 3- 10.)

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

TYPE OF PROGRAM	PERCENTAGE %
ACAD	46.5
SPEC	53.5
TOTAL N	(1384)

Slightly more than half of the participants (53.5%) had Special training programs.

Most Academic participants came from Africa or the Far East. Most Special participants came from the Near East-South Asia or the Far East. Latin America had very few participants in Special training programs.

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

FIELD OF TRAINING	PERCENTAGE %
Ag	23.9
I&M	6.4
Tr	7.4
H&S	12.8
Ed	20.2
PA	21.9
Other	7.4

TOTAL N	(1384)

Two-thirds of the participants (66%) were studying Agriculture, Education, or Public Administration. Relatively few participants received training in Industry and Mining and in Transportation.

Nearly half of the participants in Transportation, but only about 12% of those in Education, were from the Near East-South Asia. About the same proportion of participants in Industry and Mining (2 out of every 5) were from the Near-East-South Asia and the Far East. Health and Sanitation was the field of training for more participants from the Far East than for those from any other region.

One-third (34.6%) of the participants programmed directly by A.I.D. were in the field of Public Administration.

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

FIELD OF TRAINING	PERCENTAGE (%) IN TYPE OF PROGRAM	
	Acad	Spec
Ag	26.2	25.4
I&M	3.6	10.0
Tr	.7	14.8
H&S	11.6	15.9
Ed	40.1	4.9
PA	17.9	28.9
TOTAL N (1282)*	(614)*	(668)*

*102 Academic and Special participants were in other fields of training that accounted for less than 8% of the total and are not included in this table. This table and the table on sojourn length (Page 2-22) are the only ones in this part of the report in which the data from the Academic and Special participants are pictorially compared. These two tabular comparisons were specifically requested by the Office of International Training.

More than 60% of the Academic and Special participants interviewed were in either Education, Public Administration, or Agriculture. The highest proportion of the participants in Academic programs (40.1%) and the lowest proportion of the participants in Special programs (4.9%) were in Education. Public Administration was the field of training for a somewhat higher proportion of the Special participants. About the same proportions of Academic and Special participants were in Agriculture. The fields of Industry and Mining and Transportation together accounted for approximately 25% of the Special participants, but only 4% of the Academic participants.



Q. What government agencies participated in the training programs?

PARTICIPATING AGENCY	PERCENTAGE %
AID	55.2
AGRIC	17.1
OE	6.6
PHS	4.9
Other	16.1

TOTAL N	(1384)

The majority of both the Academic and Special participants were handled only by A.I.D. The Department of Agriculture was the participating agency which programmed the next highest percentage. No other agency handled more than 7% of the Academic and Special participants.

About 60% of the participants from the Near East-South Asia, the Far East, and Latin America were programmed directly by A.I.D. One-fourth of the Near East-South Asian participants and 1/5 of the African participants were programmed by the Department of Agriculture. Approximately 1 out of 7 African participants were programmed by the Office of Education.

Q. How long were the participants' sojourns in the United States?

LENGTH OF PROGRAM (Months)	PERCENTAGE (%)		
	Total Acad & Spec	Acad	Spec
1 - 4	18.9	1.9	33.7
5 - 6	20.2	3.6	34.6
7 - 11	15.8	11.8	19.2
12 - 15	13.8	18.3	9.8
16 - 24	17.5	34.9	2.3
25 or more	13.9	29.4	.4
TOTAL N	(1358)	(633)	(725)

About 2 out of 3 Special participants interviewed by DETRI were in the United States for less than 7 months, while about 1 out of 8 (12.5%) was in the United States for 1 year or more. About 3 out of 10 (29.4%) Academic participants were in the United States for more than 2 years. Only about 1 out of 6 (17.3%) of the Academic participants interviewed by DETRI had sojourns lasting less than 1 year. The median length of sojourn for Special participants was about 5 months; for Academic participants it was between 23 and 24 months.

More than 1 out of 4 (27.4%) African participants had training programs that were over 2 years in length, a much higher proportion than of participants from other world regions. Over half (53.1%) of the participants from the Near East-South Asia and 42.6% of those from the Far East had programs lasting 6 months or less. About 3 out of 10 Latin American participants (29.9%) stayed in this country between 16 and 24 months.

A majority (58.7%) of the participants in the field of Education had sojourns longer than 16 months, while 85.4% of those in the field of Transportation had programs which were 6 months or less in length. The median sojourn length of participants in the various fields of training was: Agriculture 48 weeks, Industry and Mining 25.5 weeks, Transportation 22.5 weeks, Health and Sanitation 33.2 weeks, Education 77 weeks, and Public Administration 40.4 weeks.

Participants programmed by the Office of Education more often had longer stays in the United States than did participants programmed by other agencies. About 3/4 of these participants (75.6%) had sojourns of 12 months or longer. The median length of sojourn for participants programmed by each of the agencies was : A.I.D. 44.7 weeks, Department of Agriculture 43.3 weeks, Office of Education 65 weeks, Public Health Service 51 weeks, and the "other agencies" category 26.7 weeks.

Section B

The Education, Age, Marital Status, and
Sex of the Participants

- Q. How many years of education did the participants have before they came to the United States for their training programs? (Item 169)*

YEARS OF EDUCATION	PERCENTAGE %
7-11	4.6
12	8.7
13-15	25.8
16	22.5
17-18	24.2
19 and over	14.3

TOTAL N	(1384)

*The questions preceding the tables in this part of the report are based on the items asked in the questionnaire filled out by all Academic and Special program participants. These questions are not worded precisely as they appear in the questionnaire, but are presented in a form which may be more useful to the reader of this report. The item number(s) of the exact questions used are provided for reference purposes.

Almost 90% of the participants have had more than the equivalent of a U.S. high school education. Nearly 40% of the participants have had more years of education than a U.S. college graduate. The median number of years of education was 15.5.

African participants generally had fewer years of education than the participants from other regions.

A larger proportion of participants from the Far East and Latin America had 17 or more years of education than of participants from any other regions.

A majority of participants in the fields of training we have analyzed reported having 16 or more years of education.

Almost 1/3 of the participants in Health and Sanitation reported 19 or more years of schooling.

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

AGE	PERCENTAGE %
27 or less	17.1
28-30	18.3
31-34	21.0
35-39	22.5
40-45	14.2
46 or more	6.9

TOTAL N	(1384)

Over one-half of the participants were under 35 (56.4%). About 7% of the participants were over 45 years of age. The median age of the participants was 33 years 8 months.

The participants from the Near East-South Asia and the Far East tended to be slightly older, on the average, than the participants from other regions, while the participants from Africa were much younger.

The participants in Academic training programs were younger, on the average, than the participants in Special training programs.

The participants in Agriculture, Industry and Mining, and Education tended to be younger than the participants in other fields of training. Almost one-half of the participants in the field of Transportation reported they were over 39 years old.

Q. What was the marital status of the participants? (Item 166)

MARITAL STATUS	PERCENTAGE %
Single	31.6
Married	67.7
Other	.7

TOTAL N	(1384)

About 2 out of 3 participants were married.

Almost half of the African participants were single, whereas over 80% of the Near East-South Asian participants were married.

20% more of the participants in Special training programs than in Academic training programs were married.

Two out of every 5 participants in the field of Education were single. Almost 80% of the participants in Transportation were married.

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

SEX	PERCENTAGE %
Male	87.1
Female	12.9

TOTAL N	(1384)

About 6 out of every 7 participants were males.

Proportionately more females came from Latin America and the Far East than came from Africa and the Near East-South Asia. Over 40% of the females were in the field of Health and Sanitation. Another 20% of the females were in the field of education.

CHAPTER III
 PARTICIPANTS' VIEWS ON PLANNING AND
 ANTICIPATION ABOUT UTILIZATION
 OF THEIR TRAINING

Section A

Participants' Experiences with and
 Evaluations of Program Planning
 in Their Home Countries

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

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely satisfied)	20.8
2	27.8
3	24.7
4	13.9
5	6.8
6	3.1
7 (Not at all satisfied)	2.9

TOTAL N	(1384)

About 1/5 of the participants said they were "extremely satisfied," planning of their technical training programs in their home countries "could not have been better." One participant out of 4 rated home country planning at, or below,

the middle point on the scale.

53.9% of the participants from Latin America rated their satisfaction with home country planning of their training programs at "1" or "2" on the scale, whereas only 44% of the participants from the Near East-South Asia gave such ratings on this scale. A larger proportion of the participants from the Near East-South Asia than from Latin America, however, gave "3" ratings to their satisfaction with home country planning.

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

RECEIVED PIO/P	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	78.0
No	22.0

TOTAL N	(1384)

Almost 4 out of 5 participants said they received a copy of the PIO/P for their training before they left their home countries.

85.5% of the Far Eastern participants said they received a copy of their PIO/P in their home countries. Fewer than 3/4 of the participants from Latin America and Africa said they had received this document before they left home.

Q. What was discussed at formal planning meetings participants attended in their home countries? (Items 19 & 21)

TOPIC HEARD ABOUT	PERCENTAGE* %
No meeting attended	22.0
AID administrative policies and regulations	52.2
Objectives of home country/ AID development projects	45.5
Relationships between cultural aspects of home country and United States	41.1
Specific objectives of participant's training program	26.8
Outline of proposed plan for participant's training	23.4
Relationship of objectives of training program to home country development plans	22.2

TOTAL N	(1384)

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

78% of the participants said they had formal planning and orientation meetings in their home countries.

Approximately 4 out of 5 participants from the Near East-South Asia and Africa said they attended such meetings, whereas only 2/3 of the Latin American participants said they did so.

Over half of the participants said they heard about A.I.D. administrative policies and regulations for all participants at a formal meeting in their home country. Less than 1/4 said they heard about the proposed plan for their technical training program or the relationship

of the objectives of their technical training program to a development project or program in their home country.

Much smaller proportions of Latin American participants than of participants from any other world region said they heard about the general objectives of joint home country/A.I.D. development projects or programs, and the relationship between major cultural aspects of their home country and those of the United States. The percentage of participants from Latin America and the Near East-South Asia who heard about the specific objectives of their technical training programs and the relationship of these objectives to a development project or program in their country at meetings in their home country was smaller than of those from other regions.

About half of the participants from the Near East-South Asia and Africa said they heard about the general objectives of joint home country/A.I.D. development projects or programs. Larger proportions of African participants than of those from any other world region said they heard about all the other topics listed in the preceding table at such meetings.

Q. Who attended the formal planning and orientation meetings with participants in their home countries. (Items 19 & 20)

PERSON	PERCENTAGE %
No meeting attended	22.0
AID representatives	61.4
Other AID participants going to the United States	35.6
Former AID participants from home country	24.0
Representatives of home country government (other than supervisors)	15.5
Participant's supervisor	7.4

TOTAL N	(1384)

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

3 out of 5 of the participants said A.I.D. representatives attended planning and orientation meetings in their home country. Less than 1/6 said that representatives of their government, other than their supervisors, were present, and fewer than 1 out of 10 reported that their supervisors attended.

Almost 2/3 of the participants from the Near East-South Asia and Africa, a larger proportion than of participants from the other world regions, said A.I.D. representatives were present at their briefings.

Less than 2% of the Latin American participants said that representatives of their government were present.

Although only about 1/5 of all the participants said that former A.I.D. participants attended home country planning and orientation meetings with them, almost 30% of the



participants from the Near East-South Asia said such participants were present. On the other hand, only 12.7% of the Latin American participants said former A.I.D. participants attended these meetings.

Almost half of the African participants, but only slightly more than 1/5 of the Latin American participants said that other A.I.D. participants coming to the United States attended planning and orientation meetings with them.

Q. Did participants make any suggestions about the proposed plan for their technical training programs?
(Items 22 & 23)

MADE SUGGESTIONS	PERCENTAGE %
No opportunity	69.6
Yes	21.0
No	6.7

TOTAL N	(1384)

About 30% of the participants said they had an opportunity to make suggestions in their home countries about the proposed plan for their technical training programs. About 1/5 of the participants said they made such suggestions.

About 40% of the Latin American and Far Eastern participants, but only 25% of the participants from the Near East-South Asia and less than 20% of the African participants, said they had an opportunity to make suggestions about the proposed plan for their training programs.

Of the participants who said they had had such an opportunity, 62% of the African participants, as contrasted

12

with approximately 80% of the participants from the other world regions, said they did make suggestions.

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

PERSONAL PARTICIPATION IN PLANNING	PERCENTAGE %
Adequate	53.6
Somewhat inadequate	27.0
Very inadequate	19.4

TOTAL N	(992)

A majority of the participants (53.6%) felt that their personal participation in the planning of their proposed technical training programs was adequate.

2/3 of the Latin American participants, a higher proportion than for any other world region, said that their personal participation in the planning of their proposed program was adequate. A larger percentage of participants from the Near East-South Asia and Africa said their personal participation was very inadequate than did participants from any other region.

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

SUPERVISORS' PARTICIPATION IN PLANNING	PERCENTAGE %
Adequate	41.6
Somewhat inadequate	15.5
Very inadequate	11.2
Don't know or not applicable	31.7

TOTAL N	(1002)

Approximately 2 out of 5 of the participants felt that the participation by their supervisors in the planning of their proposed technical training programs was adequate. It should be noted, however, that about 30% of the participants either did not know about the participation of their supervisors or did not have supervisors. (Of those who judged the adequacy of their supervisors' participation, 56.7% said it was adequate.)

Of the participants who made a judgment about the adequacy of their supervisors' participation in the planning of their proposed training programs, a larger proportion of those from the Near East-South Asia and Africa than of those from the other world regions said their supervisors' participation was inadequate.

Q. At the time participants left their home countries, which aspects of their technical training programs were unclear or disagreeable to them? (Items 26 & 27)

ASPECT DISAGREED WITH OR UNCLEAR	PERCENTAGE %
None	67.5
General content of training	12.8
Overall length of training	9.3
Planned use of training	8.9
Training facilities	8.7
Objectives of training program	6.3

TOTAL N	(1384)

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

2/3 of the participants said there were no aspects of the proposed plan for their technical training programs that they found disagreeable or unclear at the time they left their home countries. The aspect of the proposed plan most often mentioned was the general content of training, which nearly 13% of the participants reported disagreeable or unclear.

There was not a statistically significant relationship between the participants' world regions and their disagreement with or lack of clarity about the proposed plan for their technical training.

17

Section B

Participants' Experiences with and Evaluation of Program Planning in the United States

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

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely satisfied)	24.3
2	32.7
3	22.4
4	11.5
5	5.7
6	2.2
7 (Not at all satisfied)	1.3

TOTAL N	(1384)

Almost 1/4 of the participants said they were "extremely satisfied," planning of their technical training programs in the United States "could not have been better." 1 out of 5 of the participants rated their satisfaction with U.S. planning at, or below, the middle point on the scale.

Over 60% of the participants in the fields of Agriculture (61.2%) and Health and Sanitation (64.3%) gave "1" or "2" ratings to their satisfaction with U.S. planning of their programs. A higher percentage of participants in Transportation and Public Administration than those in other fields of training rated their satisfaction with the U.S. planning of their programs below the middle point on the scale.

Q. Before their technical training programs began, did participants have a personal meeting with their A.I.D. Program Development Officers or Program Officers of another U.S. government agency? (Item 30)

HAD MEETING WITH PDO OR PO	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	93.3
No	6.7
TOTAL N	(1384)

Over 9 out of 10 of the participants said they had meetings with their Program Development Officers or Program Officers before their technical training programs began.

A slightly larger proportion of participants in the field of Health and Sanitation and a somewhat smaller proportion of those in Education and Transportation than of those in other fields of training, said they had such meetings.

Q. What aspects of their final training plan were discussed with their Program Development Officer or Program Officer? (Items 32 & 33)

TOPIC DISCUSSED	PERCENTAGE %
Had no discussion	56.9
General content of training	40.2
Overall length of training	39.6
Objectives of training	37.4
Travel schedule	37.4
Training facilities	33.7
Time allotted to each part of technical training program	24.3

TOTAL N	(1384)

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

The majority of the participants (56.9%) said they did not discuss the final plan of their technical training programs at their meetings with their PDO or PO.

About 60% of the Special participants, as opposed to approximately half of the Academic participants, said they discussed the final plan for their technical training with a Program Development Officer or Program Officer.

A higher percentage of participants in the field of Industry and Mining and a lower percentage of those in Public Administration, than in other fields of training, said they had Washington discussions about the final plan for their training.

Half of the participants programmed directly by A.I.D. said they did not discuss the final plan for their training with their Program Development Officers. This was a larger

proportion of participants than of those programmed by any other agency.

About 2 out of 5 participants said they had a discussion about the general content of their training program, its overall length, its objectives and their travel schedules. Approximately 1/4 of the participants said they discussed the time allotted to each part of their technical training program.

Q. Did participants make any suggestions about the final plan for their technical training programs?
(Items 34 & 35)

MADE SUGGESTIONS	PERCENTAGE %
No opportunity	52.2
Yes	37.7
No	10.1

TOTAL N	(1384)

Almost half of the participants said they had an opportunity to make suggestions about the final plan for their technical training program. Approximately 2/3 of the African participants said they did not have an opportunity to make such suggestions, whereas more than half of the participants from the other world regions said they did have this opportunity. Special participants much more often than those in Academic training programs said they had a chance to

make suggestions about their final plan.

A much higher percentage of participants in the field of Industry and Mining and a much lower percentage of those in Education than of participants in other fields of training said they had such an opportunity. Proportionately more participants programmed by the Public Health Service and fewer of those programmed by the Office of Education than of those programmed by other government agencies said they had an opportunity to make suggestions about their final training program plans.

More than 1/3 of the participants said they made suggestions about the final plan for their training. Of those who said they had an opportunity to make suggestions, almost 8 out of 10 took advantage of that opportunity. A larger proportion of participants from the Near East-South Asia and a smaller proportion of participants from Latin America than participants from the other world regions said they made such suggestions.

Q. How adequate was the participants' personal participation in discussions of the final plan for their technical training programs? (Item 36)

PERSONAL PARTICIPATION IN DISCUSSION OF FINAL PLAN	PERCENTAGE %
Adequate	60.5
Somewhat inadequate	27.4
Very inadequate	12.2

TOTAL N	(362)

Of the participants who said they made suggestions about the final plan of their technical training programs, 60% felt they had an adequate amount of participation in discussions about their training.

Of these participants, 2% of the Latin Americans, a lower percentage than of those from any of the other world regions, said they had very inadequate participation in discussions of the final plan for their technical training programs. Half of the participants from the Near East-South Asia said they had inadequate participation in discussions about the final plan for their training.

Q. Before the participants' technical training programs began, which aspects of the final plan for their training did they find disagreeable or unclear? (Items 37 & 38)

ASPECT DISAGREED WITH OR UNCLEAR	PERCENTAGE %
None	69.4
General content of training	13.4
Overall length of training	9.2
Time allotted to each part of technical training program	8.2
Training facilities	7.7
Objectives of training	7.0
Travel schedule	4.3

TOTAL N	(1384)

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

7 out of 10 of the participants said they were not in disagreement with or unclear about any aspect of the final plan for their technical training programs.

About 1 out of 3 of the participants from the Near East-South Asia and the Far East said there was an aspect of their programs they disagreed with or that was unclear to them, whereas only 1 out of 4 of those from Africa and Latin America reported disagreement or unclarity.

The general content of the training was the aspect reported most frequently by participants as being one they disagreed with or which was unclear to them.

Section C

Participants' Ideas About Utilization of
Training and USAID Assistance

Q. How much did participants expect their A.I.D. training would help them in training or teaching others? (Item 157)

AMOUNT HELPFUL IN TRAINING OR TEACHING OTHERS	PERCENTAGE %
A great amount	67.0
Some	29.9
A little	3.0

TOTAL N	(806)

About 80% of the participants said they knew the job they would have on their return home. Of these participants, almost 3/4 said they expected this job to involve training others in specific work skills or teaching students. About 9 out of 10 participants in the field of Education expected to use their A.I.D. training in this way, a much larger proportion than of participants in other fields of training. The smallest proportions of participants who expected their jobs to involve teaching or training others were in the fields of Industry and Mining, Transportation, and Public Administration.

Of the participants who knew the jobs they would return to and who expected to use their training in teaching or training others, 2/3 said they expect it to be "a great amount" of help.

Q. What problems do the participants expect to face in using their training when they return to their home countries? (Item 158)

PROBLEM EXPECTED	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING*		
	Very True	Somewhat True	Not True
Lack of money	29.9	42.8	27.4
Lack of equipment and facilities	21.7	40.2	38.0
Resistance to change	12.6	47.9	39.6
Lack of qualified staff	16.0	42.5	41.5
Lack of support from higher officials	8.7	34.2	57.1
Lack of help from supervisor	5.2	26.5	68.3
TOTAL N			(1384)

*Percentages add to 100% across rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

More than 7 out of 10 participants expected to have some or much difficulty in using their training in their home countries due to a lack of money (72.7%). About 3 out of 5 participants expected to have some or much difficulty because of a lack of equipment, tools, and facilities (61.9%), general resistance to change (60.5%), or a lack of qualified staff (58.5%). Less than 1/3 of the participants expected any difficulty due to a lack of help from their immediate supervisors (31.7%)

Participants from the Near East-South Asia less often expected to have difficulties in using their training due to a lack of (1) equipment and facilities, (2) money, (3) qualified staff, (4) support from their immediate supervisors, (5) support from higher officials, or to (6) general resistance to change than did participants from any other world region.

Participants from the Far East more often than participants from any other region felt they would have difficulties due to a lack of equipment and facilities.

Proportionately more participants from Latin America felt that general resistance to change would be a problem in using their training than did participants from any other region.

On every one of the items listed in the table, a higher percentage of Academic participants than of those in Special training programs said they expected to have problems in using their training.

Lack of money, equipment and facilities, and qualified staff were expected to be home country problems by a larger proportion of participants in Health and Sanitation and Education than of participants in any other fields of training. Participants in the fields of Transportation and Public Administration less often expected these problems.

The majority of participants in Education (56.8%) anticipated some problems with a lack of support from higher officials, while nearly half of them (47%) expected to have some difficulty due to a lack of support from their supervisors. These are larger percentages than of participants in any other fields of training.

From data not shown in the above table, it was found that 70% of the Academic participants who used instruments and equipment in their courses said these were similar to instruments and equipment now available or to be available within 3 years in their home countries. About 75% of the Special participants who used instruments and equipment as an essential part of the jobs in which they were training made this statement.

Q. How many participants said they expect to call on the A.I.D. Mission in their home country to help them use their training after they return home? (Item 159)

USAID COULD HELP	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	78.2
No	21.8

TOTAL N	(1384)

More than 3/4 of the participants (78.2%) said they expected to ask the A.I.D. Mission to help them in using their A.I.D. training in their home country.

About 7 out of 10 of the participants from the Near East-South Asia said they expected to ask the USAID in their country for help in using their A.I.D. training. This was a lower percentage than the percentage of participants from the other world regions expressing that view.

A higher percentage of participants in Agriculture, Health and Sanitation, and Education than of participants in the other fields of training said they expected to ask for help from the USAID Mission.

96

Q. In what ways did the participants say the A.I.D. Mission in their countries could help them in making best use of the training they received in the United States? (Item 160)

TYPE OF MISSION ASSISTANCE	PERCENTAGE %
Provide professional magazines journals, other printed materials	86.6
Provide equipment, tools, facilities	63.4
Provide U.S. training for fellow workers	61.6
Help A.I.D. participants keep in touch with each other	55.4
Conduct seminars, meetings and conferences	47.3
Provide technical advisors	46.9

TOTAL N	(1073)

Of the participants who said they expect to ask the A.I.D. Mission in their countries to help them use their training, about 7 out of 8 planned to ask for professional magazines, journals, and other printed materials. The smallest proportions of these participants expected to ask the Mission to conduct seminars, meetings and conferences, or to provide technical advisors.

A larger percentage of Far Eastern participants than of those in any other world region expected to ask the Missions in their countries to provide technical advisors, equipment, printed materials, and to help A.I.D. participants keep in touch with each other. Proportionately more Latin American participants than of participants from the other regions planned to ask A.I.D. Missions to provide U.S. training for their fellow workers. About 62% of the participants from

the Near East-South Asia said they planned to ask the A.I.D. Missions in their countries to provide printed materials. This was the only type of assistance (see list in table) that more than 44% of the participants from this region said they expected to request from USAIDs.

