

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT WASHINGTON, D. C. 20523 BIBLIOGRAPHIC INPUT SHEET	FOR AID USE ONLY Batch 72
---	---

1. SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION	A. PRIMARY Education	JE30-0000-0000
	B. SECONDARY Development	

2. TITLE AND SUBTITLE
 Participant assessment of AID training programs; annual report, 1968/1969

3. AUTHOR(S)
 (100) Kimmel, P.R.; Lybrand, W.A.; Ockey, W.C.; (101) Am. Univ. Development Education and Training Research Inst.

4. DOCUMENT DATE 1969	5. NUMBER OF PAGES 210p.	6. ARC NUMBER ARC
--------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------

7. REFERENCE ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS

 Am. Univ.

8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES (*Sponsoring Organization, Publishers, Availability*)

 (Activity summary)

9. ABSTRACT

10. CONTROL NUMBER PN-RAB-624	11. PRICE OF DOCUMENT
12. DESCRIPTORS AID Assessments Personnel development Technical assistance	13. PROJECT NUMBER
	14. CONTRACT NUMBER CSD-1839 GTS
	15. TYPE OF DOCUMENT

PARTICIPANT ASSESSMENT
OF
AID TRAINING PROGRAMS

May 1969

Second Printing - August 1969

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

Prepared under Contract AID/csd-1839 for the Office of International Training, The Agency for International Development, U.S. Department of State. The findings, conclusions, and interpretations contained are those of the authors and not necessarily those of The Agency for International Development.

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 Carl C. Andersen, Mary Ann Dyer, Ann Fenderson, Marjorie Hinds, Eugene B. Kassman, and Wayne M. Reznick, also of the staff of the American University's Development Education and Training Research Institute (DETRI).

The authors wish to express their appreciation to Dr. John Stabler 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 council of a Technical Advisory Committee consisting 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. The technical quality of the document reflects the committee's suggestions, but, of course, the members cannot be held responsible for any inadequacies which may still exist.

PREFACE

This first 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 2420 participants included in the report.

Part 2 includes aggregate data for the 795 Academic and the 1015 Special program participants interviewed between July 17, 1967, and August 31, 1968. 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 87 observational training teams interviewed between August 22, 1967, and September 13, 1968. 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 AID'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 AID 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 II of part 2. A special Technical Supplement, at the end of the report, describes this analysis in detail.

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

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 twenty times.

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.

a brief description of the percentages in the table is given; and fourth, important differences among characteristics of 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 4850 non-contract AID participants left the United States. About half of these reported to DETRI for an exit interview. More specifically, about 65% of the departing African participants; 60% of the departing Near East-South Asian participants; 50% of the departing Far Eastern participants; and 35% 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. First, an analysis was made of the information the participants spontaneously wrote in on the open-ended questions in the structured questionnaire. It was possible to compare 970 of these write-ins with other items that were asked in a structured manner in the same questionnaire for approximately 1000 participants. Of these 970 items, 809, or 83.4% were found to be completely consistent, i.e., the written response to one item corresponded logically to the alternative checked by the same participant on another closely related (sometimes identical) question in the questionnaire. This index of internal consistency is technically acceptable for questionnaire data.

Second, Table 2 in Chapter VIII of Part 2 shows that the interviewers' estimate of the validity of the participants' responses on the questionnaire as compared with the information gathered in the individual interviews is about 90% consistent. Again, the results of this external check of the consistency of the participants' written and spoken comments is technically quite acceptable.

Third, a search was made of the literature on foreign students training in the United States. Although it was difficult to compare directly the results of such studies with the results of this report due to differences in samples' size and composition, and in the wording and analysis of the questions used, twenty-one items were found in three different studies which can be meaningfully compared. Of the twenty-one comparisons, it was found that for twelve items the percentages were virtually identical between the AID participants and those reported on in the other studies. In the other nine cases, the results favored the AID

participants in that they either had higher evaluations of the aspects of their program, or more favorable experiences during their U.S. sojourns than did the foreign trainees in the other studies.³

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

³ Kelman and Ezekiel, 1965 Sellitz, et al, 1964 and U.S. Advisory Commission, 1966.

GLOSSARY

- ACAD: Academic program participant; a student who has attended a university or college during the majority of his training program and taken courses in which academic credit is earned.*
- AID/W: Agency headquarters in Washington, D.C.
- AID/OIT: AID 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: trainees from one or more countries who proceed together through their training and whose program consists of observation training visits to a variety of training sites at which operations are observed and discussed.
- SPEC: Special program participant; a participant whose training included special academic courses, lectures, and seminars; on-the-job work experience; observational visits; or some combination of these types of training.*
- USAID: AID Mission overseas.
- WIC: Washington International Center

*These are the definitions that were used in the questionnaires from which the data for this report came. AID has subsequently revised its definitions of types of training programs, and the definitions in DETRI's revised questionnaire have been changed accordingly.

SUMMARY

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings

The generally high level of satisfaction with AID's Office of International Training programs found for the 1,201 participants covered in DETRI's first report to AID (May 1968) continues to hold for the 2,420 participants reported upon in this report. As a group, AID participants react quite favorably, on an overall basis, to 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 that first DETRI report, the results in this report compare favorably with those of four other studies of foreign students in the United States.¹ Some 21 comparisons of feelings and experiences were possible between the AID-sponsored trainees covered in this report and the predominantly non-sponsored students studied by other investigators. In none of the 21 comparisons of technical training and social-personal experiences were the feelings or experiences of the AID trainees significantly more negative, or unfavorable, than those of the foreign students in the other studies.

More specifically, in terms of technical training, there were four comparisons in which AID trainees gave more positive evaluations, and five in which they had very similar evaluations to those of the foreign students in the other studies. In terms of social and personal relations, there were five comparisons

¹Kelman and Ezekiel, 1965; Selltiz, et. al., 1963; U.S. Advisory Commission Report, 1966; and Van Ditmar, 1967.

in which the AID trainees had more, or more favorable experiences, and seven in which they had appreciably the same amount and quality of experience as the foreign students in the other studies.

Although the AID participants generally report a high level of satisfaction, and although the outcomes of the AID International Training program compare favorably with the outcomes of other programs for foreign trainees in the United States, there is ample room for improvement. A great majority of the 2,420 AID participants interviewed reported difficulties with some aspects of their training experience-- e.g., at USAID, in Washington, at a training institution-- that could be improved. Analyses were undertaken to determine if there were patterns of such difficulties and other participant experiences and reactions, which consistently differentiated between the very highly satisfied participants and the less satisfied participants, on either their technical training or social-personal evaluations. Five factors were found which relate to the technical or social-personal satisfactions of all participants. All of these factors are equally important to differentiating between the highly satisfied and less highly satisfied participants. The order in which they are presented below is arbitrary.

1. The participant's beliefs about the relevance of his specific training program to his training objectives and the suitability of the program to his prior education and experience. Participants who reported irrelevance or duplication of content were less satisfied with their technical training programs.
2. The participant's sense of his own and his supervisor's participation in the planning of his technical training program. Participants who felt more involved, and who believed their supervisors were more involved, were more satisfied with their technical training programs.

3. The participant's accommodation to life in the United States. Participants who made American friends, lived with Americans, participated in social, cultural and recreational activities, and utilized support services provided by AID/OIT, were more satisfied with the technical and social-personal aspects of their sojourns.
4. The participant's sense of being discriminated against in the United States. Participants who felt they were in some way discriminated against by Americans were less satisfied with the social-personal aspects of their sojourns.
5. The participant's feeling about his housing in the United States. Participants who reported difficulties with living arrangements were less satisfied with the social-personal aspects of their sojourns.

In addition to these five major factors which apply to all participants, three other significant but more specialized factors were identified. Two applied only to participants in Academic training programs.

6. The Academic participant's ability to use and understand English in the United States. Academic participants who had difficulties with English were less satisfied with their technical training programs.
7. Participants in Academic training programs who attended pre-Academic workshops were more satisfied with their technical training programs than those who did not attend pre-Academic workshops.

One applied only to the second half of the participants interviewed at DETRI.

8. Having difficulties with money allowances was related to less satisfaction with technical training programs for all participants interviewed after January 31, 1968. This factor was not related to satisfactions of participants interviewed before this date.

Recommendations

In light of the general findings just presented, DETRI makes the following program recommendations. These recommendations are presented to correspond to the arbitrary order in which the findings were presented.

1. A new emphasis should be placed on assuring and clarifying to the participant the relevance of all aspects of his technical training program to his training objectives. More thorough and detailed discussions of proposed and final programs, itineraries, and course schedules or curricula should be held with participants, as appropriate, at USAIDs, in Washington, D.C., and at training sites. Initial discussions should be held sufficiently in advance of the participants' departure to allow time for questions and for possible revisions that may come from participants' suggestions. For this emphasis to be effective, two conditions will have to be met. (1) All involved program planners, field coordinators, and training site personnel must become more familiar with their participants' backgrounds, interests, and home country situations; and (2) coordination between USAIDs, AID/W, Participating Agencies, and training institutions will have to be improved--at a minimum, a record of what has been told to a participant should be made immediately available to all concerned.
2. Technical program objectives and tentative program outlines should be forwarded to participants and their supervisors in advance of their USAID briefings to allow them to be understood and discussed more meaningfully at the briefings. Participants and their supervisors should be encouraged to

make suggestions about the technical training programs. Whenever possible, such suggestions should be accepted; when they cannot be accepted, participant and supervisor should be made aware of the reasons for the non-feasibility of the suggestions. If anything, it is even more important that both participants and supervisors feel that their suggestions are welcome and given careful consideration, and that they understand decisions made about the training programs, than whether or not their suggestions are accepted.

3. Training program schedules should provide more time and opportunities for participation in American social, cultural, and recreational activities. Frequently, Observation Team members and Special program participants have "tightly" scheduled programs. Such participants could be provided more opportunities by scheduling activities on weekends, providing ground as well as air transportation between training sites, and interspersing as much time as possible during their sojourns to take part exclusively in such activities. The modest fiscal investment involved in such program changes should yield huge dividends in participant satisfaction with and understanding of their U.S. experiences. Home hospitality visits should be made more available to all participants.

To increase the accommodation to American life of participants with longer training sojourns, they should be encouraged to live with Americans as opposed to living only with fellow nationals. Also, the Office of International Training should attempt to increase these participants' awareness of ways in which the medical, legal, and counseling services

that are available to them can be used during their visit, perhaps by use of brief, case-history examples.

4. Specific information on some of the more common types of discrimination that may occur to participants during their training sojourns in the United States should be presented both in the participants' home countries and during orientations to the United States held in Washington, D.C. Information should be specific and realistic, and advice on how to best cope with such situations should be given whenever possible. Comparisons of minority group problems world-wide may help to provide needed perspective.
5. Participants who will live for extended periods at frequently used training sites should be provided with lists of available private and institutional housing at those sites. These lists should contain specific information on housing location, facilities, neighborhood, transportation, other residents, etc. During orientations given at the various training sites the advantages and disadvantages of living in different accommodations should be discussed.

When feasible, reservations should be made in advance by AID for participants at sites where housing is scarce, e.g., in large cities for participants on training visits, and at Universities where participants will arrive shortly before classes begin. Whenever reservations are made in advance, participants should be told the basis on which these have been made, be given the alternatives available, and be permitted to make other choices, if feasible.

6. Participants should have some knowledge of English. For observation training teams, one member should have sufficient fluency in English to take care of the ordinary living and social situations that confront team members outside of their technical training program, especially when interpreters are not available, or the members should be given some training in basic English before their departure. At the opposite extreme, Academic program participants need an English language capability comparable to that of the average college student to avoid difficulties in the beginning of their substantive training that are detrimental to their entire technical training programs. Improved and broadened English language training can be expected to raise the social-personal satisfaction of Observation Training Team members and the technical program satisfactions of Academic participants more than satisfactions of either type for Special training program participants.
7. Participants in Academic training programs who are not thoroughly familiar with University life as it takes place in the United States, should be scheduled to take part in pre-University workshops. This recommendation is especially relevant to those participants who have not attended Universities in their home countries for some time.
8. Money allowances at all major training sites should be reviewed and adjusted by AID in light of current cost of living information.

Final Notes

It is of interest that there are no simple, consistent, overall patterns of responses by participants from different world regions, in different fields of training, or programmed by different agencies, on the eight factors which were found to be related to participant satisfactions. That is, participants from no particular region, field of training, or participating agency are consistently high, or low, on all of the items which are included in each of the eight factors. There are, however, meaningful and relevant differences in specific experiences and in specific evaluations between these different groupings of participants which are presented throughout this report.

Finally, the reader must remember that the effectiveness of these recommendations in influencing participant satisfactions is dependent upon maintaining (or improving) the standards of performance of all personnel--at USAIDS, in Washington, and at training sites--in other program aspects not mentioned as being significant in this report (e.g., as reflected in generally high participant satisfaction with travel arrangements). If these standards are not maintained, the relationships between the eight factors and participant satisfactions are also likely to change, and thus the recommendations will not be as effective in promoting greater participant satisfaction as they would otherwise be. In short, the gains to be expected from implementing the recommendations can be offset by losses from becoming lax in other program areas.

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. The 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. The 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. Sex	7
	D. Years of Prior Education	8

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)	23.0
2	42.7
3	21.8
4	7.9
5	3.1
6	.7
7 (Not at all satisfied)	.5
TOTAL N	
	(2418)

*Ratings given by 2 participants were not made according to instructions and could not be included in the total.

About 2 out of 3 participants (65.7%) checked one of the top two 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 4.3% of the participants rated their overall satisfaction below the middle of the scale.

Section B

The 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		
	Acad	Spec	Team
1	21.0	28.7	16.1
2	44.7	41.0	42.8
3	22.8	19.0	25.7
4	6.9	7.4	9.9
5-7	4.7	3.8	5.5
TOTAL N (2418)	(795)	(1015)	(608)*

*Ratings given by 2 participants were not made according to instructions and could not be included in the total.

33% of the participants interviewed at DETRI were in Academic training programs, 42% were in Special training programs, and 25% were in Observation training.

Special participants gave slightly more 1 and 2 ratings to their satisfaction with their training programs, while participants in Observation training less often gave 1 ratings and slightly more often gave ratings below the middle of the scale. This may be due, in part, to the fact that Observation training participants express their overall satisfaction ratings anonymously and thus feel freer to be critical.

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
	Agric	I&M	Tr	H&S	Ed	PA	Lab	
1	21.1	28.9	28.1	27.2	21.0	21.8	21.3	
2	44.1	36.5	42.3	47.4	43.9	39.6	43.1	
3	22.6	22.0	20.9	16.4	24.2	22.8	20.9	
4	8.4	6.3	6.6	6.5	6.9	11.1	7.9	
5-7	3.7	6.3	2.0	2.3	4.0	4.7	6.7	
TOTAL N	(478)	(159)	(196)	(213)	(476)	(513)	(239)	(2274)*

* 144 participants were in miscellaneous fields of training and are not included in this table. Ratings given by 2 participants were not made according to instructions and are also excluded from the table.

About 20% of the participants were in each of the fields of Public Administration (21.2%), Agriculture (19.7%), and Education (19.7%). Less than 10% were in the fields of Industry and Mining, Transportation, Health and Sanitation, and Labor.

Almost 3 out of 4 of the participants in the field of Health and Sanitation (74.6%) gave high satisfaction ratings with their training programs (either "1" or "2" on the scale). This was a higher percentage than for participants in other fields. Participants in Public Administration least often gave "1" or "2" ratings (61.4%) and gave slightly more ratings below the middle of the scale than did participants in other fields.

Section D

Overall Satisfaction of Participants Programmed by Different Government Agencies

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

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE (%) BY GOVERNMENT AGENCY								TOTAL N
	AID	Agric	FAA	PHS	Labor	IRS	Ed	Other	
1	24.3	18.8	34.6	21.2	24.4	20.0	18.2	23.5	
2	40.5	44.3	45.8	48.5	40.4	41.0	51.0	41.3	
3	22.0	23.8	13.1	22.4	22.2	19.0	23.3	22.1	
4	8.2	9.4	4.7	4.2	6.7	13.0	5.2	8.4	
5-7	5.0	3.7	1.9	3.6	6.3	6.0	2.2	4.7	
TOTAL N	(1064)	(404)	(107)	(165)	(225)	(99)	(137)	(213)	(2414)

1-4

Participants programmed by AID composed almost 1/2 of the total number of participants. The only other agency that programmed over 10% of the total was the Department of Agriculture, with 16.7%.

Participants programmed by the Federal Aviation Administration most often gave "1" or "2" ratings for their satisfaction with their training programs (80.4%). Participants programmed by the Internal Revenue Service appear to be least satisfied with their training programs with 60% rating it "1" or "2" and 19% rating it below the middle of the scale, a higher percentage than for participants programmed by any other agency.

Section E

The 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			
	NESA	FE	LA	AFR
1	22.6	22.9	20.9	26.7
2	38.1	45.3	46.5	40.9
3	23.6	21.4	21.7	19.6
4	8.9	7.1	7.6	7.8
5-7	6.6	3.3	3.2	4.8
TOTAL N*	(650)	(481)	(593)	(647)

*45 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 2 participants were not made according to instructions and could not be included in the total.

A slightly larger number of participants came from the Near East-South Asia and Africa than from either Latin America or the Far East.

Participants from the Near East-South Asia slightly less often gave high (1 or 2) satisfaction ratings and slightly more often gave low (4 to 7) ratings than did participants from the other regions.

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	2.2	.9	6.1
2	15.4	3.3	51.3
3	10.9	7.2	22.0
4	10.6	10.2	11.5
5 - 7	12.5	14.4	7.0
8 - 11	10.5	13.3	2.1
12 - 15	12.8	17.1	0.0
16 - 24	13.2	17.6	0.0
25 or more	11.9	15.9	0.0
TOTAL N	(2417)	(1807)	(610)

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 is presented in Part II.

More than 1/4 of the participants (28.5%) had training programs lasting 3 months or less. About half of the participants (51.6%) remained in this country for 7 months or less, the median stay being between 7 and 8 months. Most of the Observation Training Team participants (57.4%) had programs lasting 2 months or less, whereas 60.8% of the Academic and Special participants had programs of 5 or more months duration.

Section B

Age

Q. What were the participants' ages?

AGE	PERCENTAGE %
21-27	15.7
28-30	18.5
31-34	17.0
35-39	18.3
40-45	16.4
46 and over	14.2

TOTAL N	(2382)

The participants were evenly distributed over the age scale. Over half of the participants were under 35. The median age of the participants interviewed at DETRI was 34 years, 8 months.

Section C

Sex

Q. What sex were the participants?

SEX	PERCENTAGE %
Male	88.0
Female	12.0

TOTAL N	(2420)

8 out of 9 participants were males.

Section D

Years of Prior Education

Q. How much education did the participants have? (Item 128)

YEARS OF EDUCATION	PERCENTAGE %
6 or less	2.3
7-11	10.0
12	10.0
13-15	26.7
16	20.0
17-18	21.0
19 or more	9.8

TOTAL N	(2279)

87.5% of the participants had the equivalent of a U.S. high school education (12 years of schooling) or more. 50.8% of the participants had the equivalent of a U.S. college education (16 years of schooling) or more. 26.7% had between 13 and 15 years of formal education. The median number of years of education was about 16.

PART 2

PARTICIPANTS IN ACADEMIC AND SPECIAL/OJT PROGRAMS

PREFACE

Part 2 of the Annual Report is based on data from 1810 Academic and Special program participants. They include 859 participants for whom questionnaire and interview data were presented in the first Descriptive Statistical Report, May, 1968, and 951 participants who were interviewed at DETRI between February 1 and August 31, 1968. Thus, since nearly half of the sample of participants on whom data are presented in this part of the Annual Report were described in our previous research report, it is to be expected that many of the more general descriptive findings are similar in the two research reports. The larger number of participants in the Annual Report permit the tentative conclusions in the Descriptive Report to be expanded and made more definitive. Throughout Part 2 of this report, significant differences between participants are presented as narrative statements below the tables. The differences presented are those which are highly reliable and meaningful. In addition to providing more definitive descriptive information, the larger number of participants also allowed more refined statistical analyses of the data. These statistical analyses are described in detail in the technical supplement which concludes this part of the report. The basic purpose of these analyses is to account for the principal satisfactions and dissatisfactions of the 1810 Academic and Special participants. 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 Conclusions	
A. Technical and Social-Personal Criteria	1
B. Academic and Special Participants' Satisfactions With Their Technical Training Programs	2
C. Academic and Special Participants' Satisfactions With Social-Personal Aspects of Their U.S. Sojourns	7
D. General Conclusions	9
II Academic And Special Participants' Backgrounds And Training Programs	
A. The Regions the Participants Came From and the Kinds of Training They Received	14
B. The Education, Age, Marital Status, and Sex of the Participants.	20
III Participants' Views On Planning And Anticipation About Utilization Of Their Training	
A. Participants' Satisfactions and Difficulties with Program Planning	24
B. Participants' Ideas About Utilization of Training and USAID Assistance	32
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	39
B. Reactions of Participants in Special Programs to Non-Substantive Aspects of Study in Their Field of Training.	47

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>	
V	Participants' Personal And Social Experiences In The United States	
	A. Participants' Friendships and Social Activities in the United States. . . .	57
	B. Participants' Personal and Social Problems in the United States. . . .	63
	C. Participants' Use of Advisors and Special Services for Personal and Social Needs	66
VI	Participants' Views On English Language Training, Orientation Programs, And Special Communication Seminars	
	A. Participants' Use and Evaluation of English Language Training	69
	B. Participants' Experience With and Evaluation of Orientation Programs . .	75
	C. Participants' Experience With and Evaluation of Special Communication Seminars	78
VII	Participants' Views On Administrative Arrangements Associated With Their Training Programs	
	A. Participants' Experiences Prior to Departure for the United States. . . .	84
	B. Participants' Problems With Travel Arrangements	86
	C. Participants' Experiences, Problems, and Evaluations in Regard to Living Arrangements	88
	D. Participants' Problems With Money Allowances	96
VIII	Individual, Oral Interviews	
	A. Rapport With Participants and Credibility of Their Questionnaire Responses	98

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 AID 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 yard sticks which measure the outcomes of participant training.

