

371.4

L815

PN-AAS-819 40183

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTIVENESS
OF FOREIGN STUDENT ADVISERS AT
AMERICAN COLLEGES AND
UNIVERSITIES AS REPORTED BY
FOREIGN STUDENTS SPONSORED BY

LOCKETT BETTY ALLA
DEGREE DATE: 1970

University
Microfilms
International

Published on demand by

300 N ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

PN-A13-819

This is an authorized facsimile
printed by microfilm/xerography on acid-free paper
in 1984 by
UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS INTERNATIONAL
Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.

Best Available Document

71-8617

LOCKETT, Betty Alla, 1931-

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF FOREIGN STUDENT
ADVISERS AT AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
AS REPORTED BY FOREIGN STUDENTS SPONSORED BY
THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL
DEVELOPMENT.

The American University, Ph.D., 1970
Education, guidance and counseling

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

Agency for International Development
Library
Room 105 SA-18
Washington, D.C. 20523

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF FOREIGN STUDENT
ADVISERS AT AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
AS REPORTED BY FOREIGN STUDENTS SPONSORED BY
THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL
DEVELOPMENT

By

Betty Alla Lockett

Submitted to the
Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences
of The American University
in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the Degree
of
Doctor of Philosophy
in
Education

Signatures of Committee:

Chairman: Sterling Whitley
Bernard A. Hodinler
W. H. Hyland
James W. Deale

William H. Wickham
Dean of the College
Date: July 10, 1970

1970

The American University
Washington, D.C.

THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

SEP 16 1970

4206

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to express appreciation to Dr. Sterling Whitley and Dr. Bernard Hodinko for their instructions and advice on this research, as well as in the classroom; and to Mr. Joseph W. Neale who was "always available" and helpful. I am especially appreciative to Dr. William A. Lybrand and his staff at DETRI who made this study possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vi
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
A. BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM	1
B. THE DEVELOPMENT OF FOREIGN STUDENT ADVISING AS A PROFESSION	4
II. THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING.	9
A. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	9
B. SUBPROBLEMS.	9
C. DELIMITATIONS OF THE PROBLEM	10
D. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED	10
E. DEFINITIONS OF ACRONYMS USED	13
F. ASSUMPTIONS.	13
G. HYPOTHESES	15
III. THE REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE	18
A. STUDIES ON FOREIGN STUDENT ADVISING.	18
B. RELATED STUDIES IN CROSS-CULTURAL EDUCATION.	24
C. SUMMARY	34
IV. THE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE	36
A. THE SOURCE OF THE DATA	36
B. PROCEDURES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE A.I.D. PARTICIPANT EXIT INTERVIEW	38

Chapter	Page
1. Delimitation of Interview Content	41
2. The Ingratiation Factor	44
C. QUESTIONNAIRE DEVELOPMENT	46
1. Item and Instruction Intelligibility	46
2. Length of Questionnaire	48
3. Grouping and Ordering of the Items	49
4. Item Response Alternatives	50
5. Questionnaire Format	53
D. CRITERIA FOR THE ADMISSIBILITY OF DATA.	56
E. A DETAILED STATEMENT OF METHODOLOGY FOR EACH SUBPROBLEM	57
V. PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA	65
A. INTRODUCTION	65
B. DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS AND BIOGRAPHICAL DATA	66
C. DATA ANALYSIS	73
1. Subproblem I	73
2. Subproblem II	75
3. Subproblem III	76
4. Subproblem IV	78
5. Subproblem V	83
6. Subproblem VI	87
D. SUMMARY	90
VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	92

Chapter	Page
A. SUMMARY OF THE MAIN FINDINGS OF THE STUDY	92
B. CONCLUSIONS	92
C. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES	100
APPENDICES	109
A. PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF AID INTERNATIONAL TRAINING QUESTIONNAIRE	110
B. STANDARD INTRODUCTION FOR ACADEMIC AND SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS	132
C. AID TRAINING EXIT INTERVIEW DEVELOPMENT STUDY	141
BIBLIOGRAPHY	163

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1.1 Dates of Entry Into Positions of Foreign Student Adviser	6
3.1 Foreign Student Advisers' Involvements in Services Offered Foreign Students , . .	19
5.1 Marital Status of Foreign Students Studied. .	66
5.2 Years of Formal Education of Foreign Students Studied	67
5.3 Age of Foreign Students Studied	68
5.4 Sex of Foreign Students Studied	69
5.5 Population of Place Where Student Lived Most of the Time After Age Eighteen	70
5.6 Academic Level of Foreign Students Studied .	70
5.7 U. S. Degrees Earned by Foreign Students Studied	71
5.8 Field of Training of Foreign Students Studied	72
5.9 Length of Sojourn of Foreign Students Studied	73
5.10 Percentages and Total Numbers of Students Who Did/Did Not Talk with a Foreign Student Adviser	74
5.11 Percentages and Numbers of Student Responses to the Availability Ratings.	76
5.12 Percentages and Numbers of the Students' Responses to the Utility Ratings of the Foreign Student Advisers' Help	77
5.13 Country Code List	79
5.14 Percentages and Total Numbers of Students from Geographic Regions	81

Table	Page
5.15	Percentages of Students' Responses to Whether or Not They Talked with a Foreign Student Adviser According to Geographic Region 82
5.16	Percentages and Numbers of Responses to Availability Rating Categories According to Utility Rating Scale Placement 85
5.17	Percentages and Numbers of Students' Responses to Usefulness Ratings According to Responses to the Availability Rating Categories. 86
5.18	Percentages and Numbers of Usefulness Ratings According to Length of Sojourn. 89

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Background of the Problem

The number of foreign students reported in the United States in 1969 was one hundred and twenty-one thousand three hundred and sixty-two. This is almost twenty times the number who were in this country in 1922.¹ A persistent increase in the number of foreign students in this country has been one of the most important developments in higher education since World War II. This growth in international education has been worldwide; it has culminated in 1970 being designated as "International Education Year" by the United Nations. Yet, in spite of these facts, financial support for international education has decreased rapidly in the past few years in the United States.

In 1969, the Fulbright-Hayes program was cut from a yearly average of eight hundred grants for United States students to study abroad to only two hundred and fifty. Funds for foreign students to come to the United States under the same program were cut by about one-fourth.

¹Open Doors 1969. The Institute of International Education, New York, September, 1969, p. 2.

Private foundations have been turning their attention and funds away from the international scene to urgent domestic problems.

Kenneth Holland, President of the Institute of International Education, has summarized the situation well in saying:

While attacks on domestic problems are certainly, in many cases long overdue, the sudden concentration on them has been at the expense of broader international concerns. In the year that men have landed on the moon, is this not parochial? Not only are all these problems global, all global problems¹ are now domestic. We must meet them as such.

This decrease in financial support for student exchange is very recent, but criticisms of the services offered to foreign students who come to study in the United States were voiced as soon as the program began to develop. There were some critics who felt that special attention to, and counseling for, the foreign student was not necessary.²

Philip Woodyatt went so far as to say that foreign students should not be ministered to, and that educational institutions in this country had mistakenly created a formidable apparatus for handling the mechanics of kindness

¹Ibid., p. 5.

²Cora Du Bois, Foreign Students and Higher Education in the United States (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1962), pp. 30-33.

and for otherwise gratifying what he termed "benignant urges with respect to visitors from abroad."¹ Mr. Woodyatt and the critics quoted by Dr. Du Bois may represent a small vocal minority, but it is important to view their position against the background of a statement made by John W. Gardner, a "friend" of international education by any measure.

In 1952 Mr. Gardner wrote:

It is perhaps characteristic of us as a nation that we have thrown ourselves wholeheartedly into such an enormous venture [student exchange] without ever having subjected it to critical scrutiny. . . . These are times which call for reexamination of all phases of our intercourse with other nations and peoples.²

In the same article he added that he felt that

. . . the foreign student does not need to be singled out for elaborate attention . . . The student will as a rule be far better off if left to himself to a reasonable degree.³

Certainly there have been other knowledgeable observers who disagree with this position, but almost twenty years after Mr. Gardner's exhortation to "critical scrutiny," no attempt has been made to systematically evaluate (nationwide) the effectiveness of Foreign Student

¹Philip C. Woodyatt, "We are so Kind . . .," International House Quarterly, XIX, No. 1 (Winter, 1955), p. 10.

²John W. Gardner, "The Foreign Student in America," Foreign Affairs, XL, No. 4 (July, 1952), p. 640.

³Ibid., pp. 643-644.

Advisers who are at the core of this country's foreign student "industry."

It is in the context of recent drastic decrease in financial support for foreign students in the United States, persistent criticisms of the services offered by Foreign Student Advisers (even though the numbers of foreign students and Foreign Student Advisers have greatly increased in the last decade), and the lack of a critical evaluation of these services that this study is undertaken. More specifically, this study is designed to give an indication of the effectiveness of Foreign Student Advisers. The results should be directly useful to Foreign Student Advisers, to educators involved in Student Personnel Services in higher education and to institutional governmental and private policy makers in international education programs.

The Development of Foreign Student Advising
As A Profession

Foreign student advising in the United States is of more recent origin than the profession of Student Personnel Services in general. It was not until after World War II, that foreign student advising began to grow and to become a specialized area of the profession. When Homer D. Higbee surveyed the status of foreign student advising in 1960, only sixteen of the six hundred and seventy-nine Foreign Student Advisers who responded to

his questionnaire had been in foreign student advising work before 1940.¹ His table, which follows, (Table 1.1) shows the expansion of foreign student advising in the United States from 1940 to 1960.

Although the Institute of International Education was founded in 1919, and although by 1925 there were more than one hundred and fifteen organizations in the United States that were involved directly or indirectly in the exchange of students and other academic personnel,² the National Association of Foreign Student Advisers (NAFSA) was not organized until 1948. However, before that time a Conference of Foreign Student Advisers was held in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1942.³

Thirteen Foreign Student Advisers attended this conference and met with representatives from interested

¹Homer D. Higbee, The Status of Foreign Student Advising in the United States Universities and Colleges (East Lansing, Michigan: Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, Michigan State University, 1961), p. 3.

²Guy S. Metraux, Exchange of Persons: The Evolution of Cross-Cultural Education (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1952), p. 16.

³Robert B. Klinger, "A History of Non-Governmental National Services in Behalf of the Foreign Student in the United States," (unpublished manuscript), pp. 18-21, referenced by Ivan Putman, Jr., The Foreign Student Adviser and His Institution in International Student Exchange (New York, New York: NAFSA, 1964), pp. 6-8. Mr. Putman's book is the source of this and the following information about the history of NAFSA. He refers to the manuscript by Robert B. Klinger as the source of all the information prior to the founding of NAFSA in 1948.

TABLE 1.1¹

Dates of Entry Into Positions of Foreign Student
Adviser

Year Became F.S. Adviser	Number	Percentage
1940 and before	16	2.4
1940 - 1945	25	3.7
1946 - 1950	127	18.7
1951 - 1952	59	8.7
1953 - 1954	64	9.4
1955 - 1956	107	15.7
1957	66	9.7
1958	81	11.9
1959	105	15.6
1960*	6	.8
No answer	23	3.4
Total	679	100.0 %

*Incomplete.

¹Higbee, p. 5.

government agencies and national private organizations concerned with foreign students.

Another conference was held in Chicago in 1946. This time the conference was sponsored by IIE and the Department of State and thirty-one Foreign Student Advisers attended.

The need for a national association of those concerned with foreign students in the United States was recognized at a second Chicago conference in 1947. Finally, at the Conference on International Student Exchange at Ann Arbor, Michigan, in May 1948, the National Association of Foreign Student Advisers was formally organized.