Participants in the fields of Agriculture and Health and Sanitation more often mentioned wanting assistance from Missions in the form of technical advisors, tools and equipment, printed materials, and training for fellow workers than any of the other forms of assistance. The most frequently mentioned type of assistance desired by participants in Industry and Mining, Transportation, Education, and Public Administration was the provision of printed materials. Less than half of the participants in the field of Education said they expected to ask the Missions to provide technical advisors, conduct seminars, train their fellow workers, or help A.I.D. participants keep in touch with each other. Smaller proportions of participants in Industry and Mining, Transportation, and Public Administration than in other fields of training said they expected to ask for help from Missions in the form of tools and equipment or seminars, meetings, and conferences.

CHAPTER IV
PARTICIPANTS' REACTIONS TO NON-SUBSTANTIVE
ASPECTS OF STUDY IN THEIR FIELD OF TRAINING

Section A

Reactions of Participants in Academic Programs
to Non-Substantive Aspects of Study
in Their Field of Training

Q. How many of the Academic participants expected to earn a U.S. academic degree? (Item 61)

EXPECTED DEGREE	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	81.5
No	18.5

TOTAL N	(643)

Over 4 out of 5 (81.5%) of the Academic participants said their training program included a plan for them to earn an academic degree in the United States.

Q. What type of students were the Academic participants?
(Item 60)

TYPE OF STUDENT	PERCENTAGE* %
Graduate student	67.8
Undergraduate student	23.2
Non-degree student	13.4

TOTAL N	(643)

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

Q. What degrees did the Academic participants earn in the United States? (Items 62 & 63)

U.S. DEGREE EARNED	PERCENTAGE* %
None	18.0
Associate	2.7
BA/BS	25.1
MA/MS	74.1
Ph.D.	3.9

TOTAL N	(643)

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

Over 4 out of 5 Academic participants (82%) earned academic degrees in the United States. The majority of those earning any degree received an MA or MS degree (74.1%).

Q. How useful did Academic participants find the help provided by their Faculty Advisors? (Item 65)

UTILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely useful)	49.6
2	22.3
3	12.8
4	6.2
5	3.9
6	3.2
7 (Not at all useful)	2.0

TOTAL N	(615)

Almost half of the Academic participants who received help in scheduling courses from Faculty Advisors found their help "extremely useful," "could not have been better." 84.7% of these participants rated the utility of their advisors' help above the middle point on the scale.

More than half of the Academic participants from Africa (58.6%) who received help from a Faculty Advisor rated this help at "1" on the scale. At the other extreme, only 38.2% of the Academic participants from Latin America gave this high a rating to the utility of their Faculty Advisor's help. Higher percentages of Academic participants from the Near East-South Asia and Latin America than of those from the other world regions rated the utility of help from a Faculty Advisor below the middle point on the scale.

Q. What problems did the Academic participants have with the academic training at the institution where they had most of this training? (Item 68)

PROBLEM WITH TRAINING	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING*		
	Very True	Somewhat True	Not True
Too much assigned reading	19.3	43.9	36.8
Too many quizzes, tests, and papers	13.2	37.5	49.2
Subject matter too specific	6.3	25.5	68.2
Testing procedures misunderstood	5.9	25.1	69.0
Subject matter too abstract	3.0	26.8	70.2
Courses too advanced	2.4	27.1	70.5
Too much duplication of subject matter in different courses	4.0	25.3	70.7
Too many courses unrelated to major field	8.6	18.9	72.6
Too little discussion	4.4	22.2	73.4
Grading system misunderstood	4.7	18.0	77.3
Courses too simple	2.5	18.7	78.7
Too little lecturing	3.0	13.3	83.7
TOTAL N			(643)

*Percentages add to 100% by rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

The most frequently mentioned problem was the amount of reading assigned the Academic participants. 63.2% felt they had too much reading to do. The only other problem noted by more than half of the Academic participants was that there were too many quizzes, tests, and papers (50.7%).

African participants in Academic training programs less often felt that the subject matter of their courses was too abstract than participants from other regions, while Academic participants from the Far East more often felt this was the case. Academic participants from Africa more often felt they had too many quizzes, tests, and papers whereas those from Latin America less often felt this was a problem than participants from other world regions. Academic participants from the Near East-South Asia less often felt they misunderstood testing procedures.

Academic participants programmed by the Department of Agriculture more often felt they had too many quizzes, tests, and papers and that they misunderstood testing procedures than Academic participants programmed by other agencies.

Q. What recommendations did the Academic participants make regarding the educational techniques used in their training programs? (Item 69)

EDUCATIONAL TECHNIQUE	PERCENTAGE (%) RECOMMENDING*		
	Right Amount	More Needed	Less Needed
Lectures	78.7	10.3	11.0
Seminars	68.1	23.8	8.1
Lectures and small discussion groups	64.9	28.5	6.6
Laboratory work	63.2	23.7	13.2
Individual research	59.0	34.0	7.0
Field trips related to courses	45.0	49.2	5.8
TOTAL N			(643)

*Percentages add to 100% by rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

Academic participants were most satisfied with the amount of training time devoted to lectures, 78.7% indicating it was about right. Almost half (49.2%) suggested more field trips were needed, while about 1/3 suggested more individual research.

A smaller percentage of African participants in Academic training programs felt they had the right amount of seminars than did participants from any other region.

More than 2 out of 3 Academic participants from the Near East-South Asia and Latin America felt they had the right amount of individual research and laboratory work. African and Far Eastern participants in Academic programs more often wanted more of these educational techniques.

Q. How useful did the Academic participants find their courses at the institution where they had most of their academic training? (Item 70)

UTILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely useful)	29.8
2	39.3
3	18.2
4	8.0
5	2.6
6	1.7
7 (Not at all useful)	.3

TOTAL N	(643)

More than 1/4 of the Academic participants rated their courses as "extremely useful," "could not have been better." Almost 9 out of every 10 (87.3%) rated the utility of their courses in achieving their training objectives above the middle point on the scale.

There was not a statistically significant relationship between the Academic participants' world regions, fields of training, or participating agencies and their ratings of the utility of their courses.

95

Q. How useful did the Academic participants find the observation training they had? (Item 76)

UTILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely useful)	34.6
2	33.8
3	21.5
4	6.6
5	2.7
6	.3
7 (Not at all useful)	.5

TOTAL N	(376)

More than half of the Academic participants (58.8%) said they had some observation training as part of their training programs. About 1/3 of these (34.6%) rated their observation training as "extremely useful" to their training objectives.

Two-thirds of the Academic participants from Africa had observation training. At the other extreme, half of the Academic participants from Latin America had this type of training. Academic participants programmed directly by A.I.D. less often reported having observation training than those programmed by other agencies.

Only about 1 out of 3 of the participants in Public Administration had training of this type. This is a much lower percentage than of the Academic participants in any other field of training.

A higher percentage of Academic participants from the Near East-South Asia and the Far East rated their satisfaction with their observation training above the middle point on the scale than did Academic participants from any other region. A larger proportion of Academic participants from Latin America than from any other region gave ratings of their satisfaction at or below the middle point on this scale (47.6%).

Q. How useful did Academic participants find the on-the-job training they had? (Item 73)

UTILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely useful)	44.2
2	34.7
3	13.2
4	5.3
5	1.6
6	.5
7 (Not at all useful)	.5

TOTAL N	(190)

About 3 out of every 10 Academic participants (29.7%) said they had had on-the-job training. Nearly 45% of these rated this training "extremely useful" on the scale of utility to their training objectives. This is a higher percentage of "1" ratings than the Academic participants gave to either their classroom or observation training

Almost half of the Academic participants from Africa (45.5%) had on-the-job training. This was a much higher proportion than that for any other region.

Academic participants in Public Administration less often had on-the-job training than Academic participants in other fields of training, while those in Agriculture most often had this type of training.

Approximately half of the Academic participants programmed by the Department of Agriculture had on-the-job training. Only about 1/5 of the Academic participants programmed directly by A.I.D. had on-the-job training.

There was not a statistically significant relationship between the Academic participants' world regions, fields of training, or programming agencies and their satisfaction with their on-the-job training.

Q. What recommendations did the Academic participants make regarding the amount of time devoted to the different kinds of training in their training programs? (Item 82)

KIND OF TRAINING	PERCENTAGE (%) RECOMMENDING*		
	Right Amount	More Needed	Less Needed
Academic education	74.6	17.4	8.0
Observation training	45.1	50.8	4.1
On-the-job training	44.9	50.6	4.5
TOTAL N	(643)		

* Percentages add to 100% by rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

Almost 3/4 of the Academic participants felt they had had the right amount of Academic education during their training program. Half of them recommended more on-the-job training and more observation training.

A larger percentage of Academic participants from the Far East and Africa than from the other regions said they needed more academic training. Academic participants from Africa less often indicated that less academic training was needed than Academic participants from any other region.

Almost 8 out of 10 Academic participants in the field of Agriculture said they had the right amount of academic education. One-fifth of the Academic participants in the field

of Education said they needed more of this type of training.

More than 3 out of 5 of the Academic participants programmed by the Public Health Service said they had the right amount of on-the-job training, whereas about half of the Academic participants programmed directly by A.I.D., Agriculture and the Office of Education recommended more on-the-job training.

Q. After the Academic participants reached their first training site, did they request any changes in their training programs that were not made? (Item 81)

REQUESTED CHANGES DENIED	PERCENTAGE %
No	74.5
Yes	25.5

TOTAL N	(643)

Approximately 3/4 of the Academic participants indicated they requested no training program changes that were not made, after they reached their first training facility.

About 1/3 of the Academic participants from Africa reported that they requested changes that were not made, whereas about 8 out of 10 Academic participants from the Far East and Latin America said they did not ask for changes that were not made.

Q. How satisfied were the Academic participants with changes that were made in their training programs after they reached their first training facility? (Item 80)

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely satisfied)	41.4
2	26.3
3	13.1
4	7.2
5	3.5
6	3.5
7 (Not at all satisfied)	5.0

TOTAL N	(198)

Only 31.6% of the Academic participants reported that changes were made in their training programs after they reached their first training site.

Two-thirds of these Academic participants gave ratings of "1" or "2" to their satisfaction with the training program changes.

There was not a statistically significant relationship between these Academic participants' world regions, fields of training, or programming agencies and their ratings of satisfaction with these changes.

Q. How did the Academic participants assess the suitability of their technical training programs to their training and experience, their home country conditions, and their personal career plans? (Item 83)

SUITABILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING		
	To Training and Experience	To Home Country Conditions	To Career Plans
1 (Extremely suitable)	31.5	23.9	32.0
2	40.7	31.4	31.4
3	16.5	25.4	19.0
4	6.8	11.2	9.2
5	3.0	4.3	4.5
6	.8	3.1	1.8
7 (Not at all suitable)	.8	.7	2.2
TOTAL N		(643)	

A smaller percentage of the Academic participants (55.3%) rated the suitability of their training to their home country conditions at "1" or "2" on the scale than gave these ratings to its suitability to their training and experience (72.2%) or to their personal career plans (63.4%). However, more than 90% of the Academic participants stated the suitability of their technical training at or above the middle point on each of the scales.

There was not a statistically significant relationship between the Academic participants' world regions, fields of training, or programming agencies and any of their ratings of the suitability of their training.

Section B

Reactions of Participants in Special Programs to Non-Substantive Aspects of Study in Their Field of Training

Q. What kinds of training did the participants in Special training programs have? (Items 59, 63, 67)

KIND OF TRAINING	PERCENTAGE (%) HAVING TRAINING*	
	Yes	No
Observation training visits	86.4	13.6
Classroom	79.0	21.0
On-the-job work experience	51.7	48.3
TOTAL N	(741)	

*Percentages add to 100% by rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

About 4 out of 5 participants (79%) in Special training programs received classroom training. 7 out of 8 made observation training visits. Slightly more than half of the Special participants (51.7%) indicated that they received on-the-job work experience in their training programs.

Almost 90% of the Special participants from Africa, as contrasted to 70% from Latin America, had classroom training as part of their programs.

Participants in Special training programs in Health and Sanitation and Public Administration, more often than participants in other fields, had classroom training as part of

their programs. The participants in Industry and Mining and Education less often had classroom training.

Only 43% of the Special participants from the Near East-South Asia reported having on-the-job work experience in contrast to 64.1% of the African Special participants.

The percentages of Special participants having on-the-job experience varied from 41.3% of those in the field of Health and Sanitation to slightly more than 60% of those in Education.

While more than 9 out of 10 Special participants in the field of Agriculture said they had observation training visits as part of their programs, only about 3 out of 4 in Health and Sanitation said they had observation visits.

More than 3/4 of those who said they had observation training said that they made the visits as members of a group.

Q. What recommendations did the Special participants make regarding the amount of time devoted to the different kinds of training in their training programs? (Item 79)

KIND OF TRAINING	PERCENTAGE (%) RECOMMENDING*		
	Right Amount	More Needed	Less Needed
Observation training visits	53.3	36.0	10.7
Classroom	52.3	29.4	18.4
On-the-job work experience	44.7	49.8	5.5
TOTAL N		(741)	

*Percentages add to 100% by rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

About 50% of the Special participants responding to this question felt that they should have had more on-the-job work experience, whereas only about 5% recommended less on-the-job

105

experience. Over half of the Special participants reporting felt they had had the right amount of classroom training (52.3%) and observation training visits (53.3%). For both classroom and observation training the proportion of Special participants recommending more such training is larger than the proportion feeling there should be less.

A larger proportion of the Special participants from Latin America gave "right amount" ratings on each of the three kinds of training than did those from any other world region (observation visits 76.9%, classroom 70.6%, and on-the-job 66%). At the other extreme, only 34.9% of the African Special participants rated the time spent in their on-the-job training as "about the right amount." Over half of the African and Far Eastern participants in Special programs recommended more on-the-job training. Near East-South Asian participants more often suggested that they needed less classroom training (27.4%) and more frequently felt that there should be more observation training (43.7%) than participants from other regions.

Over half of the Special participants in the fields of Public Administration and Industry and Mining felt that more on-the-job training was needed, while over half of those in Health and Sanitation and Transportation felt they had had about the right amount of on-the-job training.

Q. How useful did the Special participants find their classroom training? (Item 62)

UTILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely useful)	29.0
2	32.6
3	20.4
4	10.7
5	3.9
6	2.7
7 (Not at all useful)	.7

TOTAL N	(589)

About 3 out of 10 Special participants felt their classes were "extremely useful" and "could not have been better." More than 8 in 10 rated their classroom training above the middle point on the scale of utility to the objectives of their technical training program.

Special participants from Africa more often said their classroom training "could not have been better" (43.5%), while those from the Near East-South Asia less often rated it this high (19.7%). More than 1 out of 4 Near East-South Asian participants rated the utility of their classroom training at or below the middle of the scale.

Special participants programmed directly by A.I.D. rated the utility of their classroom training at or below the midpoint of the scale more often than did those programmed by other agencies (23.1%), and conversely less often rated it "extremely useful" (24.8%).

105

Q. What problems did the Special participants have with their classroom training? (Item 61)

PROBLEM WITH CLASSES	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING*		
	Very True	Somewhat True	Not True
Too general	9.3	27.7	63.0
Too simple	6.8	26.0	67.2
Too much duplication	6.8	25.8	67.4
Too much reading	8.7	23.3	68.0
Too many subjects	8.9	17.2	73.9
Too detailed	5.1	19.4	75.5
Not enough discussion	6.7	16.4	76.9
Too advanced	3.6	19.3	77.0
Not enough lecturing	6.1	11.6	82.3
TOTAL N			(585)

*Percentages add to 100% by rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

The most frequently mentioned problem with classroom training was that the subject matter presented to the Special participants was "too general." Whereas 37% felt that generality was a problem, only 24.5% felt that the subject matter in their classes was "too detailed."

The Special participants from the Near East-South Asia much more often (45.9%) felt that their classroom work was too general; those from Latin America less often (21.1%) thought it so.

42.4% of the Near East-South Asian participants felt that their courses or presentations were too simple, whereas only 25.5-29% from the other world regions indicated that this was a problem for them.

106

Special participants from Africa and the Far East more often reported having too much assigned reading (39.6% and 40.1%) than participants from the other regions.

Latin American Special participants much less often reported problems with "too many subjects" (5.3%) than participants from other regions.

A larger proportion of African Special participants (30.9%) indicated that the subject matter in their classroom training was "too detailed" than did those from other regions.

"Too little discussion" was more often reported as a problem by Special participants from the Far East (29.4%) and Latin America (28.9%) than by those from the other 2 world regions.

Courses or presentations that were too advanced was less often a problem for participants from the Near East-South Asia (15.7%) than for those from other areas. Special participants from the Far East most often felt this to be a problem (31.4%).

There was not a statistically significant relationship between the various problems Special participants had in their classroom training and their programming agencies or fields of training.

Q. How useful did the Special participants find their on-the-job work experience? (Item 66)

UTILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely useful)	36.9
2	32.2
3	16.7
4	6.5
5	5.0
6	1.5
7 (Not at all useful)	1.2

TOTAL N	(375)

3 out of 8 Special participants (36.9%) who had on-the-job work experience rated it "extremely useful, could not have been better." Nearly 7 out of 8 (85.8%) rated this training above the middle point of the scale of utility to the objectives of their technical training program.

Over half of the Special participants from Africa (51.9%) gave "1" ratings (could not have been better) to the utility of their on-the-job training. On the other hand, only about 1/4 of the Special participants from the Near East-South Asia (24.4%) rated their on-the-job experience at "1," while nearly as many of them (23.5%) rated this training at or below the middle of the scale.

There was not a statistically significant relationship between the Special participants' fields of training or participating agencies and their ratings of the utility of on-the-job work experience.

Q. What problems did the Special participants have in their on-the-job work experience? (Item 65)

PROBLEM WITH WORK EXPERIENCE	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING*		
	Very True	Somewhat True	Not True
Too little time on any one job	16.6	33.1	50.4
Too little to do	15.3	29.1	55.6
Work too specialized	10.0	27.8	62.2
Too many different jobs	6.2	17.8	76.1
Too little supervision	7.7	15.8	76.5
Work too advanced	5.7	17.8	76.5
Work too simple	6.8	16.2	77.0
TOTAL N			(375)

*Percentages add to 100% by rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

Nearly half of the Special participants indicated that they felt to some extent that they had had too little time on any one job (49.7%) during their on-the-job work experience. Nearly as many (44.4%) indicated that they were sometimes assigned too little to do and/or lacked actual work experience in their on-the-job training. 3 in 8 felt that their on-the-job training was too specialized. Only about 1 Special participant out of 4 indicated that each of the other listed problems was true for them.

Over half of the Special participants programmed directly by A.I.D. who had on-the-job work experience felt that they were assigned too little to do or lacked opportunity for actual work experience. This problem was indicated less often by Special participants programmed by other government agencies.

1/3 of the Special participants from the Far East reported that "too little supervision" was a problem for them in their on-the-job training; those from other regions indicated this difficulty less often. Special participants programmed directly by A.I.D., more frequently felt "too little supervision" to have been a problem than Special participants programmed by other agencies.

Special participants from the Near East-South Asia more often felt that work being too simple was a problem for them in their on-the-job work experience than participants from other world regions.

Q. How useful did the Special participants find their observation training visits? (Item 71)

UTILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely useful)	26.0
2	37.1
3	23.4
4	8.3
5	2.8
6	1.7
7 (Not at all useful)	.6

TOTAL N	(641)

More than 1 out of 4 (26%) Special participants felt that their observation training visits were "extremely useful," and "could not have been better." About 6 out of 7 of these participants (85.5%) rated their observation training visits above the middle point of the scale of utility to the objectives of their technical training program.

About 2 out of 3 Special participants from each of the world regions except the Near East-South Asia (54.3%) rated the utility of the observation visits at 1 or 2 on the scale.

Special participants in the fields of Transportation, Health and Sanitation, and Public Administration more often gave utility ratings at or below the middle point on the scale to their observation training visits than Special participants in other fields of training. Special participants in Agriculture, Health and Sanitation, and Education more often gave "1" ratings to their observation training than other participants in Special training programs.

Q. What problems did the Special participants have on their observation training visits? (Item 70)

PROBLEM WITH OBSERVATION VISITS	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING*		
	Very True	Somewhat True	Not True
Visits too short	19.5	38.0	42.5
Activities too similar	10.1	35.6	54.3
Failed to visit important places	13.4	31.0	55.6
Too many visits in short time	9.8	24.9	65.3
Visited unimportant places	5.3	25.6	69.1
Group members too different in fields of training	9.7	20.3	70.0
Too little preparation at facility	4.9	25.0	70.1
Wrong time of year	6.7	19.	74.3
TOTAL N			(641)

*Percentages add to 100% by rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

111

Over half of the Special participants indicated that their observation training visits were not long enough (57.5%). Over 40% felt that they had activities at the places visited which were too similar or repetitive (45.7%) and that they had failed to visit some important places during their sojourns (44.4%). Over 1/3 of the Special participants felt that there were too many visits made in the available time (34.7%).

Almost 2/3 of the Far Eastern Special participants (64.3%) felt that their observation training visits were too short; only 37.2% of the Latin American participants indicated this.

Only about 1 out of 6 of the Latin American Special participants (17.5%) thought that their observation visits had failed to include some important places, while Special participants from the Near East-South Asia and the Far East reported this problem much more frequently. Less than 40% of the Special participants in the fields of Health and Sanitation and Agriculture believed that their observation training had not included visits to some important places, as compared to over half of those in Education and Industry and Mining who thought this.

Special participants programmed directly by A.I.D. and by the Department of Agriculture more often reported that the group they were in was composed of people who were too different in their technical backgrounds than Special participants programmed by other government agencies.

"Too little preparation by people at training facility" was felt to have been a problem by almost 40% of the Far Eastern Special participants. Only 9.5% of the Special participants from Latin America indicated that this was a problem, while about 1/4 of those from the Near East-South Asia felt this way.

Almost 3 out of 8 Special participants programmed directly by A.I.D. (36.7%) reported that lack of preparation at the training facility was one of the difficulties with their observation visits. This is a higher proportion than reported by the Special participants programmed by any other agency.

Among the fields of training, Special participants in Public Administration more frequently noted that lack of preparation at the training site was a problem on their observation visits (43.9%). Health and Sanitation Special participants reported this problem least often (18.2%).

Special participants programmed by the Department of Agriculture reported that visits at the wrong time of the year were a problem for them in their observation training more often than did those programmed by any other government agency.

Q. After the Special participants reached their first training site, did they request any changes in their training programs that were not made? (Item 76)

REQUESTED CHANGES DENIED	PERCENTAGE %
No	74.5
Yes	25.5

TOTAL N	(533)

1 out of 4 Special participants indicated that they requested changes in their technical training programs which were not made. Special participants from the Near East-South Asia (31.9%) and the Far East (27.4%) indicated this more often than those from the other 2 world regions.

Q. How satisfied were the Special participants with the changes that were made in their technical training programs after they reached their first training site? (Item 75)

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely satisfied)	29.4
2	33.1
3	18.2
4	7.6
5	5.8
6	2.6
7 (Not at all satisfied)	3.3

TOTAL N	(275)

Only about 1 in 5 participants (19.3%) indicated satisfaction ratings at or below the middle point of the scale on the changes that were made in their programs. A smaller proportion of participants programmed directly by A.I.D. (19.1%) gave a rating of "1" ("extremely satisfied," "could not have been better") to the changes in their program than Special participants programmed by other government agencies.

114

Q. How did the Special participants assess the suitability of their technical training programs to their training and experience, their home country conditions, and their personal career plans? (Item 80)

SUITABILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING		
	To Training and Experience	To Home Country Conditions	To Career Plans
1 (Extremely suitable)	30.8	22.4	31.8
2	34.4	30.2	30.7
3	19.1	24.0	21.7
4	9.6	12.6	9.2
5	2.5	7.3	2.5
6	2.5	2.7	2.9
7 (Not at all suitable)	1.1	.9	1.3
TOTAL N			(563)

A smaller percentage of Special participants (52.6%) rated the suitability of their training to their home country conditions at "1" or "2" on the scale than gave these ratings to its suitability to their personal training and experience (62.5%) or their personal career plans (62.5%). However, about 9 out of 10 of the Special participants rated the suitability of their technical training at or above the mid-point on each of the 3 scales.