Five evaluative scales and interviewer ratings were found to cluster together to form the technical training criterion of satisfaction (see Figure 1), while two others formed the social-personal criterion of satisfaction (see Figure 2). Other evaluative ratings and scales analyzed were not included in the two criterion measures because the data on them did not consistently group with the above two criteria, or into meaningful categories.

1. Gollin, 1966.

Figure 1

CRITERION — TECHNICAL

1. Satisfaction with training program as a whole
2. Satisfaction with planning
3. Utility of training for achieving training objectives
4. Change needed in program at training site
5. Change needed in planning of training

Figure 2

CRITERION —SOCIAL-PERSONAL

1. Sense of personal adjustment while in the United States
2. Interviewer rating of changes in participants' feelings about the United States

Section B

Academic and Special Participants' Satisfactions
With Their Technical Training Programs

Table 1

How satisfied were the participants with their training program as a whole? (Item 120)

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely satisfied)	25.4
2	42.7
3	20.5
4	7.3
5	2.7
6	.8
7 (Not at all satisfied)	.6

The majority of Academic and Special participants (68.1%) expressed a high degree of satisfaction with their training program as a whole, rating it at the top, or at the second highest position on the scale. Only 4.1% of these participants rated their training program satisfaction below the middle of the scale.

Participants from the Near East-South Asia more often used the ratings 3 to 7 on the satisfaction scale, indicating less overall satisfaction with their training programs than did participants from the Far East, Latin America, and Africa.

The participants in Special training programs more often used the highest rating (extremely satisfied, training program could not have been better) than did participants in Academic training programs.

Participants in the fields of Agriculture, Transportation, and Health and Sanitation more often used the ratings 1 or 2, expressing a high degree of overall satisfaction with their entire training programs, than did participants in other fields of training.

The participants programmed by the Federal Aviation Administration gave more 1 ratings and fewer 5-7 ratings, indicating greater overall satisfaction with their training programs, than did participants programmed by any other agency.

Since Academic and Special program participants usually have very different training experiences, the analyses of factors which might account for satisfactions with technical training were done separately for these two groups of participants. In these analyses, a group of 22 factors (see Technical Supplement) that were determined in other studies² to be systematically related to foreign trainees' evaluations of U.S. training programs were statistically examined.

2. See bibliography.

For Academic program participants, it was found that 5 of the 22 factors were significantly related to participants' satisfactions with their technical training. When used together, these 5 factors correlated $+0.41^3$ with the criterion. Basically, this means that, other things being equal, participant satisfactions with their technical training can be increased if their "scores" on these five 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 favorably and systematically related to his training objectives; (2) the Academic participant's successful accommodation to life in the United States, the degree to which he related to Americans, participated in activities, and used program services; (3) a lack of English language problems; (4) attendance at a Pre-university Workshop; and (5) the sense of involvement by the Academic participant of himself and his supervisor in the planning of his technical training program.

For the participants who had Special training programs, 3 of the 22 factors were significantly related to technical training program satisfactions. Taken together, these three factors correlated $+0.44$ with the criterion. They were, in order of statistical significance: (1) the extent to which the Special program participant considered his observation training visits to be favorably and systematically related to his training objectives; (2) the Special program

3. 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.

participant's successful accommodation to life in the United States, the degree to which he related to Americans, participated in activities, and used program services; and (3) the sense of involvement by the Special participant of himself and his supervisor in the planning of his technical training program.

Thus, of the 22 factors, 2 were significantly related to the technical training satisfactions of both Academic and Special program participants — program relevance and planning involvement.

Ten background variables (see Figure 3) that other studies⁴ have shown to be important in accounting for foreign student satisfactions and dissatisfactions with U.S. training programs also were examined for systematic relationships to the criterion measures. As a first step in the examination, the statistical relationship of the variables directly to the criterion was computed. A low order ($R = +.15$) relationship was determined, with age and marital status being the two significant variables (the older, married participants were more satisfied).

Figure 3

BACKGROUND FACTORS

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

4. See bibliography.

More important, however, these background variables were examined in terms of the influence which they had on the relationships between the technical training satisfaction scores of the Academic and Special participants and the significant factors identified earlier. For example, does a participant's field of training modulate, in any way, the importance of program relevance or planning involvement to his technical training satisfactions?

Although the number of participants in each category do not permit definitive conclusions, the tentative results of this analysis suggest that for Academic program participants, improvement on the 5 significant factors (see page 2-4) will be most important to the technical training satisfaction of those who are in Public Administration and who are older. For the Special program participants improvement on the 3 significant factors (see pages 2-4 & 5) should be most important to technical training satisfaction of those in Agriculture, from smaller cities and rural areas, who have not traveled extensively outside their home countries, and who have had fewer years of education. Future analyses will pay particular attention to participants with these characteristics.

For both the Academic and Special program participants, it was found that "money problems in the United States" was more strongly related to the technical training criterion for the second half of the 1810 participants, than for the first half. For the Special program participants, the factor "observation training visits overscheduled," was moderately related to technical training satisfaction. Both of these factors will be closely watched in future analyses.

Section C

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

Table 2

How comfortable and welcome did the participants feel in the United States? (Item 94)

COMFORT/WELCOME RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely comfortable)	36.2
2	31.6
3	16.2
4	9.5
5	3.6
6	1.5
7 (Not at all comfortable)	.9

About 1 out of 3 participants (36.2%) felt "extremely comfortable and always welcome" in the United States. 84% of the participants rated their feelings of comfort and welcome above the middle of the scale.

Participants from Africa less often rated their feelings of comfort in the United States high on the scale than did the participants from any other region. Only about 1 African participant in 4 (26.9%) indicated that he felt "extremely comfortable and always welcome" in the United States (1 rating). Participants from the Near East-South Asia and from Latin America most often felt comfortable and welcome in the United

States.

Participants in Special training programs gave proportionately twice as many ratings of 1 (extremely comfortable, always felt welcome) as did the Academic program participants. More than 1 in 5 participants (22.5%) in Academic training programs rated their feeling of comfort in the United States at or below the middle of the scale.

Participants programmed by the Federal Aviation Administration more often rated their feelings of comfort and welcome in the United States at 1 (extremely comfortable, always felt welcome) than did participants programmed by any other agency. Proportionately more participants programmed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture gave low ratings (5-7 on the scale) than did participants programmed by any other agency.

Two of the 22 factors were found to be significantly related to the participants' and interviewers' ratings on the social-personal criterion (see Figure 2). These 2 factors correlated +.60 with the criterion. The factors in order of statistical significance are: (1) the participant's not experiencing discrimination in the United States; and (2) the participant's having few housing problems in the United States. In addition to these 2 factors, 3 others were moderately related. These were: (1) living with Americans and other foreign nationals other than with fellow countrymen; (2) experiencing home hospitality in the United States; and (3) accommodating to life in the United States by participating in activities, making American friends, and using program services.

It was found that the 10 background variables (see Figure 3) related more strongly to participants' and interviewer ratings making up the social-personal criterion than they did with the technical training criterion. However, again, the relationship between the background factors and the social-

personal criterion was significantly weaker than the relationship of the 2 significant factors (above) with that criterion. Tentative results suggests that participants for whom improvements on discrimination and housing factors will be most important are those who come from Africa, and who have longer sojourns in the United States.

Section D

General Conclusions

The results of the analyses and cross-breaks reported in this section suggest the following program recommendations:

1. It is extremely important that both Academic and Special program participants understand the relevance of various aspects of their technical training to their training program objectives. If they feel that some of the courses they attend, the field trips that they make, or the on-the-job work experience they have had are not clearly (directly or indirectly) related to their training objectives and the needs and resources of their home countries, they are likely to be more dissatisfied with their entire technical training program than those who do not report such problems of relevance.

Frequently, the participant is unfamiliar with the AID or Participating Agency reasons for requiring him to take particular courses, attend certain institutions, make various site visits, and so forth. In other cases, he may feel that some phases of the program as described to him at the Mission or in Washington are not the same as the program he experiences at his training site(s).

To increase participant satisfaction with the technical aspects of their training programs, increased efforts to relate each participant's specific training program content

and location to the objectives of his training program, as he understands them, should be made at the USAIDs, in Washington, and at the training sites. Extensive discussions in the participant's home country and Washington and frequent communication with the participant while he is in the field will increase his understanding of the relevance of the various aspects of his training program, and give him a greater sense of participation in the development of his training program. It will also enable program planners and training site personnel to become more familiar with the individual participant's interests, expectations, and backgrounds. Immediate and honest communication can correct misperceptions and solve problems, and thus improve the satisfaction of the participants with their technical training programs.

2. Participant satisfaction with both the technical training program and the social-personal aspects of their U.S. experience are highly related to their participation in life in the United States. Participants who feel alienated or isolated, either by choice or by circumstance, from Americans and American social activities are less satisfied than participants who have taken part in U.S. social, cultural and recreational activities.

Generally, participants will take advantage of opportunities for social and personal activities which are provided for them. When these activities involve interacting with Americans, as in home hospitality programs, other studies show that both the participants and their American hosts typically benefit from the opportunity to become acquainted.

In most cases, participants who are unsure of themselves in the new culture benefit from living in an American home or with Americans in dormitories. Unfortunately, the anxieties of such participants often lead them to avoid Americans, and to live and socialize with fellow-countrymen. The tendency of many participants to live primarily with

people from their home country should generally be discouraged, as this decreases these participants' opportunities to interact with Americans and take part in American life.

It is recommended that more social, cultural, and recreational activities be made available and be allowed for by increasing the amount of free time in the participant's training program. In the case of some participants this may require specifically programming more free time during the training sojourn, so that the participant perceives that time is available to take part in more social and cultural activities. Interspersing such free time so that the participant who has a short and tightly scheduled program can sight-see and go to social and cultural events, often will greatly influence his feelings about all aspects of his U.S. sojourn.

3. Frequently, a single dramatic incident involving some kind of discrimination will color the participant's overall impressions of the United States and his personal adjustment while he is living here. It is admittedly difficult and in most cases, undesirable to protect or isolate participants from all possible unpleasant situations that they may encounter. However, it should be possible to better prepare participants for such situations. It is suggested that specific information on some of the more common types of discrimination that may occur during the sojourn be presented to the participant both in his home country by former AID participants and during his orientation to the United States in Washington, D.C.

The more specific and realistic the information and advice given can be, the more useful most participants are likely to find it. Vague generalities about such things

as dishonest landlords or hostile American minority groups or self-deprecating statements by Americans are likely to be over-reacted to by some participants and to heighten rather than alleviate negative reactions to unpleasant events that may occur. Comparisons of minority group problems in various countries, including the participant's own, are often useful in providing perspective.

4. Housing problems that do not involve discrimination might be reduced by providing participants lists of available private and institutional housing at training sites where they will be living for longer periods of time. These lists would provide information on things such as cooking facilities, cost, location relative to training institution, availability of public transportation, type of neighborhood, other residents and their characteristics, and so forth. During orientations given at the training sites, the advantages and disadvantages of living in different accommodations could be discussed and specific addresses made available at the participant's request.

At training locations where participants will be staying for shorter periods of time, (e.g., Special program participants on observation visits) or when participants will arrive at training sites too late to have much choice of accommodations, reservations could be made at places that previous participants of similar backgrounds have found to be desirable. Whenever such reservations are made, participants should be told the basis on which arrangements have been made, the alternatives available, and permitted to make other choices, if feasible.

5. Academic participants have benefitted from attendance at Pre-University Workshops and English language training programs. To the extent that the program officer in charge of a participant's program feels that the participant is unfamiliar with American University routines and procedures

or lacks necessary language skills, more time and money should be budgeted to allow such participants to prepare more adequately for their training program before they reach their first training site.

All of these suggestions are made at a general level. For more detail, the reader is urged to read the remainder of Part 2 of this report.

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	29.2
FE	24.2
LA	14.2
AFR	32.4
TOTAL N	(1810)

Approximately 60% of the Academic and Special participants came from Africa and the Near East-South Asia. The Far East contributed about 25% and Latin America contributed about 15% of the individual participants interviewed between 17 July 1967 and 31 August 1968. (Latin America contributed a majority of the observation training teams, see page 3-8.)

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

TYPE OF PROGRAM	PERCENTAGE %
ACAD	43.9
SPEC	56.1

TOTAL N	(1810)

About 4 out of every 7 participants (56.1%) had Special training programs.

More Academic participants came from Africa than from any other region. More Special participants came from the Near East-South Asia than from any other region. Latin America had the fewest participants in both types of training programs.

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

FIELD OF TRAINING	PERCENTAGE (%) IN TYPE OF PROGRAM	
	Acad	Spec
Ag	22.3	16.9
I&M	4.3	13.8
Tr	1.3	19.1
H&S	8.8	11.1
Ed	44.3	9.6
PA	19.0	29.5
TOTAL N (1648)*	(759)*	(889)*

* 162 Academic and Special participants were in other fields of training that accounted for less than 3% of the total and are not included in this table. This table and the table on sojourn length (Page 2-18) 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 (44.3%) and the lowest proportion of the participants in Special programs (9.6%) were in Education. Public Administration was the field of training for a somewhat higher proportion of the Special participants while Agriculture had proportionately more Academic participants. The fields of Industry and Mining, and Transportation together accounted for approximately 1 out of 3 of the special participants, but only 6% of the Academic participants.

Nearly 75% of the participants in Agriculture and about 35% of the participants in Education were from Africa. Over 2 out of 3 of the participants in Industry and Mining, Transportation, Health and Sanitation, and Public Administration were from the Far East or the Near East-South Asia. More of the Latin American participants were in Education than in any other field.

Q. What government agencies participated in the training programs?

PARTICIPATING AGENCY	PERCENTAGE %
AID	56.8
AGRIC	13.6
FAA	5.9
PHS	7.2
Other	16.5

TOTAL N	(1810)

The majority of the Academic and Special participants were handled only by AID. The Department of Agriculture was the participating agency which programmed the next highest percentage. No other agency handled more than 10% of the Academic and Special participants.

Almost 2 out of 3 participants from the Near East-South Asia and Latin America (65.6% each) and 3 out of 5 participants from the Far East (60%) were programmed by AID. 35% of the African participants were programmed by the Department of Agriculture and 43.5% by AID. Almost 20% of the Far Eastern participants were programmed by the Public Health Service.

A majority of both Academic and Special participants were handled by AID. Only 3 Academic participants were programmed by the Federal Aviation Administration, thus the Federal Aviation Administration is not included in the Academic tables.

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

LENGTH OF PROGRAM (Months)	PERCENTAGE (%)		
	TOTAL ACAD & SPEC	ACAD	SPEC
1 - 4	21.7	1.1	37.8
5 - 7	14.4	2.0	24.1
8 - 11	13.3	10.3	15.7
12 - 15	17.1	18.1	16.3
16 - 24	17.6	35.5	3.6
25 or more	15.9	32.9	2.6
TOTAL N	(1807)	(794)	(1013)

The majority (61.9%) of Special participants interviewed by DETRI were in the United States for less than 8 months. Only about 1 out of 5 (22.5%) Special participants was in the United States for 1 year or more. About 1 out of 3 (32.9%) Academic participants was in the United States for more than 2 years. Only 13.4% of the Academic participants interviewed by DETRI had sojourns lasting less than 1 year. The median length of sojourn for Special participants was between 6 and 7 months, for Academic participants was between 20 and 21 months.

About 1 out of 4 (25.2%) African participants had training programs that were over 2 years in length, a much higher proportion than of participants from other regions. Participants from the Near East-South Asia and the Far East more often than participants from other regions had sojourns lasting 7 months or less. 1 out of 3 (31.0%) Latin American participants stayed in this country between a year and 15

months.

As would be expected, very few Academic participants had stays of less than 8 months (3.1%). 68.4% stayed in the United States over 15 months. Conversely, a majority of participants in Special training programs (61.9%) had sojourns of less than 8 months in length and only about 6% stayed more than 15 months.

Participants in the fields of Agriculture and Education more frequently had longer sojourns than participants in other fields (26.3% of the participants in Agriculture had training programs over 2 years in length; 85.2% of the participants in Education had training programs over 15 months). A majority of the participants in Transportation (61.4%) and in Industry and Mining (58.9%) had sojourns of less than 8 months.

Participants programmed by the Federal Aviation Administration more often had shorter stays in the United States than did participants programmed by other agencies. 57.9% had sojourns of less than 8 months. Those programmed by the Public Health Service most frequently had longer sojourns (41.6% stayed over 16 months).

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 128)*

YEARS OF EDUCATION	PERCENTAGE %
7-11	17.6
12	15.8
13-15	13.5
16	21.4
17-18	21.2
19 and over	10.5

TOTAL N	(1810)

*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.

About 2 out of 3 participants have had more than the equivalent of a United States high school education. Over 30% of the participants have had more years of education than a U.S. college graduate. The median number of years of education was 16.

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

The proportion of participants in Special training programs who fall into the 7-11 years of education category is larger than the proportion of Academic training program participants having the same number of years of education.

50% of the participants in Transportation had 12 years of education or less, which is a larger proportion than for any other field of training. Participants in Industry and Mining, Health and Sanitation, and Public Administration more often reported having 16 years of education or more than did participants in any other field.

Q. What were the ages of the participants? (Item 122)

AGE	PERCENTAGE %
27 or less	17.1
28-30	20.5
31-34	17.6
35-39	17.3
40-45	15.0
46 or more	12.5

TOTAL N	(1810)

Over one-half of the participants were under 35 (55%). About 1 participant out of 8 was over 45 years of age. The median age of the participants was between 31 and 34 years.

The participants from 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. 25% of the participants in the field of Transportation reported they were over 45 years old.

Q. What was the marital status of the participants? (Item 124)

MARITAL STATUS	PERCENTAGE RESPONDING %
Single	36.6
Married	62.4
Other	1.0

TOTAL N	(1810)

About 2 out of 3 participants were married.

Only about 55% of the Latin American and African participants were married, while almost 75% of the participants from the Near East-South Asia were married.

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

Q. What was the sex of the participants? (Item 123)

SEX	PERCENTAGE %
Male	87.3
Female	12.7

TOTAL N	(1810)

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.

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

Section A

Participants' Satisfaction and
 Difficulties with Program Planning

Q. How satisfied were the participants with the planning of their training programs? (Item 29)

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely satisfied)	20.5
2	33.8
3	23.3
4	12.5
5	5.5
6	2.8
7 (Not at all satisfied)	1.3
TOTAL N	
	(1810)

The majority (54.3%) of the participants rated their satisfaction with the planning of their training program at 1 or 2. However, 1 participant out of 5 rated his satisfaction at, or below, the middle of the scale.

The Special participants were more highly satisfied with the planning of their training programs than were the Academic participants.

Q. What parts of the training program did participants recall as being planned in detail before they reached their training sites? (Item 19)

PART RECALLED AS PLANNED	PERCENTAGE* %
Objectives	91.5
Total length	90.0
Location(s)	85.8
Substance	75.5
Advisors	66.7
Utilization	60.3
Time allotted to parts of training	55.2
Required reports	54.0

TOTAL N	(1373)

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

23.3% of the participants did not recall any part of their training program as being planned in detail before they reached their first training site. Of the participants who did recall some parts as being planned, about 9 out of 10 reported the objectives (91.5%), the total length (90%), and location (85.6%) of the training program as being planned in advance of their arrival at training sites. Over 2 out of 3 of these participants indicated they knew about the content of their training program (75.5%) and

whom to inform about training program problems (66.7%) before they arrived. Plans for utilization of training in the home country (60.3%), time allotted to each part of the training program (52.2%), and training reports required (54%) were recalled as being planned in advance by more than half of these participants.

Participants programmed by the Federal Aviation Administration more often said their training programs were planned in detail before they reached their first training site than participants programmed by other agencies.