The work of NAFSA has been supported over the years by a series of grants from foundations such as The Ford Foundation, the Danforth Foundation, The Asia Foundation and the Dean Langmuir Foundation. Individual and institutional membership dues and the sale of publications also support the NAFSA program. Financial support has also been obtained more recently from corporations which have overseas interests.

The name of the organization was changed from National Association of Foreign Student Advisers to National Association for Foreign Student Affairs in 1964. By that time, NAFSA's membership included a diversified group of people from many academic disciplines, government

agencies, and private life, who had a common interest in foreign student service in the United States. In 1956 the English Language Section of NAFSA was formally organized (for teachers of English as a foreign language). The Community Section for NAFSA members concerned with community programs was organized in 1961 and a section for Admissions Officers was formulated in 1964. Thus, obviously, NAFSA had outgrown its original name.

In 1970, NAFSA's total membership is one thousand nine hundred and fifty (1,950), which includes nine hundred and seventy academic institution memberships; ninety non-academic institutional memberships; and seven hundred and eighty individual memberships.

CHAPTER II

THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this research is to study the effectiveness of Foreign Student Advisers at selected American colleges and universities as they are reported by foreign students who are sponsored by the United States Agency for International Development.

Subproblems

The problem of Foreign Student Adviser effectiveness can be divided into the following subproblems:

Subproblem 1: What percentage of the foreign students studied talked with a Foreign Student Adviser during their stay in the United States?

Subproblem 2: According to the students' ratings how often was the Foreign Student Adviser available to help them?

Subproblem 3: How useful was the help the Foreign Student Advisers provided, according to the ratings made by the students?

Subproblem 4: Are the geographic origins of foreign students systematically related to whether or not they talk with Foreign Student Advisers?

Subproblem 5: Are the students' ratings of the usefulness of the Foreign Student Advisers' help positively related to the students' ratings of the frequency of their availability?

Subproblem 6: To what extent do the ratings of usefulness of Foreign Student Advisers' help vary according to the length of time students have been in their training programs?

Delimitations of the Problem

This study will be restricted to those foreign students who attended institutions of higher education in the United States and who were interviewed in the Agency for International Development exit interview project at The American University Development Education and Training Research Institute in Washington, D.C., between July 17, 1967, and August 31, 1968.

Definition of Terms Used

A.I.D. Participants. Those persons from developing nations who are sponsored by the United States Agency for International Development to receive academic or vocational training in the United States are referred to as A.I.D. participants.

Academic Participants. Those A.I.D. participants enrolled in academic programs at institutions of higher

education are classified as academic participants. Approximately 85 percent of the academic participants are degree candidates at either the graduate or undergraduate level. The remaining 15 percent are non-degree students enrolled in specialized programs.

Cross-Cultural Education. Cross-cultural education is a social process of acquiring knowledge of an intellectual or technical nature, under institutionalized conditions, outside one's own social and cultural environment.¹

Culture Shock. Kalervo Oberg was the first to speak of culture shock.² It is the psychological disturbance in the mental and/or emotional faculties of a person who is immersed in a foreign culture for the first time. Culture shock is precipitated by the anxiety that results from losing all our familiar signs and symbols of social intercourse. "In nearly every prolonged contact that a person schooled in one culture has with that of another, some shock and forced readjustment occurs. It is compounded of frustration, exasperation, irritation, and the strain of heightened attention to strange cues and signs in a foreign situation."³

¹Metraux, op. cit., p. 1.

²Kalervo Oberg, Culture Shock and the Problem of Adjustment to a New Cultural Environment (Washington: Foreign Service Institute, Department of State, 1958) (mimeographed).

³Conrad M. Arensberg and Arthur H. Nichoff, Introducing Social Change: A Manual for Americans Overseas (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1965), p. 186.

Effectiveness. Two factors are considered to comprise effectiveness of the Foreign Student Advisers in this study. These are their availability to the foreign students and the usefulness of the help they provide as perceived by the foreign students.

Foreign Student. Any citizen of a foreign country (who is not also a citizen of the United States) enrolled as a student in an institution of higher education in the United States.

Foreign Student Adviser. The person at the institution of higher education who is officially designated to provide help and guidance to the foreign students at the institution in matters affecting their personal and social adjustment is referred to as the Foreign Student Adviser. As used in this study, the term applies to that person perceived by the students as performing this function whether or not the formal title given to that person is that of Foreign Student Adviser. Other formal titles used in recent years include Adviser to International Students, Director of International Studies, Dean of Foreign Students, or Educational Exchange Coordinator.

Special Participants. An A.I.D. participant whose training includes special courses, lectures, and seminars; on-the-job work experience; observational visits; or some combination of these types of training.

U-Curve of Adjustment. The hypothesized pattern of social and cultural adjustment first described by Sverre Lysgaard has been referred to as the U-Curve of Adjustment. It is a pattern of phases in which the attitudes of a person placed in a foreign culture for the first time fluctuated in an adjustment cycle which is positive at first and then becomes negative during the sixth to eighteenth month of his stay. After the eighteenth month the curve begins to take an upward swing again and the person's attitudes again become more positive.

Definitions of Acronyms Used

NAFSA - National Association of Foreign Student Advisers (prior to 1964) National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (since 1964).

DETRI - The American University Development Education and Training Research Institute.

IIE - Institute of International Education.

A.I.D. - The United States Agency for International Development.

Assumptions

This study is based on the assumption that the responses to the questionnaire items given by the foreign students are valid indications of their perceptions and judgments.

There is ample evidence that the information taken from the data collected from the A.I.D. exit interview project, as conducted by the Development Education and Training Research Institute of The American University, and utilized in this study is both reliable and valid.

. . . 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 1,000 participants. Of these 970 items, 809, or 83.4 percent 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.¹

A further assumption is that The NAFSA Directory 1967-68 can be used as a guide to those colleges and universities in the United States which employed Foreign Student Advisers during the 1967-68 school year.

A final assumption is that the biographical data on the foreign students submitted by the United States Agency for International Development to the Development

¹Paul R. Kimmel, et. al., Participant Assessment of A.I.D. Training Programs First Annual Report to the Agency for International Development (Washington, D.C.: The American University, Development Education and Training Research Institute, May, 1969).

Education and Training Research Institute are reliable and accurate.

Hypotheses

For the descriptive aspects of this study, i.e., subproblems one, two, three, and four, no hypotheses will be formulated. The following hypotheses are made concerning the inferential aspects of this study in order to test the empirical consequences of the analysis of the data collected in its relationship to previous research completed in this area.

Hypothesis 1: In a previous study of the adequacy of the counseling given to foreign students, one of the reasons most often listed by the students who were dissatisfied with the counseling at their institution was that the advisor was overloaded with work and had too little time to advise them.¹ This finding suggests that there may be a relationship between the lack of availability of counselors and advisors, and foreign students' perceptions of the inadequacy of their guidance. Therefore, for this study it is hypothesized that the

¹Edward C. Cieslak, The Foreign Student in American Colleges: A Survey and Evaluation of Administrative Problems and Practices (Detroit: Wayne University Press, 1955), p. 103.

ratings of the usefulness of the Foreign Student Advisers' help will have a positive relationship, i.e., that the greater frequency of the availability of the Foreign Student Adviser, the higher the ratings of his usefulness will be; with the students' ratings of the frequency of their availability.

Hypothesis 2: In studies on the effects of culture shock and adjustment it was discovered that the many foreign students went through a definite pattern of phases in which their attitudes towards the United States and their studies fluctuated. As previously defined, this adjustment cycle with its ups and downs came to be referred to as a U-curve. This curve can be defined as the psychological process undergone by foreign students during the course of their stay.

A 1948 study by Kiell stated that negative attitudes toward the United States were thought to be explained in part by a generalized downward curve of all attitudes occurring after a stay of six to eighteen months.¹ Since there has been so much reference to this U-curve factor and its effect on the students' attitudes toward the United States it would seem relevant to

¹Norman Kiell, "Attitudes of Foreign Students," Journal of Higher Education, XXII, No. 4 (April, 1955), pp. 188-194.

investigate in this study the possible effects of the U-curve of adjustment on the foreign students' perceptions of the helpfulness of the Foreign Student Advisers.

Therefore, it is hypothesized that: those students who had training programs which had a duration of six to eighteen months gave significantly lower ratings to their Foreign Student Advisers' help than did those students who had training programs which lasted for less than six months or nineteen months and longer.

CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Studies on Foreign Student Advising

Although much research has been done in cross-cultural education, very little has been done in the area of foreign student advising. A study of the status of foreign student advising was done in 1961 by Homer D. Higbee. That study surveyed the range and scope of services provided to foreign students and also gave a profile of the people primarily responsible for these services. The author identified sixteen areas of services offered to foreign students and determined the Foreign Student Adviser's involvements in each of these areas. See Table 3.1 for a graphic illustration of his findings.¹ Higbee did not evaluate the effectiveness of the services provided.

Another study which was primarily concerned with the effects of the foreign students' perceptions of their national status on their adjustment included some practical suggestions to the Foreign Student Advisers

¹Homer D. Higbee, The Status of Foreign Student Advising in United States Universities and Colleges (East Lansing, Mich.: Michigan State University, Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, 1961), p. 11.

TABLE 3.1

**Foreign Student Advisers' Involvements in Services
Offered Foreign Students¹**

Service	Complete Resp.	No Resp.	Shared Resp.	Not Offered
Admissions	20%	18%	53%	1%
Registration	22%	19%	48%	3%
Immigration-Visa Asst.	53%	3%	14%	17%
Employment	19%	12%	47%	13%
Academic Advising	26%	13%	49%	3%
Programming Foreign Visitors	19%	11%	32%	26%
Housing For. Students	17%	22%	40%	11%
Arranging Scholarships	21%	16%	40%	14%
Arranging Loans	16%	15%	40%	19%
Discipline	19%	14%	46%	10%
Assistance to U.S. Students Planning to Study Abroad	25%	16%	20%	29%
Community Contacts	45%	6%	26%	14%
Counseling on Personal Problems	49%	4%	35%	3%
Information Giving & Correspondence	54%	4%	22%	10%
Formal Orientation Program	23%	8%	27%	32%
Social Activities	34%	8%	33%	18%

¹Ibid.

and concluded that the Foreign Student Advisers could be viewed as performing three functions:

1.) They try to help solve a variety of technical problems related to academic life--transfer of credit, institutional ground rules, programs, tutoring, examinations, and the like.

2.) They assist in untangling the institutional red tape--visas, work permits, transfer of funds, dealing with immigration and other government officials--both at home and abroad.

3.) They serve as cross-cultural translators helping the student to understand and to get the most out of his social experiences here.¹

As part of his study on foreign students, Edward C. Cieslak made an attempt to evaluate Foreign Student Advisers.² In this survey, done in 1955, the question was asked, "Does your institution have a foreign student counselor [not an academic counselor] to whom you may go for advise on various matters?"³ Two hundred fifteen out of three hundred and fifty-four replied in the affirmative. Eighty-three percent (one hundred and seventy-five) of these stated that they had been to his

¹Richard T. Morris, The Two-Way-Mirror (Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1960), p. 135.

²Edward C. Cieslak, The Foreign Student in American Colleges (Detroit: Wayne University Press, 1955),

³Ibid., p. 96.

office more than once since their arrival on campus.

In the same survey, foreign students were asked to state whether they felt that they were receiving adequate counseling and academic guidance at their school. Two hundred seventy-four, 84 percent of the three hundred and twenty-five who replied, stated that they were satisfied with the guidance that they received.¹ It should be noted that the measure included both academic and non-academic counseling and was not a measure of the adequacy of the Foreign Student Adviser only.

Among the reasons for dissatisfactions with the counseling they received given by the students surveyed in that study were:

1. Little advice received toward reaching goals;
2. Left to get information or adjust by self;
3. Could have used more advice than was received;
4. Counselor was overloaded, little time for advice.