Special participants from the Near East-South Asia rated the suitability of their technical training lower on all 3 scales than did participants from the other world regions: only 54.8% gave a "1" or "2" rating for suitability to their training and experience, only 49.6% gave such a rating for suitability to their personal career plans, and only 40.6% rated the suitability to their home country conditions at

115

"1" or "2." African and Latin American Special participants more frequently gave "1" ratings on all 3 suitability scales.

There was not a statistically significant relationship between the Special participants' fields of training or programming agencies and their ratings of the suitability of their training.

CHAPTER V
PARTICIPANTS' PERSONAL AND SOCIAL EXPERIENCES
IN THE UNITED STATES

Section A
Participants' Social Activities and
Friendships in the United States

Q. Were participants guests of American families in their homes at training locations? (Item 119)

GUEST IN HOME	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	91.6
No	8.4

TOTAL N	(1311)

More than 9 out of 10 participants were the guests of American families in their homes at the training locations. Only 5.5% of the Far Eastern participants said they had not been guests in an American home, while 14.6% of the Latin American participants had not been.

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

NUMBER OF FAMILIES	PERCENTAGE %
1	15.2
2	16.6
3-5	36.6
6 or more	31.6

TOTAL N	(904)

2/3 of the participants who were guests had visited in at least 3 different American homes, and almost 1/3 had been guests in 6 or more homes.

3 out of 8 Academic participants said they had been a guest in 6 or more different homes as opposed to only 1 out of 4 Special participants who had visited this many different families.

Participants in the field of Education led those in other fields in the number of different families in whose homes they had been guests--43.6% had visited 6 or more different families. On the other hand, 30.3% of the Transportation participants said they had been a guest in only 1 home. 3/4 of the participants in the field Agriculture had visited 3 or more homes in contrast to only 53% of the Transportation participants that had visited that many families.

Q. How many visits to American homes did the participants make? (Item 121)

NUMBER OF VISITS	PERCENTAGE %
1	8.7
2	9.6
3-5	26.6
6 or more	55.2

TOTAL N	(910)

Over half (55.2%) of the participants who had been guests said that they had visited 6 or more times in American homes while only 1 in 12 of these participants said they had visited only once in an American home. More than 4/5 (81.8%) have visited an American home 3 or more times.

As with the number of different homes, participants in Education also led those from other fields of training in the number of visits they said they made to American homes; 72.2% of them said they had visited 6 or more times, while 12.4% of them had made only 1 or 2 visits. Participants in the field of Transportation had made fewer visits, per capita, than others: 30.1% said they had made only 1 or 2 visits, while 31.9% reported visiting 6 or more times.

Q. What different aspects of their visits to American homes did the participants enjoy? (Item 122)

ASPECT	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING*			
	Did Not Do	Did Not Enjoy	Enjoyed Somewhat	Enjoyed Very Much
Discussing life in the U.S. with Americans	1.4	3.0	25.1	70.4
Meeting American children	4.6	2.7	22.3	70.3
Discussing home country with Americans	.9	2.8	27.1	69.2
Observing American family life	1.8	1.7	27.5	69.0
Seeing the inside of an American home	1.3	2.2	33.5	63.0
Eating American food	0.6	13.2	52.4	33.8
TOTAL N		(932)		

*Percentages add to 100% by rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

Of the participants who responded to this question, nearly all indicated that they had taken part in each of the aspects listed in the table above, although about 1 out of 20 said they had not met American children in their visits.

About 2 out of 3 noted that they "enjoyed very much" each aspect listed except "eating American food." "Eating American food" was clearly the least enjoyable aspect of the participants' visits to American homes, with only 1/3 saying that they enjoyed it very much, 1/2 saying that they enjoyed the food only somewhat, and more than 1 in 8 saying that they did not enjoy eating American food.

120

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

ENJOYMENT RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely enjoyable)	45.3
2	33.6
3	14.6
4	5.2
5	.9
6	.3
7 (Not at all enjoyable)	.1

TOTAL N	(1052)

Nearly half of the participants rated their visits "1" or "extremely enjoyable," "could not have been better," and all but 6.5% rated their enjoyment above the middle point on the scale.

Participants from Latin America (55.6%) and the Near East-South Asia (52.4%) relatively more often gave "1" ratings than those from Africa (42.2%) and the Far East (37.4%). Participants from Africa rated their enjoyment at or below the middle point on the scale relatively more often (9.2%) than those from other regions.

Over half of the Special participants rated their home visits as "extremely enjoyable," whereas only about 40% of the Academic participants did so. About 1 in 12 Academic participants rated their home visits at or below the middle-point of the scale (8.2%)

121

Q. What kinds of informal social and recreational activities did the participants say they took part in during their stay in the United States? (Item 124)

ACTIVITY	PERCENTAGE* %
Went sightseeing	78.1
Went to movies	62.6
Went to picnics, parties, dances	58.6
Watched sporting events	53.5
Went to concerts or plays	41.7
Took part in sports	22.2

TOTAL N	(1384)

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

Q. With whom did the participants say they most often went to these informal activities? (Item 125)

PERSON	PERCENTAGE %
Most often with Americans	25.3
Most often with own countrymen	24.5
Most often with other foreigners	7.5
Most often with mixed groups	28.8
No one, most often alone	13.9

TOTAL N	(1358)

132

Participants took part in informal activities most commonly (28.8%) in mixed groups of Americans, home countrymen and other foreign nationals. The next most common modes of participating in these informal activities were with Americans only (25.3%) or with fellow countrymen only (24.5%).

38% of the African participants said they most often participated in mixed groups as contrasted to only about 22% of the Near East South Asian participants. While only about 21% of the Far Eastern participants said they participated most often with Americans, about 27-29% of those from other regions said this. The percentage of participants saying they went most often with their own countrymen ranged from 11.5% of the African participants to 30.9% of those from the Far East. Only 8.8% of the Latin American participants said they most often went alone to these activities, compared to about 14-18% of those from other regions who said this. While 15.2% of the Latin American participants said they went most often to informal activities with foreigners who were not their own countrymen, only 5-9% of those from other regions indicated this.

Q. How enjoyable were these informal activities for the participants? (Item 126)

ENJOYMENT RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely enjoyable)	36.3
2	37.5
3	18.8
4	5.0
5	1.9
6	.4
7 (Not at all enjoyable)	.2

TOTAL N	(1156)

More than 1/3 of the participants rated their informal activities as "extremely enjoyable, could not have been better," and all but 7.5% rated them above the mid-point of the scale.

About 1 in 4 participants indicated that there were some social or recreational activities in which they wanted to participate, but were not able to.

There was not a statistically significant relationship between participants ratings of enjoyment or their inability to participate and their world regions or their type of training.

Q. How many presentations did the participants say they made to American audiences about their home countries or their cultures? (Items 129 & 130)

NUMBER OF PRESENTATIONS	PERCENTAGE %
None	44.7
1	11.1
2	14.9
3-5	19.6
6 or more	9.7

TOTAL N	(1288)

Nearly 2 out of 3 participants indicated that they wanted to make some kind of presentation about life in their home country to an American audience. A majority of participants made at least 1 presentation, and nearly 30% made 3 or more presentations.

Participants from Latin America least often wanted to make presentations about their home country or its culture (47.8%) and least often did so (42%). Participants from Africa more often made presentations about their homelands than did those from other regions. The discrepancies between the number of participants who wanted to make a presentation, but did not were larger for participants from the Far East and Near East-South Asia than for the other 2 world regions.

125

Q. Did the participants say they joined or applied for membership in any U.S. professional societies during their visit to the United States? (Item 115)

JOINED	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	45.6
No	54.4

TOTAL N	(1384)

During their visit to the United States less than half (45.6%) of the participants joined or applied for membership in U.S. professional societies. A substantial proportion (22.1%) indicated that there were professional societies that they wanted to join, but were not able to.

The Latin American participants less often than those from other world regions said that there were professional organizations they were not able to join.

62.5% of the participants programmed by the Department of Agriculture said they had joined or applied for membership, whereas 40.4% of those programmed directly by A.I.D. and only 31% of those programmed by the Public Health Service reported that they had done so. The percentages of participants in various fields of training who said they had joined or applied ranged from 36.3% in Public Administration to 59.1% in Agriculture.

Q. Did participants regularly participate in any student or community clubs during their visit to the United States? (Item 117)

PARTICIPATED IN CLUBS	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	43.3
No	56.7

TOTAL N	(1005)

43.3% of the participants said that they regularly participated in student or community clubs during their stay in the United States. 1 out of 9 participants (11.3%) said that there were student or community clubs that they wanted to participate in, but were not able to. There was not a statistically significant relationship between the participants' training programs, world regions, or type of training and their inability to join these clubs or their participation in them.

127

Q. What kinds of Americans did the participants say they had personal friendships with? (Items 131 & 132)

AMERICAN FRIENDS	PERCENTAGE* %
None	7.0
American host families	63.4
Students or fellow workers	59.8
Teachers or job training instructors	57.2
Training facility staff other than teachers or instructors	39.4

TOTAL N	(1384)

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

Only 7% of the participants said they made no American friends during their sojourn. Participants from the Near East-South Asia less frequently said they had made American friends (85.7%). Nearly all the Academic participants (98%) indicated that they had American friends compared with 88.5% of the Special participants.

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

FRIENDSHIP RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely important)	43.6
2	33.5
3	15.7
4	4.8
5	1.2
6	.6
7 (Not at all important)	.6

TOTAL N	(1285)

Over 90% of the participants rated the importance of their friendships with Americans in their total experience above the middle point of the scale, and over 40% rated it "extremely important, experience would have been worthless without American friendships."

There was not a statistically significant relationship between participants' ratings of friendships and their world regions or type of program.

Section B

Participants' Personal and Social Problems
in the United States and
Sources of Help

Q. What personal and social problems did participants have during their stay in the United States? (Item 142)

PROBLEM	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING*		
	Very True	Somewhat True	Not True
Weather too cold	26.7	37.8	35.5
Homesickness	16.4	48.1	35.5
Food distasteful	8.1	41.1	50.8
Loneliness	10.4	37.6	52.0
Not enough time for social and recreational activities	10.0	37.4	52.6
Weather too hot	10.4	24.6	65.1
Rude, unfriendly people	3.4	25.1	71.5
Too little information about U.S. social customs	3.9	23.0	73.1
Illness	4.6	19.5	76.0
Lack of recognition of position in home country	5.3	16.5	78.2
Dishonest people	2.3	15.1	82.6
TOTAL N	(1384)		

*Percentages add to 100% by rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

General problems mentioned by approximately half or more of the participants were cold weather (64.5%), homesickness (65.4%), distasteful food (49.2%), loneliness (48%), and

130

insufficient time for social and recreational activities (47.4%). (Problems with discrimination are discussed later in this chapter.)

Weather in the United States

Cold weather was more frequently a problem for participants from Africa (75.8%) and the Far East (70.4%) than for those from the other world regions. Academic participants (69.2%) more often mentioned the cold weather problem than Special participants (60.4%).

Over half of the African participants (53.4%) noted a problem with hot weather in the United States, while only about 1/4 of those from the Near East-South Asia thought that this was a problem. Academic participants (42.5%) felt hot weather to be a problem much more often than Special participants (28.2%).

Homesickness, Loneliness and Illness

Participants from the Far East reported problems with homesickness, loneliness and illness more often than participants from the other world regions. Participants from Africa reported these problems second most often.

Participants in Academic training programs more often reported having "much difficulty" with homesickness than did participants in Special training programs.

American Food

Almost 60% of the Far Eastern participants and over half of those from the Near East-South Asia reported that U.S. food was distasteful to them.

Time for Social and Recreational Activities

Over half the participants from the Far East and Latin America indicated that they lacked sufficient time for social and recreational activities. Latin American participants especially felt this to be a problem, 1 in 6 indicating that

this was "very true for me." A larger proportion of Academic participants (53.8%) felt that insufficient time for these activities was a problem than did Special participants (41.8%).

Rude and Unfriendly or Dishonest People

Participants from the Near East-South Asia less often reported problems with rude and unfriendly or dishonest people than did participants from any other world region. Academic participants more often reported having problems with these kinds of people than did participants in Special training programs.

Lack of Recognition

Participants from the Far East and Latin America more often said that they had a problem with lack of recognition of their positions in their home countries.

Q. In what kinds of situations did the participants say they experienced discrimination against them? (Item 139)

SITUATION	PERCENTAGE* %
None	78.1
In housing	9.0
In public eating facilities	8.4
In service establishments	6.3
In transportation	2.6
At training facilities	2.2

TOTAL N	(1384)

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

131

Nearly 4 out of 5 participants said they did not experience any discrimination during their stay in the United States. Of those who did have such experiences, the most common situation in which it occurred was housing (45.5%), followed by restaurants and cafeterias (38.5%), and service establishments such as barbershops and laundries (28.9%). The least common of the listed situations were transportation (12% of those who experienced any discrimination) and at their training facilities (10% of those who experienced discrimination).

About half of the African participants said that they had experienced discrimination during their U.S. sojourns, while only 10-13% of those from the other world regions reported any incidents. 60% of all the participants who said they had experienced discrimination were from the African region.

3 out of 10 Academic participants reported that they had experienced discrimination against themselves, while only 14.4% of the Special participants reported such an experience.

Q. Did the participants say they used any medical, dental, counseling, or legal services while they were in the United States? (Items 134 & 135)

SERVICE	PERCENTAGE* %
None	48.8
Medical or dental	49.4
Counseling	3.6
Legal	1.1

TOTAL N	(1384)

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

177

Almost half of the participants reported that they did not use any medical, dental, counseling, or legal service during their stay in the United States. Half said they used medical or dental services. Counseling or legal services were reported as used by very few participants.

About 6 out of 10 participants from Africa and Latin America indicated that they used some of the listed services, while only 45.5% from the Near East-South Asia and 44% from the Far East indicated that they did.

2 out of 3 Academic participants said they used some of these services, but only 3 out of 8 of the Special participants did so.

Q. Did the participants ever get help from a Foreign Student Advisor or Job Trainee Advisor at their training facility and how available was that advisor? (Items 136 & 137)

HELP AND AVAILABILITY	PERCENTAGE %
Got no help	37.3
Got help, sometimes available	7.7
Got help, usually available	17.4
Got help, always available	37.6

TOTAL N	(1384)

7 out of 10 African participants said that they received help from an advisor at their training facilities, while only half of the Near East-South Asia participants said they used an advisor.

More than 70% of the Academic participants reported getting help from a Foreign Student Advisor, but only 54.4% of the Special participants indicated that they received help from a Job Trainee Advisor.

134

Q. How useful did the participants find the help they received from a Foreign Student Advisor or Job Trainee Advisor? (Item 138)

UTILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely useful)	43.6
2	29.5
3	15.9
4	5.3
5	2.9
6	1.8
7 (Not at all useful)	1.0

TOTAL N	(869)

Over 40% of the participants who received help rated that help as "extremely useful, could not have been better," and almost 9 out of 10 participants rated the help received above the middle point of the scale. Academic participants were more critical than Special participants of the usefulness of the help received from their advisors. (14.5% of the Academic as opposed to only 7.2% of the Special participants rated the help received at or below the mid-point of the scale.) There was not a statistically significant relationship between the participants' world regions and their ratings of the utility of the help they received from a Foreign Student or Job Trainee Advisor.

135

CHAPTER VI
 PARTICIPANTS' VIEWS ON ENGLISH LANGUAGE
 TRAINING, ORIENTATION PROGRAMS, AND
 SPECIAL PROGRAMS

Section A

Participants' Use and Evaluation
 of English Language Training

Q. How many participants received special English language training to prepare them to take part in the A.I.D. training program, and where did they receive it? (Items 14 & 15)

ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING	PERCENTAGE %
No training	49.2
In home country only	25.0
In home country and U.S.	20.8
In U.S. only	5.0

TOTAL N	(1384)

Slightly less than 1/2 (49.2%) of the participants received no special English language training. Of those who did receive such training, more were instructed in their home countries only (25%) than in the United States only (5%). About 1 participant out of 5 (20.8%) had English language training in both his home country and the United States.

Participants from Latin America and the Far East (where English is less often the native language) more often had special language training than did participants from the Near

136

East-South Asia and Africa.

62% of the Academic participants received special language training in English, which is a much larger percentage than of the Special participants having such training.

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

UTILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE (%) IN	
	Home Country	U.S.
1 (Extremely useful)	29.5	34.3
2	22.6	21.6
3	21.3	14.5
4	16.5	13.0
5	7.2	7.5
6	1.6	5.8
7 (Not at all useful)	1.3	3.3

TOTAL N	(637)	(399)

About 1 out of 3 (29.5%) participants who received English language training in their home countries found it "extremely useful" (1 rating). 73.4% rated the utility of their home country language training above the middle point on the scale. Although a somewhat higher percentage (34.3%) of participants found their U.S. language training "extremely useful," a larger proportion rated this training below the middle point on the scale than rated their home country training this low.

A much higher percentage of participants from Africa than from any other world region gave a "1" rating to the

127

utility of their home country English instruction. Proportionately more participants from the Far East than from any other region gave utility ratings below the middle point on the scale for this instruction.

A larger proportion of participants from the Far East and Africa (about 40%) gave "1" ratings to the utility of their English language instruction in the United States than did participants from any other regions. Only 13.3% of Latin American participants who had English language training in the United States gave "extremely useful" ratings on this scale.

Participants in Special training programs more often rated their U.S. language training "extremely useful" than did participants in Academic training programs.

Q. What kinds of problems did the participants have with the English language during their sojourn? (Item 17)

PROBLEM WITH ENGLISH	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING*		
	Very True	Somewhat True	Not True
Slang	20.4	56.6	23.0
Abbreviations and idioms	7.1	50.0	42.9
Accents	5.7	48.1	46.2
Conversations	2.7	34.3	63.0
Instructors' speech	2.3	27.3	70.4
Writing	4.4	24.8	70.8
Signs, numbers, directions	1.3	14.2	84.5
Reading	1.4	13.2	85.4
TOTAL N	(1384)		

*Percentages add to 100% by rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

138

Difficulties with slang (77%), abbreviations and idioms (57.1%), and accents (53.8%) were the only problems which bothered a majority of the participants. Nearly 2 participants out of 5 had language difficulties with personal conversations (37%). 3 out of 10 participants had difficulty understanding their instructors' speech; the same proportion had difficulty writing in English.

United States Slang

Participants from the Near East-South Asia and Africa less often said they had trouble with U.S. slang than did Latin American and Far Eastern participants. Academic participants were more apt than Special participants to mention trouble with U.S. slang.

Abbreviations and Idioms

Less than half of the participants from the Near East-South Asia said they had problems with abbreviations and idioms used in the United States, which was a smaller proportion than of those from the other world regions having this difficulty. Participants from the Far East most often had trouble with U.S. abbreviations and idioms.

About 3 out of 5 Academic participants, but only slightly more than half of the participants in Special training programs, reported having some or much difficulty with abbreviations and idioms.

U.S. Accents

About 50% of the Near East-South Asian and African participants reported having no trouble with U.S. accents. This is a higher percentage than of the participants from the other regions.

Personal Conversations

A larger proportion of Latin American and Far Eastern

participants than participants from the other regions said they had trouble with personal conversations.

7 out of 10 Special participants said they had no difficulty with personal conversations, whereas almost half of the Academic participants reported having this difficulty.

About half of the participants in Education said they had difficulty with their personal conversations in the United States, which was a larger proportion than of those in other fields of training who said they had this difficulty.

Teachers' or Supervisors' Speech

About 50% of the participants from the Far East, and 1/3 of the participants from Latin America, had trouble with teachers' or supervisors' speech. Only 1 out of 5 of the participants from Africa and 1 out of 6 from the Near East-South Asia expressed such difficulties. Academic participants more often said they had trouble with their teachers' or supervisors' speech than did participants in Special training programs.

Writing in English

More than half of the participants from Latin America and nearly half of those from the Far East said they had problems with writing in English. Much smaller proportions of participants from Africa and the Near East-South Asia had such difficulties. More than 1/3 of the Academic participants but less than 1/4 of the Special participants reported having this difficulty.

Signs, Numbers, and Directions

Participants from the Far East more often than those from the other world regions said they had difficulty understanding signs, numbers, and directions in the United States.

Reading in English

More than 9 out of 10 of the participants from the Near East-South Asia and Africa said they had no difficulty in reading English during their stay in the United States. Almost 30% of the Far Eastern participants and 20% of the Latin American participants said that reading in English was a problem for them.

Q. What are the languages which have been used most often by the participants since they were 18 years of age? (Item 13)

LANGUAGE	PERCENTAGE (%) USING LANGUAGE		
	Most Often	2nd Most Often	1st or 2nd Most Often
English	15.5	59.2	69.4
Thai	9.9	.1	10.0
Indonesian	8.0	1.6	9.4
French	1.4	7.9	8.6
Spanish	4.8	1.6	6.2
Portuguese	5.6	.1	5.7
Turkish	5.1	.2	5.3
Hindi	1.7	2.9	4.3
Amharic	4.0	.4	4.3
Urdu	2.9	1.3	4.1
Bengali	3.5	.7	4.1
Dutch	.2	3.8	3.7
Arabic	2.7	.8	3.4
Vietnamese	3.3	0.0	3.2
Tagalog	2.1	.4	2.4
Korean	2.2	.2	2.3
Nepali	2.0	.2	2.1
Yoruba	1.5	.6	2.1
Swahili	1.2	.9	2.1
Other	22.4	17.2	—
TOTAL N	(1384)	(1260)	(1384)

No language except English is used by more than 10% of the participants. 70% of the participants listed English as 1 of the 2 languages they most often used. The languages listed in the above table were each used by 2% or more of the participants. 99 other languages were reported as "used most often," some of which were spoken by only a single participant, such as Acoli and Urhobo.

14/2

Section B

Participants' Experience with and Evaluation
of Orientation Programs

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

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE (%) IN	
	Home Country	U.S.
1 (Extremely satisfied)	20.8	24.0
2	24.6	34.0
3	23.3	24.0
4	15.6	11.8
5	8.3	3.8
6	4.2	1.2
7 (Not at all satisfied)	3.2	1.2
TOTAL N	(1137)	(1281)

1/5 of the participants rated the orientations they received in their home countries as "Extremely useful," orientations "could not have been better," whereas about 1/4 of the participants gave this high a rating to their orientations in the United States. 30% of the participants rated their satisfaction with their home country orientations at or below the middle point on the scale, compared with 18% who gave such ratings to their satisfaction with U.S. orientations.

Slightly higher percentages of Latin American and African participants than of those from the other world regions rated their satisfaction with home country orientations at "1" on

the scale. A higher proportion of the Latin American participants and a lower proportion of Far Eastern participants than of those from the other regions rated their satisfaction with home country orientations below the middle point on the scale. Participants in Special training programs gave higher ratings of satisfaction with their home country orientations than did participants in Academic programs. 20% of the participants programmed by the Office of Education gave ratings below the middle point on the scale to their satisfaction with orientations in their home countries. At the other extreme, only 8% of the participants programmed by the Public Health Service rated their satisfaction with home country orientations below the middle point on the scale.

A majority of the participants from each of the world regions rated their satisfaction with U.S. orientations at "1" or "2" on the scale; ranging from 53.9% of the Latin American participants to 60.8% of the participants from the Near East-South Asia. 2/3 of the Special participants, compared with slightly less than half of those in Academic training programs, rated their satisfaction with U.S. orientations at "1" or "2" on the scale. Larger proportions of participants in Transportation and Health and Sanitation than of those in other fields of training said they were "extremely satisfied" with their orientations in the United States.

Q. Did participants receive an orientation at the Washington International Center? (Item 40)

RECEIVED ORIENTATION	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	85.1
No	14.9

TOTAL N	(1384)

85% of the participants said they attended an orientation program at the Washington International Center.