Q. What kinds of problems did the participants report with the planning of their training programs?* (Item 28)

PROBLEM WITH PLANNING	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING**		
	Very True	Somewhat True	Not True
Not enough personal participation	19.1	27.1	53.8
Did not allow enough time for training	16.1	26.2	57.7
Lack of information on content	15.9	24.4	59.6
Plan too rigid	11.9	20.6	67.4
Lack of information on site	12.7	19.0	68.1
Plan not suited to H.C.	5.0	23.1	71.1
Not enough participation by supervisor(s)	8.9	19.4	71.6
Plan not suited to expected use	4.1	19.9	75.9
Plan not suited to previous training	5.0	14.2	80.6
Plan not completed soon enough	6.0	11.8	82.0
TOTAL N	(1810)		

*Planning includes both USAID and AID/Washington programming.

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

The 3 problems with planning most often mentioned by participants were lack of personal participation (46.2%), and not enough time allowed for the training program (42.3%), and lack of information on content (40.4%). The 2 problems least of ten mentioned were that the plan was not suited to the participants' previous training (19.4%) and that it was not completed in time (17.8%). About 1 participant out of

4 felt he had some problem with the training plan not being suited to his home country conditions or its expected use.

From data not shown in the above table, it was found that 8 out of 9 participants (88.1%) wished to participate in the planning of their training programs. Also these data show that about 1 out of 3 of the participants (33.8%) felt they were not personally involved in the planning of their training programs, while about 1 out of 4 (27.1%) felt they participated a great deal. More specifically, participants from Latin America and the Far East more often felt they were personally involved in the planning of their training program than did the participants from the Near East-South Asia and Africa. Special participants more often felt personally involved than did Academic participants.

Q. Who else did the participants believe took part in planning their training programs? (Item 21)

PERSONS	PERCENTAGE (%) REPORTING PERSONS PARTICIPATED*			
	Much	Some	None	No Knowledge
USAID technician	56.1	32.0	9.9	2.0
AID PDO	52.5	24.9	12.8	9.7
Personnel at training site	39.5	28.0	12.9	19.6
Other U.S. PO	34.9	16.9	21.0	27.4
Participant's supervisor	33.0	33.8	22.5	10.7
Home government official	12.9	20.8	37.2	29.6
TOTAL N	(1340)			

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

The 1340 participants who answered this question felt that AID officials both in their home country and in the United States were most involved in the planning of their training programs. About 90% of these participants thought that USAID personnel participated to some extent in the planning of their training programs. About 80% of them thought personnel at the training sites were involved, while 2 out of 3 thought their supervisors were involved in the planning. Home government officials were least often thought to be involved in program planning.

Of the 1176 participants who reported on their supervisors' participation in the planning of their programs, the Latin American participants less often felt that their supervisors were so involved than did participants from the other 3 regions.

Of the 933 participants who reported on home government officials' participation in the planning of their training programs, the participants from Latin America and the Far East more often said that these officials had participated than did participants from other world regions.

Q. What changes did the Academic participants request in their training programs? (Items 48 & 49a)

CHANGE REQUESTED	PERCENTAGE* %
None	58.6
Length of program	21.8
Major field of study	12.1
Academic institution	10.5

TOTAL N	(795)

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

Over half the Academic participants did not request any changes in their training program (58.6%). The change most frequently asked for by those making requests was a change in the length of the training program (21.8%). About 1 participant out of 8 (12.1%) requested a change in his major field of study, i.e., the subject he was majoring in, while about 1 participant out of 10 asked to change his academic institution.

About 2 out of 3 Academic participants (67.1%) did not experience any changes in their training programs after they began. The change most frequently noted was in the length of the training program (19.2%). 1 participant out of 10 changed the subject he was majoring in after his training program began.

Q. What changes did the Special participants request in their training programs? (Items 56 & 57)

CHANGE REQUESTED	PERCENTAGE* %
None	58.9
Observation training visits	16.5
Length of program	16.4
On-the-job work experience	10.3
Classroom training	8.8
Institution	5.0

TOTAL N	(1015)

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

Almost 60% of the Special participants did not request any changes in their training program. The 2 changes most frequently asked for by those making requests were changes in their observation training visits (16.5%) and changes in the length of their training program (16.4%).

With regard to these two types of change, approximately the same percentage of Special participants reported that changes were actually made (18%). About 60% reported no changes of any kind were made.

Section B

Participants' Ideas about Utilization of Training and USAID Assistance

Q. How did the participants expect to use their training in their home countries? (Items 107 & 108)

TYPE OF EXPECTED USE OF TRAINING	PERCENTAGE %
Training others	59.4
Initiating projects	58.6
Changing on-going projects	42.0
Academic teaching	38.8
None of the above	5.6

TOTAL N	(1810)

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

Almost 3 out of 5 participants reported they expected to use their AID training to train others in specific work skills (59.4%) or to initiate new projects (58.6%). Only 5.6% indicated they would not use their training to instruct others or develop projects.

African participants more often said they would use their AID training to train others than did participants from other world regions. Participants from the Near East-South Asia less often said they would do so.

Proportionately fewer participants from the Near East-South Asia reported they would use their AID training in academic teaching than did participants from other regions.

Latin American participants more often said they would use their training in initiating new projects than did

participants from any other region. Participants from the Near East-South Asia less often had this expectation. Latin American participants also more often expected to use their AID training in changing on-going projects than did participants from any other region.

Special participants more often felt they would be changing on-going projects than did Academic participants.

Participants in the fields of Agriculture, Transportation, and Health and Sanitation more often felt they would use their training to train others than did participants in other fields.

As expected, many more participants in the field of Education said they would use their AID training in academic teaching than did participants in other fields, especially in comparison with those in Industry and Mining and in Transportation.

Participants in Agriculture more often said they expected to use their training in initiating new projects than did participants in any other field. Participants in Public Administration and Health and Sanitation less often felt they would do so.

Q. How much of their AID training did the participants expect to use right away on their jobs? (Item 109)

AMOUNT USABLE RIGHT AWAY	PERCENTAGE %
None	1.0
A little	6.4
Some	48.5
A great amount	43.9

TOTAL N	(1810)

92% of the participants indicated that they expected to use "some" or "a great amount" of their AID training right away on their jobs.

Participants from the Near East-South Asia and the Far East more often thought either "none" or "a little" of their AID training could be used right away than did participants from the other regions. African participants more often thought "a great amount" of their AID training would be useful right away than did other participants.

Q. How much of their AID training did the participants expect to use eventually on their jobs? (Item 110)

AMOUNT USABLE EVENTUALLY	PERCENTAGE %
None	.5
A little	3.7
Some	37.4
A great amount	58.1

TOTAL N	(1810)

Over 1/2 of the participants (58.1%) expected to use "a great amount" of their AID training eventually on their jobs.

African participants more often than participants from any other region felt that a great deal of their AID training would eventually be used on their jobs.

Proportionately more Academic participants said they would use "a great amount" of their AID training eventually than did Special participants.

Participants in Agriculture most often said they would use "a great amount" of their AID training eventually. Those in Public Administration least often felt they would do so.

Q. What problems do the participants expect to face in using their training when they return to their home countries? (Item 115)

PROBLEM EXPECTED	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING*		
	Very True	Somewhat True	Not True
Lack of money	28.0	42.2	29.7
Lack of equipment and facilities	21.2	39.7	38.9
Resistance to change	13.5	47.0	39.3
Lack of qualified staff	16.3	42.3	41.3
Lack of support from higher officials	7.4	34.9	57.6
Lack of help from supervisor	5.0	26.8	68.0
Lack of time	5.6	25.4	68.8
TOTAL N	(1810)		

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

About 3 out of 5 participants expected to have some or much difficulty in using their training in their home countries due to lack of money (60.2%), lack of equipment, tools and facilities (60.9%), resistance to change (60.5%), and lack of qualified staff (58.6%). Less than 1 in 3 participants expected any difficulty due to lack of time (31.0%) or help from immediate supervisor (31.8%).

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 higher officials and (5) resistance to change than did participants from any other 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 resistance to change would be a problem in using their training than did participants from any other region.

From data not shown in the above table, it was found that about half the Academic participants who used instruments and equipment in their courses said these were not similar to instruments and equipment now available in their home countries, while about 40% of the Special participants who used instruments and equipment in their classroom training made this statement.

About 40% of the Special participants who used instruments and equipment in their on-the-job work experience said these were not similar to instruments and equipment now available in their home country in the near future.

Q. How many participants indicated that the USAID in their home country could help them use their training?
(Item 116)

USAID COULD HELP	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	61.1
No	38.8

TOTAL N	(1810)

About 3 out of 5 participants (61.1%) felt that the USAID could help them in using their AID training in their home country.

About half of the participants from the Near East-South Asia felt that the USAID in their home country could help them in using their training after they returned. This was less than the proportion of participants from the other regions expressing that view. Participants from Latin America most often felt that USAID could be of assistance upon their return.

Participants in the field of Agriculture most often thought USAID could help them upon their return. Those in Industry and Mining, Transportation and Public Administration least often felt USAID could be of assistance.

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 38)

EXPECTED DEGREE	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	78.4
No	21.5

TOTAL N	(795)

Nearly 4 out of 5 (78.4%) 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 37)

TYPE OF STUDENT	PERCENTAGE* %
Graduate student	63.1
Undergraduate student	29.5
Non-degree student	15.8

TOTAL N	(501)

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

Q. What degrees did the Academic participants earn in the U.S.? (Items 39 & 40)

U.S. DEGREE EARNED	PERCENTAGE* %
None	23.9
BA/BS	26.1
MA/MS	49.0
Ph.D.	4.4

TOTAL N	(795)

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

Over 3 out of 4 Academic participants (76.1%) earned academic degrees in the United States. The majority of those earning any degree received an MA or MS degree (64.9%).

Q. How satisfied were the Academic participants with the education they received in the United States? (Item 60)

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely satisfied)	29.1
2	39.1
3	20.0
4	7.4
5	2.4
6	.4
7 (Not at all satisfied)	1.4

TOTAL N	(795)

About 3 out of 10 Academic participants (29.1%) indicated they were "extremely satisfied" with their Academic program, and that it "could not have been better." Only 5.8% of the Academic participants rated their satisfaction with the Academic education at or below the middle point on the rating scale.

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

Q. How useful did Academic participants find the help provided by their Faculty Advisors? (Item 44)

UTILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely useful)	50.4
2	22.2
3	11.3
4	8.5
5	2.9
6	2.7
7 (Not at all useful)	1.6

TOTAL N	(737)

Over half the Academic participants who received help in scheduling courses from Faculty Advisors found their help "extremely useful," "could not have been better." 83.9% of these participants rated the utility of their advisors' help above the middle point on the scale.

Academic participants from Latin America and Africa gave higher (1 or 2) ratings to the utility of the assistance they received from their Faculty Advisors than did Academic participants from other regions. Near East-South Asia participants in Academic training more often gave ratings in the 5-7 range.

Q. How useful did the Academic participants find their separate courses? (Item 58)

UTILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely useful)	32.8
2	38.9
3	20.1
4	5.5
5	1.3
6	.9
7 (Not at all useful)	.2

TOTAL N	(795)

Almost 1 Academic participant out of 3 (32.8%) rated their classes as "extremely useful," "could not have been better." Over 90% (91.8%) rated the utility of their classes in achieving their training objectives above the middle point on the scale.

Q. How many Academic participants went on field trips during their training program? (Item 52)

HAD FIELD TRIP	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	79.8
No	20.1

TOTAL N	(795)

About 4 out of 5 Academic participants (79.8%) went on field trips during their training programs.

Q. How useful did the Academic participants find their field trips? (Item 53)

UTILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely useful)	40.0
2	28.0
3	18.2
4	8.6
5	2.8
6	1.4
7 (Not at all useful)	.6

TOTAL N	(634)

40% of the Academic participants who took field trips found them "extremely useful," "could not have been better." 86.2% of these participants rated the utility of the field trips above the middle point on the scale.

Q. What problems did the Academic participants have with their training programs? (Item 57)

PROBLEM WITH TRAINING	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING*		
	Very True	Somewhat True	Not True
Too much reading	17.4	41.9	40.5
Instruction too theoretical	6.9	37.7	55.4
Too many unrelated courses	8.5	23.7	67.6
Courses too advanced	1.6	30.4	67.9
Not enough discussion	4.3	26.7	68.9
Too much duplication	4.0	26.6	69.2
Courses too simple	1.6	21.3	76.9
Instruction too detailed	3.6	18.4	77.8
Not enough lecturing	2.9	15.8	81.2
Not enough reading	.3	5.0	94.5
TOTAL N	(795)		

*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. 59.5% felt they had too much reading to do, while only 5.3% indicated there was not enough assigned reading. The next most often noted problem was that instruction was too theoretical (34.65).

Participants in Academic training programs programmed by the Department of Agriculture least often felt that their courses were too advanced, and most often felt that they had too many courses unrelated to their major field and not enough classroom discussion.

Q. What recommendations did the Academic participants make regarding the educational techniques used in their training programs? (Item 59)

EDUCATIONAL TECHNIQUE	PERCENTAGE (%) RECOMMENDING*		
	Right Amount	More Needed	Less Needed
Lectures	75.4	14.6	9.9
Seminars	53.7	37.5	8.7
Individual research	52.1	44.0	3.7
Laboratory or shop work	47.7	47.6	4.6
Field trips	39.8	54.5	5.5
TOTAL N	(795)		

*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, 75.4% indicating it was about right. A majority (54.5%) of the participants suggested more field trips were needed, while over 40% suggested more laboratory or shop work and individual research.

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 36, 43 & 49)

KIND OF TRAINING	PERCENTAGE (%) HAVING TRAINING*	
	Yes	No
Observation training visits	94.9	5.0
Classroom	78.1	21.8
On-the-job work experience	46.6	53.3
TOTAL N	(1015)	

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

About 4 out of 5 participants (78.1%) in Special training programs received classroom training. All but 5% made observation training visits. More than half of the Special participants (53.3%) indicated that they received no on-the-job work experience in their training programs.

Participants in Special training programs in Education more often than Special participants in any other field had classroom training as part of their programs. The participants in Special training programs who least often had classroom training were those participants in Industry and Mining.

Special participants programmed by the Federal Aviation Administration more often reported having classroom training than those programmed by any other agency, including AID only.

The percentage of Special participants having on-the-job experience varied from 35.2% of those in the field of Industry and Mining to almost 60% of those in Agriculture.

Almost 70% of the Special participants programmed by the Federal Aviation Administration had on-the-job work experience. This is a higher percentage than for Special participants programmed by any other agency.

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 60)

KIND OF TRAINING	PERCENTAGE (%) RECOMMENDING*			TOTAL N
	Right Amount	More Needed	Less Needed	
On-the-job work experience	33.9	56.7	9.3	(774)
Classroom	47.2	35.9	16.7	(914)
Observation training visits	48.7	40.5	10.6	(945)

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

Over 50% of the Special participants responding to this question felt that they should be given more on-the-job work experience (56.7%). About half of the Special participants reporting felt they had had the right amount of classroom training (47.2%) and observation training visits (48.7%). Twice as many participants recommended more classroom training as those recommending less, while 6 times as many Special participants recommended more on-the-job experience as those recommending less.

Special participants in the field of Education more often than Special participants in any other training field felt that they had the right amount of classroom training and, conversely, least often felt that more such training was needed. Special participants in the field of Agriculture most frequently thought that more classroom training was needed.

Special participants programmed by the Public Health Service more often than those programmed by any other agency felt that they had the right amount of on-the-job work experience. Special participants programmed by the Department of Agriculture and AID more often thought that more observation training visits were needed.

Q. How useful did the Special participants find their observation training visits? (Item 48)

UTILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely useful)	33.6
2	34.7
3	17.3
4	9.2
5	5.2
6	0.0
7 (Not at all useful)	0.0

TOTAL N	(956)

More than 1 out of 3 (33.6%) Special participants felt their observation training visits were "extremely useful" and "could not have been better." About 6 out of 7 of these participants rated their observation training visits above the middle point on the scale (85.6%).

Three out of four Special participants in all fields except Industry and Mining and Public Administration gave high utility ratings (a 1 or 2 on the scale) to their observation training visits. In the field of Industry and Mining, about 60% gave such ratings, and in Public Administration, about 57% gave them.

Over 40% of the Special participants programmed by the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Aviation Administration rated their observation training visits as "1" (could not be better). Special participants programmed by AID more frequently gave ratings in the 3 to 7 range than did Special participants programmed by any other agency.

Q. What problems did the Special participants have on their observation training visits? (Item 47)

PROBLEM WITH TOUR VISITS	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING*		
	Very True	Somewhat True	Not True
Observation visits too short	14.7	35.2	50.1
Activities too similar	8.0	35.2	56.8
Did not visit important places	10.7	29.1	60.1
Visited unimportant places	8.1	26.6	65.2
Too many insignificant activities	4.1	19.2	76.7
Descriptions not clear	2.4	20.4	77.2
TOTAL N	(958)		

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

Over 40% of the Special participants indicated that their observation tour visits were not long enough (49.9%) and that the activities they observed were too similar (43.2%). About 1 out of 4 Special participants noted that too many insignificant activities were observed (23.3%) or that these activities were not clearly described (22.4%).

Special participants programmed by the Federal Aviation Administration less often than Special participants programmed by any other agency felt that there were important places they did not visit. Special participants programmed only by AID most often felt this way. 85% of the Special participants programmed by the Federal Aviation Administration said there were no places they visited that were unimportant to their training programs, a higher percentage than

that of other Special participants having observation training programmed by any other agency.

Almost 60% of the Special participants in the field of Health and Sanitation thought that activities they saw during their observation training visits were too similar. This is a higher percentage than those of Special participants in other fields of training. Special participants programmed by the Federal Aviation Administration least often felt that the activities they observed during their observation training visits were too similar.

Special participants programmed by AID more often than Special participants programmed by any other agency felt that their observation visits were long enough. Special participants programmed by the Public Health Service most often felt the visits were too short.

Special participants from the Far East more often than Special participants from any other region thought that descriptions of the activities they observed during their observation visits were not clear.

Q. How useful did the Special participants find their classroom training? (Item 42)

UTILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely useful)	32.6
2	34.1
3	18.4
4	8.3
5	6.6
6	0.0
7 (Not at all useful)	0.0

TOTAL N	(803)

About 1 out of 3 (32.6%) Special participants felt their classes were "extremely useful" and "could not have been better." About 85% of these participants rated their classroom training above the middle point on the scale.

About 98% of the Special participants in the field of Education gave 1, 2 or 3 ratings to their classroom training, a higher percentage than Special participants in any other field of training. Special participants in the field of Public Administration more often than did participants in any other field gave ratings below 3 (22.7%).

Q. What problems did the Special participants have with their classroom training? (Item 41)

PROBLEM WITH CLASSES	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING*		
	Very True	Somewhat True	Not True
Too much reading	11.1	27.4	61.3
Too general	7.9	28.8	63.1
Too much duplication	5.3	25.6	69.0
Too simple	6.3	24.4	69.1
Too advanced	3.0	26.1	70.7
Too many subjects	7.2	18.2	74.4
Not enough discussion	5.6	19.4	74.8
Too detailed	5.7	18.8	75.3
Not enough lecturing	5.8	18.1	76.0
Not enough reading	3.8	11.3	84.8
TOTAL N	(790)		

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

Assigned classroom reading was the most frequently mentioned problem. Whereas only 15.1% of the Special participants felt there was not enough assigned reading, 40% felt there was too much. All of the other problems listed presented difficulties for between 24% and 37% of the Special participants. One out of 3 Special participants found the level of instruction of his classroom training too general.

Only about 15% of the Special participants programmed by the Department of Agriculture felt that their courses were too advanced. About 50% of those programmed by the Public Health Service and over 40% of those programmed by the Federal Aviation Administration felt their courses were too advanced.

Q. How useful did the Special participants find their on-the-job work experience? (Item 55)

UTILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely useful)	43.4
2	32.4
3	12.4
4	5.9
5	5.9
6	0.0
7 (Not at all useful)	0.0

TOTAL N	(490)

4 out of 10 Special participants (43.4%) who had on-the-job work experience rated it "extremely useful," "could not have been better." 88.2% rated this training above the middle of the scale.

About half of the Special participants in the fields of Agriculture, Health and Sanitation, and Transportation gave "1" ratings (could not be better) to the utility of their on-the-job experience. Special participants in the field of Public Administration gave lower ratings to their on-the-job experience than did Special participants in any other field of training.

Q. What problems did the Special participants have in their on-the-job work experience? (Item 54)

PROBLEM WITH WORK EXPERIENCE	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING*		
	Very True	Somewhat True	Not True
Work too specialized	12.1	25.8	62.1
Work too advanced	6.5	25.8	67.7
Work too simple	5.3	20.5	74.0
Too little to do	8.1	17.3	74.4
Too little supervision	6.2	14.8	78.8
Work not specialized enough	4.0	15.8	80.1
Inadequate working conditions	5.0	13.2	81.7
Too much to do	5.3	12.5	82.2
Too much supervision	4.4	9.0	86.6
Lack of tools and equipment	1.6	6.2	92.2
TOTAL N	(480)		

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

Less than 20% of the Special participants indicated that they experienced a lack of tools and equipment (7.8%), too much supervision (13.4%) or too much to do (17.8%) in their on-the-job training. The two problems noted most frequently were that the work was too advanced (32.3%) or too specialized (38%).