Two dissertations done at Michigan State University in 1968 studied the on-the-job behavior of Foreign Student Advisers. Both of these studies used the critical incident technique to discover significant aspects of the on-the-job behavior of Foreign Student Advisers.

¹Ibid., p. 103.

The dissertation done by August G. Benson analyzed the observations of one hundred and ten "knowledgeable Faculty Members," who reported critical incidents involving the on-the-job behavior of Foreign Student Advisers which the "knowledgeable Faculty Members," perceived as having a significant effect on the academic progress and/or personal development of foreign students at their institutions.¹ Benson's study developed the following generalizations in regard to the functions which Foreign Student Advisers perform most and least effectively:

Knowledgeable Faculty Members tend to perceive Foreign Student Advisers as performing very satisfactorily in the areas involving personal contacts with students, community groups, and off-campus agencies, as well as in personal services and emergency situations. This includes the areas of Financial Guidance, Interviewed Students, Personal Counseling, Coordinates Community Activities, Relations with Outside Agencies, Emergency Situations and Miscellaneous Personal Services.

.....
 Knowledgeable Faculty Members tend to perceive Foreign Student Advisers as performing satisfactorily in areas more closely related to the knowledgeable Faculty Members, Consultant and Advisory and Academic Guidance, as well as in Gathering Information. Knowledgeable Faculty Members perceive the Foreign Student Advisers as being heavily involved in the functions Consultant and Advisory and

¹ August Gerald Benson, "On-the-Job Behavior of College and University Foreign Student Advisers as Perceived by Knowledgeable Faculty Members," (Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1968).

Academic Guidance (as the Knowledgeable Faculty Members perceive the Foreign Student Adviser's role).

Knowledgeable Faculty Members tend to perceive the Foreign Student Adviser as performing less satisfactorily in the administrative, management area involving: Administers Office and Planning and Program Development as well as in the functions of Foreign Student Activities and Immigration Expert. Knowledgeable Faculty Members perceive the Foreign Student Adviser's actively involved in the Immigration Expert area but performing below the satisfactory mean for all incidents reported.

Knowledgeable Faculty Members do not perceive the Foreign Student Adviser as very active in the area of Referral Services and Gives Advice although the Foreign Student Adviser's performance is rated satisfactory for those incidents reported. Knowledgeable Faculty Members may have subsumed these areas in other related critical areas.¹

The related study done by Richard E. Miller investigated the aspects of the Foreign Student Adviser's on-the-job behavior which Foreign Student Advisers themselves perceive to be significant in facilitating the academic progress and/or personal development of the foreign students enrolled at their institutions.² A secondary purpose of this study was to develop some generalizations regarding which functions Foreign Student Advisers tend to perform most effectively and which

¹Ibid., pp. 3 and 4.

²Richard E. Miller, "A Study of Significant Elements in the On-The-Job Behavior of College and University Foreign Student Advisers," (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1968).

functions they tend to perform least effectively. The conclusions were the following:

Foreign Student Advisers tend to perceive themselves as being much more effective in areas where they work primarily in direct relationship with people than in areas where they work more with ideas, programs, or organizational structures.

Foreign Student Advisers tend to perceive themselves as being least effective in functions involving the academic advising of foreign students.

Foreign Student Advisers tend to perceive themselves as being more effective in working with non-university persons and agencies than with university personnel.

Foreign Student Advisers tend to perceive themselves as being more effective as they gain experience in their field.¹

These studies which are related to foreign student advising, either as the focus of the entire study or as a part of that study, are few in number. Of these studies, the most comparative to a study of the effectiveness of Foreign Student Advisers are the Michigan State dissertations. Those dissertations were done in 1968 and none of the other studies were done before 1955. Thus, the related literature in this area of investigation is of very recent origin.

Related Studies in Cross-Cultural Education

As mentioned, research in cross-cultural

¹Ibid., p. 5.

education has been quite extensive in recent years. A large number of books, journal articles, government publications and unpublished monographs have been listed in bibliographies.¹ The National Association for Foreign Student Affairs and the Institute of International Education compiled bibliographies on the subject annually since 1961. In 1962, Dr. M. L. Cormack compiled a bibliography and made an evaluation of the research on educational exchange for the United States Department of State. Still, only a few of these studies can be considered classical in the sense that they are authoritative or traditional, because the origin of research in this field has such a recent date.

A study done in 1954 by Cora Du Bois, the well-known anthropologist, has been called a pioneer effort to apply research data and techniques of behavioral

¹See the following: Richard F. Crabbs and Frank W. Holmquist, United States Higher Education and World Affairs: A Partially Annotated Bibliography (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1968); Margaret L. Cormack, An Evaluation of Research on Educational Exchange, prepared for U.S. Department of State, Policy Review and Research Staff (Washington, D.C., 1962); Institution of International Education and the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, Research in International Education, Annual Series since 1961 (Washington, D.C.); and Barbara J. Walton, Foreign Student Exchange in Perspective (Washington, D.C.: The Office of External Research, U.S. Department of State, 1967).

science to the processes of educational exchange.¹ In this book the author analyzes the status, potentialities, and problems of international educational exchange. She delineates elements that operate in foreign students' pre-departure outlooks, their adaptation to American life, and their readjustment to their homeland. She also hypothesizes a series of foreign student types, based on self-esteem, the student's situation in his homeland, and national status, as a means of predicting the adjustment he may make during his stay in the United States and upon his return to his home country.

One research program which has been extensively quoted and referred to by researchers has been a series of monographs sponsored by the committee on Cross-Cultural Education of the Social Science Research Council.² This

¹Cora Du Bois, Foreign Students and Higher Education in the United States (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1956).

²The seven books in this series are: William H. Sewell and Oluf M. Davidsen, Scandinavian Students on An American Campus; Richard T. Morris, et al., The Two-Way Mirror: National Status in Foreign Student Adjustment; John W. Bennett, et al., In Search of Identity: The Japanese Overseas Scholar in America and Japan; Ralph L. Beals and Normal D. Humphrey, No Frontier to Learning: The Mexican Student in the United States; Richard D. Lambert and Marvin Bressler, Indian Students on an American Campus; Franklin D. Scott, The American Experience of Swedish Students; and Claire Selltiz, et al., Attitudes and Social Relations of Foreign Students in the United States; all published by Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1956-63.

research project attempted to answer questions about the experiences and attitudes of foreign students in the United States and questions about their adjustment to American academic and community life.

One of the volumes in the series entitled, In Search of Identity: The Japanese Overseas Scholar in America and Japan, revealed the clear influence of the immediate post World War II period. There were distinct differences in the respondents' abilities to relate to their national identity, e.g., those who were "idealist" (who had lost faith in the Japanese system) were found to deviate more from traditional Japanese norms than those who were termed "adjustors." Possibly because innovation was pervasive in the Japanese culture at the time, no correlation was found between differences in innovation potential and differences in the American experience.

Richard T. Morris studied the effects of perception of national status on adjustment to the United States.¹ He concluded that the national status which the foreigner felt as being attached to him while in the United States, away from home, affected his impression of the United States. Morris also determined that students who rated their own country low in status tended to have more favorable attitudes toward the United States.

¹Morris, The Two-Way Mirror, op. cit.

In the last volume in this series, Attitudes and Social Relations of Foreign Students in the United States, the authors report on two separate studies in which students from countries of Western Europe, or from countries in which English is the native language, were compared with students from Asia, the Middle East and Latin America.

In the first study, students from the two world areas differed to some degree in their descriptions of every aspect of the United States. These included such subjects as characteristics of Americans, relations between students and professors, treatment of Negroes, freedom of speech, democracy in general, and goals of foreign policy. They also differed in the extent to which they qualified generalizations about the United States and its people.

Many of these differences also appeared in the second study. In both studies, Europeans were more likely to describe Americans as placing great value on success, while those from other parts of the world were more likely to describe them as ambitious. Also, in both studies Europeans reported more discrimination against Negroes.

This last volume is notable not only for its methodology and its findings about the differences in national groupings but also for finding that non-Western students who had traveled were similar to Europeans in

their lesser need for orientation programs.

In 1965 a national survey on the views and reactions of foreign students to their problems in the United States was sponsored by the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs.¹ The number of students studied in this survey was 1,486. They came from eighty-eight countries. Statistical information was collected on academic problems such as registration, language skills, academic background and status and grades. Personal and social adjustment were also studied and students were asked to respond to questions about their housing, extracurricular activities, their friends and future plans.

This study is significant in that it was a pilot study designed to secure gross data on the foreign student population. It delineates the external aspects of the foreign student population and provides statistical profiles of various regional, cultural, national and educational aggregates. It also identifies certain actual and potential problems of the foreign student.

¹Foreign Students in the United States. A Report From the U. S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, A survey conducted by Operations and Policy Research, Inc., Washington, D.C., 1966.

A series of articles in two special issues of the Journal of Social Issues are also important.¹

The 1956 issue deals with adjustment factors in cross-cultural education and the 1962 issue emphasizes the effect that cross-cultural education has on the foreign student with special reference to "identity" and "self-esteem."

Social scientists who have studied the cross-cultural adjustment of foreign students have devised theories about culture shock and social and cultural adjustment. These studies revealed that the shock of being immersed for the first time in a foreign culture was great enough to affect not only the students' personal and social adjustment, but their attitudes toward the United States and their academic performance as well.²

¹Brewster M. Smith, issue editor, "Attitudes and Adjustment in Cross-Cultural Contact: Recent Studies of Foreign Students," Journal of Social Issues, XII, No. 1 (1956), 1-70; George Victor Coelho, issue editor, "Impact of Studying Abroad," Journal of Social Issues, XVIII, No. 1 (1962), 1-90.

²Ralph L. Beals and Norman D. Humphrey, No Frontier to Learning: The Mexican Student in the United States (Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1965); and Brewster M. Smith, op. cit., entire issue.

From these studies on culture shock and social and cultural adjustment a general pattern of adjustment began to be observed. The pattern came to be referred to as the u-shape curve of adjustment and it has become one of the classic propositions in the study of cross-cultural adjustment.

It was first perceived by Sverre Lysgaard of the Institute for Social Research in Oslo. After interviewing two hundred returned Norwegian students who had studied in the United States under the Fulbright program, he found that adjustment was good among those who had been in America less than six months and more than eighteen months, but those who returned home after a stay of from six to eighteen months were less well adjusted.¹

In recent years the u-curve hypothesis has been confirmed and refined in a number of studies.²

Yet, an evaluation study of the Peace Corps teachers

¹Sverre Lysgaard, "Adjustment in a Foreign Society," International Social Science Bulletin, VII, No. 1 (1955), 45-51.

²See William H. Sewell and Oluf M. Davidsen, Scandinavian Students on an American Campus (Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1961); George Caelho, Changing Images of America: A Study of Indian Students' Perceptions (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1958); and John I. and Jeanne E. Cullahorn, "An Extension of the U-curve Hypothesis," Journal of Social Issues, XIX, No. 3 (July 1963), 33-47; and Norman Klell, "Attitudes in a Foreign Society," International Social Science Bulletin, VII No. 1 (1955), 45-51.

in a program in Ghana found that for American Peace Corps teachers in that country no such curve was evident.¹ It was suggested that this could have been due to the careful advance preparation and training, or to the nature of the assignment. This U-curve of adjustment is one of the hypotheses to be further tested in this study.

A dissertation just completed at The American University, Washington, D.C., utilizes a portion of the same population of foreign students that are studied here.² That study was an analysis of the various problems of AID participants who received their training through the United States Office of Education during the fiscal years 1965, 1966 and 1967. One aspect of the analysis was to classify the problems which individual students have according to the country of origin. The three classifications of difficulties which that research found to be most common were: 1) inadequate command of English; 2) academic

¹Brewster M. Smith, Peace Corps Teachers in Ghana. Final Report of Evaluation of Peace Corps Project in Ghana. (Berkeley: University of California, Institute of Human Development, September, 1964).