A higher percentage of participants from the Near East-South Asia and a lower percentage of those from Latin America than of those from the other world regions said they attended an orientation at the Washington International Center.

About 90% of the Special participants had a Washington International Center orientation, compared with 77.5% of the Academic participants.

A higher proportion of participants in Transportation (98%) and a lower proportion of those in Education (74.1%) than of those in other fields of training said they had an orientation at Washington International Center.

A higher percentage of the participants programmed by the Public Health Service and the Department of Agriculture than of those programmed directly by A.I.D. and by the Office of Education said they had received such orientations.

Q. What kinds of problems did the participants have with their orientation programs at the Washington International Center? (Item 45)

PROBLEM WITH W.I.C. ORIENTATION	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING*		
	Very True	Somewhat True	Not True
Group attending program too different in cultural backgrounds	16.5	30.8	52.7
Too few visits with American families	22.2	24.4	53.4
Too few tours	11.0	24.8	64.2
Some important topics omitted	6.7	28.8	64.5
Program too elementary	8.5	25.6	65.9
Too little discussion	7.7	26.2	66.1
Too many lectures	8.0	22.6	69.4
Group attending program too large	6.5	23.4	70.1
English used by lecturers hard to understand	3.2	22.8	74.0
Subject matter sometimes inaccurate	3.5	21.3	75.2
TOTAL N	(1172)		

*Percentages add to 100% by rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

None of the problems listed in the above table were a cause of difficulty for a majority of the participants who attended orientation programs at the Washington International Center. The most frequently mentioned problems were that the group attending the program was too different in cultural backgrounds and that there were too few visits with American families. Only about 1/4 of the participants who attended

this orientation said they had difficulty with the subject matter being sometimes inaccurate or in understanding the English used by lecturers.

Group Attending Program Too Different in Cultural Backgrounds

Slightly more than half of the participants from Latin America and Africa, half of those from the Far East, and only about 36% of those from the Near East-South Asia felt the group attending the program was too different in cultural backgrounds.

A higher percentage of the participants in Education and a lower percentage of those in Transportation than of those in the other fields of training said they had some or much difficulty with the Washington International Center orientation because the group was too different culturally.

Too Few Visits with American Families

There was not a statistically significant relationship between the participants' training programs, world regions, or fields of training and the amount of difficulty they had with too few visits with American families during the Washington International Center orientation. However, only 56% of the participants who attended the Washington International Center had such visits.

Too Few Tours

About 3 out of 10 participants from Latin America and Africa and 4 out of 10 participants from the Near East-South Asia and the Far East felt that there were too few tours during their Washington International Center orientation.

Some Important Topics Omitted

A larger proportion of the participants from the Near

East-South Asia than of participants from the other world regions said they had no difficulty with some important topics being omitted from their Washington International Center orientations. Participants from Latin America and Africa more often said they had much difficulty with this problem.

Almost half of the Academic participants but less than 1/3 of the Special participants felt that important topics were omitted.

Higher percentages of participants in Agriculture and Education and a lower percentage of those in Transportation than in the other fields of training said they had difficulty with the Washington International Center orientation because some important topics were omitted.

Program Too Elementary

A larger proportion of Academic participants than of those in Special training programs thought that the Washington International Center orientation program was too elementary.

About 3/4 of the participants in Transportation and Health and Sanitation and about 7 out of 10 of those in Education said this was not a difficulty for them, whereas about 45% of the participants in Industry and Mining and Public Administration felt the Washington International Center program was too elementary.

Too Little Discussion

About 1 out of 4 Near East-South Asian participants said they had difficulties with too little discussion at the Washington International Center orientation. This was a lower proportion of participants than of those from other world regions reporting this difficulty.

Proportionately more Academic than Special participants said that there was too little discussion at the Washington

International Center orientation.

A higher percentage of participants in Education and a lower percentage of those in Industry and Mining, and Transportation than in the other fields of training felt that there was too little discussion.

Too Many Lectures

Less than 1/4 of the Special participants, but 4 out of 10 Academic participants said they had difficulties with too many lectures at the Washington International Center orientation.

Group Too Large

There was not a statistically significant relationship between the participants' training programs, world regions, or fields of training and the amount of difficulty they had with the group attending the Washington International Center orientation being too large.

English Used by Lecturers Hard to Understand

About 42% of the participants from the Far East said they had difficulty understanding the English used by lecturers at the Washington International Center orientation. Participants from the other world regions much less often said they had this problem.

Subject Matter Sometimes Inaccurate

Proportionately more participants from the Far East and fewer participants from the Near East-South Asia than from the other world regions said that inaccurate subject matter was a difficulty for them at the Washington International Center orientation.

Participants in Academic training programs more often than Special program participants reported some or much difficulty with inaccurate subject matter at their Washington International Center orientations.

Q. How did the picture the participants formed of the United States while attending the Washington International Center orientation program compare with the picture they had of the United States at the end of their sojourns? (Item 46)

PICTURE OF U.S. FORMED WHILE ATTENDING WIC	PERCENTAGE %
Generally more favorable than the one I now have	25.1
Generally the same as the one I now have	60.4
Generally less favorable than the one I now have	14.5

TOTAL N	(1172)

3 out of 5 participants felt that the picture of the United States they formed while attending the Washington International Center orientation program was generally accurate. 1/4 of the participants, however, said that the picture of the United States presented at the Washington International Center was generally more favorable than the one they had at the end of their sojourn.

African participants more often said that the picture they formed at the Washington International Center was either generally more favorable or less favorable than the one they now have than participants from any other world region.

Half of the Academic participants and about 2/3 of the Special participants felt that the picture of the United States they formed while attending a Washington International Center orientation was generally accurate. Academic participants more often said the picture they formed at the Washington International Center was generally less favorable than the one they now have than did Special participants.

About 7 out of 10 participants in the fields of Industry

150

and Mining, and Transportation, but only about 45% of those in Education and Agriculture, said the image they formed of the United States at the Washington International Center was in general agreement with the one they have now. Higher percentages of the participants in the fields of Education and Agriculture than of those in the other fields of training thought that the picture they formed at the Washington International Center was less favorable. Smaller percentages of those in Industry and Mining, and Transportation than of those in other fields reported that the picture at the Washington International Center was more favorable.

Q. Did participants say they visited a Washington International Center host family for home hospitality? (Item 44)

VISITED HOST FAMILY	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	56.0
No	44.0

TOTAL N	(1202)

Slightly more than half of the participants who attended a Washington International Center orientation program said they visited a host family for home hospitality during that program.

More than 6 out of 10 participants from the Near East-South Asia and Africa who had an orientation at the Washington International Center said they had a home hospitality visit with a host family. Only about 4 out of 10 Latin American participants said their program at the Center included a host family visit.

Many more Special than Academic participants who attended this orientation said they visited a host family during the program.

Participants programmed by the Department of Agriculture and those programmed by the "Other Agencies" category more often said they had such visits than did participants programmed by the Office of Education and the Public Health Service.

Q. Did participants attend a formal orientation program for foreign trainees at their training facilities? (Item 47)

ATTENDED FORMAL ORIENTATION AT TRAINING FACILITY	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	31.7
No	68.3

TOTAL N	(1384)

About 3 out of 10 participants said they attended a formal orientation at their training facilities. Approximately 1/5 of these participants reported attending such a program for 1 day only. The median number of days of these orientations that participants had was between 5 and 6.

A smaller percentage of participants in Transportation than in any other field of training said they had such an orientation.

There was not a statistically significant relationship between the participants' type of training program or programming agencies and their attendance at a formal orientation at their training facilities.

152

Q. What subjects did participants say were covered in orientations they had after their arrival in the United States? (Item 50)

SUBJECT	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING*	
	Covered	Not Covered
U.S. cultural and social institutions and ways of life	91.3	8.7
Practical facts for day-to-day living in the U.S.	90.8	9.2
U.S. education and training practices	89.4	10.6
U.S. political systems and institutions	83.8	16.2
U.S. economic systems and institutions	82.9	17.1
TOTAL N	(1207)	

*Percentages add to 100% by rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

More than 8 out of 10 participants said they heard about each of the subjects in the above table. The two topics participants most frequently said were not covered were U.S. political and economic systems and institutions.

123

Q. How helpful was the information on various subjects that the participants received at formal orientations they had in the United States? (Item 50)

SUBJECT	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING*		
	Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Helpful
Practical facts for day-to-day living in the U.S.	48.4	45.1	6.5
U.S. education and training practices	47.0	44.8	8.3
U.S. cultural and social institutions and ways of life	42.9	48.3	8.8
U.S. economic systems and institutions	33.5	55.0	11.5
U.S. political systems and institutions	28.1	56.4	15.5
TOTAL N	(1207)		

*Percentages add to 100% by rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

None of the information presented on any of the above-listed subjects was thought to be "very helpful" by a majority of the participants, although almost half judged the information on practical facts for day-to-day living in the United States and U.S. education and training practices as "very helpful." The information most frequently felt to be "not helpful" was that on U.S. political systems and institutions.

Practical Facts for Day-to-Day Living in the United States

A lower percentage of Latin American participants than of participants from other world regions judged the information on practical facts for daily life to be "very helpful." About 10%

154

of the Latin American and African participants judged this information to be "not helpful," a higher percentage than of participants from other regions giving this rating. Less than 2% of the Far Eastern participants judged this information to be "not helpful."

A majority of the Special participants rated this information as "very helpful," whereas a majority of those in Academic training programs rated it as "somewhat helpful."

A much higher percentage of participants in Transportation than in other fields of training rated the information on practical facts for day-to-day life as "very helpful," with only 1% of these participants judging it to be "not helpful." Smaller percentages of participants in Industry and Mining, Health and Sanitation, and Education than of those in other fields of training felt this information was "very helpful."

U.S. Education and Training Practices

A larger proportion of African participants and a smaller proportion of those from Latin America than of participants from the other world regions said the information they received on U.S. education and training practices was "very helpful." About 15% of the Latin American participants rated this information "not helpful."

Proportionately more participants in Transportation than in other fields of training judged this information to be "very helpful." A somewhat lower proportion of participants in Health and Sanitation than of those in other fields of training found this information to be "very helpful," although about half of these participants felt it was "somewhat helpful."

U.S. Cultural and Social Institutions and Ways of Life

Smaller percentages of Latin American and African participants than of those from the other world regions judged the information they received on U.S. cultural and social institutions and ways of life to be "very helpful." Only 4.8% of the

participants from the Far East rated this information as "not helpful"; while 15% of the Latin American participants gave this rating.

Almost half of the Special participants, but only slightly more than 1/3 of the Academic participants, found the information they received on this topic "very helpful."

More than 60% of the participants in Transportation, a much higher percentage than of participants in the other fields of training, judged the information on U.S. culture to be very helpful. About 60% of the participants in Industry and Mining rated this information as "somewhat helpful." Much lower percentages of participants in Industry and Mining, and Transportation than in other fields of training judged this information to be "not helpful."

U.S. Economic Systems and Institutions

2 out of 5 of the Special participants, but only slightly more than 1 out of 4 of the Academic participants, thought the information they received on U.S. economic systems and institutions was "very helpful." Academic more often than Special participants felt this information was "not helpful."

There was not a statistically significant relationship between the participants' world regions or fields of training and their assessment of the helpfulness of the information they received on this topic.

U.S. Political Systems and Institutions

A larger proportion of participants from the Near East-South Asia than from the other world regions thought that the information they received on U.S. political systems and institutions was "very helpful." Larger proportions of participants from Latin America and Africa than from the other regions rated this information "not helpful."

Approximately 1/3 of the Special participants, as compared with about 1/5 of the Academics, rated the information they received on U.S. political systems as "very helpful."

Section C

Academic Participants' Experience with and
Evaluation of Pre-Academic Workshops

Q. How many of the Academic participants attended a Pre-Academic Workshop? (Item 87)

ATTENDED WORKSHOP	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	35.9
No	64.1

TOTAL N	(643)

Slightly more than 1/3 of the Academic participants said they attended a Pre-Academic Workshop. More than 2/3 of these participants said they attended the Workshop at Georgetown University, approximately 1/4 said they attended at George Washington University, and fewer than 1 out of 10 said they attended the Workshop conducted by the University of Hawaii.

Half of the Academic participants from Africa, a much larger proportion than of participants from any other world region, reported that they attended a Workshop. Only 1/5 of the Academic participants from the Near East-South Asia so reported.

Higher percentages of the Academic participants in Agriculture and Education and lower percentages of those in Health and Sanitation and Public Administration than in the other fields of training said they attended a Pre-Academic Workshop. 7 out of 10 Academic participants programmed directly by A.I.D. said they did not attend, as compared with 4 out of 10 programmed by the Office of Education, and 5 out of 10 programmed by the Department of Agriculture.

157

Almost 3/4 of the participants who attended said that their program at the Workshop included training in writing a research paper. Of these participants, more than 7 out of 10 said they were able to use all or most of this training in writing research papers at their training sites.

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

UTILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely useful)	18.8
2	32.9
3	22.6
4	9.8
5	5.6
6	6.4
7 (Not at all useful)	3.8

TOTAL N	(230)

Slightly more than half of the participants (51.7%) rated the utility of the Pre-Academic Workshop in preparing them for their training at "1" or "2" on the scale. However, 1/4 of the participants rated its usefulness at or below the middle point on the scale.

There was not a statistically significant relationship between the Academic participants' world regions, fields of training, or programming agencies and their ratings of the utility of the Pre-Academic Workshop.

Q. What difficulties did the Academic participants have with the Pre-Academic Workshops? (Item 92)

PROBLEM WITH PRE-ACADEMIC WORKSHOP	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING*		
	Very True	Somewhat True	Not True
Classmates too different in educational backgrounds	35.1	32.5	32.5
Too few topics covered	11.4	34.8	53.7
Too little discussion	14.0	32.0	54.0
Lectures too elementary	15.4	27.3	57.3
Too many lectures	11.4	28.1	60.5
Subject matter too specific	7.1	21.3	71.6
Subject matter too abstract	7.5	19.5	73.0
TOTAL N	(230)		

*Percentages add to 100% by rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

Approximately 2/3 of the participants felt that their classmates at the Pre-Academic Workshop were too different in educational backgrounds. One out of 3 felt this was a very great problem with the Workshop. This was the only aspect of the Workshop that was reported to be a difficulty by a majority of the participants.

Section D

Academic Participants' Experiences with and
Evaluation of Leadership Training Programs

Q. How many of the Academic participants attended an A.I.D.-
sponsored Leadership Training Program? (Item 94)

ATTENDED LEADERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAM	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	62.8
No	37.2

TOTAL N	(643)

About 6 out of 10 Academic participants said they attended a Leadership Training Program sponsored by A.I.D.

A much larger proportion of Academic participants from Africa (81.3%) than of those from any other world region said they had attended Leadership Training Programs. Only 35% of the Latin American participants in Academic programs said they had attended such programs, which was a considerably lower percentage than of participants from other regions.

Almost 7 out of 10 Academic participants in the fields of Agriculture and Education, a larger proportion than of those in other fields of training, said they attended Leadership programs.

More than half of the Academic participants programmed by each of the various agencies attended such programs. Percentages ranged from 86.6% of the participants programmed by the Office of Education to 57% of those programmed directly by A.I.D.

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

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely satisfied)	17.2
2	32.6
3	27.9
4	14.2
5	4.4
6	2.4
7 (Not at all satisfied)	1.2

TOTAL N	(402)

Approximately half of the Academic participants who attended Leadership Training Programs rated their satisfaction with them at "1" or "2" on the scale. About 1/5 of these participants rated their satisfaction with the programs at or below the middle point on the scale.

There was not a statistically significant relationship between the Academic participants' world regions, fields of training, or programming agencies and their satisfaction with Leadership Training Programs they attended.

Q. What aspects of the Leadership Training Program did Academic participants take part in? (Item 97)

ASPECT OF LEADERSHIP PROGRAM	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING	
	Took Part In	Did Not Take Part In
Seeing a different part of the United States	97.5	2.5
Visits to museums and places of historic interest	92.7	7.3
Meeting international visitors from other cultures	92.6	7.4
Visits to city government and civic organizations	90.4	9.6
Visits to American families other than overnight visits	85.1	14.9
Learning about the role of volunteer groups in community affairs	82.9	17.1
Participating in seminars on local community affairs	78.7	21.3
Overnight visits with American families	74.9	25.1
TOTAL N	(402)	

Almost all of the participants (97.5%) who attended a Leadership Training Program said that it gave them an opportunity to see a different part of the United States. About 9 out of 10 said they had visits to museums and places of historic interest, met international visitors from other cultures, and visited city government and civic organizations. Approximately 1 out of 4 said they did not have overnight visits with American families and 1 out of 5 said they did not participate in seminars on local community affairs.

162

Q. What difficulties did the Academic participants have with Leadership Training Programs they attended? (Item 96)

PROBLEM WITH LEADERSHIP PROGRAM	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING*		
	Very True	Somewhat True	Not True
Lack of U.S. students	47.1	28.7	24.2
Group members too different in cultural backgrounds	19.3	32.8	47.9
Too many planned group activities	15.1	28.6	56.4
Group too large	9.6	24.8	65.6
Too few field trips	11.4	22.6	66.0
Too little discussion	10.4	23.4	66.2
Too few visits with American families	9.7	21.3	69.0
Group members too much alike in cultural backgrounds	5.7	14.4	79.8
TOTAL N	(402)		

*Percentages add to 100% by rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

The most frequently mentioned problem with the Leadership Training Programs was the lack of U.S. students; nearly half of the participants said this was a great difficulty with the Leadership Training Programs. Slightly more than half of the participants reported having some or much difficulty because the group members in the Leadership Training Programs were too different in cultural backgrounds. Conversely, group members being too much alike in cultural backgrounds was thought to be a problem by only about 20% of the participants.

163

Q. How interesting did the Academic participants find the various aspects of the Leadership Training Program that they took part in? (Item 97)

ASPECT OF LEADERSHIP PROGRAM	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING			TOTAL N
	Very Interesting	Somewhat Interesting	Not Interesting	
Seeing a different part of the United States	86.0	13.5	.5	(392)
Meeting international visitors from other cultures	71.1	26.2	2.7	(363)
Visits to museums and places of historic interest	64.0	31.8	4.2	(358)
Learning about the role of volunteer groups in community affairs	59.2	35.5	5.3	(321)
Participating in seminars on local community affairs	59.1	33.7	7.2	(303)
Visits to city government and civic organizations	57.4	36.8	5.7	(350)
Overnight visits with American families	56.0	34.2	9.7	(289)
Other visits to American families	52.4	42.5	4.5	(332)

*Percentages add to 100% by rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

7 out of 8 participants who said they saw a different part of the United States when they attended a Leadership Training Program thought this was "very interesting." Less than 10% of the participants thought that any of the aspects they participated in were "not interesting."

Section E

Participants' Experience with and Evaluation of Special Communication Seminars

Q. How many participants went to the Michigan State University Seminar and other Special Communication Seminars?
(Items 99 & 100)

SEMINAR ATTENDED	PERCENTAGE %
MSU at East Lansing	24.2
MSU at Dellroy	36.7
Other	2.3
None	36.8

TOTAL N	(1384)

About 6 out of 10 participants attended a Special Communication Seminar conducted by Michigan State University at either East Lansing or Dellroy. More than 1/3 of the participants (36.8%) had not attended a Special Communication Seminar at the time of their interview at DETRI.

Less than half of the Latin American participants had attended a Special Communication Seminar at the time of their DETRI interview. This is a much smaller percentage than of those from the other world regions.

Almost 7 out of 10 Special participants, compared with approximately 6 out of 10 in Academic programs, attended such a Seminar.

Over 70% of the participants in Agriculture, Health and Sanitation, and Transportation, but less than 4 out of 10

participants in Industry and Mining, attended a Special Communication Seminar.

A larger proportion of the participants programmed by the Department of Agriculture than of those programmed by other agencies or directly by A.I.D. said they had attended a Special Communication Seminar.

Q. How helpful did the participants think the ideas they got from the Special Communication Seminar would be in using their training when they return home? (Item 103)

HELPLEFULNESS RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely helpful)	22.6
2	28.0
3	21.7
4	13.4
5	5.9
6	5.3
7 (Not at all helpful)	3.0

TOTAL N	(889)

More than 1/5 of the participants (22.6%) rated the Special Communication Seminar as "extremely helpful," ideas for using this training "could not be better." Less than 15% of the participants rated the helpfulness of the Seminar below the middle point on the scale.

African participants more often than those from the other world regions rated these Seminars as "extremely helpful." Participants from the Near East-South Asia most often rated the helpfulness of the Special Communication Seminar below the middle point on the scale.

Q. What problems did the participants have at their Special Communication Seminar? (Item 102)

PROBLEM WITH SPECIAL COMMUNICATION SEMINAR	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING*		
	Very True	Somewhat True	Not True
Participants too different in technical backgrounds	37.4	32.1	30.4
Participants too different in cultural backgrounds	33.3	32.1	34.6
Subject matter too general	15.9	36.0	48.1
Lack of definite program schedule	22.5	27.4	50.1
Too few social and recreational activities	16.8	29.8	53.4
Too little opportunity to practice use of principles and techniques	11.7	32.2	56.1
Specific objectives unclear throughout program	11.5	28.8	59.7
Too elementary	13.4	26.6	60.0
Subject matter unsuited to home country conditions	8.0	23.8	68.2
Too much duplication with subject matter of technical training program	7.9	15.0	77.1
TOTAL N	(889)		

*Percentages add to 100% by rows in this table because each participant had to respond to each alternative.

2 out of 3 participants said that it was very true or somewhat true for them that their group at the Special Communication Seminar was too different in technical backgrounds (69.5%)

167

and too different in cultural backgrounds (65.5%). About half of the participants felt that the Special Communication Seminar subject matter was too general and a similar percentage were bothered by a lack of a definite program schedule.

Less than 1/4 of the participants felt that there was too much duplication of Seminar material with their technical training subject matter. About 2/3 felt that the subject matter was suited to their home country conditions.

Lack of Definite Program Schedule

A much larger proportion of participants from the Far East had difficulty with the lack of a definite program schedule at the Special Communication Seminar than those from any other world region. Less than half of the participants from each of the other regions indicated that this was a problem for them.

About half of the Academic and of the Special participants had some difficulty because of a lack of a definite schedule, but a higher percentage of Academics than Specials said this caused them much difficulty.

Too Few Social And Recreational Activities

Higher percentages of participants from the Far East and Africa than from the other world regions said they had problems at the Special Communication Seminar because of too few social and recreational activities. More than half of the Academic participants, but only 4 out of 10 participants in Special training programs found this to be a problem.

Larger proportions of the participants in Agriculture and Education and a smaller proportion of those in Transportation than in other fields of training reported some or much difficulty with too few social activities at the Special Communication Seminar they attended.

Too Little Opportunity to Practice Use of Principles and Techniqu

Over half of the participants from the Far East, but only about 1/3 of those from Latin America and Africa, reported some or much difficulty with too little opportunity at the Special Communication Seminar to practice the use of the principles and techniques demonstrated there.

Specific Seminar Objectives Unclear Throughout the Program

A higher percentage of participants from the Far East than of those from the other world regions had difficulty with the objectives of the Seminar being unclear.

Too Elementary

Proportionately more participants from the Near East-South Asia and Latin America than from the other world regions thought the Special Communication Seminar was too elementary. A higher percentage of participants in Academic training programs than of those in Special programs had difficulty with the Seminar being too elementary.

Other Difficulties

4 out of 10 Far Eastern participants, but less than 1/4 of the participants from Latin America and Africa felt that the subject matter dealt with at the Seminar was unsuited to their home country conditions.

More Academic than Special participants thought there was too much duplication at the Seminar of the subject matter of their technical training programs.

There was not a statistically significant relationship between the participants' world regions, training programs, or fields of training and the amount of difficulty they had with the participants at the Seminar being too different in technical or cultural backgrounds or in the subject matter of the Seminar being too general.