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

Section A

Participants' Friendships and Social Activities
 in the United States

Q. What kinds of Americans did the participants have personal friendships with? (Items 84 & 85)

AMERICAN FRIENDS	PERCENTAGE* %
Students	67.5
Teachers	52.6
Other University staff	37.4
Job training instructors	35.1
Public officials	30.4
Businessmen	28.4
AID representatives	27.0
Farmers	20.0
None	5.9

TOTAL N	(1810)

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

Only 5.9% of the participants made no American friends during their sojourn. The 2 categories of Americans most often chosen as friends by the participants were students (67.5%) and teachers (52.6%).

Participants from Africa more often reported having made friends with Americans than did participants from any other region. Participants from the Near East-South Asia more often reported not having made American friends.

Q. Did the participants feel their friendships with Americans contributed to their training experience? (Item 86)

FRIENDSHIPS CONTRIBUTED	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	81.4
No	18.4

TOTAL N	(1679)

More than 4 out of 5 participants (81.4%) who had friendships with Americans felt that they contributed directly to improving their training experience.

Participants from Latin America more often reported that friendships with Americans improved their training experiences than did participants from any other region. Participants from the Near East-South Asia less often reported that American friendships contributed to their training experiences.

- Q. Did the participants take part in any social or recreational activities specially organized for them as AID participants? (Item 75)

HAD RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES ORGANIZED	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	70.3
No	29.6

TOTAL N	(1797)

About 70% of the participants reported they took part in social or recreational activities organized especially for them.

Participants in Special training programs more often reported having recreational or social activities organized especially for them than did participants in Academic training programs.

- Q. How much did the participants enjoy specially arranged (for them) social and recreational activities? (Item 79)

ENJOYMENT RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely enjoyable)	40.0
2	32.7
3	16.9
4	6.9
5	2.4
6	.4
7 (Not at all enjoyable)	.4

TOTAL N	(1245)

2 out of 5 participants (40%) who participated in specially arranged social activities found them "extremely enjoyable," "could not have been better." 89.6% of these participants rated the activities above the middle point on the scale.

Participants from Africa more often gave low ratings of enjoyment to the social activities arranged for them than did participants from any other region. Participants from the Near East-South Asia and Latin America more often reported high ratings of enjoyment.

Participants in Special training programs more often found the social activities arranged for them "extremely enjoyable, could not be better" (a 1 rating) than did participants in Academic training programs.

Q. What kinds of specially arranged social and recreational activities did the participants take part in? (Items 75, 76 & 77)

ACTIVITIES PARTICIPATED IN	PERCENTAGE* %
Visits to American homes	62.7
Dances	22.7
Parties	41.4
Picnics	35.8
No activities available	29.6
Did not participate	8.1

TOTAL N	(1810)

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

The social activity most often organized for and participated in by AID participants was visiting American

homes. About 2 out of 3 participants (62.7%) indicated they received home hospitality during their sojourn. 41.4% went to parties arranged for them and 35.8% to picnics. About 30% noted that no special social or recreational activities were organized for them, while 1 participant in 12 did not take part in activities which were organized.

Q. Who arranged the special social activities for the participants? (Item 78)

ACTIVITIES ARRANGED BY	PERCENTAGE* %
Program advisors	31.1
Church groups	20.5
University officials	26.6
Students	19.8
WIC volunteers	41.3
None arranged or no participation	37.7

TOTAL N	(1810)

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

Washington International Center volunteers were remembered by more participants for organizing special social activities than any other group (41.3%). The primary activity organized by these volunteers was visits to American homes.

Q. Did the participants join any formal organizations in the U.S., such as student or community clubs or professional societies? (Item 71)

JOINED	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	46.1
No	53.8

TOTAL N	(1810)

Almost half (46.1%) of the participants joined formal organizations in the U.S.

Participants from Africa more often reported joining formal organizations in the United States (such as student, community or professional societies) than did participants from any other region. Participants from the Near East-South Asia least often did so.

Section B

Participants' Personal and Social Problems
in the United States

Q. What personal and social problems did participants have during their stay in the United States? (Item 93)

PROBLEM EXPERIENCED	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING*		
	Very True	Somewhat True	Not True
Not enough money for recreation	20.6	42.7	36.6
Weather too cold	24.1	37.8	37.9
Homesickness	13.1	47.8	38.9
Not enough money to return hospitality	20.5	40.2	39.1
Loneliness	9.6	36.4	53.9
Food distasteful	8.7	37.1	54.0
Not enough time for unprogrammed activities	7.8	32.5	59.6
Not knowing manners	3.5	34.7	61.7
Racial discrimination against others	9.8	24.5	65.5
Weather too hot	7.3	24.1	68.5
Rude, unfriendly people	3.9	26.2	69.7
Racial discrimination against participant	5.9	17.9	76.1
Illness	3.3	16.6	80.0
Dishonest people	2.7	14.2	82.9
TOTAL N	(1810)		

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

The problems mentioned by more than half the participants were lack of money for recreation (63.3%), cold weather (61.9%), homesickness (60.9%), and lack of money to return hospitality (60.7%). Less than 1 participant in 4 experienced racial discrimination (23.8), was ill (19.9%), or dealt with dishonest people (16.9%).

(Participants' problems with money allowances will be discussed in more detail in Chapter VII.)

Weather in the United States

Participants from Africa more often reported problems with hot weather in the United States than did participants from any other region. Participants from the Far East, Latin America, and Africa more often reported problems with cold weather in the United States than did participants from the Near East-South Asia.

Proportionately more participants in Academic training programs reported problems with both hot and cold weather in the United States than did participants in Special training programs.

U.S. Food

Participants from the Far East much more often reported that U.S. food was distasteful than did participants from any of the other regions.

Time for Unprogrammed Activities

A higher proportion of participants from the Far East reported problems with insufficient time for unprogrammed activities in the United States than did participants from any of the other regions.

Proportionately more participants in Academic training programs reported that time for unprogrammed activities was insufficient than did participants in Special training programs.

U.S. Manners

A higher proportion of participants from the Far East

and Africa reported problems with not knowing expected manners in the United States than did participants from the Near East-South Asia and Latin America.

Racial Discrimination

Participants from Africa much more often reported (52.5%) having personal problems with racial discrimination and discrimination against others than did participants from any other region.

Rude or Unfriendly People

Participants from the Near East and South Asia less often reported problems with rude and unfriendly people than did participants from any other region. Participants from Africa and the Far East most often reported having such problems.

Dishonest People

Participants from Latin America and the Near East-South Asia less often reported having problems with dishonest people than did participants from any other region.

Loneliness, Homesickness, and Illness

Participants from the Far East most often reported problems with feeling lonely or homesick, and being ill in the United States, while participants from the Near East-South Asia least often reported such problems.

Section C

Participants' Use of Advisors and Special Services for Personal and Social Needs

Q. How many participants talked with a Foreign Student Advisor or Job Trainee Advisor? (Item 90)

TALKED WITH ADVISOR	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	69.8
No	30.2

TOTAL N	(1810)

About 2 participants out of 3 (69.8%) talked with a Foreign Student or Job Trainee Advisor.

Participants in Academic training much more often reported speaking with a Foreign Student Advisor than participants in Special training reported speaking to a Job Trainee Advisor.

Q. How available was the Foreign Student Advisor or Job Trainee Advisor to help the participant? (Item 91)

FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE %
Always available	54.8
Usually available	28.4
Sometimes available	16.5

TOTAL N	(1257)

Of the 1257 participants reporting having talked to an advisor, over half (54.8%) said that he was "always available" when they needed him.

Q. How useful did the participants find the help provided by their Foreign Student Advisor or Job Trainee Advisor? (Item 92)

UTILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely useful)	39.1
2	22.7
3	17.9
4	11.0
5	4.2
6	3.0
7 (Not at all useful)	1.7

TOTAL N	(1257)

39.1% of the participants who talked with a Foreign Student or Job Trainee Advisor found their advisor's help "extremely useful," "could not have been better" (1 rating). One participant in 5 rated the utility of the help at or below the middle point on the scale.

The participants in Special training programs rated the utility of the help provided by their advisors much higher than did participants in Academic training programs.

Q. What special services did the participants make use of? (Items 87, 88, & 89)

SERVICE USED	PERCENTAGE* %
None	42.5
Medical	50.9
Counselling	7.1
Legal	1.6

TOTAL N	(1800)

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

About 43% of the participants did not use any special service (8.3% of whom said they did not know where to get such services). 50.9% of the participants made some use of American medical services. Less than 10% used legal (1.6%) or counselling (7.1%) services.

Participants from the Far East more often reported not using any of these services than did participants from any other region.

Participants in Academic training programs more often reported using these services than did participants in Special training programs.

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

Section A

Participants' Use and Evaluation
 of English Language Training

Q. How many participants received special English language training for their trip, and where did they receive it? (Items 14 & 15)

ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING	PERCENTAGE %
No training	52.4
In home country only	19.1
In home country and U.S.	16.4
In U.S. only	12.4
TOTAL N	(1810)

Slightly more than 1/2 (52.4%) of the participants received no special English language training. Of those who did receive such training, more were instructed in their home countries (19.1%) than in the United States (12.4%). About 1 participant out of 6 (16.4%) had English language training both in 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 before they left for the United States than did participants from the Near East-South Asia and Africa.

60% of the Academic participants received special language training in English before leaving their country for the United States, 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 %
1 (Extremely useful)	31.3
2	21.5
3	23.5
4	12.4
5	6.8
6	2.1
7 (Not at all useful)	2.3

TOTAL N	(859)

About 1 out of 3 (31%) participants who received English language training found it "extremely useful" (1 rating). Over 70% rated the utility of their language training above the middle point on the scale.

Participants from the Far East gave higher utility ratings to their language training (1 and 2 on the scale) than did participants from any of the other regions.

Almost 60% of the Special participants receiving language training gave high (1 or 2) utility ratings to this training. This was a higher percentage than was given these ratings by Academic participants.

Those participants who received English language training in their home countries rated it significantly more useful than those who received their training only in the United

States. Those who received training both in their home countries and in the United States rated it more useful (84.1% 1, 2 or 3 ratings) than either the participants who had home country training (76% 1, 2 or 3 ratings) or United States training (67.1% 1, 2 or 3 ratings) only.

(It is possible that the participants' ratings of the usefulness of their language training is directly related to the amount of this training they received.)

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	20.9	53.1	25.8
Accents	9.9	51.4	38.5
Conversations	3.2	31.7	64.9
Instructors' speech	3.5	25.8	70.5
Public services	3.1	24.8	72.0
Reading	3.0	17.4	79.4
Signs	1.0	15.5	83.3
Numbers	2.3	14.0	83.5
TOTAL N	(859)		

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

Difficulties with slang (73%) and accents (61.3%) were the only two problems which bothered a majority of the participants. About 1 participant out of 3 had language difficulties with personal conversations (34.9%).

United States Slang

Participants from the Near East-South Asia and Africa less often expressed having trouble with United States slang than did Latin American participants and much less often than did participants from the Far East. Academic participants were more apt than Special participants to mention trouble with United States slang. Participants in Agriculture less often said they had trouble with United States slang than did participants in any other field of training. Participants in Health and Sanitation and Education reported having more trouble with U.S. slang than did participants programmed by any other agency.

United States Accents

50% of the Near East-South Asia participants reported having no trouble with United States accents. This is a higher percentage than of the participants from any other region. Participants from the Far East most often had trouble with United States accents.

Personal Conversations

African and Near East-South Asia participants more often said they had no trouble with personal conversations than participants from the other regions.

Teachers' or Supervisors' Speech

About 50% of the participants from the Far East, and 40% of the participants from Latin America, had trouble with teachers' or supervisors' speech. Only 20% of the participants from the other two regions expressed such difficulties. Academic participants more often said they had trouble with their teachers' or supervisors' speech than did Special participants.

Public Services

Far East participants much more often said they had trouble in getting adequate public services. Near East-South Asia participants least often mentioned this problem. Participants in Special training programs less often said they had difficulty getting public services than did Academic participants.

Class Assignments

Participants from Africa and the Near East-South Asia reported fewer difficulties reading classroom assignments than did either participants from the Far East (who most often reported such difficulties) or Latin America. Almost 90% of the participants in the field of Agriculture reported that they had no trouble with reading class assignments. This is a higher percentage than of participants in any other fields saying they did not have this difficulty. Participants in Education and Health and Sanitation more often said they had trouble with reading assignments than did participants in other fields of training.

Signs and Directions; Numbering Systems

Participants from the Near East-South Asia reported having fewer difficulties with signs and directions and numbering systems than did participants from any other region. Far East participants reported relatively more such difficulties than did participants from any of the other regions.

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	3rd Most Often	1st, 2nd or 3rd
English	21.5	56.9	34.0	93.6
French	1.5	7.9	10.3	14.6
Spanish	6.8	1.6	5.0	11.0
Thai	10.2	0.0	.1	10.3
Urdu	2.3	2.9	6.0	8.1
Portuguese	6.6	0.0	.1	6.6
Vietnamese	4.3	.5	.1	4.9
Bengali	2.9	.8	0.0	4.2
Turkish	3.1	.1	0.0	3.9
Arabic	2.0	.5	.1	3.9
Amharic	3.1	.3	.1	3.6
Tagalog	2.0	1.0	.2	3.6
Indonesian	2.6	.5	0.0	3.4
Persian	1.6	.4	.2	2.5
Nepali	2.8	.1	0.0	2.1
Korean	2.8	0.0	0.0	2.1
Other	27.4	24.0	32.9	
TOTAL N	(1345)	(1265)	(734)	(1345)

No language except English is used by more than 20% of the trainees. 94% of the participants listed English as one of the 3 languages they most often use. 45 other languages were listed as "used most often," some of which are spoken by very few participants, such as Vai and Ngemba. (This question was not analyzed for the first 465 participants, as they were used to build the language code.)

Section B

Participants' Experience with and Evaluation of Orientation Programs

Q. Where did the participants receive orientations about the U.S.? (Item 31)

PLACE	PERCENTAGE* %
USAID	91.1
AID/Washington	85.6
Washington International Center	80.6
Other government agencies	27.7
Training site	24.7
Pre-university workshop	23.6

TOTAL N	(1810)

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

Over 80% of the participants were given orientations by their USAID, AID/Washington or the Washington International Center. About 1 participant in 4 got orientations from another U.S. government agency (27.7%), a pre-university workshop (23.6%) or a formal program at their training site (24.7%)

Q. What difficulties did the participants have with the various orientation programs? (Item 33)

DIFFICULTY WITH PROGRAM	PERCENTAGE (%) ATTENDING PROGRAM*				
	USAID	AID/Washington	WIC	Pre-Univ. Workshop	Formal Univ. Program
No difficulties with this agency's presentation	61.8	75.0	75.8	81.9	76.1
Information not specific	26.8	10.5	4.0	8.1	8.7
Not enough information	23.2	10.9	3.8	7.4	8.0
Not enough discussion	16.0	11.3	3.7	6.7	5.8
No former AID participants	10.8	X	X	X	X
No films	7.3	3.8	1.9	5.8	5.8
Information inaccurate	7.2	3.5	2.0	2.8	2.9
Too much information	3.6	5.4	5.6	4.6	3.3
No printed matter	3.3	1.1	1.3	1.8	2.6
Not able to understand speakers	2.1	2.3	2.3	5.6	3.7
TOTAL N	(1650)	(1550)	(1459)	(428)	(448)

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

Most of the participants attending orientation programs indicated that they had no difficulties with the agency's presentation. The only difficulties mentioned by more than 20% of the participants were with their USAIDS' presentations, where 1 participant out of 4 felt that the information given was too general (26.8%) and not sufficient (23.2%).

Q. Where did the participants feel they received the most helpful orientation information on given topics? (Item 34)

TOPIC PRESENTED	PERCENTAGE (%) ATTENDING PROGRAM*			
	Most Helpful Information Given at USAID	Most Helpful Information Given at WIC	Most Helpful Information Given at Formal Univ. Program	No Helpful Information On This Topic
Facts for getting along in U.S.	31.0	41.6	17.2	6.6
Ways of life in the U.S.	21.6	56.2	23.4	6.5
U.S. social activities	16.6	59.0	25.6	8.3
U.S. education	14.4	35.0	44.4	11.1
Economic facts about U.S.	11.4	46.7	35.0	13.1
U.S. Government	10.4	45.7	31.9	12.4
Race relations in U.S.	10.3	54.2	26.5	14.3
Religion in U.S.	10.0	57.4	26.3	13.6
TOTAL N	(1650)	(1459)	(428)	(1810)

*Percentages add to more than 100% because participants were allowed more than one response. The percentages are based on those attending orientation, not entire sample.

More than 6 out of 7 participants felt they got helpful information on all of the topics listed in the table. The Washington International Center was rated as giving the most helpful information on every topic except education in U.S. universities, where the formal university orientations received more "most helpful" ratings.

Section C

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	55.7
Other	13.2
None	31.1

TOTAL N	(1810)

Slightly more than 1/2 of the participants (55.7%) went to the Michigan State University Special Communication Seminar during their sojourn. Almost 1 out of 3 participants (31.1%) had not attended a Special Communication Seminar at the time of their interview at DETRI.

African and Near East-South Asia participants more often than participants from other regions attended a Special Communication Seminar. About 60% of the participants from each of these regions attended the Michigan State University Communication Seminar, higher percentages than for the other 2 regions.

Participants in the field of Transportation more often reported attending the Michigan State University Communication Seminar (69.4%) than did participants in other fields, while participants in the field of Industry and Mining least often did so (44.4%). Over half of the participants in Industry and Mining (51%) did not attend any Communication Seminar.

Almost 25% of the participants in Agriculture attended Communication Seminars other than Michigan State University, a higher percentage than participants in other fields.

Participants programmed by the Department of Agriculture more often attended a Special Communication Seminar than did participants programmed by other agencies. Participants programmed by the Public Health Service least often attended a Special Communication Seminar.

Q. How satisfied were the participants with the Special Communication Seminars they attended? (Item 106)

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely satisfied)	24.0
2	28.9
3	21.6
4	13.1
5	5.7
6	5.5
7 (Not at all satisfied)	1.5

TOTAL N	(1245)

75% of the participants attending Special Communication Seminars rated them above the middle point on the satisfaction scale.

Special participants who attended Special Communication Seminars gave higher satisfaction ratings than did Academic participants. Participants in the fields of Education and Public Administration were less satisfied with their Communication Seminars than were participants in other fields.

Q. Did the participants feel that the subject matter of their training program was repeated in the subject matter of the Communication Seminar? (Item 101)

SUBJECT MATTER REPEATED	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	30.4
No	69.5

TOTAL N	(1245)

Only about 20% of the participants from the Near East-South Asia believed that the subject matter of their training programs was repeated in the Communication Seminars they attended. This is a lower percentage than the participants from any other region reported. 38.6% of the African participants thought some of their training programs subject matter was repeated.

Academic participants more often than Special participants thought that some subject matter of their training programs was repeated in the Special Communication Seminar they attended.

Participants in different fields of training differed substantially in thinking that some subject matter of their training programs was repeated in the Communication Seminar they attended. 40% of the participants in the field of Education thought that some of their training program subject matter was repeated, while only 17% of the participants in Transportation believed this to be true.

Q. How much of the subject matter covered in this Special Communication Seminar do the participants think they will be able to use in their work? (Item 105)

AMOUNT USABLE	PERCENTAGE %
All	13.5
Almost all	22.4
Most	30.9
Some	25.8
Little	7.2

TOTAL N	(1245)

About 2 out of 3 of the participants who attended a Special Communication Seminar thought that they would be able to use a majority (all, almost all, most) of the subject matter covered when they arrived home.

A majority of Latin American participants who attended Special Communication Seminars thought that "all" or "almost all" of the subject matter covered would be useful in their work at home. This is a higher percentage than for participants from any other region.

Special participants, more often than Academic participants, felt that all or almost all the subject matter would be useful.

Over 45% of the participants in the field of Agriculture checked one of the two highest usage categories, a larger percentage than participants in any other field. Participants in the fields of Education and Health and Sanitation least often felt that a majority of the subject matter of their Communication Seminars would be useful in their work.

Q. What problems did the participants have at their Special Communication Seminar? (Item 104)

PROBLEM WITH SPECIAL COMMUNICATION SEMINAR	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING*		
	Very True	Somewhat True	Not True
Lack of social activities	15.6	26.7	57.6
Subject matter not specific	9.8	30.8	59.2
Too much repetition	7.6	20.5	71.7
Too many lectures	7.3	17.1	75.5
Not enough discussion	4.4	15.9	79.5
Instruction too detailed	4.8	13.8	81.2
TOTAL N	(1240)		

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

The two problems mentioned most frequently by participants who attended a Special Communication Seminar were a lack of social activities (42.3%) and subject matter that was not specific enough (40.6%).