²Gerald Hays Little, "An Analytical Study of Problems of Participants in The Technical Assistance Program of the Federal Government," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The American University, Washington, D.C., 1970.

difficulties in United States educational institutions, and 3) illness, physical disability, or accidental injury.¹

It was further concluded that students from the Far East and Africa had more problems per person than students from the Near East and Latin America. It was also concluded that participants from the Near East were somewhat more prone toward emotional, attitudinal, and personality problems; and that African students had more financial problems than the other students.²

Therefore that dissertation is related to this study due to the fact that the students sponsored by the same agency were investigated, and because the relationship of geographic origins to the experiences of the participants was also analyzed as will be done in this study.

A report was prepared by John W. Gardner in 1964 entitled AID and the Universities.³ This study was mainly concerned with the relations between the Agency for International Development and American Universities, but one chapter was devoted to Participant Training. Deficiencies of the existing programs were discussed and suggestions were made for improving participant training

¹Ibid., p. 113.

²Ibid., pp. 118-119.

³John W. Gardner, AID and the Universities (New York; New York: Education and World Affairs, 1964).

in the future.

Summary

The studies cited in this chapter indicate that much research has been done on foreign students and their adjustment in cross-cultural education. Adjustment problems of students, orientation of the students, and their academic adjustment have been widely researched. Yet, research with respect to the work of the Foreign Student Advisers on the United States university campuses is limited. The significant studies on foreign student advising were the survey on the Status of Foreign Student Advising by Higbee in 1961,¹ and the doctoral dissertations by Miller and Benson done at Michigan State University in 1968.² These two dissertations were studies of the significant elements in on-the-job behavior of Foreign Student Advisers. One used the critical incident technique to study on-the-job behavior as perceived by the Foreign Student Advisers themselves and the other used the same technique to study the behavior as perceived by knowledgeable faculty members.

These authors suggest that the area of foreign student advising needs to be studied from the point of view of the foreign students themselves as well, which is

¹Higbee, op. cit., 1961.

²Miller, op. cit., 1968; Benson, op. cit., 1968.

the approach of this present study. As far as this writer could determine, no other attempt has been made to quantitatively evaluate the effectiveness of Foreign Student Advisers in American colleges and universities as they are perceived by the foreign students.

CHAPTER IV

THE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE

The Source of the Data

Primary Data: The data for this study have been collected by The American University Development Education and Training Research Institute (DETRI), where the writer as a graduate research assistant has participated in the collection of the data. These data have been collected as part of a DETRI project for the U. S. Agency for International Development. In this project, foreign nationals who come to the United States from developing countries in the Near East, South Asia, the Far East and Latin America for academic and vocational training are given an exit interview before leaving the United States. This exit interview consists of a one hundred and forty-item structured questionnaire which is administered by a questionnaire administrator to groups of participants, and a private oral unstructured interview given to each participant individually.

The function of the exit interview, conducted at the completion of the participant's training program prior to his departure for his home country, is to provide data for two major concerns: first, a record of significant

events and aspects of the total training experience of the participant; second, the evaluative judgements of the participant regarding his satisfaction with the completion of his non-technical and technical training objectives, and with regard to the adequacy of administrative arrangements during his stay.

The exit interview presents an overview of all aspects of the participant's total training sojourn, from his selection in his home country to his departure from the United States at the end of the program. It includes home country orientation meetings, orientation in the United States, travel and living arrangements, arranged and spontaneous social activities, a special seminar designed to help the participant re-enter his home country and successfully perform a change agent role, technical and non-technical aspects of his training program, and plans for utilization of his training after his return to the home country.

Between July 17, 1967, and August 31, 1968, aggregate data were collected at DETRI on seven hundred and ninety-five academic program participants and one thousand and fifteen special program participants. This study utilized only the data collected from the seven hundred and ninety-five academic participants who attended institutions of higher education in the United States.¹

¹See Introduction to Appendix A for a list of the selected items from the Participant Evaluation of AID Training Questionnaire utilized in this study.

Secondary Data: Published articles in professional journals and books containing information concerning educational exchange, research on foreign students in the United States, and the effectiveness of advisers and counselors in student personnel services in higher education were used in this study.

Unpublished studies, government publications, and doctoral dissertations found in bibliographies of cross-cultural education and Dissertation Abstracts were also included. See the Selected Bibliography of this study for a complete list of the secondary sources which were utilized.

Procedures For the Development of the AID Participant Exit Interview¹

Plan of the Study: The AID exit interview project development was based on two major considerations. Comparable data needed to be elicited from participants who have a fairly broad range of English language capabilities, and who also represent a wide variety of cultural backgrounds. Interview instruments had to be constructed which would elicit this comparable data. A large number of

¹Information for this section of the chapter has been taken from "Final Report: AID Participant Training Exit Interview Development Study," The American University Development Education and Training Research Institute, Washington, D.C., mimeographed, and personal statements from personal interviews with the Project Director, Dr. Paul Kimmel, January 1970.

participants had to be processed at minimal cost while, at the same time, a standardization of environment and treatment needed to be maintained so that these factors would not have differential influence on the interview results.

In an extensive review of the related literature, no prior study could be found which was faced with both of these considerations simultaneously in the magnitude and complexity involved in this current study. For this reason, the basic thrust of the development strategy was to allow for extensive pretesting of the procedures and instruments. This extensive pretesting provided an objective basis for specific decision-making in the development of the procedures, and in the construction of the instruments.

The developmental stage was planned and executed in three major phases. In the first phase, initial instruments and procedures were developed and a full-time interviewing staff organized and trained. During this time the first pretesting was conducted with these instruments on approximately seventy-five academic and special participants. One purpose of this initial pretesting was to establish the most meaningful grouping of items for the participants and the most relevant categories of administrative procedures for the staff. The instruments and procedures were revised accordingly.

Then, during Phase II, final pretesting was conducted on three hundred and eight academic participants and four hundred and sixteen special participants. During this final pretesting, revisions and refinements were made within groupings on items, ordering of items, instructions in the interview instruments, and in administrative procedure at a detailed operational level.

Finally, for two months, the final forms of the instruments and procedures which emerged from the pretesting phase were used in a full scale operational check out of the total system. This third phase check out was conducted during the months of June, July and August when participant departures reach their highest level of the year and when the administrative procedures receive their most severe operational test.

An additional strategic choice of approach was made in regard to the order of development of the various instruments. In view of the lengthy pretesting planned it was considered desirable to begin making feedback reports to the office of International Training at the Agency for International Development as soon as possible. Therefore, the first focus of the project was on the construction of questionnaires; feedback reporting was started with the final pretest form of the questionnaire used in the pretesting phase. Then, project effort was shifted to development of the private oral interview.

This sequence also had advantages for the development of the private, oral interview. Since completely unstructured, free discussions with the participants were conducted during this pretesting phase much valuable knowledge was acquired regarding the types of topics on which participants would most likely express themselves. This not only provided a cathartic interview for the departing participants, but also provided information necessary for the development of appropriate interview methodologies for the private, oral interviewing situation.

Delimitation of Interview Content

It was necessary to formulate an explicit set of information objectives for the exit interview before technical development of specific interview instruments could begin. The broad boundaries for the substance to be included and the type of information required were established by the defined purpose and scope of the exit interview, but the initial problem for phase one of the study was to identify and define the specific content within these boundaries.

The Office of International Training of AID was the primary source of materials concerned with AID International Training programs and these sources were carefully analyzed. These were:

- 1.) "Operations of the A.I.D. Participant-Training Program," prepared by H. O. Preston;

2.) AID Manual Orders, forms, and publications pertaining to and outlining the participant training programs;

3.) The reports, questionnaire forms, and code books used in the AIL/IT World Wide Follow-up Surveys; and

4.) An early preliminary draft of an exit interview developed internally at AID and given a brief tryout with a few participants.¹

A critical review of empirical studies in the literature on foreign student training in the United States also was undertaken. This review of instruments used and results obtained by others in the field provided a greater scope and depth to the development of the information objectives and also helped to guide the general technical progress of the project, that is, instrument construction, data analysis and interpretation of results.

A detailed list of information requirements concerning the administrative, technical and non-technical aspects of the participant's training program was compiled from these two general sources. This list, was composed of the following categories: (A) criterion measures (evaluative judgments of participants), (B) program background, selection and language information, (C) orientation, (D) technical training program, including program planning, (E) travel, (F) housing, (G) financial, (H) personal adjustment and

¹See the Bibliography of this study for complete references to these sources.

social relations, (I) post-return plans, and (J) extra-curricular learning and attitudes.

There were three hundred and twenty items on the list. Multiple copies of this list were circulated within AID/IT for review. The purposes of the review were to ascertain the relative importance of the type of information identified to AID Office of International Training and to insure that all useful types of information had been identified. Each person in AID/IT who reviewed the information requirements was asked to follow this procedure:

1) to delete any information requirement he thought would not be useful.

2) to add any requirement he felt should be covered that was not included on the list.

3) and to give a priority rating of either High, Medium or Low to each item in the final list of requirements. This final list of priority-rated information requirements was the basis for the content of the first pretest interview instruments.

The first pretest interview instrument was then reviewed by selected members of the academic community who are eminent in the field on cross-cultural communications and research. These scholars became the Technical Advisory Committee for the development of the project. The principal function of this committee was to review the overall exit interview system to insure that it was meeting specific

requirements on a sound scientific basis, and to make specific contributions to the interview instruments and methodologies used in the project. The members of this committee were:

Mr. Lloyd Free, Director
Institute for International Social Research
Bethesda, Maryland

Dr. Eugene Jacobsen
Associate Dean for Research and Development
International Programs
Michigan State University

Dr. Daniel Lerner, Professor of Political Science
Center for International Studies
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Dr. Harley O. Preston, Executive Secretary
Committee on Psychology in National and
International Affairs
American Psychological Association
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Bryant Wedge, Director
Institute for the Study of International Behavior
Princeton, New Jersey

The Ingratiation Factor

The ingratiation factor has to be faced to some degree in any type of interview situation. Because of cross-cultural factors, it was acknowledged from the beginning of this project that additional attention would have to be given to techniques to be used to overcome this tendency of some respondents to give answers to questions which they believe are wanted, rather than their actual perceptions. Expressions of dissatisfaction can mean a loss of "face" or status in some cultures. In other

cultures it is forbidden to express any displeasure to your host, and since these participants are in this country at the expense of the United States government, and through the AID Home Country Mission, AID is frequently considered to be their host by the participants.

To minimize the influence of this ingratiation factor an interview environment was created and interviewing instruments and methods developed which provided the least possible basis for definition by the respondent of a "right" or "correct" answer and which emphasized, through demonstration, the value which the interviewers place on objectivity.

The fact that A.I.D. employs an independent, university-affiliated study group, which had no direct institutional or personal responsibility for operation of the training program is explained to the participants. In the administrations of the questionnaire to the participants, the form of feedback reporting to AID/IT is fully and factually explained. (See the Standard Introduction used by the Questionnaire Administrator, Appendix B, of this study). Participants are urged to respond as frankly and honestly as possible because their comments and suggestions can be a major determinant of future training programs for other participants who may come from their home countries. They are assured that their responses and their remarks in the private interview will not be used against them in any way and that their future relationship with AID Missions in their

home country would not be affected. The private oral interview is described in the standard introduction and tends to further reinforce the objectivity of the total exit interview.

Also a series of empirical checks on the participants responses was developed.