CHAPTER VII

PARTICIPANTS' VIEWS ON ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH THEIR TRAINING PROGRAMS

Section A

Participants' Experiences Prior to Departure for the United States

- Q. Did the participants feel they had enough time after notification of their selection by A.I.D. to make necessary occupational and social arrangements? (Item 9)

HAD ENOUGH TIME	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	74.5
No	25.5

TOTAL N	(1384)

Almost 3/4 of the participants (74.5%) felt they had sufficient time to arrange their affairs at home after they were officially notified of their selection by A.I.D. Proportionately more Special participants than participants in Academic training programs reported having enough time for making necessary arrangements. This may be related to the fact that Academic participants have longer sojourns in the United States on the average than do Special participants.

Q. Did the participants receive an A.I.D. Participant Handbook before their technical training programs began?
(Item 29)

RECEIVED HANDBOOK	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	97.5
No	2.5

TOTAL N	(1384)

9 out of 10 participants said they attended a meeting in the United States in which A.I.D. administrative policies and regulations for all participants were discussed.

Almost all of the participants (97.5%) said they received an A.I.D. Participant Handbook before their technical training programs began.

Q. Did the participants feel they had enough time to pack and otherwise get ready for their trip to the United States after being notified of their date of departure? (Item 11)

HAD ENOUGH TIME	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	62.0
No	38.0

TOTAL N	(1384)

Approximately 6 out of 10 participants felt they had sufficient time to pack and prepare for their trip to the United States after being notified of their date of departure.

Almost 7 out of 10 participants in Special training programs said they had sufficient time to get ready for their trip, whereas only slightly more than half of the Academic participants said they had enough time after being notified of their departure date.

Section B

Participants' Experiences After Arrival in the United States

Q. Did the participants attend a meeting in the United States at which A.I.D. administrative policies and regulations for all participants were presented? (Item 28)

ATTENDED ADMINISTRATIVE MEETING	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	90.5
No	9.5

TOTAL N	(1384)

Q. What administrative arrangements were discussed in meetings between the participants and their A.I.D. Program Development Officer or Program Officer? (Items 30 & 31)

ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENT	PERCENTAGE* %
No meeting	6.7
Book and training materials allowance	89.4
Living allowance	89.2
Travel arrangements to training locations	84.7
Training and location reports	84.5
Personnel to contact at training facilities	62.4

TOTAL N	(1384)

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

More than 9 out of 10 participants said they had a personal meeting with their Program Development Officer or a Program Officer of another government agency before their training programs began.

Smaller percentages of participants in Education and Transportation than of those in other fields of training said they had a personal meeting with the U.S. government official responsible for their training before their training program began.

Of the participants who attended such meetings, more than 8 out of 10 said they heard about all of the items listed in the above table except whom to contact at their training sites. Less than 2/3 said they were given this information.

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

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely satisfied)	46.9
2	28.9
3	12.5
4	6.6
5	2.6
6	1.3
7 (Not at all satisfied)	1.2

TOTAL N	(1384)

Almost half of the participants said they were "extremely satisfied," communication with the government official responsible for their training "could not have been better" (1 rating). Only about 12% rated their satisfaction in communicating with this official at or below the middle point on the scale.

Latin American participants more often rated their satisfaction on this scale at "1," while participants from the Near East-South Asia and the Far East more often gave lower ratings.

There was not a statistically significant relationship between the participants' training programs, fields of training, or programming agencies and their satisfaction with their communication with the U.S. government official responsible for their training.

Q. Did the participants know, before their technical training programs began, how to contact the A.I.D. or other U.S. government official in Washington responsible for their training while they were at their training facilities? (Item 39)

KNEW HOW TO CONTACT RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	94.3
No	5.7

TOTAL N	(1384)

More than 9 out of 10 participants said that, before their technical training programs began, they knew how to contact the A.I.D. or other U.S. government official in Washington who was responsible for their training while they were at their training facilities.

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

HAD DIFFICULTY	PERCENTAGE %
No	88.0
Yes	12.0

TOTAL N	(1384)

175

Only 12% of the participants said they had any difficulty in communicating with this official during their sojourns.

About 5% of the Latin American participants, compared with approximately 13% of the participants from each of the other world regions, said they had some difficulty communicating with the U.S. government official in Washington responsible for their training.

There was not a statistically significant relationship between the participants' training programs, fields of training, or programming agencies and difficulties in communicating with their A.I.D. Program Development Officer or Program Officer in another U.S. government agency.

Q. Did the participants say any A.I.D. administrative policies and regulations should be changed to improve the participant training program? (Item 52)

REGULATIONS SHOULD BE CHANGED	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	86.7
No	13.3

TOTAL N	(1384)

More than 7 out of 8 participants said there should be some change in A.I.D. administrative policies and regulations in order to improve the participant training program.

About 9 out of 10 African participants, a larger proportion than from any of the other world regions, thought some A.I.D. administrative policies and regulations should be changed.

A higher percentage of Academic participants (89.7%) than Special participants (84.1%) said there should be some changes in these policies and regulations.

116

Higher percentages of the participants in the fields of Industry and Mining, Agriculture, and Education, and a lower percentage of those in Transportation than in the other fields of training felt that some A.I.D. participant policies and regulations should be changed.

Q. Which A.I.D. administrative policies and regulations did the participants say should be changed?

A.I.D. POLICY	PERCENTAGE* %
Living allowance at training institutions	53.8
Books and training materials allowance	47.1
Use of automobiles	46.5
Travel per diem	45.0
Extension of training time	37.9
Dependent relatives accompanying participants	32.5
Mail and shipping arrangements	17.3
Travel arrangements	17.3
Medical care	16.5
Sickness and accident insurance	14.9
Training and location reports	8.8

TOTAL N	(1172)

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

Living Allowances at Training Institutions

Of the participants who thought some A.I.D. administrative policies or regulations should be changed, more than

half (53.8%) recommended changing the policy regarding living allowances at training institutions.

A majority of the participants from Africa (52.7%), but only about 1/3 of those from Latin America, recommended changes in this policy. Special participants more often than Academic participants thought the living allowances should be changed.

Books and Training Materials Allowance

A higher percentage of participants from the Far East and a lower percentage of those from Latin America than from the other world regions recommended changing the policy about books and training materials allowances.

Use of Automobiles

46.5% of the African participants, but less than 1/3 of those from the Near East-South Asia, suggested a change in the policy about the use of automobiles. Half of the Academic participants, compared with 30% of those in Special training programs, suggested such a change.

Travel Per Diem

Approximately 4 out of 10 participants from the Far East and from the Near East-South Asia felt there should be a change in the travel per diem policy. Only about 3 out of 10 Latin American and African participants recommended a change in this policy. A higher percentage of Special than of Academic participants thought the travel per diem policy needed change.

Extension of Training Time

A larger proportion of participants from Africa and a smaller proportion of participants from Latin America than from the other world regions thought the extension of training time policy should be changed. Almost 4 out of 10 participants in the field of Education, but less than 2 out of 10 participants

in the field of Transportation felt a change in this policy was needed.

Dependent Relatives Accompanying Participants

Higher percentages of participants from Latin America and Africa (about 1/3 from each region) than of those from the other world regions recommended a change in the policy about dependent relatives accompanying participants. Only about 1/5 of the participants from the Far East thought this policy should be changed. Participants in Academic training programs more often suggested changing this policy than participants in Special training programs.

Section C

Participants' Problems With and Evaluation of Travel Arrangements

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

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely satisfied)	37.2
2	34.9
3	16.9
4	6.9
5	3.0
6	.7
7 (Not at all satisfied)	.5

TOTAL N	(1007)

More than 7 out of 8 participants (88.9%) rated their travel arrangements above the middle point of the satisfaction scale, with 3 out of 8 reporting they were "extremely satisfied, travel arrangements could not have been better."

Latin American participants more often gave high ratings to their travel arrangements than did participants from other regions. 84.8% gave either a "1" or "2" rating, while only 4.8% gave a rating at or below the middle point of the scale.

Participants in the field of Transportation more often gave high satisfaction ratings to their travel arrangements than other participants. Those in the fields of Industry and Mining and Public Administration were much less satisfied with more than 15% in each of the 2 fields giving ratings at or below the middle-point of the scale of satisfaction with travel arrangements.

Participants programmed by the Office of Education and the "Other Agencies" category gave satisfaction ratings at or below the middle point of the scale proportionally less often than those programmed by the remaining listed agencies. A.I.D. and Agriculture programmed participants have high ("1" or "2") ratings relatively less often than participants programmed by other agencies.

Q. What problems did the participants have with their travel arrangements during their stay in the United States?
(Item 144)

PROBLEM WITH TRAVEL	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING*		
	Very True	Somewhat True	Not True
Trips too short	10.4	29.6	60.0
Poor transportation at training facility	6.2	19.5	74.3
Not being met	5.7	19.2	75.1
Inconvenient schedules	3.7	17.5	78.8
Inadequate advance arrangements	4.1	14.0	81.9
Trips too long	2.6	14.8	82.6
TOTAL N			(1384)

*Percentages add to 100% across rows in this table because participants had to respond to each alternative.

The most often mentioned travel difficulty for participants was that "trips are too short and there is no opportunity to see the country." 40% of them noted this to be a problem, and 10% thought it was very much of a problem. The other travel difficulties listed presented difficulties for between 17% and 26% of the participants.

Participants from the Far East and Africa more often indicated that they had short trips which gave them no opportunity to see the United States and a lack of escorts at airports and depots than did those from the other world regions. Inadequate transportation at the training facilities, inconvenient travel schedules, inadequate advance arrangements for traveling, and trips being too long and tiring were all problems which Far Eastern participants mentioned relatively more often than did participants from other regions. Latin

100

American participants less often reported difficulty with all aspects of their travel arrangements except inadequate advance arrangements than did participants from the other regions.

Academic participants more often felt that inadequate transportation at the training facilities and the lack of escorts at airports and depots were difficulties than did Special participants. The Special participants, on the other hand, more often reported that trips being too long and tiring was a difficulty.

Participants in the field of Industry and Mining, relatively more often than those in other fields, indicated that inconvenient travel schedules, inadequate advance arrangements and trips that were too long and tiring were difficulties for them.

Participants programmed by the Department of Agriculture and in the field of Agriculture relatively more often than those programmed by other government agencies felt that their trips were too long and tiring.

Section D

Participants' Experiences, Problems, and Evaluations in Regard to Living Arrangements

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

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely satisfied)	26.7
2	32.0
3	22.1
4	11.3
5	3.6
6	2.4
7 (Not at all satisfied)	1.9

TOTAL N	(1384)

About 1/4 of the participants were "extremely satisfied" with their living quarters and felt they "could not have been better." About 4 out of 5 rated their satisfaction with living arrangements above the middle point of the scale.

While only 52% of the African participants gave "1" or "2" ratings to their satisfaction with housing arrangements, 60% or more of the participants from the other world regions did so. 24.8% of the African participants gave ratings at or below the middle point of the scale compared to 16-18% of the participants from other regions.

Participants in Academic training programs were less well satisfied with their living arrangements than were Special participants. 24% of the Academic participants gave ratings at or below the mid-point of the scale, as compared with 15% of the Special participants.

Q. What types of housing did the participants have at the place where they stayed the longest time in the United States? (Item 107)

TYPE OF HOUSING	PERCENTAGE %
Apartment	45.0
Dormitory	20.5
Hotel or motel	20.3
Room in private home	6.4
YMCA-YWCA	4.4
House	3.5

TOTAL N	(1384)

More participants lived in apartments (45%) at the place where they stayed longest in the United States than in any other kind of housing. The 2 other types of housing most often lived in by the participants were dormitories (20.5%) and hotels or motels (20.3%).

Only about 11% of the Near East-South Asian participants stayed their longest period in dormitories while about 29% of the Africans said they did. 36% of the Near East-South Asian participants said they stayed longest in hotels or motels, a much higher percentage than for participants from the other world regions.

As one would expect, the housing patterns of Academic and Special participants are quite different. Over half of the Academic participants (51.8%) but only 39% of the Special participants said they stayed longest in apartments. 31.2% of the Academic and 11.2% of the Special participants said they stayed longest in dormitories. Hardly any (1.1%) of the Academic as contrasted to 37.1% of the Special participants said they stayed longest in hotels or motels.

Q. With whom did participants share their living quarters?
(Items 109 & 110)

PERSON	PERCENTAGE* %
No one, lived alone	27.8
With home countrymen	45.8
With other foreign nationals	24.0
With U.S. citizens	21.5
With own family	6.9

TOTAL N	(1384)

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

More than 7 out of 10 participants (72.2%) said they shared their living quarters with someone. Almost half said they shared their quarters with people from their own country, while about 1/4 said they shared living quarters with people from other foreign countries. Only about 1 out of 5 said they shared living quarters with U.S. citizens.

African participants most often said they shared their living quarters (76.7%), while participants from Latin America said they shared relatively less often (65.8%).

Only 1 out of 6 Latin American participants (16.4%) said they shared their living quarters with people from their home country contrasted to more than half of the participants from the Near East-South Asia who said they shared quarters with their home countrymen (54.5%).

Participants from Africa relatively more often said they lived with foreign nationals who were not their own countrymen (32.4%) while participants from the Near East-South Asia said they lived with other foreign nationals relatively least often (13%).

15

28.9% of the Academic as compared to only 18.2% of the Special participants said they shared their living quarters with people from countries other than their own or the United States. Participants in the fields of Education (28%) and Health and Sanitation (27.7%) said they shared living quarters in this way relatively more often than those in other fields.

While only 9.7% of the Near East-South Asian participants and 10.3% of the Latin American participants said they shared living quarters with U.S. citizens, 34.2% of the African participants said they did. Almost 30% of the Latin American participants said they lived with their own families in the United States while less than 5% of the participants from other world regions said they did so.

Q. From whom did the participants get help in finding housing at their training locations? (Items 104 & 105)

PERSON	PERCENTAGE* %
No one	16.3
Officials at training facility	45.0
AID representatives	27.5
Home countrymen	25.1
U.S. government officials (not from AID)	13.1
Other Americans	10.4
Community volunteers	7.3
Other foreigners	5.0

TOTAL N	(1384)

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

5 out of 6 participants received help from someone in finding their housing. Participants who did receive help often mentioned more than 1 source. Officials of the training facility were the most frequent source of this help (45%). 1/4 of the participants said they received help from A.I.D. representatives and almost as many said they received help from people from their own country.

Q. How useful was the help received in finding housing?
(Item 106)

UTILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely useful)	50.6
2	26.2
3	11.6
4	5.7
5	2.2
6	2.5
7 (Not at all useful)	1.3

TOTAL N	(1165)

Half of the participants rated the help they received as "1" ("extremely useful," "could not have been better") while only 11.7% rated it at or below the middle point of the scale.

Special participants more often gave high utility ratings to the help they received in finding housing than did Academic participants. 80.5% of the Special participants gave "1" and "2" ratings as opposed to 72.4% of the Academic participants.

187

Q. What problems did participants have with their housing arrangements? (Item 111)

PROBLEM WITH HOUSING ARRANGEMENTS	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING*		
	Very True	Somewhat True	Not True
Inadequate public transportation	16.1	19.2	64.7
Unable to eat as wanted	7.5	21.8	70.7
Too much noise, and other disturbances	6.7	20.3	73.0
Too far from business and social areas	7.8	18.7	73.5
Inadequate facilities and equipment	4.1	21.9	74.1
Too far from training facility	6.9	16.8	76.3
Undesirable neighborhood	3.8	10.9	85.3
Unable to rent due to discrimination	3.6	9.5	86.9
TOTAL N			(1384)

*Percentages add to 100% across rows in this table because participants had to respond to each alternative.

The housing difficulty mentioned most often by participants was inadequate public transportation services (35.3%). Eating arrangements, noise, distance from businesses and training facility, and inadequate facilities were reported by about 25% of the participants. Undesirable neighborhoods and discrimination problems were each noted by less than 15% of the participants.

Inadequate Public Transportation

44.2% of the participants from Latin America felt inadequate public transportation to be a problem, while only 27.9%

188

of those from the Near East-South Asia mentioned this was a difficulty. Inadequate transportation was much more often reported a problem by Academic participants than by Special participants. Among the fields of training, participants in Industry and Mining most often felt inadequate transportation to be a problem (43.7%) while those in Health and Sanitation least often said this was a difficulty (21.4%).

Unable to Eat as Wanted

Eating arrangements were a problem relatively more often for participants from the Near East-South Asia (35.2%) than for those from the other world regions. Participants from Latin America least often reported that they were unable to eat as they wished (18.1%).

Too Much Noise and Other Disturbances

31.4% of the participants from Africa indicated that there was too much noise and disturbances where they lived in contrast to only 20.8% of the Latin American participants who noted this. 29.8% of the Academic participants complained of noise and disturbances where they lived, while only 24.5% of the Special participants did so.

Inadequate Facilities and Equipment

Far Eastern and African participants reported problems of inadequate facilities and equipment relatively more often than participants from other world regions. 30% of the Academic participants said that they had inadequate facilities and equipment where they lived, while only 22.3% of the Special participants noted this as a problem.

Too Far from Business and Social Areas and Training Facility

28.2% of the Near East-South Asian participants said that they lived too far from their training sites; participants from other world regions reported this relatively less often. 29.2% of the Special participants felt that the distance between

their housing and their training site was a problem, while only 17.4% of the Academic participants indicated this. 35.6% of the participants in the field of Industry and Mining indicated that the distance from housing to training site was a problem contrasted to only 16.9% of those in Education who said this. Participants programmed by the Office of Education least often mentioned the difficulty of living too far from their training sites.

30.9% of the Academic participants reported a problem of living too far from business and social areas, while only 22.6% of the Special participants noted this.

Unable to Rent Due to Discrimination

1 out of 4 of the African participants reported difficulty in renting housing due to discrimination; about 10% of the Far Eastern and Near East-South Asian participants reported this difficulty while less than 2% of the Latin Americans (1.8%) mentioned it. About 1 out of 6 Academic participants as compared with about 1 out of 10 Special participants said they had housing rental difficulties due to discrimination. Participants in the field of Agriculture relatively more often (19%) than those in other fields noted this to be a problem.

Section E

Participants' Experiences with Money Allowances

Q. How adequate were the money allowances of the participants?
(Items 148, 150 and 151)

ALLOWANCE	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING*			TOTAL N
	Not Adequate	Barely Adequate	Adequate	
Daily living allowance at training site where participant stayed 30 days or more	21.5	47.0	31.5	(1220)**
Per diem while traveling	21.3	43.8	35.0	(1384)
Money for books, training materials and other program expenses	29.7	32.5	37.9	(1384)

*Percentages add to 100% across rows because participants had to respond to each alternative.

**Only 1220 answered this question because some (12.8%) of the participants said that they had not stayed in any single location for 30 days or more.

20% to 30% of the participants felt that each of the 3 kinds of allowances were not adequate. About 2/3 of the participants felt that all 3 kinds of allowances were either not adequate or only barely adequate.

Living Allowance

About 3 out of 10 of the Near East-South Asian participants (29.5%) indicated that the daily living allowance was not adequate, while only about 20% of the participants from the other world regions said their allowances were not adequate. Far Eastern participants more often reported their daily living allowances were adequate (38.1%).

Only about 30% of the participants in the fields of Agriculture, Education, and Public Administration said they thought the daily living allowance at their training sites was adequate. This is a lower percentage than of participants in other fields of training.

Travel Per Diem

Almost 1/4 of the participants from the Far East and Near East-South Asia said their per diem while traveling was not adequate, as contrasted to 14.7% of the Latin American participants who said they felt the travel per diem was not adequate. Only 27.3% of the participants from the Far East felt their travel per diem was not adequate. This is a lower percentage than from any other world region.

Special participants were more dissatisfied with per diem while traveling than were Academic participants. Only 31.7% of the Special participants thought that their travel per diem was adequate, while 22.8% of them said it was not adequate. 38.7% of the Academic participants said it was adequate, and only 19.7% said it was not adequate.

Training Materials

Only about 1 in 4 Far Eastern participants said they thought the allowance for books and other training expenses was adequate, while more than 40% of the participants from the other world regions thought it was. The percentage saying that the money for training materials was not adequate ranged from 21.3% of the Latin American participants to 35.5% of those from the Far East.

More Special participants (34.7%) said that the money for books and other training expenses was not adequate than did Academic participants (23.9%).

44.6% of the participants in the field of Health and Sanitation said that the money for books and other training expenses was not adequate, as contrasted to only 21.3% of those in the field of Education who said this.

While only 13.2% of the participants programmed by the Office of Education said that the money for books, etc., was not adequate, 38.8% of those programmed by the Public Health Service said this. 28.7% of the participants programmed directly by A.I.D. said they thought the training materials allowance was not adequate. (The reader will notice the similarity between fields of training and programming agencies in these cross-tabulations.)

Those participants who indicated that their daily living allowances were either "not adequate" or "barely adequate," were asked to suggest the amount of money that would have provided them with an adequate daily living allowance.

Q. What amount of money would have provided an adequate daily living allowance? (Item 149)

SUGGESTED AMOUNT	PERCENTAGE %
\$7 or less	7.0
\$8	13.4
\$9	8.9
\$10	18.2
\$11-12	19.7
\$13-15	8.0
\$16-18	14.0
\$19 or more	10.7

TOTAL N	(836)

The median suggested amount that participants thought would have provided an adequate daily living allowance was \$11 (rounded to the nearest dollar).

192

Participants from different world regions varied considerably in the amounts they suggested as an adequate daily living allowance. The median amounts suggested by participants from the various regions are as follows: Africa \$9.77, Latin America \$9.81, Far East \$10.16, and the Near East-South Asia \$12.16.

Special program participants suggested larger daily allowances (median \$14.06) than did Academic participants (median \$10.05).

The median daily living allowances suggested by participants in various fields of training were: Education \$9.36, Agriculture \$10.43, Industry and Mining \$11.80, Public Administration \$12.52, Health and Sanitation \$12.93, and Transportation \$13.80.

As would be expected, the median amounts suggested by participants programmed by different agencies also varied: Office of Education \$9.83, Department of Agriculture \$10.37, A.I.D. \$11.26, Public Health Service \$11.50, and other agencies \$12.99.

CHAPTER VIII

INDIVIDUAL, ORAL INTERVIEWS

Section A

Description of Individual Interviews, Objectives, and Procedures

Individual, oral interviews are held privately with all Academic and Special program participants as the second phase of the exit interview. During the Standard Introduction presented to the participants at the beginning of the exit interview, a clear distinction is made between the objectives and use of the structured questionnaire and of the private interview. Participants are assured that the information provided in the oral interviews is treated confidentially and is reported to A.I.D. only in aggregate form, unless they agree that some incident should be reported directly. (See Appendix B of Final Report, AID Participant Training Exit Interview Development Study for more detail.)

There are two major objectives of the anonymous individual interview. The first is to provide more detail and depth about salient participant experiences. Through the conversation the interviewer can get an idea of how strongly the participant feels about his responses to items in the questionnaire. For example, a participant's questionnaire ratings may be very similar for both travel and housing arrangements, although the participant was deeply concerned about his housing and paid little attention to his travel experiences. By discussing the more salient experiences, the individual interviewer can obtain a more complete record of the participant's concerns.

The second objective of the individual interview is to provide the participant an opportunity to express himself in a more unconstrained manner than the questionnaire permits. Allowing participants to verbally express themselves on topics they wish to discuss has provided most participants a greater sense of involvement and participation in the exit interview and, in many instances, a needed opportunity for emotional release before returning to their home countries.

The individual interviews are conducted in an unstructured, conversational manner. Our results show that the opportunity to talk in this manner with a sympathetic and understanding interviewer is welcomed by a majority of the participants.

Examples include a Vietnamese participant, naturally very concerned about the situation in his country but optimistic about its future, who was distressed by what he felt was a critical attitude of the American public toward his country and "distortion" of the situation in the U.S. news media. He spent much of his 80 minute interview voicing these concerns, and at the end said to the interviewer, "I have talked to you like a friend."

Another participant, from Thailand, had spent 2 years in the United States. Originally he had planned to bring his wife, but her pregnancy prevented her from coming to the United States. He was extremely lonely, homesick, and anxious to see his new child. Until arriving at DETRI, this participant's image of Americans was that they were "materialistic, unfriendly," and impersonal." He was very complimentary about the exit interview, saying, "it serves a real purpose. The whole program would have been worthless without it."