Lack of Social Activities

More African and Far East participants than participants from other regions who attended Communication Seminars felt that a lack of social activities was a problem for them. Latin Americans least frequently felt this to be a problem.

Academic participants attending Special Communication Seminars more often felt a lack of social activities than did Special participants.

Too Much Repetition

Participants from Africa more often thought that too much repetition of material in their Special Communication Seminars was a problem than did participants from other regions attending these seminars.

Of those participants attending Special Communication Seminars, proportionately more participants in Academic training programs felt that there was too much repetition of material than did participants in Special training programs.

Too Many Lectures

Participants from the Near East-South Asia less often said they had too many lectures at the Special Communication Seminars than participants from the other world regions.

A higher proportion of Academic participants than Special participants said they had too many lectures at their Special Communication Seminars.

More participants in the field of Education than in any other field said they heard too many lectures.

Other Difficulties

More Academic than Special participants felt that there was not enough discussion and that the subject matter was not specific enough at the Special Communication Seminars they attended.

Participants in Education and Public Administration, more often than participants in other fields of training, felt that instruction was too detailed in their Special Communication Seminars.

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 AID to make necessary occupational and social arrangements? (Item 7)

HAD ENOUGH TIME	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	72.3
No	27.6

TOTAL N	(1810)

More than 7 out of every 10 participants (72.3%) felt they had sufficient time to arrange their affairs at home after they were officially notified of their selection by AID.

Participants in Special training programs more often reported having enough time for making necessary arrangements than did participants in Academic training programs. This may be related to the fact that Academic participants have longer U.S. sojourns on the average than do Special participants.

Q. Did the participants feel they had enough time to pack and otherwise get ready for their trip to the U.S. after being notified of their date of departure? (Item 9)

HAD ENOUGH TIME	PERCENTAGE %
Yes	60.4
No	39.5

TOTAL N	(1810)

6 out of 10 participants (60.4%) felt they had sufficient time to pack and prepare for their trip to the United States after being notified of their date of departure.

Participants in Special training programs more often reported having enough time to prepare for departure than did participants in Academic training programs.

Section B

Participants' Problems
With Travel Arrangements

Q. What problems did the participants have with their travel arrangements in the United States? (Item 95)

PROBLEM WITH TRAVEL	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING*		
	Very True	Somewhat True	Not True
Trips too short	10.8	28.3	60.8
Not being met	7.3	22.1	70.5
Trips too long	3.1	19.6	77.2
No lodging arranged	2.3	12.5	85.0
No help or information	1.4	8.3	89.6
TOTAL N	(1810)		

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

The problem mentioned most often (39.1%) was that the participants found their trips too short with little opportunity to see the country. Only 10% of the participants indicated that they had travel problems due to a lack of help or information.

More than 1 out of 3 (38.5%) of the participants in Academic training programs reported having problems with not being met at airports and depots, whereas about 1 out of 4 (22.4%) of the participants in Special training programs reported this problem.

A higher proportion of participants from Africa, than

participants from any other region, and of those programmed by the Public Health Service, than those programmed by any other agency, reported having problems with not being met at airports and depots. Participants programmed by the Federal Aviation Administration least often reported this problem.

Section C

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 69)

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely satisfied)	24.3
2	34.6
3	20.7
4	10.9
5	4.4
6	2.9
7 (Not at all satisfied)	1.8

TOTAL N	(1810)

About 1/4 of the participants were "extremely satisfied" with their living arrangements and felt they "could not have been better" (1 rating). 79.6% rated their satisfaction with living arrangements above the middle point on the scale.

The participants in Academic training programs were less often satisfied with their living arrangements than were participants in Special training programs.

Participants from Latin America more often reported being satisfied with their living arrangements than did participants from any other region (61.5% gave 1 or 2 ratings). Participants from the Near East-South Asia least often were satisfied with their living arrangements.

Q. What types of housing did the participants have at the place where they stayed the longest time in the U.S.? (Item 66)

TYPE OF HOUSING	PERCENTAGE* %
Apartment	49.1
Dormitory	27.2
Hotel	19.6
Room in private home	9.9
House	5.8
YMCA-YWCA	4.7
Motel	4.3

TOTAL N	(1810)

*Percentages add to more than 100% because participants were allowed more than one answer, if they had remained at two or more locations an equal length of time.

More participants lived in apartments (49.1%) at the place where they stayed longest in the United States than in any other type of housing. The other two types of housing most often lived in by the participants were dormitories (27.2%) and hotels (19.6%).

Almost 60% of the participants from the Near East-South Asia lived in apartments for the longest time during their sojourns. Participants from Africa more often reported living in dormitories than did participants from any other region, while participants from Latin America much more often reported living in houses.

Q. How long did the participants live in the place where they stayed the longest time in the U.S.? (Item 67)

LENGTH OF TIME	PERCENTAGE %
Less than 30 days	9.7
1 to 4 months	28.1
5 to 12 months	35.1
More than 12 months	26.9

TOTAL N	(1810)

Only 26.9% of the participants lived over 1 year in the place where they stayed longest.

Q. From whom did participants get help in finding housing at their training sites? (Items 62 & 63)

HELP WITH HOUSING	PERCENTAGE %
Officials at training site	57.6
AID representatives	32.5
Fellow nationals	26.0
Other government agency officials	18.4
No one	14.9
Other Americans	14.8
Visitors from other countries	6.9

TOTAL N	(1810)

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

Participants got help most frequently from officials at their training sites (57.6%). Representatives of AID provided help to about 1 participant out of 3 (32.5%). Foreign visitors from countries other than the participant's home country were the least often used source of help in finding housing (6.9%).

Q. How useful did the participants find the help they got in locating housing at their training sites? (Item 64)

UTILITY RATING	PERCENTAGE %
1 (Extremely useful)	51.6
2	25.3
3	11.7
4	5.7
5	2.8
6	1.4
7 (Not at all useful)	1.3

TOTAL N	(1503)

A majority of the participants (51.5%) found the help "extremely useful," "could not have been better" (1 rating). 88.6% of the participants rated the utility of the help they received above the middle point on the scale.

Q. With whom did the participants live in the United States?
(Item 65)

LIVING COMPANIONS	PERCENTAGE* %
Home country AID trainees	54.4
Other country AID trainees	35.0
U.S. students	34.4
Foreign nationals other than AID trainees	26.6
Other U.S. citizens	22.3
Lived alone only	11.3
Own family	10.2
<hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/>	
TOTAL N	(1810)

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

Participants lived with other AID trainees from their home country more often than with any other group (54.4%). Only about 1 participant in 8 (11.3%) reported living alone during his entire sojourn. About 1 in 12 (8.4%) said he had his family with him.

The largest percentage of Latin American participants (37.9%) lived with U.S. students. They also more often reported living with their own families than did participants from any other region. In contrast, the largest percentage of participants from the other regions lived with home country AID participants.

Q. What problems did participants have with their living arrangements? (Item 68)

PROBLEM WITH LIVING ARRANGEMENTS	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING*		
	Very True	Somewhat True	Not True
Cost too great	17.8	41.3	40.8
No information about housing	10.7	19.4	69.7
No cooking facilities	7.2	20.7	72.0
Inadequate transportation	9.1	18.6	72.3
Too much noise	5.6	17.9	76.4
Below desired living standard	6.1	17.3	76.5
Too far from businesses	4.7	17.9	77.2
Too far from training site	5.5	16.5	77.8
Undesirable location	3.3	11.4	85.2
Troublesome landlord	2.9	10.2	86.2
Separation from friends	2.8	10.1	87.0
TOTAL N	(1810)		

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

The problem noted by the highest proportion of participants was that the cost of housing was too high (59.1%). No other problem was mentioned by more than 30% of the participants. 13.1% of the participants had some trouble with their landlord, and less than 15% mentioned being in an undesirable location (14.7%) or being separated from people they wanted to live with (12.9%).

Participants in Academic training programs more often reported housing problems of (a) no information, (b) too great a cost, (c) troublesome landlord, (d) inadequate

transportation, (e) undesirable location, and (f) too much noise, than did participants in Special training programs. Participants in Special training programs more often reported housing below desired living standard and living too far from training site than did participants in Academic training programs.

Proportionately fewer participants programmed by Federal Aviation Administration reported difficulty with having no information about housing than did participants programmed by any other agency.* Participants programmed by AID more often felt that their housing was below desired living standards than did participants programmed by other agencies. Participants programmed by Federal Aviation Administration* and Agriculture least often reported this difficulty.

A higher proportion of participants programmed by Federal Aviation Administration* expressed difficulty with being too far from the training site than did participants programmed by any other agency. Participants programmed by the Public Health Service and AID least often reported this difficulty.

* Many Federal Aviation Administration participants are housed in the Sheraton Hotel in Oklahoma City.

Section D

Participants' Problems With Money Allowances

Q. What problems did the participants have with AID money allowances during their U.S. sojourns? (Item 96)

PROBLEM WITH MONEY	PERCENTAGE (%) RESPONDING*		
	Very True	Somewhat True	Not True
Not enough money for personal expenses	17.5	39.2	43.7
Travel per diem too small	17.9	37.7	44.2
Unable to maintain usual standard of living	10.4	37.5	52.0
Not enough money for books and training material	18.1	27.7	54.0
Not enough money for other program expenses	12.7	26.8	60.4
TOTAL N	(1810)		

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

Between 39.6% and 55.8% of the participants had some problems with their per diem and money allowances.

Participants in Academic training programs more often reported problems with (1) maintaining their usual standard of living, and (2) insufficient funds for personal and program expenses (other than books and training materials) than did participants in Special training programs.

Participants from the Near East-South Asia and the Far East less often reported financial problems with personal expenses and maintaining their usual standard of living than did participants from other regions. Participants from the

Far East most often reported problems with books and training materials expenses, and with per diem while traveling. Participants from Latin America most often reported problems with maintaining their usual standard of living. Financial difficulties with personal and program expenses other than those for books and training materials were more frequently mentioned by participants from Africa than by participants from any other region.

Proportionally fewer participants in Health and Sanitation and Transportation reported problems with book and training material expenses than did participants in other fields of training.

Participants in Academic training programs more often reported having problems with insufficient funds for recreational activities and to return hospitality than did participants in Special training programs. (See page 63 & 64).

CHAPTER VIII INDIVIDUAL, ORAL INTERVIEWS

Section A Rapport With Participants and Credibility of Their Questionnaire Responses

Individual, oral interviews are held privately with each Academic and Special program participant as the second phase of the exit interview. During the Standard Introduction to the participants that begins the exit interview, a clear distinction is made between the objectives and use of the structured questionnaire and the private oral interview. Participants are assured of anonymity in the latter. Information provided in the oral interviews is treated confidentially and is reported to AID only in aggregate form. (See Appendix B. of Final Report, AID Participant Training Exit Interview Development Study for more detail.)

The main objective of the oral interviews is to assess participant attitudes toward U.S. experiences. While the questionnaire is best for obtaining descriptive information and evaluations of various aspects of the participant's training program, important attitudinal information is frequently better expressed in a spontaneous and confidential exchange of views.

It will be recalled from the Descriptive Statistical Report that the interviews are conducted in an unstructured, conversational manner. Two kinds of information are helpful in evaluating this communication process: the interviewers' judgments and the participants' reactions.

Rapport

To give an indication of the quality of the communication process, the interviewer rates his rapport with each participant. For the interviews on which data are presented in this chapter, the ratings are as follows:

Table 1

RATING OF RAPPORT	PERCENTAGE %
Excellent	20.0
Good	46.6
Average	23.4
Poor	9.3
None	.6

TOTAL N	(1525)

In about 9 out of 10 interviews (90%), the interviewer felt that his rapport with the participant was as good or better than average for a personal conversation.

While no systematic collection of data about the participants' reactions to the exit interview was made with the participants reported on herein (such data collection has subsequently been instituted), spontaneous expressions indicate that 2 out of 3 participants consider the time spent at DETRI to be pleasant and a rewarding experience. Participants who have had an appropriate training program welcome the opportunity to talk about what they have learned, and how their new knowledge will contribute to development in

their home countries. Those who have had good relationships with Americans are eager to express the importance of having met genuinely friendly people who often went out of their way to be helpful. For example, a Nigerian participant was eager to share his observations about African-American friendships and his satisfaction with the way his orientations had prepared him for his experiences here. He felt that the exit-interview provided his first opportunity to do so with someone who wouldn't feel he was "just saying the right things."

On the other hand, participants who have had experiences in the United States that were unrewarding or unpleasant, often find that a discussion of these experiences helps to relieve their anxieties or reduce their feelings of hostility or frustration. For example, a Cambodian who had made no friends and had been lonely and very unhappy during his 5 years in the United States, indicated his pleasure, at the conclusion of his exit-interview, in meeting an American who took him seriously and sympathized with him. This participant entered the interview room in a "quiet rage," was encouraged by the interviewer to speak of his problems, broke into tears while recounting them, and, although still unhappy at the end of the conversation, obviously felt somewhat more relaxed, emotionally. Clearly, the exit-interview provided the participant with a needed emotional release.

Credibility

The interviewer also makes ratings of the validity of the participants' questionnaire responses based on their comments in the conversational interviews. If any part of the information they receive cannot be reconciled with the participants' responses on the written questionnaire,

they rate the validity of the questionnaire as suspect. These ratings appear in Table 2:

Table 2

RATING OF QUESTIONNAIRE VALIDITY	PERCENTAGE %
Suspect	9.1
Do not suspect	90.8

TOTAL N	(1503)

Again, in about 9 out of 10 individual interviews, nothing the participant said led the interviewer to doubt the validity of his responses on the structured questionnaire.*

Section B

Interviewer Ratings Of Participant Attitudes and Characteristics

Participant Attitudes

The interviewer makes ratings of the participant's feelings about the United States, AID and/or his participating agency, and his training institution(s). These are ratings

*In those few cases where the interviewer does discover a discrepancy between the participant's written and oral statements due to a misunderstanding of the questionnaire item, he brings it to the participant's attention near the conclusion of the interview, and corrects it with the participant's consent.

of change in the participant's attitudes between the beginning of his program and the time of his exit-interview. Thus, a participant who the interviewer feels began with positive feelings about the United States and still has a positive attitude toward it at the time of the interview is rated as having stayed the same in his attitude.

Results from these ratings are presented in Table 3:

Table 3

RATING OF ATTITUDE CHANGE	PARTICIPANT'S ATTITUDE TOWARD*		
	U.S. %	AID and/or Part. Agency %	Training Institution %
Has become more positive	61.9	35.9	58.4
Has stayed the same	25.4	38.0	22.4
Has become more negative	12.6	26.0	19.1
TOTAL N	(1105)	(1380)	(1173)

*The total numbers for each category vary, and are less than 1525, because there were some instances when the interviewer did not have sufficient evidence to make one or more of these judgments. In addition, the category "training institution" was not relevant for those participants in Special programs whose training consisted primarily of observational visits.

As might be expected, the data show that AID and/or the participating agency have more often become more negatively viewed than either the United States or the participant's training institution. It is likely that these more negative

attitudes are based mainly on the rules and regulations that these agencies must enforce with participants in the United States. The United States, on the other hand, is a broad category, including people, institutions, and values toward which most participants are favorably disposed.*

Pervasive Concerns

Topics that were most frequently felt by the interviewer to be of pervasive concern to participants are listed in rank order in Table 4. A "pervasive concern" represents an occurrence that colored a participant's entire 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. The table indicates the number of participants who made generally positive comments on the topic, and the number who made generally negative comments.

*More differentiated ratings of the United States are currently being made and will be reported in the next annual report. Participants are now being rated on their attitudes toward the United States at both the societal and the personal level.

Table 4

TOPICS	Total Number Of Participants For Whom Topic Was Pervasive Concern	Number of Participants Making Favorable Comments About Topic	Number of Participants Making Unfavorable Comments About Topic
Relevance of training program	82	35	47
American hospitality, friendships and social life in the U.S.	74	53	21
Experiences in the U.S. involving discrimination	49	0	49
Training program instructors and facilities	40	25	15
Program Development Officer, Program Officer, and other program officials	39	14	25
An American university degree	27	15	12
AID rules and regulations	25	0	25
Separation from family	23	0	23
Length of training program	22	2	20
Sense of personal achievement and/or development	19	14	5

2-104

As can be seen in Table 4, with the exceptions of discrimination, AID rules and regulations and separation from family which are always negative experiences, the "pervasive concern" topics can be either a positive or a negative experience for the participants. The data generally support the findings presented in Chapter I, particularly with respect to the importance to participants of the relevance of their programs and the unhappiness generated by discrimination which they experience.

Images of Americans

During the interview, participants frequently express their feelings and beliefs about the American people. The interviewers include in their interview reports any adjectives that were used by participants to describe Americans. Such information is available for 1,103 interviews. Of these, the most frequently mentioned adjectives are presented in Table 5. (In some instances, participants have referred to specific groups of Americans; however, the information in Table 5 represents only general descriptions of all Americans.)

Table 5

AMERICANS ARE	PERCENTAGE (%) OF PARTICIPANTS USING ADJECTIVE
Friendly	43.0
Hospitable	31.0
Hard-working	30.6
Helpful	27.3
Independent	15.9
Informal	15.1
Sincere, honest	13.7
Frank	11.8
Uninformed	11.7
Intolerant	10.7

TOTAL N	(1103)

Of the 10 adjectives used most frequently by participants, 8 reflect a favorable impression of the American people. This, again, supports the findings in Chapter I that most participants have a good experience in the United States and that, as shown in Table 3, the majority are felt to have become more favorably disposed toward the United States during their stay here.

Development-Related Behavioral Characteristics

Several ratings are made by the interviewers of participant behavioral characteristics which are believed by American social scientists to be related to social and economic development. Although the research evidence on the importance of these characteristics is not extensive in

studies done outside the United States, they have been shown to be related to occupational achievement in this country. One of these ratings is a judgment as to whether the participant may be termed "internally controlled," primarily planning and acting in terms of his own initiative; or "externally controlled," that is, more heavily influenced by people and events. A person who is "internally controlled" may be more apt to be a change agent in his work than one who is "externally controlled."

Table 6

RATING OF CHARACTERISTIC	PERCENTAGE %
1 Very externally controlled	6.2
2	20.2
3	22.8
4	33.3
5 Very internally controlled	17.5

TOTAL N	(1126)

One-half (50.8%) of the participants interviewed for whom these ratings were made were judged to be internally controlled (4 and 5 ratings), while about 1/4 (26.4%) were judged to be externally controlled (1 and 2 ratings), with approximately 1/5 (22.8%) being rated at the mid-point on this dimension (3 rating).

A second rating is concerned with the participant's occupational "orientation," relative to people and work. The distinction here is whether the person seems more

interested in social relationships with people, or is more concerned with contractual, task-oriented responsibilities. The latter type may be expected to utilize his training in a more systematic way, and to make a better job adjustment in a developing economy.

Table 7

RATING OF CHARACTERISTIC	PERCENTAGE %
1 Very people-centered	6.2
2	23.8
3	27.2
4	31.8
5 Very work-centered	10.9

TOTAL N	(1138)

Of the participants interviewed for whom these ratings were made, about 2/5 were rated as being work-oriented (4 and 5 ratings) and slightly less than 1/3 (30%) were judged to be people-oriented (1 and 2 ratings), with about 1/4 (27.2%) being judged equally work- and people-centered.

A third rating of this type concerns whether or not the participant is dogmatic in his thinking. It may be expected that the less dogmatic, more flexible person will make a greater contribution to changes in work procedures and processes than a more dogmatic person.

Table 8

RATING OF CHARACTERISTIC	PERCENTAGE %
1 Very dogmatic	11.2
2	20.8
3	26.3
4	33.6
5 Very non-dogmatic	8.1

TOTAL N	(1130)

A larger proportion of the participants in the sample were judged to be non-dogmatic (about 41% in the 4 and 5 categories) in their thinking than were felt to be dogmatic (about 32% in the 1 and 2 categories). Again, about 1/4 (26.3%) were judged to be in the middle (3 rating).

On all three indices, therefore, more participants interviewed were rated as possessing behavioral characteristics found to be positively related to occupational achievement in the United States than participants possessing opposite characteristics. Clearly, selection of participants accounts for much of this finding. USAID personnel who accept U.S. occupational values are not as apt to select participants who are more dogmatic, people-oriented and externally controlled, all other things equal, as participants who are more flexible, work-oriented, and internally controlled. However, in view of the other relevant information in this part of the annual report, it is not unreasonable to assume that participant experiences in the United States frequently

reinforced these behavioral characteristics as well as developing more favorable attributes in participants who were previously neutral, or mildly "negative" with regard to these characteristics. Further research and analysis of relations between these ratings and the participants' home country performance can establish the relevance of these behavioral characteristics to social and economic development in cultures other than the United States.