Empirically, an estimate of the extent to which the ingratiation factor is operating is provided in two ways: internal consistency of answers to items within the questionnaire is one index; significant discrepancies, for example, between difficulties experienced and degrees of satisfaction expressed are explored in the private interviews. Even when no apparent discrepancies are discerned within the questionnaire the interviewer in the private interview indirectly covers some of the same substance included in the questionnaire to determine if the same judgments are expressed by the participant and explores any significant differences. Results of the private interviews, which from the nature of the comments made, are clearly accepted as off-the-record by participants, firmly support the reliability and validity of the questionnaire and group interview responses of all but a small, insignificant number of participants.¹

Questionnaire Development

Item and Instruction Intelligibility

In the development of any survey instrument a critical problem is to word the items so that they communicate the intended meaning to all the respondents. In the exit interview situation, the complexity of this task was increased because the respondents are from a number

¹"AID Participant Training Exit Interview Development Study," unpublished report by The American University Development Education and Training Research Institute, Washington, D.C., p. 15.

of cultures and vary greatly in their ability to understand and use the English language. Thus, the questionnaire items had to be very specific, simple, clear, and non-directive. Also, the items on the questionnaire could not assume a great deal of conceptual-substantive knowledge of English on the part of the participants. Key words which would have different meanings when translated by the participants into other languages had to be avoided.

To do extensive pretesting of the questionnaire items to handle these problems was essential. Throughout the developmental phase of the project, the Questionnaire Administrators were always in the interview rooms when participants were filling out the forms. In the beginning they asked the participants directly about the comprehensibility of the items and the instructions that went with them. Difficulties were noted and items were changed as needed to improve their intelligibility.

The Questionnaire Administrators were given the task of noting the less obvious problems of ambiguity, generality, and presumptiveness in questions as the major problems with wording were resolved. These problems appeared in the questions asked by the participants about specific items. After questions were noted by the Questionnaire Administrators, they were discussed at periodic staff meetings. When the problems were not idiosyncratic in nature changes were made in the items. Some items were expanded into a series of questions, each

of which related to the one before. Other questions were omitted or incorporated into the individual interviews when they proved to be too complex to be presented in questionnaire form. Response alternatives and visual aids aided with the understanding of items and instructions.

Length of the Questionnaire

As conceived in the research design the written questionnaires were to take approximately one and a half hours of the participant's time at DETRI. The number of items developed from the initial list of information objectives had to be reduced in size to reach this criterion. The major means of item reduction was through empirical pretesting of the total item pool since few items had been eliminated in the AID/IT and academic review.

As discussed earlier, some items were too difficult for the majority of the participants to understand, even when presented in the simplest terms. Others had no meaning or a variety of meanings across different cultures. These items were eliminated. Information on some items was found to be redundant with other items in the questionnaire. In such instances, only one of the items was retained, with modifications if necessary to cover the information requirements of related items that were eliminated.

Code sheets were devised to tally the responses

of a number of participants when the questionnaires were in final pretest form. Those items that were found to have little or no response variability over participants, or which showed a very high correlation in responses with other items were eliminated from the final questionnaire form since they provided no unique information.

A few items were empirically eliminated because they appeared to be politically sensitive or to represent an invasion of privacy. If any item could have possibly been construed by the participants to infer a potentially unjustifiable intrusion into the internal political affairs of their home countries or a threat to its political sovereignty it was eliminated. No item was included which might be perceived by the participants as violating their rights as individuals to decide for themselves how much they would reveal about their personal life.

The final form of the questionnaire met the time requirement specified in the research design.

Grouping and Ordering the Items

The grouping and ordering of the questions was another technical problem during the developmental phase of the project. Since the questionnaire covered the participants' entire sojourn there were both time and topic dimensions to be considered and accommodated. If only the time dimension were used, certain topics (e.g., housing arrangements) would have been repeated for each phase of

the tour. If only the topics were used to group and order the items, the participant would be forced to rethink his sojourn several times, once for each topic.

A combined time-sequence and topical grouping was developed by means of pretesting and staff discussions. Items were grouped into topic areas that could be ordered according to a general time sequence, from selection to expected utilization of training. (See Appendix A, the questionnaire table of contents).

Items were arranged in the same conceptual order within each topic area. First, descriptive questions are asked, so that the participant can specify how he experienced this phase of his sojourn. (The descriptive questions allow for either static or changing experiences as appropriate). Next, there is a question in each section on problems the participant encountered in these experiences. Finally, there is an item or items which calls for the participant to evaluate his experiences in the given area of his sojourn being examined. Thus, for each topic area, the participant first recalls his experiences, then thinks about his problems with these experiences, and finally evaluates the experiences in light of the problems he had.

Item Response Alternatives

The response alternatives available to the respondent are as important as items and instructions for

clarity of communication in a questionnaire. The response alternatives help to define the dimensions of the question and represent the options the respondent has for expressing his answer. It is important that the response alternatives be as understandable as the questions and instructions, and that they permit the participants to express themselves as completely as possible.

One method of response alternative construction is the "open-ended" approach which permits the respondent to write out his answer in any way he chooses. While this type of response alternative provides for completeness of answers, it does little to help define the question, requires more time and effort from the respondent, and makes the aggregation and analysis of data more costly and difficult. The written answers must be coded into common categories so that they can be compared across respondents.

The "closed-ended" approach was used in the development of response alternatives for the questionnaires. Specific response alternatives were provided with each question for the respondent to select among. This simplifies his intellectual and physical tasks, increases the clarity of the questions, and makes possible the aggregation of data over respondents directly from the questionnaire. The major concern in developing "closed-ended" response alternatives is to be certain they are complete and meaningful in terms of the answers the

respondents have to give.

Again extensive pretesting was essential to solve this problem. Many of the initial questions asked of participants were open-ended so that they could write whatever answers they might chose. These written answers were then put on 5 x 8 cards, and when a sufficient number had been gathered, they were coded by the staff to provide a list of responses that was complete and comprehensive for each question. This list was then put into the next version of the questionnaire as "closed-ended" response alternatives for the question under development. Thus open-ended questions became closed ended questions.

A tentative list of logical response alternatives was drawn up at the outset for a number of other items. Participants were then asked to comment on the clarity-completeness of these alternatives in accordance with the answers they wanted to give. Their suggestions and criticisms were used to change the alternatives in the same way that their advice was used to improve the intelligibility of the items-instructions.

It was found as the final form of the questionnaire was being constructed that there were three basic different forms of response alternatives: (1) mutually exclusive alternatives of which the participant was to choose only one, 2) multiple alternatives of which the participant could choose as many as were applicable, and (3) forced choice

alternatives of which the participant was to choose only one of a graded series of answers for each alternative, but in which he must make such a choice for each alternative under the question. It was decided to give these three types of response alternatives a visual distinctiveness, one from the other, in order to facilitate the participants' comprehension of them.

The mutually exclusive alternatives were usually one choice of two, that is, yes or no. These alternatives were placed side by side on the page with a box after each of the choices. The multiple alternatives and forced choice alternatives were usually several in number. The multiple alternative responses have one box after each alternative, while the forced choice alternatives have three boxes after each with column heads above each describing the gradations each box represents.

To further assist in the visual presentation of the response alternatives, a lettering system was developed. The mutually exclusive alternatives have no letter prefixes. The multiple alternatives have letters in parentheses, and the forced choice alternatives have letters with periods, as prefixes before each alternative.

Questionnaire Format

The questions or problems experienced in each section of the questionnaire are all laid out identically on the page. The item wording is always the same except

for the topic area being considered. The problems are listed as alternatives with letter and period prefixes down the left side of the page under the heading DIFFICULTIES in bold type. The three columns of boxes are always headed NOT TRUE FOR ME, SOMEWHAT TRUE FOR ME and VERY TRUE FOR ME, from left to right in bold type. Room is provided at the bottom of each list of alternatives for the participant to add any difficulties not covered and check an appropriate box. Although these problem questions are more difficult for the participants to understand than other types of questions at the outset, the use of a visual aid in the front of the room plus the similarity of the item lay-outs throughout the questionnaire, make this comprehensive type of question clear to all but a few of the participants.

The response alternatives to the evaluative questions appear as rungs on a ladder with numbers from 1 to 7 between the rungs. The 1 and 7 categories are defined by written alternatives as "could not have been better" and "could not have been worse" respectively (see Appendix A, Questionnaire). The other numbers, 2 through 6, have no written alternatives beside them. This allows the participant to make up his own definitions for these scale points. This type of scaling is a modification of Cantril and Free's Self-Anchoring Scale.

According to Cantril the Self-Anchoring Scale provides a simple, widely applicable, and adaptable technique for tapping the unique reality world of an

individual and learning what it has in common with that of others.¹

A person is asked to define on the basis of his own assumptions, perceptions, goals, and values, the two extremes or anchoring points of the spectrum on which some scale measurement is desired--for example, he may be asked to define the 'top' and 'bottom' the 'good' and 'bad,' the 'best' and the 'worst.'²

This self-defined continuum is a measuring device which is often utilized in cross-cultural research because it is a nonverbal ladder device which is in a sense "culture free" because the concept of a ladder, with each rung denoting a higher position, is a concept common to all cultures.

This form of evaluative scale was used for two reasons: (1) it reduces the amount and the ambiguity or arbitrariness of the written alternatives that appear on most rating scales, and (2) it helps to alleviate the ingratiation factor of giving very favorable responses to evaluative items. Since the end categories are so extreme they are less often used, and the participant is freer to utilize the remainder of the scale which he defines.

For this study the mutually exclusive alternative item form was used to determine whether or not the

¹Hadley Cantril, The Pattern of Human Concerns (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1965), p. 22.

²Ibid.

foreign student talked with his Foreign Student Adviser. The multiple alternative form was used to ascertain how often the Foreign Student Advisers were available, and the evaluative scale form was used to evaluate the usefulness of the Foreign Student Advisers' help to the foreign students. Thus all three forms in the AID exit interview that have just been described, and that were developed for the AID exit interview project, have also been utilized in this study.

Criteria for the Admissibility of Data

All data contained within this study were carefully subjected to the following criteria. These criteria were established in order to insure that only those data which are responsible and authentic would be incorporated in the research project.

1. The questionnaire was constructed in such a way as to elicit comparable data from participants having a fairly broad range of English language capabilities and who also represented a wide variety of cultural backgrounds.

2. The questionnaire was submitted to an initial eight months of pretesting and then a final pretesting on three hundred and eight academic participants in order to establish the most meaningful groupings of items and the most relevant categories. During the final pretest iterative revisions and refinements were made within the

groups of items, ordering of items, instructions in the interview instruments, and administrative procedures.

3. The validity and comprehensiveness of the participants' responses to the questionnaire were directly assessed by trained interviewers in an unstructured oral interview. The interviewers made ratings of the validity of the participants' questionnaire responses based on their comments in the individual interviews. They rated the validity of the questionnaire suspect if any part of the information they received could not be reconciled with the participants' responses on the questionnaire. Only 9.1 percent of the questionnaires were rated suspect.¹ That is, in about nine out of ten of the individual interviews, nothing that was said by the participants led the interviewers to doubt the validity of any of the responses that were written by the participant in his questionnaire.

A Detailed Statement of Methodology for Each Subproblem

Restatement of Subproblem I: What percentage of the foreign students talked with a foreign student adviser during their stay in the United States?

¹Paul R. Kimmel et al., Participant Assessment of AID Training Program--First Annual Report to the Agency for International Development (Washington, D.C.: The American University Development Education and Training Research Institute, May 1969), p. 101.

The Data Needed

In order to determine the percentage of the foreign students who talked with a Foreign Student Adviser during their stay in the United States it was necessary to collect from the subsample of academic participants, the number of students who gave an affirmative response in the Participant Evaluation of A.I.D. International Training Questionnaire to the question: Did you ever talk with a Foreign Student Adviser or Job Trainee Adviser? (See Appendix A, Questionnaire item 90).

How The Data Were Obtained

The data for the percentage of foreign students who talked with a Foreign Student Adviser were obtained from the sample of one thousand eight hundred and ten A.I.D. participants who were interviewed between July 17, 1967, and August 31, 1968. It was necessary to do a card sort of the aggregate data on all the A.I.D. participants in order to find the number of academic participants in the total sample and an additional card sort to determine the number who gave a positive response to the question. All responses made by students who attended institutions not listed in the NAFSA Directory 1967-68 were eliminated.