A third example was a Nepalese participant who talked at length about the irrelevance of much of his training and his concern that, because he had not received the training he expected, he would not be able to accept the job planned

for him on his return. He concluded the interview by saying, "I appreciate the chance to talk to you. I have told these things to other people, but this is the first chance to get it off my chest. You are the first person who has listened to me with interest."

Section B

Quality of Exit Interview Process

Two kinds of information are used to evaluate the quality of the exit interview process: participant reactions and interviewer judgments.

Participant Reactions

In June 1969 DETRI developed a brief questionnaire form for evaluating the exit interview process itself, which is given to each Academic and Special participant at the conclusion of his visit at DETRI. Among other things, this form permits participants to indicate anonymously (secret ballot technique) whether the DETRI exit interview obtained a complete picture of their A.I.D. experiences (see Section C, below). Also on this form, participants are asked to make 2 ratings (on 7-point scales). The first scale is in response to the question, "How useful do you think the exit interview is for getting the participant's evaluation of his A.I.D. training program?" (See Section C.) The second scale is in response to the question, "How pleasant did you find the exit interview?"

Table 1

How pleasant did the participants find the exit interview?

RATING OF PLEASANTNESS	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Very pleasant)	53.5
2	30.6
3	12.2
4	3.2
5	.3
6	.2
7 (Not at all pleasant)	.2

TOTAL N	(1128)

More than half of the participants rated their exit interview experience as "very pleasant" (a "1" rating on the scale). There is a higher percentage of "1" ratings on this scale than on any other scale in the report.

Interviewer Judgments

The DETRI staff interviewers who talk to the participants make ratings of their conversations shortly after the oral interviews.

Ratings of rapport between interviewers and participants that appeared in previous reports have been replaced by ratings of completeness of communication and of the conversational structure, to give more differentiated information. These changes were made during the period covered by this report and the data therefore are not sufficiently complete to be presented here.

198

However, one rating that is indicative of the quality of the individual, private, oral interview process is the interviewers' affective impressions of the participants. These are ratings, on a 5-point scale, of the interviewer's reaction to the participant in terms of his "likability."

Table 2

RATING OF AFFECTIVE IMPRESSION	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Didn't enjoy at all)	3.6
2	12.7
3	35.2
4	34.0
5 (Found completely enjoyable)	14.3

TOTAL N	(1343)

A much higher percentage of participants were rated as "completely enjoyable" than as "not at all enjoyable." Almost half of the participants were rated at 4 or 5 on this scale.

Higher percentages of participants from Latin America were rated at "5" on the scale, while higher percentages of participants from the Near East-South Asia and the Far East were rated at "2" than participants from other world regions.

179

Section C

Validity of Exit Interview Information

Participant Reactions

Two items on the questionnaire form for evaluating the exit interview, which participants complete anonymously, give an indication of the validity of the exit interview data. These are the items which register the participants' estimates of the completeness of the picture that was obtained in the exit interview of their A.I.D. experiences and their ratings of the usefulness of the exit interview for obtaining their evaluations of their experiences. The data on these items from the DETRI evaluation form are presented next.

Table 3

How much difficulty did the participants experience in having the exit interview obtain a complete picture of their A.I.D. experiences?

AMOUNT OF DIFFICULTY	PERCENTAGE %
Much	2.0
Some	12.5
None	85.5

TOTAL N	(1123)

85.5% of the participants said they had no difficulty with the exit interview getting a complete picture of their A.I.D. experiences, as compared with 14.5% who said this caused them some or much difficulty.

Table 4

How useful did the participants say the exit interview was for getting their evaluation of their experiences?

RATING OF USEFULNESS	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Very useful)	45.8
2	32.6
3	16.0
4	4.5
5	.6
6	.3
7 (Not at all useful)	.2

TOTAL N	(1128)

Almost 8 out of 10 participants (78.4%) rated the usefulness of the exit interview for getting their evaluation of their A.I.D. experiences at "1" or "2" on the scale. Only 5.6% of the participants gave ratings at or below the middle point on this scale.

Interviewer Judgments

Another method of assessing the validity of the information obtained by the exit interview is by means of the interviewers' ratings of the consistency between the information the participant provides on the questionnaire and that which he provides in the individual interview. In making these ratings, the interviewer also judges whether the information given represents the participant's feelings or whether it represents ingratiation, deception, or guesswork.

201

TABLE 5

RATING OF VALIDITY	PERCENTAGE %
Do not suspect	91.7
Suspect questionnaire data	5.8
Suspect individual interview data	1.6
Suspect both questionnaire and interview data	0.8
<hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/>	
TOTAL N	(1343)

In 9 out of 10 cases, the data provided by participants on their questionnaires and in their individual interviews were judged to be consistent and valid. This is a highly acceptable proportion for this kind of data.

Section D

Pervasive Concerns

Topics that were most frequently listed by the interviewer as being of pervasive concern to participants are presented in Table 6. A "pervasive" concern represents an occurrence that permeated a participant's overall experience in the United States--typically a critical incident or a situation that the participant discusses with considerable emotional intensity, frequently returning to it throughout the interview. Topics that are judged to be pervasive may reflect

either positive or negative experiences a participant had in the United States. During this report period, about 10% of the participants were rated as having had a pervasive experience.

The rank order of pervasive topics in Table 6 is similar to that in the First Annual Report, with the addition of 3 new topics: U.S. degrees, difficulties with English, and personal danger.

About 3 out of 10 of the pervasive comments concerned the relevance of the participant's training program. This topic includes comments about the suitability of the type of program a participant had and the appropriateness of his field of training and of the training institution he attended. The topic that was second most often pervasive includes such aspects of a training program as its intensity or pace, lack of familiarity with the U.S. educational system, difficulties with examinations and grading systems, and the adequacy of classroom and campus housing facilities.

Of the topics listed in Table 6, only experiences with American hospitality were commented on positively more frequently than negatively. As would be expected, comments about difficulties with English, personal danger, and family separation were always negative.

Table 6

TOPIC	PERCENTAGE (%) OF PERVASIVE COMMENTS		
	All Comments	Favorable Comments	Unfavorable Comments
Relevance of training program	29.3	46.2	53.8
Training program, training institution, instructors, facilities	16.0	20.8	79.2
American hospitality, friendships, social activities	12.9	70.6	29.4
A.I.D. rules and regulations	8.7	2.6	97.4
PDO, PO, and other officials	7.3	24.2	75.8
U.S. degree	5.8	15.4	84.6
Discrimination	5.6	4.0	96.0
Length of training program	5.1	4.3	95.7
Difficulties with English	3.9	0.0	100.0
Personal danger	2.9	0.0	100.0
Separation from family	2.5	0.0	100.0
TOTAL N		(450)	

Section E

Interviewer Ratings of Participant Characteristics, Activities, Experiences, and Attitudes

Participant Characteristics

Based on their conversations, the interviewers make ratings* of several participant behavioral characteristics which, as explained in the First Annual Report, are believed to be related to social and economic development. These ratings are made on 5-point scales, the high ends of which represent qualities that are important to making contributions to the development of a country.

One of these ratings is of the participant's relation to his environment. This rating is characterized at one end of the scale as passive and fatalistic, and at the other as active and self-determining.

Table 7

RATING OF CHARACTERISTIC	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Passive, fatalistic)	1.7
2	17.5
3	25.7
4	44.4
5 (Active, self-determining)	10.7

TOTAL N	(1303)

A majority of the participants (55%) were rated at the

*Not all ratings can be made for each participant; for most items, the interviewer does not make a rating if he feels that he has an insufficient basis on which to do so.

high end of this scale (4 or 5 ratings), with about 1/4 being rated in the middle category.

A higher percentage of Latin American participants (19%) than participants from the other world regions were judged to be active and self-determining (5 ratings).

Another rating of participant characteristics concerns whether or not the participant reflected a dogmatic style of thought.

Table 8

RATING OF CHARACTERISTIC	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Dogmatic)	3.4
2	16.9
3	33.4
4	36.9
5 (Non-dogmatic)	9.6

TOTAL N	(1301)

Nearly half of the participants (46.5%) were judged to be at the "non-dogmatic" end of the scale (4 and 5 ratings). 1/3 of the participants were assessed to be somewhat flexible in their thinking, although not completely open to new interpretations (3 ratings).

There was not a statistically significant relationship between the world regions from which the participants came, or their fields of training, and the interviewers' ratings of their dogmatism.

106

Participant Social Activities

The interviewers make a number of ratings about social activities the participant engaged in during his stay in the United States. Judgments are made as to how active the participant was, whether he more frequently took the initiative in organizing these activities or more often took part in those that were prearranged, how many people were involved, and whether he interacted primarily with his colleagues or with persons with a variety of backgrounds and interests.

Table 9

RATING OF AMOUNT OF SOCIAL ACTIVITY	PERCENTAGE %
Very active	18.0
Active	42.8
Not very active	39.3
TOTAL N	(1253)

Less than 20% of the participants were judged to have been very active socially. About 40% were rated as being not very active.

Higher percentages of Near East-South Asian and Far Eastern participants than participants from the other world regions were assessed as being not very active. A smaller proportion of participants from the Far East than participants from the other regions were rated as being very active in social affairs.

207

Table 10

RATING OF TYPE OF SOCIAL ACTIVITY	PERCENTAGE %
Mostly spontaneous	36.5
Mixed	43.2
Mostly arranged	20.2

TOTAL N	(1161)

More than 4 out of 10 participants were judged to have taken part in social activities that were spontaneous as often as prearranged. The interviewers indicated that only 1 participant out of 5 (20.2%) restricted themselves to mostly prearranged activities.

Approximately 6 out of 10 Latin American participants, as compared with about 3 out of 10 participants from the Near East-South Asia and the Far East, were judged to have taken part in social activities that were mostly spontaneous. Proportionately more participants from the Near East-South Asia and fewer from Latin America than from the other world regions were rated as having participated in activities that were mostly prearranged.

Higher percentages of participants in Industry and Mining and Transportation were judged to have taken part in activities that were mostly prearranged and smaller percentages of participants in these fields were judged to have been active in mostly spontaneous social affairs than was true of participants in the other fields of training. A larger proportion of participants in Education were judged to have taken part in

208

spontaneous activities and a much smaller proportion of participants in this field were judged to have restricted themselves to mostly prearranged activities than participants in other fields of training.

Table 11

RATING OF NUMBER OF PEOPLE INVOLVED	PERCENTAGE %
Many	19.0
Some	43.0
Very few	37.9

TOTAL N	(1218)

Fewer than 20% of the participants were judged to have been socially active with many different persons in the United States. The interviewers indicated that nearly 40% had only a very few different persons with whom they were socially active.

Larger proportions of Latin American and African participants than participants from the other world regions were judged to have been involved with many different people in their social activities. Participants from the Near East-South Asia and the Far East more frequently than those from the other regions were assessed as having only a few different people with whom they were socially active.

209

Table 12

RATING OF OCCUPATIONAL INTEREST OF PEOPLE INVOLVED	PERCENTAGE %
Mostly with colleagues	36.4
Sometimes with colleagues, sometimes with other groups or individuals	48.4
Mostly with other groups or individuals	15.1

TOTAL N	(1183)

Almost half of the participants were judged to have taken part in social activities about as often with colleagues (professional or students) as with non-colleagues. More than 1/3 of the participants were judged to have been socially active with just their colleagues.

Half of the participants in Industry and Mining, a larger proportion than in the other fields of training, were assessed to have been involved mostly with colleagues in their social activities; a smaller percentage of these participants than in the other fields of training were judged to have been socially active mostly with just non-colleagues. Participants in Public Administration more frequently than participants in other fields of training were rated as having entered into social activities mostly with people who were non-colleagues.

Participant Experiences

Several ratings are made by the interviewers of the participants' experiences in the United States. Two of these concern the way the participant was treated by Americans he came in contact with during his stay in the United States. One of these ratings is concerned with whether he was made to feel welcome and wanted during his sojourn.

Table 13

FELT WELCOME AND WANTED	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	91.4
No	8.6

TOTAL N	(975)

Approximately 9 out of 10 participants were reported by the interviewers as having been received by at least some of the Americans they had contact with in such a way as to have felt welcome and wanted in the United States.

Percentages of participants assessed to have felt welcome in the United States varied from 85.9% of those in the field of Public Administration to 97% of those in the field of Transportation.

There was not a statistically significant relationship between the world regions from which the participants came, their types of training programs, or programming agencies, and the interviewers' judgments about their feeling welcome and wanted during their U.S. sojourn.

The other rating of a participant's treatment by Americans is the interviewer's judgment as to whether or not he encountered any kind of discrimination in the United States.

Table 14

ENCOUNTERED DISCRIMINATION	PERCENTAGE %
No	80.6
Yes	19.4

TOTAL N	(1125)

From the participants' accounts, during their individual interviews, of their experiences in the United States, the interviewers indicated that 80.6% of the participants had not encountered discrimination by Americans.

Almost half of the African participants (48.6%) were judged to have experienced discrimination during their sojourn in the United States, as compared with less than 9% of the participants from any of the other world regions.

Interviewer ratings are also made of the amount of opportunity the participant had to learn about the United States, and whether he gained in understanding U.S. institutions and ways of life.

Table 15

RATING OF AMOUNT OF OPPORTUNITY	PERCENTAGE %
Extensive	17.1
Moderate	50.6
Limited	32.3

TOTAL N	(1144)

The interviewers indicated that half of the participants had a moderate opportunity to learn about the United States during their sojourn. Almost 1/3 of the participants were judged to have had only a limited opportunity.

Larger proportions of Latin American (23%) and African participants (33.6%) than participants from the other world regions were judged to have had the kind of experiences that provided them an extensive opportunity to learn about the United States. Proportionately more participants from the Near East-South Asia (37%) and the Far East (35.8%) than from the other regions were assessed as having had a limited opportunity.

1 out of 4 Academic participants, as compared with about 1 out of 10 participants in Special training programs, were considered to have had an extensive opportunity to learn about the United States. Special participants much more frequently than Academics were judged to have had a limited opportunity.

A lower percentage of participants in Transportation than of participants in other fields of training were rated as having had an extensive opportunity. Larger percentages of participants in Industry and Mining and Transportation were considered to have had a limited opportunity and a smaller

213

percentage of those in Industry and Mining were judged to have had a moderate opportunity to learn about the United States than was true of participants in the other fields of training. A much larger percentage of participants in Education were assessed as having had moderate opportunity and a much smaller percentage of these participants to have had a limited opportunity than participants in other fields of training.

Proportionately more participants programmed by the Office of Education were rated as having had an extensive opportunity to learn about the United States, and proportionately fewer of these participants were judged to have had a limited opportunity, than participants in the other fields of training.

Table 16

RATING OF HOW WELL PARTICIPANT UNDERSTANDS THE UNITED STATES	PERCENTAGE %
Very well	12.5
Well	34.5
Fairly well	48.1
Poorly	4.9

TOTAL N	(879)

More than 8 out of 10 participants for whom ratings of understanding were made were assessed as understanding the United States "well" or "fairly well" at the time of their

214

exit interviews. Proportionately more Latin American participants than participants from the other world regions were judged to understand the United States either "very well" or "well" at the end of their sojourns.

Participant Attitudes

Interviewers make ratings of the participants' attitudes toward, or feelings about, the United States, A.I.D., and their training institution(s).

The ratings about the United States and the American people are relative ratings, based on the interviewer's assessment of how the participant felt when he arrived in the United States and whether or not his feelings had changed by the end of his program.

Table 17

RATINGS OF CHANGE IN FEELINGS	PARTICIPANTS' FEELINGS ABOUT	
	U.S. Society %	American People %
Have become more positive	56.0	64.1
Have stayed the same	25.9	23.1
Have become more negative	18.0	12.8
TOTAL N	(969)	(1092)

Although a majority of the participants were judged to have become more positively disposed toward both the U.S. society and the American people, a larger percentage was assessed as having become more positive in their feelings toward the people than toward the society. The feelings of

215

18% of the participants were rated as having become more negative toward the society during their sojourns, as compared with 12.8% who were judged to have become more negative toward the people.

Approximately 6 out of 10 African participants, a larger proportion than of participants from the other world regions, were reported to have become more positive in their feelings about the U.S. society. However, a larger proportion of African participants than of those from the other regions, were also assessed as having become more negative about the society (22.6%). A somewhat smaller percentage of Far Eastern participants than those from the other regions were judged to have become more negative in their feelings about the U.S. society.

More than half of both the Academic and Special participants were rated as having become more positive in their feelings about the U.S. society at the end of their sojourns, but a larger proportion of Academics (20.6%) than Specials (15.5%) were judged to have become more negative.

Higher percentages of participants programmed by the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Education than of participants programmed by the other agencies were rated as having become more positive in their feelings about the U.S. society. Proportionately more participants programmed by the Public Health Service than participants programmed by the other agencies were assessed as having become more negative in their feelings about the U.S. society.

Participants in Academic training programs more frequently than those in Special programs were judged to have become more negative in their feelings about the American people.

There was not a statistically significant relationship between the world regions from which the participants came, their fields of training, or programming agencies, and the

interviewers' ratings of their change in feelings about the American people.

Ratings of A.I.D. and training institutions are absolute ratings, ranging from "excellent" to "terrible." In rating the participant's feelings about A.I.D., the interviewer accepts the participant's definition of A.I.D.; i.e., a participant may see A.I.D. as his programming agency, the agency responsible for his administrative arrangements, or in the broader sense of the U.S. foreign aid program.

Ratings of training institutions are based on a participant's overall assessment of the place (or places) where he received training. The data presented in this report represent, in the majority of cases, ratings of the institution where the participant received most of his training.

Table 18

RATING OF AID	PERCENTAGE %
Excellent	13.4
Good	38.1
Adequate	31.6
Poor	14.3
Terrible	2.6

TOTAL N	(974)

More than 8 out of 10 participants were judged to see A.I.D. as adequate or better.

Higher percentages of Latin American and African participants than participants from the other world regions were

assessed as viewing A.I.D. as excellent. Participants from the Near East-South Asia (20.9%) more often than participants from the other regions were judged to see A.I.D. as poor. Percentages of participants who were assessed as seeing A.I.D. as either good or adequate ranged from 64.2% of the Latin American participants to 74.7% of the participants from the Far East.

Special participants more frequently than those in Academic training programs were assessed as seeing A.I.D. as poor. A higher percentage of Academic than Special participants were judged to view A.I.D. as good.

Table 19

RATING OF TRAINING INSTITUTION	PERCENTAGE %
Excellent	28.1
Good	43.7
Adequate	18.3
Poor	8.6
Terrible	1.3

TOTAL N	(925)

Almost 3 out of 10 participants were judged to evaluate their training institutions as "excellent." The interviewers indicated that 90% of the participants felt that their training institutions were adequate or better.

Section F

Interviewer Assessments of Participants' Feelings of Appreciation for Their Personal-Social Experiences and Technical Experiences

Ratings of participants' appreciation of their personal-social and technical experiences in the United States are based on the affective aspects of these experiences. The first is an assessment of the quality of participants' experiences with individual Americans or groups of Americans, while the second is an evaluation of the relevance and expected usefulness of their technical experiences.

Table 20

APPRECIATION OF PERSONAL-SOCIAL EXPERIENCES	PERCENTAGE %
Very appreciative	79.4
About equally appreciative and not appreciative	3.8
Very unappreciative	6.2
Not relevant (few experiences or no general reaction)	10.7

TOTAL N	(1066)

Approximately 8 out of 10 participants were rated as being very appreciative of their personal-social experiences in the United States.

Proportionately more Special than Academic participants were judged to be very appreciative of these experiences.

There was not a statistically significant relationship between the world regions the participants came from, their fields of training, or programming agencies, and the interviewers' ratings of participants' appreciation of their personal-social experiences.

Table 21

APPRECIATION OF TECHNICAL EXPERIENCES	PERCENTAGE %
Very appreciative	79.4
About equally appreciative and not appreciative	2.3
Very unappreciative	8.3
Not relevant (no general reaction to experiences)	10.0

TOTAL N	(1146)

About 8 out of 10 participants were judged to be very appreciative of their technical experiences in the United States. Based on their conversations with the participants, the interviewers reported that for 10% of the participants, their technical experiences were not especially salient.

A higher percentage of participants from the Near East-South Asia (13.2%) and a lower percentage of those from Latin America (3.9%) than participants from the other world regions were reported as being very unappreciative of their technical experiences.

Proportionately more Academic participants were rated as being very appreciative, while proportionately more Special participants were judged as being very unappreciative for their technical experiences.

230

PART 3

OBSERVATION TRAINING TEAM PARTICIPANTS

PREFACE

Part 3 of the report is based on data from 82 observation training teams with 503 members, interviewed between September 24, 1968 and September 2, 1969. The standard Observation Training Team questionnaire administration procedures and interview report form were utilized in the interview for each of these teams. (See A.I.D. Participant Training Exit Interview Development Study, December 1, 1967.)

This part of the report contains 12 chapters: (1) Principal Findings and Conclusions; (2) Overall Satisfaction of Participants with Their Entire Training Experience; (3) Description of the Observation Training Teams; (4) Pre-departure Preparations; (5) Official Meetings After Arrival in the United States; (6) Planning of Training Program; (7) Washington International Center Orientation; (8) Program Content; (9) Administrative Arrangements; (10) Personal and Social Experiences; (11) Communication Seminar; and (12) Utilization of Training.

The interview format was revised during the period covered by this report. Consequently, the number of team members in some of the tables in Chapters III to X is less than the total of 503 because not all members were asked all of the questions. In Chapter II, some missing data are due to the fact that biographic information was not received by DETRI for some of the observation training team members.

CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
Preface	i
I Principal Findings and Conclusions	1
II Overall Satisfaction of Participants with Their Entire Training Experience.	7
III Description of the Observation Training Teams	10
Origin and Size	10
Field of Training	12
Participating Agency	13
Length of Program	14
Language Used by Participants	15
Age, Sex, and Education of Participants	16
Validity of Participant Responses	18
IV Pre-Departure Preparations	20
Selection	20
English Instruction	20
Notification of Departure	20
USAID Briefings	21
V Official Meetings after Arrival in the United States	24
A.I.D. Administrative Briefing	24
Discussion of Final Plan of Training Program	24
VI Planning of Training Program	26
VII Washington International Center Orientation	27

223

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
VIII Program Content	28
Oral Presentations	28
Observation Visits	30
IX Administrative Arrangements	32
Money Allowances	32
Travel and Living Arrangements	33
X Personal and Social Experiences	34
XI Communication Seminar	37
XII Utilization of Training	38

224

CHAPTER I
PRINCIPAL FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

A. Findings

Members of observation training teams expressed high satisfaction with their training programs and the non-training experiences afforded them. Almost 2 out of 3 rated their overall satisfaction with their entire training experience in either the first or second positions on the satisfaction rating scale. Team members in the field of Education more often gave ratings of "1" or "2" than those in other fields of training. Comparisons of data by regions were not possible because of the unequal regional distribution of teams.

Discussions of the major subjects specified in M.O. 1382.4 were not given in all of the USAID briefings attended by the team members. Discussion of the A.I.D. program in their home country was reported by only 1 out of 5 members; 2 out of 3 heard about the objectives of their training program; the proposed plan of the training program was discussed with 1 out of 2 members; A.I.D. administrative policies and regulations for participants were discussed in briefings attended by nearly 9 out of 10 members; 3 out of 5 heard about some aspects of culture and life in the United States.

The majority of team members considered that their USAID briefing was useful in helping to prepare them for their experiences in the United States. However, 1 out of 4 rated the usefulness at "4" and below. Suggestions for improving the USAID briefing were received from 75% of the team members.

The most frequently offered suggestions for improving the USAID briefing concerned their proposed training programs. Team members suggested that (1) they should receive a copy of the objectives and content of the proposed program in advance of the briefing; (2) the program should be discussed in the briefing;

and (3) they should be given an opportunity to make suggestions concerning it.

Team members also frequently suggested that more practical facts and current information about life in the United States, and particularly about the areas they would visit on their training program, should be presented at the USAID briefing.

Three out of 4 team members attended a meeting in the United States, before their training began, in which the final plan for their training program was discussed. Suggestions for improving this discussion were made by 42% of the number who attended. Most frequently made suggestions were: (1) team members should be given a printed prospectus of the training program, preferably in advance of the discussion; (2) they should be given sufficient opportunity to discuss the program in detail; and (3) greater cognizance should be taken of the team members' suggestions.