PART 3

OBSERVATION TRAINING TEAM PARTICIPANTS

PREFACE

Part 3 of the report is based on data from 87 observation training teams, comprising 610 participants, interviewed between August 22, 1967 and September 13, 1968. In the interview for each of these teams, the standard Observation Training Team questionnaire administration procedures and interview report form were utilized. (See AID Participant Training Exit Interview Development Study, December 1, 1967.)

This part of the report contains 14 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) Washington International Center Orientation; (6) Participant Handbook; (7) Planning of Training Program; (8) Program Content; (9) Travel and Living Arrangements; (10) Money Allowances and Expenses; (11) Personal and Social Experiences; (12) Communication Seminar; (13) Utilization of Training; (14) Spontaneous Expression of Views by Participants.

The number of persons represented varies in some of the tables in Chapters III-XIII because not all of the participants were required to answer 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	5
III Description of the Observation Training Teams	9
Origin and Size	9
Field of Training	11
Participating Agency	13
Length of Program	14
Language Used by Participants	15
Age, Sex, and Education of Participants	16
Validity of Participant Responses	19
IV Pre-Departure Preparations	21
Selection	21
Examinations	21
USAID Briefings	22
V Washington International Center Orientation	25
VI Participant Handbook	27
VII Planning of Training Program	28
VIII Program Content	30
IX Travel and Living Arrangements	33
X Money Allowances and Expenses	34

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page</u>
XI	Personal and Social Experiences	35
XII	Communication Seminar	38
XIII	Utilization of Training	40
XIV	Spontaneous Expression of Views by Participants	42

CHAPTER I
PRINCIPAL FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

A. Findings

Observation training team participants expressed a high degree of satisfaction with their training programs and the experiences afforded them. Three out of five rated their overall satisfaction with their entire training experience in either the first or second positions on the satisfaction rating scale. No significant differences in ratings by world regions or fields of training were apparent. However, participants programmed by the Office of Education gave higher satisfaction ratings than those handled by any other participating agency.

Participants, generally, considered the USAID briefings useful in helping them to prepare for their training visit to the United States. However, members of 76 teams (92% of the participants) gave suggestions for improving briefings and other pre-training activities for future participants.

The area in which most observation team members suggested that improvement could be made was in discussions of their proposed training programs. They felt that they should be given a proposed training plan considerably in advance of their USAID briefings so that they would have an opportunity to make suggestions before the program was crystallized. They also suggested that they should engage in a thorough discussion of the program and itinerary after leaving their home country, but before they entered upon their training.

Participants frequently suggested that the USAID briefing should stress specific practical information about life in the United States. Discussions with former AID participants were mentioned as being particularly helpful in this connection. The need for some instruction in basic English before the

participants' departure was also stressed by many observation teams.

Despite a generally high level of satisfaction with their technical training programs, participants were not uncritical. Suggestions were given in an effort to improve the technical aspects of training programs for future participants. Among the most frequent suggestions were that: (1) time should be scheduled in the training program for subjects or activities of special interest to individual team members; (2) instructors, course coordinators and others taking part in the training program should be thoroughly briefed on the home countries, professional backgrounds, and training objectives of the participants; and (3) duplication and repetition of the training program content should be eliminated as much as possible.

The great majority (92%) of the participants were fully satisfied with the travel arrangements during their training program. In contrast, nearly one-half indicated that they had had problems with their housing arrangements. The two major problems with housing accommodations were: (1) the high cost of hotel rooms in relation to the per diem; and (2) the poor quality of some hotel accommodations and service. Nearly 3 out of 5 participants stated that their per diem was not sufficient and almost half found their training materials allowance insufficient.

The bulk of the participants (90%) engaged in some social, cultural, and recreational activities during their sojourn in the United States. Four out of five said they felt very much at home in the United States. Participants who reported an inability to engage in the social activities they desired and to feel at home in the United States attributed these problems principally to their inability to speak and understand English (the suggestion of some instruction in basic English is relevant to this point).

Members of about 2 out of 3 of the teams (378 participants) were not specific about the ways in which they intended to apply their training after their return home. For the most part, they indicated that they had obtained much information and many new ideas which would require study and evaluation to reveal the possibilities for adaptation to their own situations. Members of 1 out of 3 of the teams (232 participants) 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 2 out of 3 of the participants expected to encounter problems in their home countries in utilizing the training they had received. The most frequently expected problems were: (1) lack of sufficient financial resources and trained personnel; (2) fear of innovation and general resistance to change; and (3) need for legislation to implement changes.

Most (85%) of the participants felt that USAID could help them use the training they received. Specifically, they suggested that USAID might provide technical advice and assistance, teaching materials, books, and current technical publications.

B. Conclusions

1. Observation training team participants should receive a tentative outline of their training program before their USAID briefings. The program objectives and tentative program outline should be discussed with them at USAID and their suggestions, if any, forwarded to Washington in advance of their arrival.

2. A detailed discussion with observation training teams of their final program and itinerary should take place after their arrival in the United States, but before their program begins at the first training site. Team members should

be encouraged to offer suggestions and, to the extent possible, their suggestions should be accepted. If not accepted, the participants should be told why. It is important that they gain the impression that their suggestions are welcomed and are given careful consideration.

3. USAID briefings should be held sufficiently in advance of the participants' departure so that time is available for detailed presentations and for questions and discussion. When held on the day of departure, the briefing frequently is hurried and participants often are too excited to pay attention.

4. Members of observation training teams should be relatively homogeneous so far as education, professional interests, job responsibilities, and training objectives are concerned. This would help to assure that observation visits and other parts of the training program, if any, are pertinent to the interests of most members of the team.

5. Officials at AID/W, in Participating Agencies, and at training sites who conduct orientations, briefings, and programs for observation training teams should be aware of the educational and professional backgrounds of the participants and avoid the appearance of giving a "canned presentation," or instruction adapted to the lowest level of understanding.

6. The program itinerary should provide time for visits to places of cultural and historic interest, and sightseeing, particularly on weekends. Efforts should be made to afford participants an opportunity to gain an understanding of the United States both through their technical training and their non-training experiences.

7. At least one member of observation training teams should have sufficient fluency in English to take care of the ordinary living and social situations that confront team members outside of their technical training program, especially when interpreters are not available. To the extent practicable, observation training team participants 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 scale position of 1 represents the highest possible satisfaction, a position of 7, the opposite extreme. The overall satisfaction rating scale and the ratings given by members of the 87 observation training teams included in this report are shown in Table 1.

Table 1
OVERALL SATISFACTION RATING

RATING SCALE	PARTICIPANTS	
	No.	%
Extremely satisfied, things could not have been better . . . 1	98	16.1
2	260	42.8
3	156	25.7
4	60	9.9
5	27	4.4
6	5	.8
Not at all satisfied, things could not have been worse . . . 7	2	.3
	608*	100.0

*Ratings given by 2 participants were not made according to instructions and could not be included in the total.

Observation training team participants, for the most part, expressed a high degree of satisfaction with their training programs and the experiences that were afforded them. Almost 3 out of 5 (59%) rated their overall satisfaction in positions 1 and 2 on the scale.

Table 2
PARTICIPANTS' OVERALL SATISFACTION RATINGS BY REGIONS

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION					TOTAL N
	AFR	FE	LA	NESA	M-R*	
1 (Extremely satisfied)	19.4	17.1	15.7	18.7	6.7	(98)
2	37.3	39.1	47.0	35.8	42.2	(260)
3	28.4	31.7	22.9	27.6	31.1	(156)
4	13.4	7.3	9.6	8.9	13.3	(60)
5	1.5	2.4	3.3	8.2	6.7	(27)
6	0.0	2.4	.9	.8	0.0	(5)
7 (Not at all satisfied)	0.0	0.0	.6	0.0	0.0	(2)
TOTAL N	(67)	(41)	(332)	(123)	(45)	(608)**

*Multi-region

**Ratings given by 2 participants were not made according to instructions and could not be included in the total.

The small number of participants from Africa, the Far East, and in Multi-region teams do not permit statistical comparisons to be made.

Table 3
 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)	17.9	11.7	17.6	9.0	23.3	(98)
2	42.3	40.8	44.4	58.9	34.9	(260)
3	23.5	29.6	21.3	17.8	33.8	(156)
4	8.7	13.6	11.2	10.7	4.6	(60)
5	7.1	3.1	3.7	1.8	2.3	(27)
6	.5	.6	.9	1.8	1.1	(5)
7 (Not at all satisfied)	0.0	.6	.9	0.0	0.0	(2)
TOTAL N	(196)	(162)	(108)	(56)	(86)	(608)*

*Ratings given by 2 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. Differences in ratings given by participants in these 4 fields were not statistically significant.

Table 4
PARTICIPANTS' OVERALL SATISFACTION BY PARTICIPATING AGENCY

SATISFACTION RATING	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM PARTICIPATING AGENCY						TOTAL N
	Lab	USDA	IRS	OOE	Other	None	
1 (Extremely satisfied)	19.3	12.7	20.1	22.8	17.3	15.0	(98)
2	40.6	40.5	43.3	57.9	50.0	27.5	(260)
3	25.2	28.5	16.7	10.6	25.0	37.5	(156)
4	8.0	13.9	13.3	7.1	2.5	12.5	(60)
5	6.4	3.2	4.4	0.0	3.9	7.5	(27)
6	.5	.6	1.1	1.6	1.3	0.0	(5)
7 (Not at all satisfied)	0.0	.6	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	(2)
TOTAL N	(187)	(158)	(90)	(57)	(76)	(40)	(608)*

*Ratings given by 2 participants were not made according to instructions and could not be included in the total.

Participants programmed by the Office of Education gave the highest ratings; those having no Participating Agency, lowest ratings.

CHAPTER III
DESCRIPTION OF THE OBSERVATION TRAINING TEAMS

Origin and Size

Table 5
DISTRIBUTION OF OBSERVATION TRAINING TEAMS BY REGIONS

REGION	TEAMS		PARTICIPANTS	
	No.	%	No.	%
Africa	10	11.4	67	10.9
Far East	9	10.3	42	6.8
Latin America	44	50.6	332	54.5
Near East-South Asia	21	24.1	124	20.4
Multi-Region	3	3.6	45	7.4
TOTALS	87	100.0	610	100.0

Although all regions sent some teams, about half (51%) of the teams with 55% of the participants, were from Latin America. (All but 3 of the teams — 12 participants — from Near East-South Asia were from Turkey.)

Table 6
 SIZE OF OBSERVATION TRAINING TEAMS

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	TEAMS	
	Number	%
1 - 3	17	19.5
4 - 5	20	30.0
6 - 7	21	24.2
8 - 10	15	17.3
11 - 24	14	16.0
TOTALS	87	100.0

The 87 observation training teams varied in size from 1 to 24 participants; 58 (74%) were made up of 7 or fewer participants. Of the 14 teams with 11 or more participants, 10 (71%) were from Latin America.

Field of Training

Table 7
DISTRIBUTION OF OBSERVATION TRAINING TEAMS
BY FIELDS OF TRAINING

FIELD OF TRAINING	TEAMS		PARTICIPANTS	
	No.	%	No.	%
Labor	31	35.6	197	32.2
Agriculture	22	25.3	162	26.6
Public Administration	13	14.9	108	17.7
Education	8	9.2	56	9.3
Public Health and Sanitation	6	6.9	47	7.7
Transportation	4	4.5	16	2.7
Industry and Mining	1	1.2	3	.4
Other	2	2.4	21	3.4
TOTALS	87	100.0	610	100.0

Over three-fourths (77%) of the participants had training programs in Labor (32%), Agriculture (27%) or Public Administration (18%).

Table 8
 DISTRIBUTION OF OBSERVATION TRAINING TEAM
 PARTICIPANTS BY FIELD OF TRAINING AND REGION

FIELD OF TRAINING	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION					TOTAL N
	AFR	FE	LA	NESA	M-R*	
Agriculture	88.1	0.0	23.5	7.2	35.6	(162)
Industry and Mining	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	(3)
Transportation	0.0	23.8	1.7	0.0	0.0	(16)
Labor	0.0	47.6	13.0	84.7	64.4	(197)
Public Health and Sanitation	0.0	4.8	13.6	0.0	0.0	(47)
Education	7.4	21.4	12.7	0.0	0.0	(56)
Public Administration	0.0	2.4	32.2	0.0	0.0	(108)
Other	0.0	0.0	3.3	8.1	0.0	(21)
TOTAL N	(67)	(42)	(332)	(124)	(45)	(610)

* Multi-regional.

African participants were principally (88%) in the field of Agriculture. The great majority (85%) of the participants from Near East-South Asia had training programs in the field of labor. Participants from Latin America were distributed more widely in the fields of training with the greatest concentration being in Public Administration (32%) and Agriculture (24%). Almost half (48%) of the participants from the Far East had training programs in the field of Labor.

Participating Agency

Table 9
DISTRIBUTION OF OBSERVATION TRAINING TEAMS
BY PARTICIPATING AGENCY

PARTICIPATING AGENCY	TEAMS		PARTICIPANTS	
	No.	%	No.	%
Department of Labor	30	34.5	189	31.0
Department of Agriculture	21	24.1	158	25.9
Internal Revenue Service	8	9.3	90	14.7
Office of Education	8	9.3	57	9.3
Public Health Service	4	4.6	35	5.7
Bureau of Public Roads	4	4.6	16	2.6
Bureau of Reclamation	2	2.3	9	1.5
Other Agencies*	4	4.4	16	2.7
No Participating Agency	6	6.9	40	6.6
TOTALS	87	100.0	610	100.0

*The Department of Housing and Urban Development, Geological Survey, Bureau of Customs, and Social Security Administration each handled 1 program.

Although 11 agencies took part in one or more programs, the large majority of participants (72%) were in programs handled by the Department of Labor, the Department of Agriculture, and the Internal Revenue Service.

Length of Program

Table 10
DISTRIBUTION OF OBSERVATION TRAINING TEAM PARTICIPANTS
BY LENGTH OF PROGRAM AND REGION

LENGTH OF PROGRAM (Weeks)	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION					TOTAL	
	AFR	FE	LA	NESA	M-R*	N	%
3 - 5	0.0	4.7	19.9	8.0	0.0	(78)	12.8
6	8.9	9.5	18.7	63.7	0.0	(151)	24.7
7 - 8	16.4	9.5	27.1	12.9	0.0	(121)	20.0
9 - 11	34.3	45.2	9.3	7.3	42.2	(101)	16.5
12 - 16	31.3	23.8	10.8	8.1	57.8	(103)	16.9
17 and over	9.1	7.3	14.2	0.0	0.0	(56)	9.1
TOTAL N	(67)	(42)	(332)	(124)	(45)	(610)	100.0

*Multi-regional

The training programs of the majority of participants from Africa (75%) and Far East (76%) were 9 weeks or longer. The programs of 66% of the participants from Latin America were from 3 to 8 weeks in length. The bulk of the participants from Near East-South Asia (72%) had programs of 6 weeks duration or less.

Language Used By Participants

Table 11
LANGUAGE USED BY PARTICIPANTS

LANGUAGE USED	TEAMS		PARTICIPANTS	
	No.	%	No.	%
Portuguese	30	33.0	232	38.0
Turkish	18	19.8	112	18.4
English	15	16.4	79	13.0
Spanish	14	15.4	89	14.6
French	9	9.9	65	10.7
Vietnamese	4	4.4	27	4.4
Thai	1	1.1	6	.9
TOTALS	91*	100.0	610	100.0

*Four teams were divided into 2 sections each to facilitate interviewing; 2 teams because of language differences and 2 because of the size of the teams.

Portuguese and Turkish were used by more than half (56%) of the participants. English was used in 15 interviews with 13% of the participants.

Age, Sex, and Education of Participants

Table 12
AGE OF OBSERVATION TRAINING TEAM
PARTICIPANTS BY REGIONS

YEARS	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION					TOTAL	
	AFR	FE	LA	NESA	M-R *	N	%
27 and under	31.8	7.3	11.0	4.1	7.0	(67)	11.6
28 - 30	22.7	7.3	11.8	7.1	9.3	(68)	11.7
31 - 34	13.6	12.2	15.9	13.4	20.9	(88)	15.3
35 - 39	12.1	39.1	17.1	36.7	16.3	(123)	21.4
40 - 45	7.7	14.6	20.1	31.6	30.2	(121)	21.1
46 and over	12.1	19.5	24.1	7.1	16.3	(109)	18.9
TOTALS	(66)	(41)	(328)	(98)	(43)	(576)	100.0

* Multi-regional.

Participants from Africa were younger than those from other regions; more than half (54%) were 30 years of age and under. About three-fourths of the participants from Near East-South Asia and from the Far East were over 35 years of age. Participants from Latin America were distributed more evenly over the age range than were participants from the other regions. Of note, however, is the fact that almost one-fourth (24%) were 46 years and over.

Table 13
SEX OF OBSERVATION TRAINING TEAM
PARTICIPANTS BY REGIONS*

REGION	MALE		FEMALE	
	No.	%**	No.	%**
Africa	68	89.5	8	10.5
Far East	49	92.5	4	7.5
Latin America	304	87.9	42	12.1
Near East-South Asia	129	95.6	6	4.4
TOTALS	550	90.2	60	9.8

*The regional distribution of participants in Table 13 includes participants in both single and multi-region observation training teams.

**Percentages add to 100% by rows in this table.

Of the total of 610 participants, 60 (10%) were female. Approximately 12% of the participants from Latin America were female. The number of female participants from Africa (8), Near East-South Asia (6) and the Far East (4), was very small.

Table 14
 EDUCATION OF OBSERVATION TRAINING TEAM
 PARTICIPANTS BY REGIONS

YEARS OF SCHOOLING	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION					TOTAL	
	AFR	FE	LA	NESA	M-R*	N	%
6 and under	9.4	15.4	.3	27.7	2.5	(31)	6.0
7 - 11	39.6	28.2	13.1	36.9	30.0	(110)	21.3
12	5.7	12.8	9.4	7.7	5.0	(45)	8.7
13 - 15	20.7	25.7	21.3	7.7	2.5	(95)	18.4
16	5.7	7.7	20.1	9.2	22.5	(85)	16.5
17 - 18	17.0	5.1	27.3	4.6	22.5	(110)	21.3
19 and over	1.9	5.1	8.5	6.2	15.0	(40)	7.8
TOTALS	(53)	(39)	(319)	(65)	(40)	(516)	100.0

* Multi-regional.

Information concerning years of schooling was received for 516 participants (85%) of the total.

Participants from Latin America tended to have more years of formal schooling than participants from the other regions, while participants from the Near East-South Asia had less. More than one-half (56%) of the participants from Latin America had 16 years or more of schooling; about two-thirds (65%) of the participants from the Near East-South Asia had 11 years or less of schooling.

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 that interview. An appraisal of the responses given by participants in the 87 observation training teams is presented in Table 15.

Table 15
VALIDITY, COMPLETENESS, AND FRANKNESS OF OBSERVATION
TRAINING TEAM PARTICIPANT RESPONSES

APPRAISAL OF RESPONSES	TEAMS		PARTICIPANTS	
	No.	%	No.	%
Fully valid, complete and frank	61	70.1	475	77.9
Not fully valid, complete and frank	26	29.9	135	22.1
TOTALS	87	100.0	610	100.0

For the most part, observation training team participants have taken part in the exit interviews willingly and have expressed their views freely. The responses of nearly 4 out of

5 (78%) of the participants (70% of the teams) were considered to be fully valid, complete, and frank. Information given by 135 participants (22%) in 30% of the teams was considered not to be completely valid for the following reasons:

1. Some facts or information were withheld. 55 participants (41%); 11 teams.
2. Lack of interest; participants responded to the minimum extent. 41 participants (30%); 8 teams.
3. Friction within the team; 1 or 2 members dominated the discussion. 34 participants (25%); 4 teams.
4. Language or interpreting difficulties. 5 participants (4%); 3 teams.

CHAPTER IV
PRE-DEPARTURE PREPARATIONS

A summary of replies given by participants in the 87 observation training teams to specific questions asked in their exit interviews is presented in the following chapters (IV-XIII) of the report. Questions are quoted and the responses are indicated, together with the numbers and percentage of participants responding. The item number from the Observation Training Team Interview Report Form also is given for each question. Questions which call for opinions or suggestions are not quoted, but are identified in the text by their item numbers.