How The Data Were Treated

The following method was employed in obtaining the percentage of foreign students who talked with the

Foreign Student Advisers:

After the total number of academic participants and the number of academic participants who gave a positive response to the question were obtained from the aggregate data on all A.I.D. participants, the percentage of the academic participants (foreign students) who talked with Foreign Student Advisers was computed arithmetically.

Restatement of Subproblem 2: According to the students' ratings how often was the Foreign Student Adviser available to help them?

The Data Needed

In order to procure the availability ratings for the Foreign Student Advisers it was necessary to obtain the data from all academic participants who responded to the question: How often was he available to help you? (See item number 91, Appendix A).

How The Data Were Obtained

The ratings made by the respondents was compiled from the subsample of academic participants who responded to the question: How often was he available to help you? by choosing one of three categories.

How The Data Were Treated

After the ratings for all three categories were collected and separated according to category, the number

of students who responded to each category was totaled separately. The percentage of students from the total number, who indicated they had talked with a Foreign Student Adviser, who responded to each category was computed arithmetically.

Restatement of Subproblem 3: How useful was the help the Foreign Student Advisers provided according to the ratings made by the students?

The Data Needed

In order to determine the ratings of the Foreign Student Advisers' usefulness it was necessary to procure the data from all academic participants who responded to the question: How useful was any help he provided? (See Questionnaire item number 92, Appendix A).

How The Data Were Treated

Since the responses to this question in the questionnaire were made on a seven point scale, the responses were tabulated and divided according to the number of responses for each point on the scale. The percentage of responses for each point on the scale was then computed arithmetically.

Restatement of Subproblem 4: Are the geographic origins of the foreign students systematically related to whether or not they talk with Foreign Student Advisers?

The Data Needed

In order to determine if the geographic origins of the foreign students are systematically related to whether or not they talk with Foreign Student Advisers it was necessary to collect data from the questionnaire which records the name of the country in which the student was born (See item number 121, Appendix A). These data were needed for the academic subsample only.

How The Data Were Obtained

The data needed to determine the geographic origin of the students in the academic subsample were obtained by means of a card sort of the questionnaire data from item number 121 which records the name of the country in which the student was born. These data were needed for A.I.D. participants in the academic subsample.

How The Data Were Treated

The responses to the question which asked whether or not they had talked with the Foreign Student Advisers made by the academic subsample was compiled by four geographic regions: Latin America, Near East-South Asia, Africa, and the Far East. The number of positive responses and the number of negative responses to this item were tabulated separately for each region. The chi square test of significance was then utilized to determine if there was a significant difference in the number of negative or

positive responses from each geographic region. The chi square test was used because the data could be classified into categories and recorded in a 4 x 2 contingency table as a set of observed frequencies to be compared with expected chance frequencies.

Restatement of Subproblem 5: Are the students' ratings of the usefulness of the Foreign Student Advisers' help positively related to the students' ratings of the frequency of their availability?

The Data Needed

The usefulness ratings from item number ninety-two of the questionnaire which were utilized in subproblem three and the availability ratings from item number ninety-one which were utilized in subproblem two were needed in order to find the relationship between the two ratings.

How The Data Were Obtained

The data for this subproblem were collected for use in subproblems two and three. No additional data were needed.

How The Data Were Treated

Again the chi square test was used to determine whether or not a positive relationship existed between the availability ratings and the usefulness ratings.

Restatement of Subproblem 6: To what extent do the ratings of usefulness of Foreign Student Advisers' help vary according to the length of time students have been in their training programs?

The Data Needed

In order to determine if the usefulness ratings vary according to the length of time the students have been in training it was necessary to use the responses made by the participants in the academic subsample to item number ninety-two of the questionnaire which is the usefulness rating. The responses from item number thirty-six of the questionnaire also were needed to determine the lengths of the participants' training programs (See Questionnaire item number 36, Appendix A).

How The Data Were Obtained

The data from item number ninety-two were collected for use in subproblems three and five. Data from item number thirty-six of the questionnaire were collected to determine the duration of the academic participants' training programs. The responses made by the academic subsample to item number thirty-six were sorted from the aggregate data on all participants.

How The Data Were Treated

The data collected from questionnaire item number ninety-two were divided into two groups according to the

responses of the students to item number thirty-six in the questionnaire which reports the length of the students' training programs. The responses to item number ninety-two made by students who had training which was from six to eighteen months in length were placed in one group and the responses from those who had training which lasted for nineteen months or longer were compiled in the other group. Any data on participants who had training for less than six months were added to this second group.

The chi square test of significance was applied to determine if there was a statistically significant difference in the ratings of the Foreign Student Advisers' usefulness as made by the two groups. The data were classified into categories and recorded in a table as a set of observed frequencies. For this subproblem a 2 x 2 contingency table was used.

CHAPTER V

PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

Introduction

In the preceding chapters the need for this study and its purpose have been discussed, the literature pertaining to cross-cultural education and the profession of foreign student advising was reviewed, and the methodology used in this study was explained. A quantitative analysis of the data has been used to study the effectiveness of Foreign Student Advisers as perceived and reported by foreign students.

In Chapter V the principal findings which are germane to the purpose of this study are presented and discussed. In the first section demographic characteristics and biographical data of the seven hundred and ninety-five foreign students are described. Section two is a presentation of the findings from the data analysis. The data for each subproblem are treated separately. In this chapter the statistical interpretation of the findings are presented; conclusions and recommendations will follow in Chapter VI.

Demographic Characteristics and Biographical
Data of the Foreign Students ¹

The seven hundred and ninety-five foreign students included in the sample for this study were almost evenly divided in marital status. Forty-eight and five tenths percent of them were single, 51.1 percent were married, and .4 percent responded that they were either widowed or divorced. (See Table 5.1).

TABLE 5.1

Marital Status of Foreign Students Studied

Marital Status	Percentage of Students
Single	48.5
Married	51.1
Other	.4
<hr/>	
Total Number of Students	794

The years of previous formal education that these students had completed varied from seven years to nineteen years and over. Only 12.4 percent had from seven to eleven

¹The total number of students will vary in the following tables due to the fact that not all students in the sample responded to all of the items on the questionnaire.

years of education while 45 percent of them had had from sixteen to eighteen years of formal education. Those students who had eleven years of education or less most probably were enrolled in special non-degree programs at the colleges and universities which they attended in the United States. (See Table 5.2).

TABLE 5.2

Years of Formal Education of Foreign Students Studied

Years of Education	Percentage of Students
7 - 11	12.4
12	17.9
13 - 15	15.5
16	21.9
17 - 18	23.1
19 and over	9.2
Total Number of Students	772

The age of the students varied from 22.7 percent who were less than twenty-seven years of age to 4.6 percent who were forty-six years of age or older. Twenty-eight

and four-tenths percent of the students were between twenty-eight and thirty years of age: therefore, more than half of them were thirty years of age and younger. (See Table 5.3).

TABLE 5.3

Age of Foreign Students Studied

Age	Percentage of Students
Less than 27	22.7
28 - 30	28.4
31 - 34	17.9
35 - 39	15.6
40 - 45	10.8
46 and over	4.6
Total Number of Students	(793)

Only 13.5 percent (one hundred and seven) of the students were women. Eighty-six and two tenths percent were male students. Thirteen participants did not respond

to this question. (See Table 5.4).

TABLE 5.4

Sex of Foreign Students Studied

Sex	Percentage of Students
Male	86.2
Female	13.5
No response	.3
Total Number of Students	(795)

The places where these students lived most of the time after they were eighteen years of age varied in size from under one thousand nine hundred and ninety-nine in population to over one million. Twenty-six and six tenths percent of the students lived in cities of one million or over while only 69 percent lived in towns of one thousand nine hundred and ninety-nine or less. Fifty-six and nine tenths percent of these students lived in places where the population was between twenty-five thousand and nine hundred ninety-nine thousand, nine hundred and ninety-nine. (See Table 5.5).

TABLE 5.5

Population of Place Where Student Lived
Most of the Time After Age 18

Population of Place	Percentage of Students
Under 1,999	6.0
2,000 to 24,999	10.5
25,000 to 99,999	16.5
100,000 to 499,999	21.9
500,000 to 999,999	18.5
Over 1,000,000	26.6
Total Number of Students	(789)

Most of the students in this study were graduate students (63.1 percent). Twenty-nine and five tenths percent were undergraduate while 15.8 percent were non-degree. (See Table 5.6).

TABLE 5.6

Academic Level of Foreign Students Studied

Type of Student	Percentage
Graduate Student	63.1
Undergraduate Student	29.5
Non-degree Student	15.8

Although only 15.8 percent of the students were not in degree programs, 23.9 percent reported that they did not earn a degree, thus not all students who were enrolled in degree programs were able to earn their degrees. Almost half of the students earned either a Master of Arts or a Master of Science degree. Only 4.4 percent of the students earned Ph.D. degrees. (See Table 5.7).

TABLE 5.7

U.S. Degrees Earned by Foreign Students Studied

U. S. Degrees Earned	Percentage
None	23.9
BA/BS	26.1
MA/MS	49.0
Ph.D.	4.4

It is interesting to note that 44.3 percent of the students studied in the field of education. Twenty-two and three tenths percent of the students studied agriculture while 19 percent of them studied public administration. Only 14.4 percent of the students

studied in the field of industry and mining, transportation, and public health combined. (See Table 5.8).

TABLE 5.8

Fields of Training of Foreign Students Studied

Field of Training	Percentage of Students
Agriculture	22.3
Industry and Mining	4.3
Transportation	1.3
Public Health & Sanitation	8.8
Education	44.3
Public Administration	19.0
Total Number of Responses	(759)

Most of these students stayed in the United States for sixteen months or longer (78.4 percent), while only 3.1 percent stayed from one to seven months. Twenty-eight and four tenths percent of them stayed between eight and fifteen months. (See Table 5.9).

TABLE 5.9

Length of Sojourn of Foreign Students Studied

Length of Sojourn (months)	Percentage of Students
1 - 4	1.1
5 - 7	2.0
8 - 11	10.3
12 - 15	18.1
16 - 24	35.5
25 and over	32.9
Total Number of Responses	(794)

Data AnalysisSubproblem I

Subproblem I: What percentage of the foreign students studied talked with a Foreign Student Adviser during their stay in the United States?

Seven hundred and ninety-four of the seven hundred and ninety-five AID academic participants to whom the Participant Evaluation of AID International Training Questionnaire was administered responded to the question: "Did you ever talk with a Foreign Student Adviser?" From these seven hundred ninety-four responses six hundred and

seventy-six responded in the affirmative, while one hundred and eighteen gave negative responses. That is, 85.1 percent of the students said that they did talk with a Foreign Student Adviser. (See Table 5.10).

TABLE 5.10

Percentages and Total Numbers of Students Who Did/
Did Not Talk With a Foreign Student Adviser

Talked to Adviser	Percentage of Students	Total Number
Yes	85.1	676
No	14.9	118
Total Number of Students		(794)

Only three of the one hundred and eighteen students who gave negative responses to this question attended institutions which were not included in The NAFSA Directory 1967-68, and listed as having a Foreign Student Adviser on campus.¹

¹The NAFSA Directory is published biannually by The National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1860 19th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. It is a membership directory of the National Association of Foreign Student Affairs and the Directory of Foreign Student Advisers, Fulbright Program Advisers, Teachers of English as a Second Language, Foreign Student Admission Affairs, Advisers for American Study Abroad, Contact Officers for

Thus, it may be assumed that the one hundred and eighteen foreign students (except those three - 2.5 percent) had attended institutions which had at least one person employed either on a full or on a part time basis, to serve as an adviser to the foreign students.