In summary, 3 out of 4 members reported that they had had no opportunity to make suggestions about the proposed plan of their training program. More than 2 out of 5 reported no opportunity to make suggestions about the final plan of their program.

Members of observation training teams expressed relatively high satisfaction with their technical training programs. However, about 1 out of 10 gave ratings of "4" and below. Although the large majority was satisfied, 82% of the team members offered suggestions to improve future programs similar to theirs. Among the most frequently made suggestions were (1) provide more opportunity for in-depth observation of activities during training visits; (2) select teams that are homogeneous in terms of the backgrounds and professional interests of the members; (3) relate the training program more directly to the needs of the home country and the members; and (4) provide greater depth and detail in oral presentations.

Nearly 2 out of 5 team members said that their per diem was not sufficient to take care of their living expenses during their training program. Another one-third indicated that they were able to live on their per diem only by sharing hotel accommodations, eating inexpensively in cafeterias, and being extremely frugal in their expenditures.

One-third of the team members did not receive a training materials allowance.

Almost all (97%) of the team members found travel arrangements during their sojourn fully satisfactory. However, more than one-half (52%) indicated that they had had difficulties with some of their housing accommodations. The principal difficulties mentioned by the team members were: (1) inadequate facilities and service; (2) accommodations not clean; and (3) housing personnel rude, uncooperative, and indifferent to the needs of the guests.

The bulk of the team members (95%) reported that they had engaged in some social, cultural, or recreational activities during their sojourn in the United States. Nine out of 10 members had been guests in the homes of American families at their training locations. Other activities engaged in were sight-seeing, visiting museums and places of historical interest, dinners, lunches, and various types of theatrical or other commercial entertainment.

More than 3 out of 5 team members indicated that they had not engaged in as many of these non-training activities as they desired. The most common reasons given by members for their inability to engage in more of these activities were: (1) the activities were not programmed or formally arranged; (2) inability to speak and understand English; and (3) insufficient time.

More than 3 out of 5 team members found life in the United States, as they had observed it during their training program,

207

to be different from their expectations. Differences mentioned most frequently were: (1) Americans are friendlier toward foreigners than expected; (2) more wealth and a higher standard of living than expected; (3) Americans work harder than expected; and (4) the society is more peaceful and orderly than expected.

Fewer than one-third (31%) of the team members attended a Communication Seminar.

Members of 3 out of 5 teams (70% of all team members) felt that they were unable at the time of the exit interview to be specific about ways in which they expected to utilize their training when they returned home. For the most part they indicated that they had received much information and observed many activities during their relatively short and full training programs. They felt that the impressions and information they had gained would have to be analyzed to determine what was applicable, and then necessary adaptations made to conform to their home country situations.

About 38% of the teams (152 members) gave one or more specific ideas, practices, or programs of work which they intended to recommend or introduce as a result of their training in the United States.

More than 4 out of 5 (82%) of the team members expected to encounter difficulties in utilization of their training. Difficulties most frequently expected to be encountered were: (1) lack of sufficient financial resources; (2) resistance by people to innovation; (3) lack of qualified staff; and (4) legal or legislative obstacles.

Three out of 4 (76%) of the team members suggested types of assistance that USAID might provide in the future. Suggestions most frequently advanced were: (1) provide technical advisors; (2) provide professional or training-related journals and literature; (3) provide equipment, materials, or facilities; and (4) provide United States training for fellow workers.

B. Conclusions

1. The objectives and content of the proposed training program for observation training teams should be discussed at the USAID briefing. Team members should be given an outline of the proposed program before the briefing. They should have an opportunity to indicate their training interests to USAID in advance of the briefing, and offer specific suggestions concerning the proposed training program during the briefing.

2. The USAID briefing should be held sufficiently in advance of the team members' departure date so that time is available for discussion of the major subjects specified in M.O. 1382.4. Briefings held on the day of departure are frequently hurried, and the team members too excited about leaving to pay full attention.

3. The final plan of the training program should be discussed in detail with the team members before their training program begins. A written outline of the program, preferably in the native language of the members or in a language they can use, should be furnished to them in advance of the briefing. They should be given an opportunity to offer suggestions concerning the program; if their suggestions cannot be accepted, they should be given an explanation.

4. Members of observation training teams should be relatively homogeneous in terms of educational and professional backgrounds, job responsibilities, and training interests. Lack of homogeneity in a team frequently results in lowered satisfaction, and lack of interest by individual members in parts of the training program.

5. Opportunity for in-depth observation of training activities should be provided during training visits. This might be accomplished by scheduling fewer visits during a training program and allowing more time for each.

6. Officials at A.I.D./W, in participating agencies, and at training sites who conduct orientations, briefings, and training programs for observation teams should be aware of the educational and professional backgrounds of the team members, and adapt the level of their presentations accordingly.

7. The program itinerary should allow time for cultural, social, and personal activities. These activities should be arranged as part of the scheduled program. Team members should be afforded an opportunity to gain an understanding of the United States both through their technical training and their non-training activities.

8. At least one member of observation training teams should have sufficient knowledge of English to help the team make known its needs and wishes in situations when the interpreter is not present. To the extent practicable, observation training team members should be given some training in basic English before their departure.

CHAPTER II

OVERALL SATISFACTION OF PARTICIPANTS WITH THEIR ENTIRE TRAINING EXPERIENCE

Observation training team participants are requested to indicate anonymously through a "secret ballot" technique, their overall satisfaction with their entire training experience on a rating scale with 7 positions. A rating of 1 represents the highest possible satisfaction, a rating of 7, the opposite extreme. The overall satisfaction rating scale and the ratings given by members of the 82 observation training teams included in this report are shown in Table 1.

Table 1
OVERALL SATISFACTION RATING

<u>RATING SCALE</u>	<u>PARTICIPANTS</u>	
	No.	%
Extremely satisfied, things could not have been better . . . 1	94	18.8
2	229	45.8
3	124	24.8
4	35	7.0
5	10	2.0
Not at all satisfied, things could not have been worse . . . 6	6	1.2
7	<u>2</u>	<u>.4</u>
	500*	100.0

*Ratings given by 3 participants were not made according to instructions and could not be included in the total.

Satisfaction ratings shown in Table 1 do not vary by more than 3 percentage points in any position from ratings given by the 608 observation training team participants included in the previous annual report.

231

Table 2
PARTICIPANTS' OVERALL SATISFACTION RATINGS
BY FIELD OF TRAINING

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE (%) IN FIELD OF TRAINING					TOTAL N
	Lab	Ag	PA	Ed	Other	
1 (Extremely satisfied)	20.0	16.7	19.8	35.2	11.8	(94)
2	44.8	47.2	46.5	44.4	45.7	(229)
3	23.2	25.0	25.6	14.8	29.9	(124)
4	8.0	8.3	7.0	3.7	6.3	(35)
5	1.6	2.8	1.1	0.0	3.1	(10)
6	2.4	0.0	0.0	1.9	1.6	(6)
7 (Not at all satisfied)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	(2)
TOTAL N	(125)	(108)	(86)	(54)	(127)	(500)*

*Ratings given by 3 participants were not made according to instructions and could not be included in the total.

The numbers of participants in all fields of training except Labor, Agriculture, Public Administration, and Education were too small to support statistical comparisons. Participants in the field of Education more often gave "1" or "2" ratings of overall satisfaction (79.6%) than did participants in the other fields of training.

231

Table 3
 PARTICIPANTS' OVERALL SATISFACTION RATINGS
 BY PARTICIPATING AGENCY

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE (%) IN AGENCY					TOTAL N
	Lab	Ag	OE	Other	AID	
1 (Extremely satisfied)	20.0	14.3	38.7	17.4	7.9	(94)
2	44.8	48.2	43.6	46.5	44.5	(229)
3	23.2	26.8	12.9	26.1	33.3	(124)
4	8.0	7.1	3.2	5.8	11.1	(35)
5	1.6	3.6	0.0	1.4	3.2	(10)
6	2.4	3.6	0.0	1.4	0.0	(6)
7 (Not at all satisfied)	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	(2)
TOTAL N	(125)	(112)	(62)	(138)	(63)	(500)*

*Ratings given by 3 participants were not made according to instructions and could not be included in the total.

As in the previous annual report, participants programmed by the Office of Education more often gave "1" or "2" ratings (82.3%), while those programmed directly by A.I.D. more often gave ratings of "3" or lower (47.6%).

033

CHAPTER III
DESCRIPTION OF THE OBSERVATION TRAINING TEAMS

Origin and Size

Table 4
DISTRIBUTION OF OBSERVATION TRAINING TEAMS BY REGIONS

REGION	TEAMS		PARTICIPANTS	
	No.	%	No.	%
Africa	6	7.3	31	6.2
Far East	4	4.9	18	3.6
Latin America	50	61.0	300	59.6
Near East-South Asia	19	23.2	95	18.9
Multi-Region	3	3.6	59	11.7
TOTALS	82	100.0	503	100.0

Unlike the previous annual report, statistical comparisons by regions for the participants in the 82 observation training teams covered by this report were not possible because (1) the numbers of participants in teams from Africa and the Far East were too small, (2) 75% of the participants from Latin America were in teams from Brazil, and (3) all but 1 team (6 participants) from Near East-South Asia were from Turkey. Because of this distribution of teams by region, no further statistical comparisons of interview data were made on this dimension.

234

Table 5
 SIZE OF OBSERVATION TRAINING TEAMS

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	TEAMS	
	Number	%
1 - 3	28	34.2
4 - 6	24	29.3
7 - 9	17	20.7
10 - 12	7	8.5
13 - 26	6	7.3
TOTALS	82	100.0

The 82 observation training teams varied in size from 1 to 26 participants; 52 (63.5%) were made up of 6 or fewer participants. The percentage of teams containing 1 - 3 participants was considerably larger (34.2%) than for the 87 teams (20%) covered by the previous annual report.

235

Field of Training

Table 6
DISTRIBUTION OF OBSERVATION TRAINING TEAMS
BY FIELDS OF TRAINING

FIELD OF TRAINING	TEAMS		PARTICIPANTS	
	No.	%	No.	%
Labor	20	24.4	127	25.2
Agriculture	19	23.2	108	21.5
Public Administration	12	14.6	86	17.1
Education	9	11.0	54	10.7
Industry and Mining	8	9.8	35	7.0
Health and Sanitation	6	7.3	46	9.1
Transportation	3	3.6	17	3.4
Other	5	6.1	30	6.0
TOTAL N	82	100.0	503	100.0

While the large majority of participants had training programs in Labor, Agriculture, and Public Administration, the combined percentage of team members in these 3 fields was smaller (63.8%) than in the previous annual report (77%).

Participating Agency

Table 7
DISTRIBUTION OF OBSERVATION TRAINING TEAMS
BY PARTICIPATING AGENCY

PARTICIPATING AGENCY	TEAMS		PARTICIPANTS	
	No.	%	No.	%
Department of Labor	20	24.4	127	25.2
Department of Agriculture	19	23.2	112	22.3
Office of Education	10	12.2	62	12.3
Public Health Service	5	6.1	42	8.3
Internal Revenue Service	5	6.1	34	6.8
Geological Survey	4	4.9	22	4.4
Census Bureau	2	2.4	17	3.4
Bureau of Public Roads	2	2.4	15	3.0
Other Agencies*	4	4.9	9	1.8
A.I.D.	11	13.4	63	12.5
TOTALS	82	100.0	503	100.0

*The Department of Housing and Urban Development, Department of Transportation, Social Security Administration, and the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries each handled 1 program.

Although 12 agencies took part in 1 or more training programs, 3 out of 5 participants were in programs handled by the Department of Labor, the Department of Agriculture, and the Internal Revenue Service. The percentage of participants programmed by these 3 agencies, however, was smaller (60%) than in the previous report (72%). The percentage of participants programmed directly by A.I.D. was almost double (12.5%) the percentage in the previous report (7%).

931

Length of Program

Table 8

DISTRIBUTION OF OBSERVATION TRAINING TEAM PARTICIPANTS
BY LENGTH OF PROGRAM

LENGTH OF PROGRAM (Weeks)	TEAMS		PARTICIPANTS	
	No.	%	No.	%
3 - 5	15	18.3	77	15.3
6	28	34.1	163	32.4
7 - 8	15	18.3	77	15.3
9 - 11	9	11.0	71	14.1
12 - 16	13	15.9	97	19.3
17 and over	2	2.4	18	3.6
TOTALS	82	100.0	503	100.0

The percentage of participants having training programs of 6 weeks or less was higher (47.7%) than in the previous annual report (38%). The percentage of team members having training programs of 12 weeks or longer showed less variation; 22.9% compared to 26% in the previous annual report. The median sojourn length was 7.3 weeks.

238

Language Used By Participants

Table 9
LANGUAGE USED BY PARTICIPANTS

LANGUAGE	TEAMS		PARTICIPANTS	
	No.	%	No.	%
Portuguese	28	32.9	208	41.4
Spanish	23	27.1	109	21.7
Turkish	17	20.0	87	17.3
English	10	11.8	51	10.1
French	6	7.0	42	8.3
Vietnamese	1	1.2	6	1.2
TOTALS	85*	100.0	503	100.0

*Three teams were divided into 2 sections each to facilitate interviewing because of language differences.

About 4 out of 10 members of observation training teams spoke Portuguese in the Exit Interview, while only 1 out of 10 spoke English. While the percentages of participants using Portuguese and Turkish in the Exit Interviews showed relatively small differences from the percentages in the previous annual report, the percentage using Spanish was significantly larger-- 21.7% compared with 15%.

Age, Sex, and Education of Participants

Table 10

AGE OF OBSERVATION TRAINING TEAM PARTICIPANTS

AGE (Years)	PARTICIPANTS	
	No.	%
27 and under	56	11.5
28 - 30	62	12.8
31 - 34	74	15.2
35 - 39	89	18.3
40 - 45	105	21.6
46 and over	100	20.6
TOTALS	486	100.0

The percent of team members in each of the age groupings varied by less than 3 percentage points from the previous annual report. 1 participant out of 5 (20.6%) was over 45 years of age, while about 2 out of 5 were less than 35. The median age for team members in this report (36.8 years) is slightly lower than in the previous annual report (37.6 years).

240

Table 11
SEX OF OBSERVATION TRAINING TEAM PARTICIPANTS

SEX	PARTICIPANTS	
	No.	%
Male	448	89.1
Female	55	10.9
TOTALS		
	503	100.0

About 1 out of 9 members of the observation teams was female.

Table 12
EDUCATION OF OBSERVATION TRAINING TEAM PARTICIPANTS

YEARS OF SCHOOLING	PARTICIPANTS	
	No.	%
6 and under	36	7.6
7 - 11	67	14.2
12	26	5.5
13 - 15	123	26.1
16	87	18.4
17-18	100	21.2
19 and over	33	7.0
TOTALS		
	472	100.0

The percentage of team members having 12 and under years of schooling was smaller (27.3%) than in the previous annual report (36%). The median years of education was about the same: 15.6 years this year and 15.3 years in the First Annual Report.

241

Validity of Participant Responses

During the exit interview, the interviewer forms opinions about the extent to which participants feel free to present their views and the validity of the information they give. In a private conversation at the conclusion of the interview, the interviewer asks the interpreter for his opinions concerning the frankness, accuracy, and completeness of the responses made by the participants. Based on his own observations and the interpreter's comments, the interviewer records in each interview report his conclusions concerning the validity of the information given by participants in the interview. A summary of these conclusions for the 82 observation training teams is presented in Table 13.

Table 13

VALIDITY, COMPLETENESS, AND FRANKNESS OF OBSERVATION
TRAINING TEAM PARTICIPANT RESPONSES

APPRAISAL OF RESPONSES	TEAMS		PARTICIPANTS	
	No.	%	No.	%
All fully valid, complete and frank	62	75.6	390	77.5
Some fully valid, complete and frank	20	24.4	113	22.5
TOTALS	82	100.0	503	100.0

For the most part, observation training team participants have been interested and cooperative in the exit interviews, and have expressed their views freely. The responses of nearly 4 out of 5 (78%) of the participants (76% of the teams) were considered to be fully valid, complete, and frank. Information

2/1/72

given by 113 participants (22%) in 24% of the teams was considered to be not fully valid for the following reasons:

1. Diversity of interests and backgrounds of team members; friction within the team. 45 participants (8.9%), 4 teams.
2. Attempts by 1 or 2 members to dominate the team's responses. 33 participants (6.6%), 8 teams.
3. Language and interpreting difficulties. 25 participants (5.0%), 5 teams.
4. Time pressures. 8 participants (1.6%), 2 teams.
5. Training officer from Participating Agency served as interpreter. 2 participants (0.4%), 1 team.

CHAPTER IV

PRE-DEPARTURE PREPARATIONS

A summary of replies given by participants in the 82 observation training teams to specific questions asked in their exit interviews is given in the following chapters (IV-XII) of the report. Questions are quoted, and the responses are shown, together with the numbers and percentages of participants responding.

Selection

Members of the observation training teams for the most part were nominated or designated (i.e. did not apply) to take part in the training programs.

Q.	How many of you made a formal or informal request to take part in this training program?	<u>Response</u>			
		<u>Requested</u>		<u>Nominated</u>	
		<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
		20	4	483	96

English Instruction

Few observation training team members (6%) received instruction in basic English prior to their departure.

Q.	Were you given any special instruction in basic English before you left your country to take part in this training program?	<u>Response</u>		<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
		Yes	No	21	6
				322	94

Notification of Departure

About 1 out of 2 team members felt that they needed 4 weeks or less notification to make arrangements prior to their departure. Nearly 1 out of 4, however, indicated that 12 weeks or more were required.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
	Weeks		
Q. What is the minimum number of weeks needed for you to make the necessary arrangements to come to the United States?	1 - 3	37	22
	4	50	29
	4 - 7	22	13
	8	15	9
	9 - 11	6	3
	12	20	12
	13 or more	20	12

More than half of the team members said they had not received the minimum length of notification they felt necessary.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Did you have this much or more time? (Answers to previous question)	Yes	81	48
	No	89	52

USAID Briefings

Although the great majority of observation team members reported that they had been given 1 or more briefings by USAID personnel before their departure, more than 1 out of 10 indicated that they had had no briefing.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Did you attend any formal briefing or orientation meeting(s) with USAID personnel in your home country before you left?	Yes	441	88
	No	62	12

The USAID briefing for one-half of the team members was held 1 day or less before their departure.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
	Days		
Q. How many days before you left your home country was the USAID briefing held?	1 or less	80	50
	2 - 3	44	27
	4 - 6	13	8
	7 - 9	10	6
	10 or more	15	9

245

Discussions of the major subjects specified in M.O. 1382.4 were not given in all of the USAID briefings attended by the team members. Discussion of the A.I.D. program was reported by 1 out of 5 members; 2 out of 3 heard about the objectives of their training program; the proposed plan of the training program was discussed with one-half of the members; A.I.D. administrative policies and regulations were discussed in briefings attended by nearly 9 out of 10 members; 3 out of 5 heard about some aspects of culture and life in the United States.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Which of these subjects were discussed or presented at the briefing(s)?			
(a) General objectives of the A.I.D. program in your country	Yes No	59 246	19 81
(b) The objectives of your training program	Yes No	287 154	65 35
(c) The proposed plan of your training program	Yes No	220 221	50 50
(d) A.I.D. administrative policies and regulations for participants	Yes No	378 63	86 14
(e) Aspects of culture and life in the United States	Yes No	266 175	60 40

When asked to rate the usefulness of the USAID briefing in helping to prepare them for their experiences in the United States, one-half of the team members gave ratings of "1" or "2" on the 7-point scale. More than 1 out of 4 rated the usefulness at "4" and below.

Q. How useful was the briefing meeting with USAID personnel in helping to prepare you for your experience in the United States?

	<u>RATING SCALE</u>	<u>PARTICIPANTS</u>	
		<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Extremely useful	1	71	35.5
	2	30	15.0
	3	42	21.0
	4	33	16.5
	5	11	5.5
	6	6	3.0
Not at all useful	7	7	3.5

Suggestions for improving the briefing meeting with USAID personnel were received from 75% (338) of the team members. The principal suggestions, together with the number of teams and team members making each suggestion follow:

1. Give detailed information about the training program content and itinerary. 25 (30%) teams; 164 members.
2. Provide team members with a copy of the objectives and content of the proposed training program in advance of the briefing. 23 (28%) teams; 178 members.
3. Provide more practical facts about life and customs in the United States. 20 (24%) teams; 122 members.
4. Afford team members an opportunity to make suggestions about their proposed training program. 9 (11%) teams; 70 members.
5. Do not hold briefing close to departure time. 7 (9%) teams; 45 members.
6. Have former A.I.D. participants take part in the briefing. 6 (7%) teams; 50 members.

CHAPTER V

OFFICIAL MEETINGS AFTER ARRIVAL IN THE UNITED STATES

A.I.D. Administrative Briefing

Nearly all (96%) of the team members attended a meeting after their arrival in the United States in which A.I.D. administrative policies and regulations for observation training team members were discussed. More than 9 out of 10 felt that the policies and regulations had been made clear to them.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Before your training program began did you attend any meeting(s) in the United States in which A.I.D. administrative policies and regulations for observation training team members were discussed?	Yes	481	96
	No	22	4
Q. Were there any A.I.D. administrative policies or regulations that were not clear to you?	Yes	39	8
	No	455	92

Discussion of Final Plan of Training Program

About 3 out of 4 team members attended a meeting in which the final plan of their training program was discussed.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Before your training program began, did you attend any meeting(s) in Washington (or elsewhere) where the final plan of your training program was discussed or presented?	Yes	380	76
	No	123	24

The team members were quite well-satisfied with the discussion of the final plan of their training program. More than 2 out of 3 gave ratings of "1" or "2" on the 7-point scale. One out of 10, however, gave ratings of "6" and "7".

Q. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the discussion or presentation of the final plan of your training program?

<u>RATING SCALE</u>	<u>PARTICIPANTS</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Extremely satisfied 1	94	47.5
2	41	20.7
3	31	15.6
4	10	5.1
5	2	1.0
6	7	3.5
Not at all satisfied 7	13	6.6

Although the team members were fairly well-satisfied with the discussion of the final plan of their training programs, suggestions for improvement of the discussion were received from 42% (171) of the number who had attended. The suggestions most frequently made were:

1. Provide team members with a printed prospectus of the training program, preferably in advance of the discussion. 13 (16%) teams; 69 members. 5 of the 13 teams (28 members) also suggested that the prospectus be printed in the native language of the members.
2. Give the team members sufficient opportunity to discuss the training program in detail. 8 (10%) teams; 56 members.
3. Take greater cognizance of the team members' suggestions for modifying the program. 6 (7%) teams; 46 members.

249

CHAPTER VI

PLANNING OF TRAINING PROGRAM

Team members were considered to have taken part in the planning of their training programs if they had had an opportunity to make suggestions about the proposed plan of the training program prior to their departure, and/or to offer their suggestions during a discussion of the final plan of the training program before the program began.

Three out of 4 team members did not have an opportunity to make suggestions about the proposed plan of their training program. Of those who had the opportunity, 94% offered suggestions.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Prior to your departure, did you ever have an opportunity to make suggestions about the proposed plan of your training program?	Yes	125	25
	No	378	75
Q. Did you make any suggestions?	Yes	117	94
	No	8	6

Nearly 3 out of 5 team members were afforded an opportunity to make suggestions about the final plan of their training program. Of those who had an opportunity, 85% offered suggestions.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Did you have an opportunity to make suggestions about the final plan of your training program before your program began?	Yes	283	56
	No	220	44
Q. Did you make any suggestions?	Yes	240	85
	No	43	15

250

CHAPTER VII

WASHINGTON INTERNATIONAL CENTER ORIENTATION

About 3 out of 4 of the team members received an orientation at the Washington International Center.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Did you receive an orientation at the Washington International Center?	Yes	361	72
	No	142	28

The large majority of the participants found the WIC orientation to be useful. More than 7 out of 10 rated its usefulness at "1" or "2" on the 7-point scale.