Selection

Participants in the observation training teams, for the most part, were designated, (i.e., did not apply) for selection as participants in the training programs.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Did you participate in any way in making application for this training program? (Item 18)	Yes	80	13
	No	530	87

Examinations

The observation team participants, except in a relatively few cases, were not required to take examinations before selection.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Were you required to take any English examinations? (Item 22)	Yes	58	10
	No	552	90

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Were you required to take a competitive examination? (Item 23)	Yes	14	2
	No	596	98

USAID Briefings

All but 20 (3%) of the participants reported that they had been given one or more briefings at USAID in their countries. Timing of the briefings ranged from the day of departure to more than 9 weeks before leaving, with about two-thirds being held 5 days or less before departure.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. How close to the time you left for the U.S. were the briefings held? (Item 25)	5 days or less	385	65.5
	6 days to 2 weeks	137	23.2
	3 to 4 weeks	39	6.1
	5 to 6 weeks	19	3.3
	7 to 8 weeks	2	.3
	9 weeks and over	9	1.6

Timing of the briefings was not mentioned by participants as constituting a problem unless it contributed significantly to hasty pre-departure preparations or incompleteness of the information presented. Obviously, briefings held on the day of departure often were mentioned as being hurried and inadequate.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Did any former AID participants from your country help in these briefings? (Item 26)	Yes	243	41
	No	347	59

(20 participants had no briefing)

About two-thirds of the participants felt that the USAID briefings were very useful; only 5% felt they were not useful.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. To what extent do you feel that the USAID briefings were useful? (Item 28)	Very useful	393	67
	Somewhat useful	161	28
	Not useful	32	5
	(4 participants did not respond)		

Table 16
USEFULNESS OF USAID BRIEFINGS BY REGIONS

REGION	PERCENTAGE (%) FROM REGION			TOTAL N
	Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Not Useful	
Africa	75.4	24.6	0.0	(65)
Far East	64.9	35.1	0.0	(37)
Latin America	67.9	26.1	6.0	(321)
Near East-South Asia	66.9	23.3	9.7	(124)
Multi-Region	48.7	48.7	2.6	(39)
TOTAL N	(393)	(161)	(32)	(586)

The numbers of participants from the Far East and in multi-region teams were too small to justify comparisons. Among the other 3 regions, participants from Africa gave highest ratings.

Although 95% of the participants considered that the USAID briefings were useful, suggestions for improvement in the briefings and other pre-departure activities (Item 30) were made by all but 11 teams (8% of the participants). The major suggestions, together with the number of teams and participants making each suggestion follow:

1. Participants should be given detailed information about their proposed training program and itinerary before their departure. 35 (42%) teams; 260 participants.
2. Participants should be given some instruction in basic English before their departure. 31 (36%) teams; 256 participants.
3. Participants should be given definite confirmation of their selection at least 30 days prior to notification of their date of departure. 28 (32%) teams; 234 participants.
4. Former AID participants should take part in briefings or orientations held in the home country. 7 (8%) teams; 50 participants.
5. Observation training teams should be made up of members with homogeneous backgrounds and interests. 6 (7%) teams; 63 participants.

CHAPTER V
WASHINGTON INTERNATIONAL CENTER ORIENTATION

Table 17
ATTENDANCE OF OBSERVATION TRAINING TEAM PARTICIPANTS
AT WIC ORIENTATION BY REGIONS*

REGION	PARTICIPANTS			
	No. Attending	%**	No. Not Attending	%**
Africa	71	93.4	5	6.6
Far East	36	67.9	17	32.1
Latin America	328	94.8	18	5.2
Near East-South Asia	41	30.4	94	69.6
TOTALS	476	78.0	134	22.0

*The regional distribution of participants in Table 17 includes participants in both single and multi-region observation training teams.

**Percentages add to 100% by rows in this table.

Nearly 4 out of 5 (78%) of the observation training team participants reported that they had attended the WIC orientation.

Almost all of the observation training team members from Africa and Latin America attended WIC while more than 2 out of 3 from the Near East-South Asia did not take part in this orientation.

Of the 476 participants who attended the WIC orientation, only 5% felt that the orientation was not useful.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. To what extent was the WIC orientation useful? (Item 40)	Very useful	370	78
	Somewhat useful	81	17
	Not useful	25	5

About three-fifths (61%) of the participants who attended the WIC orientation offered suggestions for improving the orientation.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Do you have any ideas for improving the WIC orientation for other participants? (Item 42)	Yes	289	61
	No	187	39

Suggestions from the 289 participants who had ideas for improving the WIC orientation (Item 43) covered a wide range. Suggestions relating to the pedagogical aspects of the orientation were made by 14 (16%) teams; 120 participants. The principal suggestions were:

1. Participants should be grouped according to their educational and intellectual levels and the lectures varied to fit each group.
2. The lectures should be better organized and more practical.
3. Greater use should be made of visual aids.
4. The participants' own language should be used in the orientation.
5. The lectures were too broad and general.

Other suggestions were varied, and often contradictory. No clustering was evident.

CHAPTER VI
PARTICIPANT HANDBOOK

All but 8 (1%) of the participants said they had received the AID Participant Handbook. About four-fifths (81%) said they found the Handbook to be useful and clearly presented.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. How clear and useful was the information in the Participant Handbook? (Item 37)	Useful	488	81
	Not Useful	114	19

While the large majority of the participants found the Handbook to be useful, Turkish participants, with few exceptions, said the Handbook was not useful. They explained that the Handbook they received was printed in English, which they could not read. They recommended that the Handbook be translated and printed in Turkish for future participants from their country.

CHAPTER VII
PLANNING OF TRAINING PROGRAM

Nearly half (46%) of the participants indicated that they did not know how their training program was planned.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. As far as you know, how was your training program planned? (Item 48)	Had some knowledge	333	54
	Had no knowledge	277	46

A large majority (83%) of the participants said that they wanted to participate in planning their training programs. However, about 3 out of 5 (62%) indicated that they did not participate.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Did you want to participate in the planning of your training? (Item 49)	Yes	507	83
	No	102	17
(1 participant did not respond)			

Q. Did you participate in the planning of your training? (Item 50)	Yes	232	38
	No	378	62

About 3 out of 4 (74%) of the participants reported that they were satisfied with the planning of their training programs; the remaining 26% expressed dissatisfaction with the planning.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Were you satisfied or dissatisfied with the planning of your training program? (Item 55)	Satisfied	440	74
	Dissatisfied	157	26
(13 participants did not respond)			

Participants were asked for their ideas (Item 58) as to how the planning of their training program could have been improved; almost 3 out of 4 (74%) offered suggestions. Many of the participants who had indicated that they were satisfied with the planning of their own training program offered suggestions in an effort to improve programs for future participants. Suggestions most frequently made were:

1. Participants should be given more information about the details of their programs and should have increased opportunities to make suggestions while the program is being planned. 32 (37%) teams; 227 participants.
2. The specific interests and backgrounds of each of the participants should be considered more carefully in planning the program. 10 (15%) teams; 177 participants.
3. The program should be planned in full detail to eliminate duplication and repetition of activities to the greatest extent possible. 9 (10%) teams; 58 participants.

Among the suggestions which were strongly advanced by individual teams were:

1. The participants' government should jointly plan the training programs with AID.
2. Former AID participants should assist in planning training programs.
3. Climatic, seasonal, and cultural factors in the United States should be considered when planning the training program.

CHAPTER VIII
PROGRAM CONTENT

While no attempt is made in the exit interview to evaluate the substantive content of training programs, some questions are asked to bring out the participants' general reactions to aspects of the programs.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Were there places which you felt were important to your training program that you were unable to visit? (Item 61)	Yes	348	58
	No	249	41
	Don't Know	4	1
	(9 participants did not respond)		
Q. Were there some places that you did visit which you felt were unimportant to your training program? (Item 63)	Yes	324	53
	No	286	47
Q. Were any of the activities observed not clearly presented to you? (Item 67)	Yes	173	28
	No	437	72

Participant responses to the first two questions showed that more than half of the participants felt that some change would have been desirable in places visited (a "Yes" answer to either question). Nearly 3 out of 4 (72%) indicated that the activities observed had been clearly presented.

Responses of participants to Items 61 and 63 (the first two questions above) were tabulated by regions. Significant variations from the responses given by all participants were apparent only for the Near East-South Asia region. In responding to Item 61, 75% of the participants from this region felt that there were places important to their training program that they were unable to visit. (58% of all participants gave this answer.) Responses to Item 63

showed that 62% of the Near East-South Asia participants felt that they had visited places which were unimportant to their training program (compared to 53% for all participants).

Participant responses to Items 61 and 63 were also compared by fields of training. (Numbers of participants in all fields except Labor, Agriculture and Public Administration were too few to provide a basis of comparison.) Variations from the averages for all participants were found in the following:

1. Participants in the field of Agriculture more frequently said (Item 61) there were places important to their training program that they were unable to visit. (67% of the participants in Agriculture; 58% for all participants.)
2. Participants in Public Administration less frequently said there were places they were unable to visit (Item 61 -- 40% compared to 58% for all participants), or that they had visited places unimportant to their training program (Item 63 -- 45% compared to 53% for all participants).

Members of 76 observation training teams (82% of all participants) offered suggestions (Item 73) when asked how they believed their training program itself could be improved. Suggestions advanced frequently by participants were:

1. Time should be scheduled in the training program for subjects or activities of special interest to individual members of the team. 10 (12%) teams; 87 participants.
2. Instructors, course coordinators and others taking part in the training program should be thoroughly briefed on the home countries, professional backgrounds, and training objectives of the participants. 9 (10%) teams; 101 participants.
3. Repetition in the training program content should be eliminated to the greatest extent possible. 9 (10%) teams; 59 participants.

4. Training programs should stress more practical (as opposed to theoretical) instruction. 5 (7%) teams; 31 participants.
5. Participants should be provided with fact sheets describing the activities and personnel of places to be visited. 5 (7%) teams; 29 participants.

CHAPTER IX
TRAVEL AND LIVING ARRANGEMENTS

More than 9 out of 10 (92%) of the participants said they were satisfied with travel arrangements during their training programs. Slightly less than half (48%) indicated that they had had problems with their housing accommodations.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Were you satisfied or dissatisfied with AID's arrangements for getting you from one place to another? (Item 74)	Satisfied	564	92
	Dissatisfied	46	8
Q. Did you have any problems with your housing arrangements? (Item 76)	Yes	290	48
	No	320	52

One suggestion was made by a few participants concerning travel arrangements. They felt that for short distances, e.g., from Chicago to Milwaukee, participants should be permitted to travel by bus or railroad rather than by air. The reasons given were that they would be able to see more of the country and save AID money.

The two major problems with housing accommodations were: (a) the high cost of hotel rooms in relation to the per diem, mentioned by 17 (20%) teams; 118 participants; and (b) the poor quality of some hotel accommodations and service, commented upon by 18 (21%) teams; 152 participants.

CHAPTER X
MONEY ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES

Nearly 3 out of 5 (56%) of the participants indicated that their per diem was not sufficient to take care of their living expenses. Almost half (46%) said that their training materials allowance was insufficient.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Was your per diem adequate for your living expenses? (Item 80)	Yes	264	44
	No	339	56
	(7 participants did not respond)		
Q. Is the amount of your training materials allowance sufficient? (Item 81)	Sufficient	232	38
	Insufficient	282	46
	No allowance	95	16
	Did not use	1	--

Other than a suggestion to increase the rate of per diem, which was made by 20 (25%) teams, 134 participants; the most frequent comment (Item 83) concerning money allowances referred to reimbursable expenditures. Suggestions that this procedure be changed, so that participants would not be required to spend their funds and be reimbursed later, were offered by 14 (17%) teams; 97 participants.

CHAPTER XI
PERSONAL AND SOCIAL EXPERIENCES

The bulk of the participants (90%) 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, dinners, lunches, picnics, and various types of theatrical or other commercial entertainment.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. While you were in the U.S. did you engage in any social, recreational or cultural activities? (Item 84)	Yes	551	90
	No	59	10

More than half (55%) of the participants felt that they had had enough opportunity to engage in social activities.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Did you have enough opportunities to engage in the social activities that you wanted? (Item 86)	Yes	338	55
	No	272	45

The most common reasons given by participants (Item 87) who did not feel that they had had sufficient opportunity to engage in social and recreational activities during their sojourn, were the following:

1. Inability to speak and understand English. 25 (29%) teams; 193 participants.
2. Training program too short and intense. 14 (16%) teams; 89 participants.
3. No invitation received. 14 (16%) teams; 74 participants.
4. Insufficient funds. 9 (10%) teams; 57 participants.

Almost 3 out of 5 (59%) of the participants felt that they did not have as much opportunity during their sojourn to meet different types of U.S. citizens as they would have liked.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Do you believe that you had the opportunity to meet as many different types of U.S. citizens as you wanted? (Item 89)	Yes	252	41
	No	358	59

The principal kinds of Americans that participants indicated (Item 90) that they wanted to meet were:

1. A wealthy, middle-class, and poor family in their homes. 22 (25%) teams; 229 participants.
2. Average workers in their own homes. 21 (24%) teams; 147 participants.
3. Their professional equals, informally, at home. 6 (7%) teams; 38 participants.
4. University students, farmers, Negroes were each mentioned by 2 teams, and American Indians by 1.

Participants frequently 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 usually find living in the United States much as you expected it would be for you, or was it quite different? (Item 92)	Usually as expected	259	43
	Sometimes as expected	215	35
	Seldom as expected	134	22

(2 participants did not respond)

The ways in which participants found conditions in the United States different from their expectations (Item 93) mentioned most frequently were:

1. Participants had expected Americans to be self-centered, cold, and distant; they found them to be helpful, kind, and thoughtful. 16 (18%) teams; 130 participants.
2. The standard of living is higher, and the quality and quantity of goods and services are better than expected. 12 (14%) teams; 93 participants.
3. Unlike their expectations, participants found that many Americans also have happy marriages and good home lives. 6 (7%) teams; 40 participants.

The great majority (81%) of the participants said that they felt very much at home in the United States during their training sojourn.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Did you feel at home in the United States? (Item 94)	Very much	493	81
	Somewhat	109	18
	Very little	8	1

Failure to feel fully at home in the United States was attributed (Item 95) mainly to the participants' inability to speak English and to communicate with the American people. This reason was given by 9 teams containing 73 (62%) of the 117 participants who indicated that they felt "Somewhat" or "Very little" at home in the United States. Other reasons given were the unaccustomed food, homesickness, and failure to receive invitations to visit with Americans.

CHAPTER XII
COMMUNICATION SEMINAR

Table 18
ATTENDANCE OF OBSERVATION TRAINING TEAM PARTICIPANTS
AT A COMMUNICATION SEMINAR*

REGION	PARTICIPANTS			
	No. Attending	%**	No. Not Attending	%**
Africa	26	34.2	50	65.8
Far East	19	35.9	34	64.1
Latin America	176	50.9	170	49.1
Near East- South Asia	61	45.2	74	54.8
TOTALS	282	46.2	328	53.8

*The regional distribution of participants in Table 18 includes participants in both single and multi-region observation training teams.

**Percentages add to 100% by rows in this table.

Less than half (46%) of the participants attended a Communication Seminar. Fewer participants from Africa and the Far East took part than from Latin America (51%) and Near East-South Asia (45%).

Of the participants who attended a Communication Seminar, almost 9 out of 10 felt that the Seminar was "Very useful" (73%) or "Somewhat useful" (16%).

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. How useful do you feel the Seminar will be in helping you to use your training after you return to your home country? (Item 99)	Very useful	207	73
	Somewhat useful	45	16
	Not useful	30	11

Of the 282 participants who attended a Communication Seminar, only 46 (16%) responded to a request (Item 100) for suggestions for improving it. Most frequently expressed comments were:

1. Participants should be grouped according to their educational and cultural backgrounds to avoid difficulties in understanding and participation. 39 participants; 7 teams.
2. The level of instruction and course content were too elementary. 34 participants; 5 teams.
3. The instruction was not sufficiently definite and the entire Seminar was too unscheduled. 16 participants; 2 teams.

CHAPTER XIII
UTILIZATION OF TRAINING

Members of about 2 out of 3 (64%) of the training teams (378 participants) were not specific (Item 101) about the ways in which they intended to apply their training after their return home. They indicated that they had received much information and observed many activities during the relatively short time of their training programs. Therefore, they felt that the impressions and information they had gained would have to be sorted out, analyzed to determine what was applicable, and then adapted for use in their home country situations.

About 36% of the teams (232 participants) 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 2 out of 3 (71%) of the participants expected to encounter problems in their home countries in utilizing the training they had received.

		<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q.	Do you anticipate any problems in your home country in utilizing the training that you gained here? (Item 102)	Yes	432	71
		No	144	23
		Don't know	22	4
		Declined to answer	12	2

The problems participants most frequently expected to encounter (Item 103) in utilizing their training were:

1. Lack of sufficient financial resources. 32 (37%) teams; 274 participants.
2. Fear of innovation and general resistance to change. 18 (21%) teams; 164 participants.

3. Need for legislation to implement changes. 13 (15%) teams; 102 participants.
4. Lack of trained personnel. 10 (11%) teams; 72 participants.
5. Lack of support from superiors. 5 (6%) teams; 25 participants.

A majority (85%) of the participants felt that USAID could help them to use the training they had received.

	<u>Response</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Q. Could the USAID in your home country help you to use your training after you return? (Item 104)	Yes	511	85
	No	79	13
	Declined to answer	9	2
	Don't know	1	--
(10 participants did not respond)			

Participants most frequently suggested that USAID could help them in the following ways:

1. Provide technical advice and assistance. 41 (47%) teams; 421 participants.
2. Provide teaching materials. 15 (17%) teams; 130 participants.
3. Provide books and current technical publications. 8 (9%) teams; 54 participants.

CHAPTER XIV

SPONTANEOUS EXPRESSION OF VIEWS BY PARTICIPANTS

In concluding the questionnaire administration in an observation training team exit interview, the interviewer asks the participants if they wish to make comments or suggestions concerning any aspect of their experience in the United States that may or may not have been brought out previously. Comments were offered in response to this question by 62 teams (76% of all participants); the remaining teams indicated that they had no further observations to make.

A wide variety of topics were mentioned. Certain topics, however, were commented upon spontaneously by members of several teams. These topics were:

1. Suggestions, previously mentioned or new, for improving future training programs. 12 (19%) teams; 94 participants.
2. Appreciation for, or satisfaction with, the training program. 10 (16%) teams; 87 participants.
3. Appreciation for the help given by the interpreters. 9 (15%) teams; 94 participants.
4. Appreciation for the efforts of the Team Leader, Program Development Officer, or Program Officer. 9 (15%) teams; 89 participants.
5. Criticism of the Team Leader, Program Development Officer, or Program Officer. 4 (6%) teams; 22 participants.
6. Criticisms, previously mentioned or new, of aspects of the training program. 4 (6%) teams; 21 participants.
7. Need for homogeneity of interests and background among team members. 3 (5%) teams; 19 participants.
8. Need for participants to visit places of historical and cultural interest and learn more about U.S. history, customs and folklore. 3 (5%) teams; 16 participants.

In general, this unstructured, free discussion gave participants an opportunity to express the intensity of their feelings, either positive or negative, about topics previously brought up (e.g., suggestions concerning the training program), or to make comments that were not brought out in the interview (e.g., appreciation for the services of the interpreter). Many of the participants indicated that the exit interview gave them their first opportunity to express spontaneously their feelings about their entire U.S. sojourn. It can be assumed that those who so used the opportunity will be able to view their training program in the United States with more perspective in their home countries.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Gollin, A. E. 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.
- Kelman, H. C., & Ezekiel, R. S. Broadcasters abroad: An evaluation study of an international exchange program. Washington, D.C.: Policy Review and Coordination Staff, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, U.S. Department of State, 1965.
- Lysgaard, S. Adjustment in a foreign society: Norwegian Fulbright Grantees visiting the United States. International Social Science Bulletin, 1955, 7, 45-51.
- Scott, F. D. The American experience of Swedish students: Retrospect and aftermath. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956.
- Selltiz, C., Christ, J. R., Havel, J., & Cook, S. W. Attitudes and social relations of foreign students in the United States. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1963.
- Sewell, W. H., & Davidsen, O. M. Scandinavian students on an American campus. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1961.
- U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs. Foreign students in the United States: A national survey. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, 1966.
- Van Ditmar, E. Latin America Students in U.S. Universities. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, UCLA, 1967.

SUPPLEMENT

TECHNICAL SUPPLEMENT

Introduction

The purpose of this supplement is to describe the methodological steps that were taken to systematically consolidate and inter-relate the data obtained from the 1810 exit interview participants described in this report. The basic analysis plan was to select the major dependent (criterion outcome) and independent (factor) variables measured by the exit interview questionnaires and individual interviews, determine the most meaningful significant relationships among the variables, and then comparatively analyze these relationships in terms of selected characteristics of the participants (e.g., age) and their training programs (e.g., field of training).

In order to accomplish this task, the data were reduced through the technique of factor analysis, and the consolidated data were interrelated in multiple regression equations. The factor analyses and multiple regression equations were computed on data from half of the sample. The data from the other half of the participants were then used to test the predictive validity of the equations, and further refine them. The reliability of the final equations was checked and forecasts of predictive efficiency were run on selected samples of the data.

Initial Analyses

The first screening of data was done on 54 items of the first group of 859 exit interview questionnaires. These items were selected to represent both outcome or dependent information (e.g., the participant's satisfaction with various aspects of his training program, or his evaluation of the utility of his training), and predictive or independent

information (e.g., events the participant experienced during his sojourn, places he stayed, people he stayed with, institutions he attended). The 54 items were chosen both on theoretical and empirical grounds. Many of the items were those that previous research has shown to be important in determining people's evaluations and satisfaction with certain aspects of their lives, whereas others were known to be important on the basis of previous research done by DETRI on the AID participants as reported in the first descriptive report, May, 1968.