Subproblem II

Subproblem II: According to the students' ratings how often was the Foreign Student Adviser available to help them?

The students rated the availability of the Foreign Student Advisers in three ways; always available, usually available, and sometimes available. Six hundred and seventy-three students responded to this question. Three hundred and fifty-three or 52.5 percent said that their Foreign Student Advisers were always available. Two hundred and five or 30.5 percent responded that the Foreign Student Advisers at their institutions were usually available to help them. Seventeen percent, one hundred and fifteen students, said that the Foreign Student Adviser was sometimes available. (See Table 5.11).

Students Sponsored by the Agency for International Development and Community Service Program Leaders of U.S. Institutions of Higher Education.

TABLE 5.11

Percentages and Numbers of Student Responses
to the Availability Ratings

Availability Rating	Percentage of Students	Number of Students
Always Available	52.5	353
Usually Available	30.5	205
Sometimes Available	17.0	115
Total Number of Students		673

Subproblem III

Subproblem III: How useful was the help the Foreign Student Adviser provided?

Six hundred and seventy-four of the seven hundred and ninety-five participants responded to the question how useful was the help the Foreign Student Adviser provided. Their responses were made on a seven point scale. The scale ratings ranged from one, which was labelled "extremely useful, help could not have been better" to seven which was "not at all useful, help could not have been worse." Twenty-nine and six-tenths percent of the six hundred and seventy-four students gave a one rating to the help given by the Foreign Student Advisers. Twenty two and three tenths percent of the students gave a two rating to the help provided by the Foreign Student Advisers. Thus, over fifty

percent of the foreign students gave very high usefulness ratings to the help of the Foreign Student Advisers.

Twenty-two and seven-tenths percent of the students rated the Foreign Student Advisers' help at the three level, while fourteen percent rated it at the four level. Only eleven and four-tenths percent of the students rated the help given them at the five, six and seven levels combined. (See Table 5.12 for graphic representation of this data).

TABLE 5.12

Percentages and Numbers of the Students' Responses to the Utility Ratings of the Foreign Student Advisers' Help

Utility Rating*	Percentage of Students**	Number of Students
1	29.7	200
2	22.3	150
3	22.6	152
4	13.9	94
5 - 7	11.6	78
	TOTAL	674

* Number One is "extremely useful, could not be better." Number Seven is "not at all useful, help could not have been worse."

** Any percentage which exceeded or was less than 100% would be due to rounding numbers to the nearest tenth of one percent.

Subproblem IVSubproblem IV: Are the geographic origins of the foreign students systematically related to whether or not they talked with Foreign Student Advisers?

In order to determine if the geographic origins of the foreign students are systematically related to whether or not they talked with a Foreign Student Adviser, data from the Questionnaire which recorded the name of the country in which the student was born (See Appendix A, Questionnaire item number one hundred and twenty-one), were collected for the academic subsample. These data from item number one hundred and twenty-one were processed through a card-sorter in order to divide the data on all the academic participants into four regions. This was possible because the first digit of each three digit country numbers in the coding of the Questionnaire data corresponds to the region to which that country belongs. Number two in the first digit column indicates that the country is in the Near East. Number three indicates that it is a South Asian country. Countries of the Far East, except Viet Nam, are indicated by the number four. Viet Nam is designated by the number seven. All countries in Latin America have the number five in the first digit column, and African countries are designated by the number six. For this study the countries of the Near East (Number two) were combined with those from South Asia (Number three)

to form one region referred to as Near-East South Asia. Viet Nam (Number seven) was combined with all other Far Eastern Countries. See Table 5.13 for a list of the countries from which the students originated and the code numbers assigned to each country.

TABLE 5.13

Country Code List

306	Afghanistan	670	Libya
510	Argentina	687	Madagascar Malagasy
511	Bolivia	612	Malawi
512	Brazil	688	Mali
505	British Honduras	608	Morocco
695	Burundi	524	Nicaragua
442	Cambodia	367	Nepal
631	Cameroon	620	Nigeria
513	Chile	391	Pakistan
484	China, Republic of	525	Panama
514	Colombia	526	Paraguay
679	Congo (Bra.)	527	Peru
515	Costa Rica	492	Philippines
233	Cyprus	696	Rwanda
517	Dominican Republic	636	Sierra Leone
518	Ecuador	649	Somali
519	El Salvador	650	Sudan
663	Ethiopia	621	Tanzania
641	Ghana	493	Thailand
504	Guyana	693	Togo
520	Guatemala	664	Tunisia
522	Honduras	277	Turkey
386	India	263	U. A. R. (Egypt)
497	Indonesia	617	Uganda
265	Iran	528	Uruguay
266	Iraq	529	Venezuela
532	Jamaica	730	Vietnam, Republic of
488	Japan	611	Zambia
278	Jordan	000	U.S.A.
615	Kenya	680	Dahomey
489	Korea, Republic of	660	Congo, Belgian Republic
439	Laos	677	Chad of the (Kinshasa)
669	Iberia	383	Ceylon

It should be noted that five positive responses from the total seven hundred and ninety-four cases were not included in this analysis because those five participants who gave positive responses to the question, "Did you talk with a Foreign Student Adviser during your stay in the United States?" failed to indicate in the Questionnaire (Appendix A, page forty-one, item number one hundred and twenty-one) from which country they had originated. Therefore only seven hundred and eighty-nine cases could be utilized and this led to a slight change in the percentage distribution (from 86.3 percent who answered yes to 85 percent and from a negative response of 13.9 percent to 15 percent).

The seven hundred and eighty-nine students whose responses were utilized were not equally distributed among the four regions.

Forty and eight tenths percent of the students (or three hundred and twenty-two students) were from Africa. Only 13.7 percent (108 students) were from Latin America. One hundred and eighty-three students (23.2 percent) came from the Near East-South Asia region and 22.3 percent came from the Far East region. (See Table 5.14).

TABLE 5.14

Percentages and Total Number of Students
From Geographic Regions

Region	Percentage of Students from Total Number	Number of Students
Near East-South Asia	23.2	183
Far East	22.3	176
Latin America	13.7	108
Africa	40.8	322
Total Number of Students		(789)

Fifteen and eight-tenths percent of the African students reported that they did not talk with a Foreign Student Adviser, while 84.2 percent gave a positive response to that question. Eighteen and five-tenths percent of the Latin American students gave a negative answer while 81.5 percent gave a positive response. Students from the Far East gave 12.5 percent negative responses, with 87.5 percent positive ones. The one hundred and eighty-three students from the Near East-South Asian region gave 86.3 percent positive responses and 13.7 percent negative ones. From these percentages it can be readily seen that the students did not vary to

any great extent by region as to whether or not they talked with their Foreign Student Advisers. (See Table 5.15).

TABLE 5.15

Percentages of Students' Responses to Whether or Not They Talked With a Foreign Student Adviser According to Geographic Region

Response	Region	
	Near East-South Asia	Far East
Yes	86.3	87.5
No	13.7	12.5
	Latin America	Africa
Yes	81.5	84.2
No	18.5	15.8

When these data were submitted to a chi square test of significance it was determined that there was no significant systematic relationship between the regional origins of the students and whether or not they talked with Foreign Student Advisers. The chi square computed with three degrees of freedom was 2.350. To be significant at the .05 level, the necessary chi square would have to be 7.82.

These data were submitted to the chi square test of significance as described by McCallough and Van Alta in

their book, Statistical Concepts.¹

Subproblem V

Subproblem V: Are the students' ratings of the usefulness of the Foreign Student Advisers' help positively related to the students' ratings of the frequency of their availability?

In order to determine if the ratings of the usefulness of the Foreign Student Advisers' help were positively related to the students' ratings of the frequency of their availability it was necessary to submit the two rating scales to the chi square test of significance.

Six hundred and seventy-three students from the academic subsample had responded to both questions. Eighty-three and nine tenths percent of the students who gave the advisers' help a one rating also responded that he was "always available," while 14.1 percent said that he was "usually available." Only 2 percent who gave the help a one rating said that the Foreign Student Adviser was "sometimes available."

Fifty-four percent of the students who gave the Foreign Student Adviser's help a two rating also said

¹Celeste McCollough and Locke Van Alta, Statistical Concepts (New York: McGraw Hill Co., 1963), Chapter 7.

that he was "always available" while 38.7 percent said that he was "usually available." Only 7.3 percent of those who gave the help a two rating reported that the Foreign Student Adviser was "sometimes available."

Among those students who rated the Foreign Student Adviser's help as three, 41.8 percent said that he was "always available." Forty-three and eight tenths percent responded that he was "usually available," and 14.4 percent reported that he was "sometimes available."

Ninety-three of the six hundred and seventy-three students gave the Foreign Student Adviser's help a four rating, which was the mid-point on the seven point scale. Twenty-seven and seven tenths percent of these students reported that the Foreign Student Adviser was "always available," and 37.2 percent of them responded that he was "usually available," while 35.1 percent said that he was "sometimes available."

Only seventy-seven of the six hundred and seventy-three students gave the Foreign Student Adviser's help ratings of five, six and seven combined. Nineteen and five-tenths percent of these students responded that the Foreign Student Adviser was "always available" while 22.1 percent responded that he was "usually available." Fifty-eight and four-tenths percent of these students who gave the lowest ratings to the Foreign Student Adviser's help reported that he was "sometimes available." (See Table 5.16).

TABLE 5.16

Percentages and Numbers of Responses to Availability Ratings
Categories According to Utility Rating Scale Placement

Availability Rating	Utility Ratings									
	Percent- age	Number 1	2	3	4	5-7				
Always	83.9%	(167)	54.0% (81)	41.8% (64)	27.7% (26)	19.5% (15)				
Usually	14.1%	(28)	38.7% (58)	43.8% (67)	37.2% (35)	22.1% (17)				
Sometimes	2.0%	(4)	7.3% (11)	14.4% (22)	35.1% (33)	58.4% (45)				
Number of Students		(199)	(150)	(153)	(94)	(77)				
Total Number of Students										(673)

Of the three hundred and fifty-three students who responded that their Foreign Student Advisers were "always available," one hundred and sixty seven or 47.3 percent gave them a one rating on usefulness of help. Eighty-one or 22.9 percent gave the help at two ratings while sixty-four or 18.1 percent gave a three rating. Twenty-six of these students (7.4 percent) rated the Foreign Student Adviser's help at the midpoint of four on the utility scale while only fifteen students (4.2 percent) of the three hundred and fifty-three who found their Foreign Student Advisers "always available," rated the help given them at the five, six and seven points combined. (See Table 5.17).

TABLE 5.17

Percentages and Numbers of Students' Responses to the Usefulness Ratings According to Responses to the Availability Rating Categories

Usefulness Ratings	Availability					
	Always		Usually		Sometimes	
	Percent- age	No.	Percent- age	No.	Percent- age	No.
1	47.3	(167)	13.7	(28)	3.5	(4)
2	22.9	(81)	28.3	(58)	9.6	(11)
3	18.1	(64)	32.7	(67)	19.1	(22)
4	7.4	(26)	17.1	(35)	28.7	(33)
5-7	4.2	(15)	8.3	(17)	39.1	(45)
Number of Students	(353)		(205)		(115)	
Total No.	(673)					

The differences between the two distributions were tested for statistical significance by application of the chi square test of significance. The chi square value obtained of 231.293 with eight degrees of freedom. Thus the positive relationship tested significant beyond the .001 level. That is to say that a difference as large as the one obtained between the two distributions would occur much less frequently than only one time in 1,000 by chance. Therefore, it is accepted that this is not a chance difference.

Subproblem VI

Subproblem VI: To what extent do the ratings of the usefulness of the Foreign Student Advisers' help vary according to the length of time students have been in their training program?