<u>RATING SCALE</u>	<u>PARTICIPANTS</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Extremely useful 1	65	36.5
2	62	34.8
3	24	13.5
4	9	5.1
5	12	6.7
6	3	1.7
Not at all useful 7	3	1.7

While the team members for the most part found the WIC orientations to be useful, 56% (201) of the number who attended offered suggestions for improving the orientation. The suggestions, however, were often contradictory, and covered a wide range with insufficient clustering to provide statistical significance.

251

CHAPTER VIII
PROGRAM CONTENT

Questions are asked about observation training team programs according to the training methods used. One method consists of oral presentations, such as lectures, seminars, or discussions, without any observation of the activities or subjects discussed. A second method consists of visits to observe activities or to learn about job operations with or without oral presentations and discussions of the activities observed.

Oral Presentations

Two out of 3 members of the observation training teams had training programs in which oral presentations constituted part or all of the program. Of those members having oral presentations as part of their programs, nearly 9 out of 10 were given oral presentations in Washington, D.C.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Did any part of your training program consist of <u>just</u> oral presentations <u>without</u> observation of the activities or subjects discussed?	Yes	335	67
	No	168	33
Q. Did any part of the oral presentations take place in Washington, D.C.?	Yes	192	87
	No	29	13

The team members, generally, found the oral presentations given in Washington, D.C. to be very useful. Seven out of 10 gave ratings of "1" or "2" on the 7-point scale.

Q. How useful were the oral presentations given in Washington in achieving your program objectives?

<u>RATING SCALE</u>	<u>PARTICIPANTS</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Extremely useful 1	77	40.1
2	59	30.7
3	44	32.9
4	9	4.7
5	3	1.6
6	0	0.0
Not at all useful 7	0	0.0

About 2 out of 3 team members were given oral presentations at places outside of Washington, D.C.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
	Q. Were you given oral presentations any place besides Washington, D.C?	Yes	144
	No	77	34.8

The team members' ratings of the usefulness of the oral presentations given outside of Washington, while relatively high, were lower than the ratings given to the presentations in Washington.

Q. How useful were the oral presentations given outside of Washington in achieving your program objectives?

<u>RATING SCALE</u>	<u>PARTICIPANTS</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Extremely useful 1	43	29.8
2	50	34.7
3	36	25.0
4	5	3.5
5	7	4.9
6	2	1.4
Not at all useful 7	1	.7

253

Observation Visits

The bulk (93%) of the team members made observation visits during their training programs.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Did any part of your training program consist of visits to observe activities or to learn about job operations with or without discussions of the activities observed?	Yes	467	93
	No	36	7

The majority of the team members felt that their observation visits had been very useful in achieving their program objectives. However, 15% rated the usefulness at "4" or below on the rating scale.

Q. How useful were your observation visits in achieving your program objectives?

<u>RATING SCALE</u>	<u>PARTICIPANTS</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Extremely useful 1	69	32.5
2	78	36.8
3	33	15.6
4	11	5.2
5	14	6.6
6	7	3.3
Not at all useful 7	0	0.0

Members of the observation training teams expressed relatively high satisfaction with their technical training programs. Slightly more than 2 out of 3 members gave ratings of "1" or "2" on the rating scale. About 1 out of 10 gave ratings of "4" and below.

Q. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the training program you have had?

<u>RATING SCALE</u>	<u>PARTICIPANTS</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Extremely satisfied 1	78	31.7
2	89	36.2
3	53	21.5
4	10	4.1
5	9	3.7
6	6	2.4
Not at all satisfied 7	1	.4

Although the large majority of the team members were satisfied with their training programs, members of 62 teams (82% of all members) offered suggestions when asked how they believed their programs could be improved. Suggestions given greatest emphasis were:

1. Provide more opportunity for in-depth observation of activities during training visits. 17 (21%) teams; 136 members.
2. Select teams that are homogeneous in terms of the backgrounds and professional interests of the members. 12 (15%) teams; 84 members.
3. Relate the training program more directly to the needs of the home country and the team members. 10 (12%) teams; 81 members.
4. Provide greater depth and detail in oral presentations. 10 (12%) teams; 80 members.
5. Provide visits to training sites related to the specific interests of the team members. 10 (12%) teams; 50 members.
6. Schedule visits to a variety of training sites to obtain different points of view concerning activities observed. 9 (11%) teams; 57 members.
7. Provide opportunity for team members to indicate their specific training interests. 7 (9%) teams; 57 members.

CHAPTER IX
ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

Money Allowances

Nearly 2 out of 5 team members said that their per diem was not sufficient to take care of their living expenses during their training program. Another one-third indicated that they were able to live on their per diem only by sharing hotel accommodations, eating inexpensively in cafeterias, and being extremely frugal in their expenditures.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.*</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. How adequate was the amount of your per diem during your training program?	Adequate	149	30
	Barely Adequate	159	32
	Not Adequate	192	38

*3 team members were not on A.I.D. financing and are not included in the totals.

One-third of the team members did not receive a training materials allowance.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Did you receive a training materials allowance?	Yes	333	64
	No	170	34

Of those who had received a training materials allowance, slightly more than one-half (52%) felt that the allowance was not sufficient.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.*</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Was the amount of your training materials allowance sufficient?	Yes	149	48
	No	164	52

*20 team members had not spent their allowance at the time of the interview and felt they could not answer.

256

Travel and Living Arrangements

Almost all (97%) of the team members found travel arrangements fully satisfactory.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Did you find the travel arrangements during your sojourn in the United States fully satisfactory?	Yes	487	97
	No	16	3

More than one-half (52%) of the team members indicated that they had had difficulties with some of their housing accommodations.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Did you have any difficulties with your housing accommodations?	Yes	261	52
	No	242	48

The principal difficulties mentioned by the team members were:

1. Inadequate facilities and service. 18 (22%) teams; 126 members.
2. Accommodations not clean. 16 (20%) teams; 146 members.
3. Housing personnel rude, uncooperative, and indifferent to the needs of the guests. 7 (9%) teams; 68 members.

257

CHAPTER X

PERSONAL AND SOCIAL EXPERIENCES

The bulk of the team members (95%) reported that they had engaged in some social, cultural, or recreational activities during their sojourn in the United States. These activities included home hospitality, sight-seeing, visiting museums and places of historical interest, dinners, lunches, and various types of theatrical or other commercial entertainment.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. While you were in the United States did you engage in any social, recreational, or cultural activities?	Yes	478	95
	No	25	5

More than 3 out of 5 of the team members indicated that they had not engaged in as many of these activities as they wanted.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Were there any of these kinds of activities that you wanted to take part in but were unable to?	Yes	309	61
	No	194	39

The most common reasons given by team members for their inability to engage in more cultural, recreational or social activities during their sojourn were the following:

1. These activities were not programmed or formally arranged. 21 (26%) teams; 181 members.
2. Inability to speak and understand English. 19 (23%) teams; 175 members.
3. Insufficient time. 13 (22%) teams; 120 members.
4. Insufficient funds. 9 (11%) teams; 59 members.

The great majority (89%) of the team members indicated that they had been guests in the homes of American families

during their training sojourn.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Were you a guest of any American families in their homes at your training locations?	Yes	445	89
	No	58	11

Slightly more than one-half (52%) of the team members felt that they were able to meet as many different kinds of Americans during their sojourn as they wanted.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Were you able to meet as many different kinds of Americans as you wanted to meet?	Yes	262	52
	No	241	48

The principal kinds of Americans that the team members indicated they wanted to meet were:

1. Poor, lower class citizens. 9 (11%) teams; 83 members.
2. University students. 8 (10%) teams; 75 members.
3. Black citizens, 6 (7%) teams; 52 members.
4. Middle class citizens. 6 (7%) teams; 52 members.

More than 3 out of 5 team members found life in the United States, as they had observed it during their training program, to be different from their expectations.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.*</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Did you find life in the United States as you expected it would be or was it different in some ways?	As Expected	187	37
	Somewhat as expected	238	48
	Seldom as expected	74	15

*4 team members felt that they could not make this judgment.

2.59

Differences from expectations mentioned most frequently by team members were:

1. Americans are friendlier toward foreigners than expected. 16 (20%) teams; 96 members.
2. There is more wealth and a higher standard of living than expected. 10 (12%) teams; 56 members.
3. Americans work harder than expected. 9 (11%) teams; 53 members.
4. The society is more peaceful and orderly than expected. 8 (10%) teams; 56 members.
5. Americans are less knowledgeable and less interested in foreign countries and world affairs than expected. 6 (7%) teams; 71 members.

Team members generally felt welcome and accepted during their stay in the United States. More than 9 out of 10 rated their feelings about being welcome and accepted at "1" or "2" on the rating scale.

<u>RATING SCALE</u>	<u>PARTICIPANTS</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Extremely welcome 1	169	72.5
2	47	20.2
3	9	3.9
4	7	3.0
5	1	.4
6	0	0.0
Not at all welcome 7	0	0.0

260

CHAPTER XI

COMMUNICATION SEMINAR

Fewer than one-third (31%) of the team members attended a Communication Seminar.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Did you attend a Communication Seminar?	Yes	158	31
	No	345	69

The 158 team members who attended a Communication Seminar were asked if they had any suggestions for improving the Seminar. Nearly 3 out of 4 (73%) offered suggestions. The following were given most frequently:

1. The Seminar should be more structured and better organized. 8 (10%) teams; 67 members.
2. Seminar participants should be divided into more homogeneous groups. 5 (6%) teams; 57 members.

Three teams (21 members) felt that the Seminar was not relevant to them in its present form. Two teams (9 members) suggested that participants should be told of the purpose of the Seminar at the outset.

CHAPTER XII

UTILIZATION OF TRAINING

Members of about 3 out of 5 teams (70% of all team members) were not specific about ways in which they expected to use the training they had received when they returned home. For the most part they indicated that they had received much information and observed many activities during their training programs. They felt that the impressions and information they had gained would have to be analyzed to determine what was applicable, and then adapted for use in their home country situations.

About 38% of the teams (152 members) gave one or more specific ideas, practices or programs of work which they intended to recommend or introduce as a result of their training.

More than 4 out of 5 (82%) of the team members expected to encounter difficulties in using their training.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Do you expect to encounter any difficulties in using your training?	Yes	337	82
	No	72	18

The difficulties that the team members most frequently expected to encounter were:

1. Lack of sufficient financial resources. 23 (28%) teams; 181 members.
2. Resistance by people to innovation. 21 (26%) teams; 169 members.
3. Lack of qualified staff. 10 (12%) teams; 88 members.
4. Legal or legislative obstacles. 8 (10%) teams; 59 members.
5. Lack of power or authority. 8 (10%) teams; 35 members.

Three out of 4 (76%) of the team members suggested types of assistance that USAID might provide in the future. Suggestions most frequently advanced were:

1. Provide technical advisors. 30 (37%) teams; 177 members.
2. Provide professional or training-related journals and literature. 29 (35%) teams; 161 members.
3. Provide equipment, materials or facilities. 21 (26%) teams; 111 members.
4. Provide United States training for fellow workers. 11 (13%) teams; 49 members.

TECHNICAL SUPPLEMENT

TECHNICAL SUPPLEMENT

Introduction

The purpose of this supplement is to describe the steps that were taken to consolidate and interrelate the data obtained from the 1384 Academic and Special program participants described in this report. The basic analysis plan was the same as that described in the Technical Supplement of the First Annual Report (May 1969). First, the major dependent (criterion outcomes) and independent (predictor) variables measured by the exit interview questionnaires and individual interviews were selected. Second, the most meaningful combinations of items for each of these two types of variable were determined and scores were derived. Third, the scores of predictor items were related to the scores of outcome items. Fourth, these relationships were analyzed in terms of selected characteristics of the participants and their training programs.

Since this analysis plan is similar to that described in the First Annual Report, the reader is referred to that report for details on the methodological steps that were taken. The information in this Technical Supplement will be limited to a description of the variables chosen, scores derived, and relationships obtained from the data contained in this report. There will also be a brief description of minor differences in methodology that were followed in the analysis for this report.

Factor Analyses of Dependent Variables

The results of the First Annual Report suggested that the data in this report be analyzed separately for Academic

and Special training program participants. Therefore, somewhat different sets of dependent and independent variables were chosen for participants in different types of training programs. For the Academic training program participants, 22 items from the questionnaire and the individual interview code sheet were chosen as possible dependent variables. For the Special training program participants, 23 items from these sources were selected. Also, an analysis of 20 items that the 2 groups had in common were used in a factor analysis of the total population of participants.

These outcome data were factor analyzed using the centroid method; 3 to 8 factor solutions were used in all 3 analyses. In each case, the 5-factor solution showed the most meaningful grouping of variables. The first factor was always the clearest; it was composed of the suitability of the participant's training program to his background, his home country conditions, and his career plans; his overall evaluation of his technical training; and his ratings of the utility of the different types of technical training he received to his training objectives. This factor was labeled Satisfaction with Technical Training and made up the first criterion in further analyses.

A second factor in all 3 analyses was composed of 5 items: the participant's satisfaction with his housing arrangements, his home hospitality, his informal activities, his travel arrangements, and his feeling of welcome and acceptance in the United States. This factor was labeled Satisfaction with Personal-Social Experiences in the United States. It was used as the second criterion in further analyses.

The remaining 3 factors were somewhat less clear and varied across the 3 different factor analyses (Academic analysis, Special analysis, and total population analysis).

After looking more closely at the items which composed these factors, it was decided that some of these items represented evaluations that either were not of the same general level of importance as other items in the analysis or which were unlikely to be meaningfully related to the participants' experiences in the United States. These items were dropped from the second series of factor analyses.

The second series of factor analyses of the dependent variables again produced meaningful 5-factor solutions. The first factor in each case was identical with the first factor of the previous factor analysis. The second factor contained the items on home hospitality, informal activities, and feeling of welcome and accepted in the United States. (The items on housing and travel were omitted because they were not at the same general level of evaluation as the 3 items in this factor listed above.)

The third factor was composed of the items on participant satisfaction with planning in his home country, planning in the United States, and his total experience as an A.I.D. participant. This factor was labeled Overall Satisfaction as a Participant. It was used as the third outcome in all further analyses.

The fourth and fifth factors in each analysis were based exclusively on interviewer ratings of the participants. The fourth factor contains the interviewer's rating of the participant's attitude toward the United States as a society, toward the American people, and his appreciation of his personal-social experiences in the United States. The fifth factor contains the interviewer's ratings of the participant's evaluation of A.I.D. and his appreciation for his technical training. It was found in further analyses of the data that these 2 outcomes did not systematically relate to participant experiences for the total group of participants; rather the indication was that they might relate to the experiences of

specific groups of participants. Therefore, they were not used in the final multiple regression equations and will not be discussed in this report.

Factor Analyses of Independent Variables

As in the First Annual Report, the items which appear in the questionnaire as difficulty questions were factor analyzed, reducing the number of these items from 62 to 19 meaningful factors. These factors were used as predictors throughout the multiple regression analyses. In addition to these difficulties' scores, there were 48 items in the Academic questionnaire, 43 items in the Special questionnaire, and 11 individual interviewer ratings that qualified as possible independent variables. The same ground rules that were used in the First Annual Report were followed to eliminate or consolidate a number of these items prior to their factor analysis.

The first factor analysis of the Academic predictors produced a 12-factor solution. This solution permitted the number of possible predictors to be reduced and regrouped to provide 52 scores for a second factor analysis. The first factor analysis of the Special program participants' data produced 12 factors also, which permitted a consolidation of the items to 50 scores. The first factor analysis of the total population of participants produced a 12-factor solution which allowed the number of items to be reduced to 40 scores for the second factor analysis.

The results of these second factor analyses reduced the list of predictors to 25 for the Academic participants; to 23 for the Special program participants; and to 21 for the total population. These predictors were used in various combinations with the 3 outcome criteria to produce the first multiple regression equations. They are listed

alphabetically as Figure 1.

Figure 1

PREDICTORS

1. Accommodation to life in the United States
2. Adjustment to American food
3. Amount of home hospitality
4. Amount of social activity
5. Attendance at a Mid-Winter Leadership Program (Academic participants only)
6. Attendance at a Pre-Academic Workshop (Academic participants only)
7. Attendance at a Special Communication Seminar
8. Attendance at the Washington International Center
9. Classes unrelated, duplicative, too simple (Academic participants only)
10. Classes too difficult (Academic participants only)
11. Difficulties with classroom training (Special participants only)
12. Difficulties with observation training (Special participants only)
13. Disagreement with content of proposed and final plans
14. Discussion of proposed program at USAID
15. Illness
16. Importance of American friendships
17. Involvement of participant and supervisor in advance planning
18. Meeting with Program Officer in the United States
19. Nationality of roommates and friends (enclaves)
20. Opportunity to make suggestions on proposed and final plans
21. Personal style of participant
22. Problems with English language in the United States
23. Problems with housing in the United States
24. Problems with money allowances in the United States

25. Problems with travel in the United States
26. Satisfaction with communication with Program Officer in the United States
27. Sense of being discriminated against in the United States

Screening by Intercorrelations and Multiple Regressions

It was decided that the final multiple regressions in the analysis of this year's data would be carried out on the total sample of participants (1384 total population, 643 Academic participants, 741 Special participants). Since this would require a great deal of computer time if all of the predictors were run against each outcome criterion, an initial screening of the data was done by computing the intercorrelations among all the predictors and outcomes, and running multiple regressions suggested by these intercorrelations on samples of the total populations. By examining the intercorrelations, it was possible to select predictor scores which had significant correlations with at least 5 of the items that were used to make up each of the 3 outcome criteria.

The 4 multiple regression equations were run on an 18% sample of each of the populations. Those predictors which were not significant at or beyond the .40 level by T-test were dropped. Thus, no predictors which might possibly be effective with a larger sample were omitted on the basis of these screening analyses.

The results of these screening procedures permitted a reduction of the number of predictors from 52 to 14 for the Academics on the first criterion, from 50 to 13 for the Specials on the first criterion, and from 40 to 10 predictors on the second criterion, and to 9 predictors on the third criterion for the total population.

Multiple Regression, Academic Participants Only —
14 Predictors, First Criterion

The multiple regression equation relating the 14 predictors listed in Figure 2 to the first criterion produced a multiple correlation of +.27. Four predictors were directly related to the outcome (significant by T-test beyond the .05 level), and 1 other was suggestive. These 5 predictors are underlined in the list of predictors presented alphabetically as Figure 2.

Figure 2

PREDICTORS

1. Accommodation to life in the United States
2. Attendance at a Mid-Winter Leadership Program
3. Attendance at a Pre-University Workshop
4. Attendance at a Special Communication Seminar
5. Classes too low level
6. Classes unrelated, duplicative and simple
7. Disagreement with content of proposed and final plans
8. Discussion of final plan with Program Officer
9. Importance of American friendships
10. Nationality of roommates and friends (enclaves)
11. Personal style of participant
12. Problems with English language in the United States
13. Problems with money allowances in the United States
14. Satisfaction with communication with Program Officer in the United States

Multiple Regression, Special Participants Only —
13 Predictors, First Criterion

The multiple regression equation relating the 13 predictors listed in Figure 3 to the first criterion for Special participants produced a multiple correlation of +.36. Eight of the 13 predictors were directly related to the outcome (significant by T-test beyond the .05 level), while 1 other acted as a suppressor variable. These 9 predictors are underlined in the list of predictors which appears alphabetically as Figure 3.

Figure 3

PREDICTORS

1. Attendance at a Special Communication Seminar
2. Difficulties with classroom training
3. Difficulties with observation training
4. Disagreement with content of proposed and final plans
5. Importance of American friendships
6. Involvement of participant and supervisor in advance planning
7. Meeting with Program Officer in the United States
8. Nationality of roommates and friends (enclaves)
9. Personal style of participant
10. Problems with English language in the United States
11. Problems with housing in the United States
12. Satisfaction with communication with Program Officer in the United States
13. Sense of being discriminated against in the United States

Multiple Regression, Total Population —
10 Predictors, Second Criterion

The multiple regression equation relating the 10 predictors listed in Figure 4 to the second criterion for the entire population of Academic and Special participants produced a multiple correlation of +.40. Eight of the 10 predictors were directly related to the outcome (significant by T-test beyond the .05 level). These 8 predictors are underlined in the list of predictors listed alphabetically in Figure 4 below.

Figure 4

PREDICTORS

1. Accommodation to life in the United States
2. Ammount of home hospitality
3. Discussion of final plan with Program Officer in the United States
4. Importance of American friendships
5. Nationality of roommates and friends (enclaves)
6. Problems with English language in the United States
7. Problems with housing in the United States
8. Problems with travel in the United States
9. Satisfaction with communication with Program Officer in the United States
10. Sense of being discriminated against in the United States

Multiple Regression, Total Population —
9 Predictors, Third Criterion

The multiple regression equation relating the 9 predictors listed in Figure 5 to the third criterion produced a multiple correlation of +.32. Six of the predictors were directly related to the outcome (significant by T-test beyond the

.05 level). These 6 predictors are underlined in the list of predictors presented alphabetically as Figure 5.

Figure 5

PREDICTORS

1. Amount of home hospitality
2. Attendance at a Special Communication Seminar
3. Disagreement with content of proposed and final plans
4. Importance of American friendships
5. Meeting with Program Officer in the United States
6. Nationality of roommates and friends (enclaves)
7. Opportunity to make suggestions on proposed and final plans
8. Problems with housing in the United States
9. Satisfaction with communication with Program Officer in the United States

Background Variables

The same background variables that were run in the First Annual Report were used as independent variables in multiple regression equations to predict the first, second and third criteria in this report. These variables are listed as Figure 6 below.

Figure 6

BACKGROUND VARIABLES

1. English the native language
2. Age
3. Sex
4. Marital status

5. Years of education
6. Previous travel outside home country
7. Previous travel to the United States
8. Size of hometown

The multiple regression equation relating these 8 background variables to the first criterion (satisfaction with technical training program) produced a multiple correlation of $+0.01$. None of the background variables were significantly related by T-test at the $.05$ level. This multiple regression equation accounted for significantly less variance on the first criterion than did the equation using experiential predictors for the entire population of Academic and Special participants (see Figures 1 and 2).

The multiple regression equation relating the 8 background variables to the second criterion (satisfaction with personal-social experiences in the United States) produced a multiple correlation of $+0.04$. Three of the variables were found to be significantly related by T-test beyond the $.05$ level. These variables were: age, marital status, and previous travel outside home country. This multiple regression equation accounted for significantly less variance on the second criterion than did the equation using experiential data (see Figure 3).

The multiple regression equation relating the 8 background variables to the third criterion (overall satisfaction as a participant) produced a multiple correlation of $+0.03$. Two of the background variables were found to be significantly related by T-test beyond the $.05$ level. These variables were marital status and years of education. For the third time the multiple regression equation using the background variables as predictors accounted for significantly less variance on the criterion than did the equation using experiential predictors (see Figure 5).

On the basis of these data, it was decided that the background variables were not sufficiently related to any of the criteria to serve as predictors of participants' satisfaction with their technical training program, their personal-social experiences in the United States or their overall experiences as participants. However, these variables were used as control categories in further analyses of the 4 established multiple regression equations.

Control Variable Analyses

The final step in the analysis was to use the 4 established multiple regression equations to compare the responses to the predictor and outcome items given by participants having different background and training program characteristics. In these 4 analyses, participant responses were compared in terms of the 8 background factors listed in Figure 6, plus 4 other program variables (world region, field of training, type of training program, and length of sojourn).

Generally speaking, the multiple regression equations seem to predict outcomes for participants in Special training programs more accurately than they do for participants in Academic training programs. The indices of predictive efficiency for the Special participants on the first criterion are on the average higher than those of the Academic participants on their first criterion. On the second and third criteria, the characteristic of the total population which appears to make the most difference in how well the multiple regression equations predict is the type of training program. In both instances, the predictions for participants in Special training programs are more likely to be accurate than those for participants in Academic training programs.

The only other background or training program category

which makes any difference in prediction is age. The findings suggest that the predictions are somewhat better for older participants on the personal-social criterion and for older Special training programs participants on the first criterion.*

These data suggest that the 4 established multiple regression equations can be applied with equal accuracy to participants with different backgrounds and in different types of training programs, with the 2 exceptions noted above.

* These categories of high predictive efficiency are suggestive of practical guidelines to be used in management decisions on program changes. There is no known way to test their statistical significance.