The data on the 54 items were represented in an inter-correlation matrix, and those items which showed a correlation of $\pm .20$, or higher, were considered meaningful. The data indicated that 9 of the 17 satisfaction and utility scales had inter-correlations at $\pm .20$ or higher, 5 of the 7 recommendations for changes in training programs had inter-correlations at $\pm .20$ or higher, and 2 of 12 single event, problem, or participant characteristic items had inter-correlations of $\pm .20$ or higher. None of the remaining 18 items had inter-correlations of $\pm .20$.

This first analysis indicated that there were a limited number of underlying dependent, or outcome, parameters. The rather high number of significant correlations among satisfaction and utility scales suggested that a clustering of these scales might give 2, or possibly 3, criterion parameters.

On the other hand, the relatively low number of high correlations among the independent, or predictor, variables indicated that there would be comparatively larger number of underlying predictor parameters, as expected. On the basis of these observations, it was decided to separately factor analyze both outcome and predictor data from the first 859 exit interview questionnaires and individual interviews, in order to consolidate the data in a meaningful manner, and eliminate non-relevant items.

The initial analysis also suggested that 3 sets of items (each of which had between 3 and 8 alternatives) should be scaled (combined into a single core), because theoretically and empirically they seemed to be measuring the same variable. The scale was developed with items concerning type of housing, number of friendships, and type of roommates the participant had.

Factor Analyses of Dependent Variables

The inter-correlation matrix developed in the initial analytic step indicated that 5 evaluation scales should be included in the outcome data to be factor analyzed. These scales included the satisfaction of the participant with the entire training program, with the planning, with his living arrangements, his feelings of comfort and welcome in the United States, and the utility of his training program in accomplishing his program objectives.

A second set of items entered into the factor analysis involved the participants' recommendations for changes in their total AID experience. The changes were in areas such as the planning of the program, the training program itself, living arrangements, money allowances and travel arrangements.

The final data included in this factor analysis were the individual interviewer ratings of the participant's attitude toward the United States, AID, and his training institution(s).

By using this latter source of data, the number of participants with total data available dropped from 859, which was used in the initial analysis, to 488. Data were missing for a number of participants, because the individual interviewer ratings either were not reliable, or had not been developed at the time the participant was interviewed. A demographic analysis was run on the 488 participants, and

they were found to be similar on all critical dimensions, except educational level, to the larger group of 859 participants. The sample of 448 was then supplemented with data from additional participants in order to make it comparable with the larger group on the education dimension.

These outcome data were factor analyzed using the centroid method; 6, 5, and 4 factor solutions were used. The 6 factor solution indicated that there were 3 meaningful underlying factors. The first factor was the clearest; it was composed of the participant's satisfactions with his overall training program, with planning, and with the utility of the training program in accomplishing the training objectives; it also included suggestions of change in planning, or in the training program. This 5 item factor was labeled satisfaction with technical training and made up the first criterion in further analyses.

A second factor was composed of 2 items; the individual interviewer ratings of the participants' attitudes toward AID and toward their training institutions. This factor was labeled satisfaction with administrative arrangements:

The third factor was also composed of 2 items: the participants' feeling of comfort and welcome in the United States and the individual interviewer's ratings of the participants' attitude toward the United States. This factor became the third criterion to be used in further analysis and was labeled the participants' social-personal adjustment in the United States.

Other items in the analysis tended to either not load on any of the factors, or to spread themselves rather evenly across several factors, and thus not be meaningful in terms of any one. It was decided to drop these other items as outcome information, because they did not illuminate, theoretically or statistically, our criterion measures.

The results of this analysis revealed some minor measurement ambiguities. There tended to be some confusion between the method of measurement used in the exit interview questionnaire and the individual interviewer ratings, and the actual underlying factor structure. This confusion was due to the fact that the satisfaction and utility items were measured on 7-point scales, whereas the change and individual interviewer ratings data were measured on 3-point scales. This type of ambiguity was cleared up by arithmetic operations for use of the data in subsequent analyses.

Factor Analyses — Predictors

The next step in the analysis was to go through a series of factor analyses on predictor items — the various experiential and situational items that the participants indicated were a part of their sojourn in the United States. The first factor analysis was done on a group of 7 questions which asked the participant about difficulties he had had with various aspects of his training program, e.g., housing, travel, money allowances. These 7 questions encompassed 60 separate difficulty items. When factored, the 60 items loaded on 20 meaningful factors. These 20 factors were used as predictors in the first attempt to develop a meaningful multiple regression equation.

In addition to the difficulties questions, there were approximately another 63 items in the questionnaire (to which the majority of the participants responded) that qualified as possible predictors. Some arbitrary ground rules were devised to eliminate or consolidate a number of these items prior to the first factor analysis of all predictors. The following were eliminated: (1) items with very low variance across participants; (2) single items which were not found to correlate with the satisfaction items in the very first

analysis conducted (on the 54 items); (3) items to which less than 85% of the participants responded; (4) items which did not relate to the participant's AID experiences, but which were descriptive of his expectations of the future.

The application of these rules to the 63 items plus the data reduction by the factor analysis of the difficulties items (see above), reduced the number of predictor variables to a possible 48. These 48 items from the first 859 questionnaires were rotated by the centroid method and produced a 13 and 11 factor solution. The 13 factor solution showed 7 meaningful factors containing 3 predictor items or more. These 7 factors were labeled: money problems, planning problems, English language problems, housing problems, discrimination, gregarious participant behavior, and living arrangements.

The analysis suggested combining 2 sets of 2 items each into an index, and dividing up 3 of the factors from the factor analysis of the difficulties items. It also suggested that 7 of the 48 items were not meaningful in this particular factor analysis. The suggested changes resulted in a set of 43 predictor items.

The second factor analysis of the 43 predictors produced a 10 factor solution. The same 7 meaningful factors found in the 48 item rotation appeared in the 43 item rotation. Also 11 individual items stood out in the analysis as being meaningful predictors, independent of any other items. Finally, the new combinations of items suggested by the first analysis held together as anticipated.

The results of this second factor analysis reduced the list of predictors from 43 to 22. These 22 predictors were used in the first attempt at producing a multiple regression equation. (See Figure 1)

Figure 1

PREDICTORS

1. Attendance at the Washington International Center
2. Attendance at a Pre-University Workshop
3. Attendance at a Special Communication Seminar
4. Desire to participate in the planning of training program
5. Adequacy of time to prepare for sojourn (in home country)
6. Involvement of participant and Supervisor in advance planning
7. Formal English language instruction after selection
8. Problems with English language in the United States
9. Problems with money in the United States
10. Problems with housing in the United States
11. Relations with landlord(s) in the United States
12. Accessibility of housing to training site and activities
13. Type of housing and nationality of roommates in the United States (enclaves)
14. Participation in home hospitality
15. Participation in spontaneous (not programmed) social activities
16. Adequacy of time for unprogrammed activities
17. Outgoingness of participant with Americans and in use of program services.
18. Sense of exclusion from organizations and activities
19. Sense of being discriminated against
20. Homesickness
21. Illness
22. Adjustment to American food

Multiple Regression — 22 Predictors, 3 Criteria

The next step in the analysis was to relate the three outcome criteria to the 22 predictors. 436 cases had usable data on both the 22 predictors and the 3 criteria. Again, these cases were checked against the total of 859 to see if

they were similar in relevant demographic characteristics. This comparison indicated that there were no significant differences in the sample.

The first multiple regression equation related the 22 predictors to the participant's satisfaction with technical training program (first criterion). The multiple correlation here was +.43.¹ In carrying out T-tests on the individual predictors, it was found that 8 of the 22 were significant beyond the .05 level, and 6 others were suggestive or nearly significant. The remaining 8 predictors were dropped from ensuing multiple regression analyses on this criterion, as their T values had chance probabilities of more than 1 in 5.

The multiple regression equation relating the 22 predictors to the second criterion (administrative arrangements) produced a multiple correlation of +.14. Three predictors were found to be significant beyond .05 and 5 others were suggestive. On the basis of these results, this second criterion was dropped from further analyses. The low multiple correlation and the rather meaningless pattern of significant predictors resulted in this decision.

The multiple regression equation between the 22 predictors and the third criterion (social-personal adjustment in the United States) produced a multiple correlation of +.25. Five predictors were found to be significant (by T-test) beyond the .05 level and 4 others were suggestive.

All of the significant and suggestive predictors (from the R's with the first and third criteria) were included in a group of 14 predictors. (See Figure 2)

1. In carrying out all multiple regression analyses, B weights rather than Beta weights were used so that the predictors could be scored in their dimensional form.

Figure 2

PREDICTORS

1. Attendance at the Washington International Center
2. Attendance at a Special Communication Seminar
3. Desire to participate in the planning of training program
4. Involvement of participant and Supervisor in advance planning
5. Problems with English language in the United States
6. Problems with money in the United States
7. Problems with housing in the United States
8. Relations with landlord(s) in the United States
9. Type of housing and nationality of roommates in the United States (enclaves)
10. Participation in home hospitality
11. Adequacy of time for unprogrammed activities
12. Outgoingness of participant with Americans and in use of program services
13. Sense of being discriminated against
14. Homesickness

Multiple Regressions — 14 Predictors, 2 Criteria

With 14 predictors, the size of the sample of participants on which total data were available increased from 436 to 598. Before beginning the second set of multiple regression analyses, the predictors which were significantly related to the first and third criteria in the first analysis were further examined separately.

The set of items accounting for the largest proportion of the variance on the first criterion was the planning problems factor. In examining the 11 items which made up this factor, it was decided that 8 were more nearly retrospective judgments by the participant about his training program than they were events, experiences, or situations

in the sojourn. Since these retrospective judgments were similar in meaning to the judgments the participant made on the items in the first criterion, the 8 items were dropped from the next multiple regression analysis, with the remaining 3 items used to make up the planning problems predictor.

In looking at the significant predictors of the third criterion, it was noticed that the factor which included items on participant's feelings of homesickness and loneliness was very similar in meaning to the scale in the criterion measure which asked about the participant's feelings of comfort and welcome in the United States. Therefore, this factor was dropped from further multiple regression analyses for the same reason that the 8 planning problems items were dropped.

The multiple regression equation relating the 13 remaining predictors to the first criterion produced a multiple correlation of $+0.15$. Six predictors were significant by T-test beyond the $.05$ level, 2 others were suggestive. On the basis of this analysis the remaining 5 predictors were dropped from further analysis, since their T values had chance probabilities of more than 1 in 5. (The rather dramatic drop in multiple correlation between the first and second analysis — from $+0.43$ to $+0.15$ — was almost entirely accounted for by the change in the planning problem factor.)

The multiple regression between the 13 predictors and the third criterion produced a multiple correlation of $+0.26$, which was very similar to the multiple correlation in the first analysis. Seven of the 13 predictors were significant beyond the $.05$ level, and 3 others suggestive. Three predictors were dropped since their T values had chance probabilities of more than 1 in 5.

Replication of Multiple Regressions —
13 Predictors, 2 Criteria

In order to test the predictive validity of the two multiple regression equations which were developed above, the same B weights were used with data from the second half of the participant population. This included the 952 participants who were interviewed between February, 1968, and September, 1968. Of these 952 participants, 507 had data which were complete and usable for this check on predictive validity. An analysis of these 507 cases indicated they were not significantly different on any important demographic characteristics from the total group of 952.

The multiple regression between the 13 predictors and the first criterion on the second half of the data produced a multiple correlation of +.22, 5 predictors were found to be significant, 3 of which had been significant in the same analysis on the first half of the data. Three other predictors were suggestive, 2 of which have been previously significant.

In looking at the results of this intended replication, the different pattern of predictors, and the higher multiple correlation indicated that there were some meaningful differences between the first half of the population and the second half. One immediate difference which accounted for much of the higher multiple correlation in the second half, is that this group of participants tended to give somewhat lower ratings, as a group, on the satisfaction scales which made up part of the first criterion. This higher degree of criticality produced more variance in the ratings and thus allowed for the multiple correlation to be higher.

In addition to the degree of participant criticality, it was also noted that on some items — in particular the money problem predictor — the change in time from the first

half of the population to the second half was a meaningful one. In other words, the second half of the participants did not have a comparable experience in the United States to the first half in terms of some items. In the case of money, for example, the higher cost of living made the fixed AID money allowances less adequate, and created a higher degree of dissatisfaction.

Since the two halves of the populations were not comparable for the reasons indicated above, it was decided to use the 3 predictors which were significant in multiple regression analyses for both halves of the population, plus 5 others which were known to be of some theoretical or management interests to AID/OIT, to develop a new multiple regression equation on the first criterion for the second half of the population. (See Figure 3)

Figure 3

PREDICTORS

1. Attendance at the Washington International Center
2. Attendance at a Pre-University Workshop
3. Attendance at a Special Communication Seminar
4. Involvement of participant and Supervisor in advance planning
5. Problems with English language in the United States
6. Problems with money in the United States
7. Outgoingness of participant with Americans and in use of program services
8. Sense of being discriminated against

The multiple regression between the 13 predictors and the third criterion for the second half of the data produced a multiple correlation of +.37. Eight predictors were found to be significant beyond the .05 level, 4 of which had been significant for the first half of the population, while 2 others were suggestive.

Again in examining the data, it was found that the higher multiple correlation could be accounted for to a large extent by the fact that the participants were more critical in the second half of the sample. Thus, it was decided that this multiple regression did not represent the intended replication. Four significant factors from both halves of the data, plus 5 other predictors which were of some theoretical or management interest to AID/OIT, were used to produce a new multiple regression on the third criterion for the second half of the participants. (See Figure 4)

Figure 4

PREDICTORS

1. Attendance at the Washington International Center
2. Attendance at a Special Communication Seminar
3. Problems with English language in the United States
4. Problems with money in the United States
5. Problems with housing in the United States
6. Type of housing and nationality of roommates in the United States (enclaves)
7. Participation in home hospitality
8. Outgoingness of participant with Americans and in use of program services
9. Sense of being discriminated against

Multiple Regression — Second Half of the Data

The multiple regression analysis between the 8 predictors and the first criterion produced a multiple correlation of +.22. Five predictors were found to be significant, including the 3 which came from both of the previous multiple regression analyses. Interpretation of these 5 variables

appeared to be quite meaningful, so it was decided to use this multiple regression as the equation to be tested for reliability.

Multiple regression between the third criterion and the 10 predictors on the second half of the data produced a multiple correlation of +.36. Five predictors were found to be significant, including 3 of the 4 which came from both of the previous multiple regression equations. Interpretation of these 3 variables appeared to be meaningful, so this equation was used for the reliability test.

Background Variables

The next step in the analysis was to see to what extent selected background variables on the participants could be used to predict the first and third criterion. This analysis was run to indicate whether these variables should be used as predictor variables in the development of further multiple regression equations. If it was found that they were highly predictive of the 2 criteria, then they could be included in the multiple regression equations developed above. (See Figure 5)

Figure 5 BACKGROUND VARIABLES

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

The multiple correlation between the 10 background variables and first criterion (satisfaction with technical training program) produced a multiple correlation of +.03. Three variables were significant beyond the .05 level. This multiple regression equation accounted for significantly less variance than did the equation using experiential predictors on the second half of the population (see Figure 3).

The multiple correlation between the third criterion (social-personal adjustment in the United States) and the 14 background variables produced a multiple correlation of +.12. Seven of the variables were found to be significant beyond .05. This multiple regression equation also accounted for significantly less variance than the multiple regression equation on the second half of the population using experiential data (see Figure 4).

Thus, it was decided that in both cases the background variables were not sufficiently related to the criteria to serve as predictors of participants' satisfaction with their technical training program, or social-personal adjustment in the United States.

However, it was decided to use these variables later in further analyses of the final multiple regression equations.

Reliability of Multiple Regression Equations

Since it was found that the first and second half of the participant data was not comparable, and thus could not be used in testing the predictive validity of the multiple regression equations, it was decided to use a random sample of all participants for this purpose, based on their DETRI identification numbers. This produced 557 cases which had odd numbers and 548 cases which had even numbers. In using these 2 samples, it was possible to check the reliability

of the developed multiple regression equations on the first and third criteria.

The reliability check showed the first criterion to be the more stable. The multiple regression for the odd numbered participants was $+0.13$, for the even numbered participants $+0.18$. Planning problems and gregarious participant behavior were the most highly significant predictors in both of these multiple regression equations. Discrimination and English language problems were also found to be significant predictors in both equations. The other predictors were either significant in only 1 of the 2 equations, or were suggestive in both.

The third criterion was found to be less stable than the first. This was possibly due to the fact that it was based on fewer items than the first criterion. The multiple correlation for the odd numbered participants was $+0.35$, for the even numbered participants $+0.25$. Discrimination and housing problems were the 2 most highly significant predictors in both of these equations. Other predictors were found to be significant for only 1 of the 2 equations, or suggestive in both.

In light of the results of these reliability tests, it was decided to further analyze the more stable first criterion by type of participant training programs. Since the technical training program of those participants who go to academic institutions in the United States are quite different from those who do not, it was felt that some of the items from the training program section of the questionnaires also should be used as predictors of the first criterion.

The third criterion did not require this further analysis, as it was not expected to be directly related to any particular training category. However, in light of the more unstable nature of this criterion, it was decided to emphasize in the report only the two highly significant predictors of

this third criterion: discrimination and housing problems.

Multiple Regressions, First Criterion:
Academic and Special Participants

Three new predictors were added to the multiple regression equation for the Special program participants. Two of these were factor scores which came from the list of difficulties with observational training tours and 1 was an item on changes requested in the training program. Five new predictors were added to the multiple regression equation for the Academic program participants. Four of these were factor scores from the difficulty with course work question, and one an item on changes requested in the training program. (See Figure 6).

Figure 6

ACADEMIC PARTICIPANTS' PREDICTORS

1. Not enough lectures and discussions.
2. Course work too elementary
3. Course work too advanced
4. Course work repetitious, irrelevant
5. Changes requested in training program

SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS' PREDICTORS

1. Training visits repetitious, irrelevant
2. Training visits overscheduled
3. Changes requested in training program

The multiple correlation between the 11 predictors and the first criterion for Special program participants was +.19. The similar figure for the Academic program participants

using 13 predictors was +.16. The reader will notice that both of these co-efficients were slightly lower than the +.22 value for the second half of the data (see Figure 3). These slight drops can be accounted for by the introduction of new items.

The predictors which were significant seem to be interpretable and meaningful in both of these equations, and so they were used in place of the single multiple regression equation for all second half participants developed earlier.

Control Variable Analyses

The final step in the analysis was to take the 3 refined multiple regression equations and apply them, comparatively to different groups of participants selected according to background and training sojourn variables of interest to AID/OIT. In both of these analyses, 10 background (see Figure 5) and 2 program variables were used to test the predictive efficiency of the regression equation for different groups of participants.

This control variable analysis on the first criterion was done twice, once for the multiple regression equation developed on the 50% sample of Academic participants (N=402), and once for the equation developed on the 40% sample of Special program participants (N=407). Generally speaking, the regression equation developed for the Special program participants seems to predict better the first criterion than does the equation developed for the Academic participants. (The indices of predictive efficiency range from -14% for a short sojourn group of Academics, to +30% for a long sojourn group of Special program participants.)

The most informative categories in terms of predictive efficiency for the Academics on the first criterion, include being in the field of Public Administration, and age. That

is, for Academics who are younger, and who are in the field of Public Administration, there is a higher predictive efficiency with the equation than for other types of Academic participants.²

For the Special participants, being in the field of Agriculture, the size of participant's home city, travel outside the home country and educational level, are the most informative in terms of predictive efficiency. That is, for Special participants from smaller towns, who have not traveled outside their home country, who have less education, and in the field of Agriculture, there is a higher predictive efficiency on the first criterion using the multiple regression equation than for other types of Special participants.

In analyzing the third criterion, it was possible to use the total sample of 1105 cases from both halves of the population. Again, 10 background variables (see Figure 5) plus 2 program variables were used to test the predictive efficiency of the final multiple regression equation (see Figure 4).

Throughout the predictive efficiency analysis it was apparent that the efficiency of prediction on the third criterion is more enhanced by grouping participants on the control variables, than is efficiency of prediction enhanced on the first criterion by a similar operation. This is due to the fact that the participants' social-personal evaluations logically can be expected to be more affected by their demographic characteristics than their training program evaluations.

The participants from Africa who have longer sojourns in the United States have a higher predictive efficiency

2. These categories of high or low predictive efficiency are suggestive of practical guide lines to be used in management decisions on program changes. There is no known way to test their significance statistically. Small sample size and/or high error variance would make replicability unlikely in categories where it occurs.

on the third criterion using the multiple regression equation than do other types of participants. (The indices of predictive efficiency range from +4% for female participants to +25% for participants in the field of Agriculture).

All of the findings in this section are discussed in Part 2, Chapter I of this analytic report.