In order to determine to what extent the students' ratings of the usefulness of the Foreign Student Advisers help varied according to the length of time the students had been in their training program, the seven point usefulness rating scale was reduced to a five point scale. Then, the responses of the six hundred and seventy-four students who answered both the usefulness question and the question which asked for the length of their sojourn in the United States were divided into two groups. One group included only responses from those students who had

been in the United States for from six to eighteen months. The other group was composed of responses from all other students who had been in the United States for nineteen months or longer or less than six months. From the total of six hundred and seventy-four students, two hundred and sixty-four had been in the United States from six to eighteen months, while four hundred and ten students fell into the "all other" category.

The usefulness ratings made by the two hundred and sixty-four students who were in the United States for from six to eighteen months had the following distribution: eighty-eight, or 33.3 percent, gave the Foreign Student Advisers' help a one rating; fifty-five (20.8 percent) gave the help a two rating while fifty-three (20.1 percent) gave a three rating. Twelve and nine tenths percent or thirty-four students rated the help at the four level, and the same number (thirty-four) gave the Foreign Student Advisers' help ratings of five, six, or seven.

The ratings made by the four hundred and ten students who were in the "all other" category had the following distribution: one hundred and twelve or 27.3 percent gave the highest possible rating of one. Twenty-three and two tenths percent or ninety-five students gave a two rating while 24.1 percent or ninety-nine students gave a three rating. Fourteen and six tenths percent (sixty students)

rated the usefulness of the Foreign Student Advisers' help at the four level, and 10.7 percent (forty-four students) gave ratings between five and seven. (See Table 5.18).

TABLE 5.18

Percentages and Numbers of Usefulness Ratings
According to Length of Sojourn

Usefulness Rating	Length of Sojourn (Percentage in Each Category)			
	6 - 18 Months		All Other Lengths	
1	33.3%	(88)	27.3%	(112)
2	20.8%	(55)	23.2%	(95)
3	20.1%	(53)	24.1%	(99)
4	12.9%	(34)	14.6%	(60)
5 - 7	12.9%	(34)	10.7%	(44)
Total Number of Students	(264)		(410)	

The differences between the two distributions (the two sojourn categories) were tested for statistical significance by application of the chi square technique. The chi square figure obtained was 4.527 with four degrees of freedom. To be significant at the .05 level a 9.49 figure would be needed. This means that the size of the difference obtained is likely to have occurred by chance. The probability of a difference of that size occurring by chance alone is so high

that the hypothesis about any real relationship between the students' ratings of the usefulness of the Foreign Student Advisers' help and the length of sojourn in the United States is rejected. That is to say that these data do not indicate a relationship between the "U-curve" of adjustment in cross-cultural education and the students' perception of the usefulness of the help given them by Foreign Student Advisers.

Summary

As a resume of the statistical analysis of the collected data, the most significant findings for each sub-problem can be briefly described as the following.

Eighty five and one-tenth percent of the foreign students talked to the Foreign Student Advisers while 14.9 percent of them did not. Over seventy percent of the students interviewed rated the help that Foreign Student Advisers had given them above the midpoint on a seven point scale while only 11.6 percent rated their help below the midpoint on that scale. Fifty-two and five tenths percent of the foreign students reported that their Foreign Student Advisers were "always available." Thirty and five tenths percent of them responded that the Foreign Student Advisers were "usually available" and seventeen percent said that the foreign Student Adviser was "sometimes available." Statistical analysis showed no systematic relationship between the region of the world from which the participants came and whether or not they talked with a Foreign

Student Adviser.

An extremely high and statistically significant positive relationship was found between the foreign students' perceptions of the Foreign Student Adviser's availability and their perceptions of his usefulness to them. Finally, the statistical analysis of the data did not confirm the hypothesis that the "U-curve" of adjustment would affect the foreign students' perceptions of the helpfulness of the Foreign Student Advisers. Chapter VI will include a detailed summary of these findings as well as conclusions which may be drawn from this study and any implications for further research which these findings indicate.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Main Findings of the Study

The Effectiveness of Foreign Student Advisers at Selected American Colleges and Universities

This study revealed that over eighty-five percent of the foreign students who were interviewed had at least one talk with college and university Foreign Student Advisers. Since these students were sponsored by the United States Agency for International Development, they would not normally be confronted with the common difficulties of the unsponsored students such as visa problems and problems of financial support which often bring the unsponsored student into the office of the Foreign Student Adviser. Thus, this probably is a conservative estimate of the percentage of foreign students generally who talked with Foreign Student Advisers.

It should also be noted that on November 17 and 18, 1969, at Meridian House in Washington, D.C., a special NAFSA-AID workshop was held in an attempt to recruit the closer cooperation of Foreign Student Advisers with AID in providing services to the students sponsored by AID. The

meeting was organized because AID program development officers, other AID officials, and NAFSA members alike felt that there was considerable misunderstanding of each other and a lack of knowledge about the international training program of AID on the part of the Foreign Student Advisers, and a similar lack of knowledge on the part of AID officers as to the function of the university as an educational institution for the AID participant.¹ If this is in fact the existing situation it would seem that fewer AID sponsored foreign students would have less personal contact with the Foreign Student Advisers than other foreign students on the campus might have with the Foreign Student Advisers.

Other than these Program Development Officers who are in the Washington, D.C., office of AID and who are responsible for the students during their stay in the United States, some campuses with large numbers of AID participants also have a Contact Officer (or Campus Coordinator) designated by AID to assist the participants in their communication with AID and their home country. Many times the Foreign Student Adviser at the university simply "wears this hat" also; but just as often another person serves in this capacity. In the latter case, it would seem

¹NAFSA Newsletter, XXI, No. 5 (February 1970), p. 1.

that here again the AID participant as compared to other foreign students would be less likely to visit the office of the Foreign Student Adviser with his problems.

Over half of the students who talked with a Foreign Student Adviser reported that he was "always available" when they wanted to ask for his help or advice. Almost a third (30.5 percent) said that their Foreign Student Advisers were "usually available" while only seventeen percent reported that the Foreign Student Adviser was "sometimes available." Since this was a closed-end question and the students did not have a fourth alternative such as "hardly ever available" it is not possible to ascertain how many students who used the lowest category felt that the Foreign Student Adviser was not often available to them, but only three of the foreign students who responded that they had talked with a Foreign Student Adviser failed to answer this question. Since the respondents are told by the questionnaire administrator at the beginning of the interview that they may decline to answer any question if they wish to do so,¹ it may have been that three participants out of the six hundred and seventy-six who were eligible to answer this question declined to do so because there was not a lower rating, however, a more likely assumption is that the three fewer answers can be

¹See Appendix B for the Standard Introduction given by the Questionnaire Administrator.

accounted for by a lack of rigorous quality control in data collection at that stage of the project.

The significant finding here is the large percentage who rated the Foreign Student Advisers as "always available" and "usually available." Eighty-three percent of foreign students who talked with their Foreign Student Advisers responded in these two categories.

No statistics are available as to the number of Foreign Student Advisers who are serving in a part-time capacity in this job, but in most of the smaller institutions where the enrollment of foreign students is also small, the Foreign Student Adviser is working on a part-time basis. When Higbee did his survey in 1964 only twenty-five universities reported that they had full-time Foreign Student Advisers,¹ and eighty-four percent of the Foreign Student Advisers reported that they spent one fourth of their time or less as Foreign Student Advisers. Only three and five tenths percent reported that they were full-time Foreign Student Advisers.²

With the growth of the foreign student population in the last decade and the increasing number of full-time

¹Higbee, op. cit., p. 4.

²Ibid., p. 5.

Foreign Student Advisers with their additional staff at the larger universities, these percentages would not be accurate today, but many Foreign Student Advisers, especially at the smaller colleges are acting in a part-time capacity and may also serve as the Dean of Students, a Department Chairman, or as a Faculty member.

In view of this part-time basis factor, the high availability ratings that the foreign students made would indicate that even though many of the Foreign Student Advisers are serving in this capacity on a part-time basis, they still designate a sufficient portion of their time for the foreign students and their needs.

The utility rating which the foreign students gave to the Foreign Student Advisers' help revealed that almost three fourths of the students (seventy four and six tenths percent) gave ratings of one, two and three which were ratings higher than the mid-point of four on the scale. Thirteen and nine tenths percent rated the help given them at the mid-point while only eleven and six tenths percent gave ratings of three, six and seven which were below the mid-point on the scale. These ratings indicate that the large majority of those students who did have personal contact with their Foreign Student Advisers and received assistance from them found that help to be very useful to them.

Exploratory Findings

In the review of the related literature for this study a number of significant studies were cited in which nationality or national status was an important factor in the adjustment of foreign students.¹ The Selltiz study in particular noted the differences that students from different world regions gave to every aspect of their description of the United States. Although no directional hypothesis was formulated, this influence of world region of origin was investigated to determine if there might have been a systematic relationship between this regional factor and whether or not the foreign students talked with a Foreign Student Adviser. The analysis of the data for this study did not reveal any systematic relationship between these two variables.

Results of the Test of Hypotheses

The first hypothesis formulated in this study, was that the students' ratings of the usefulness of the Foreign Student Advisers' help would be positively related to the students' ratings of the Foreign Student Advisers' availability. This hypothesis was confirmed by the data. According to

¹Cora Du Bois, op. cit.; Richard T. Morris, op. cit., and Selltiz et al., op. cit.

the findings of this research there is a high positive correlation between these two variables.

The second hypothesis of the study was developed with reference to the U-curve of adjustment which was defined and discussed in Chapter I. If the ratings that the foreign students gave to the usefulness of their Foreign Student Advisers' help had been related to the U-curve of adjustment, the ratings made by those students who were in this country from six to eighteen months would have been significantly lower than those made by the students who had shorter or longer sojourns. The data analysis did not support this hypothesis and therefore it could not be determined that the students who were in the negative phase of the u-curve of adjustment (six to eighteen months) gave lower ratings to the help given them by the Foreign Student Advisers.

Limitations of the Study

The Sample

In Chapter V of this study the foreign student population from whom the data was collected was described. In order to determine the extent to which the findings from this study can be generalized the subjects utilized in this study should be compared as closely as possible with foreign students in the United States in general.

According to Open Doors, 1969, the annual

publications of statistics on foreign students in the United States of the Institute of International Education, one out of every three foreign students in the United States is a woman.¹ In the student sample for this study only thirteen and five tenths percent were women.

Forty-nine percent of all foreign students in the United States are undergraduate while twenty-nine and five tenths percent of the students used in this study were undergraduate. Sixty-three and one tenth percent of the students sampled were graduate students while forty-five percent are graduate students in the total population of foreign students. Fifteen and eight tenths percent of the study sample were non-degree students while only five percent of the total population are non-degree or special students.²

The greatest differences in the characteristics came within the fields of training. Forty-four and three tenths percent of the sample were enrolled in the field of Education while only six percent of the total population was studying in that field. Agriculture was the field of study for twenty-two and three tenths percent of the sample while only three percent of the total population is studying in that field.³

¹Open Doors, p. 13.

²Ibid., p. 11.

³Ibid., p. 10.

Thus, the findings of this study can not be generalized to the extent that a study done with a random sample of the total foreign student population might be.

Conclusions

The main findings of the study have been reviewed and the limitations of the application of the findings have been discussed. From these findings several conclusions may be drawn.

1. Foreign Student Advisers at American Colleges and Universities are effective in their role as they are perceived and reported by the large majority of the foreign students interviewed.

The analysis of the data revealed that not only did over eighty five percent of the students talk with the Foreign Student Advisers on the campuses of their institutions, but that of those who did have personal contact with Foreign Student Advisers, seventy-four and six tenths percent rated the help that was given them above the midpoint of the utility scale. Only eleven and four tenths percent rated the help that was given them below that midpoint. Therefore, if the effectiveness of the Foreign Student Advisers as perceived by the foreign students is defined by their availability to the foreign students and by their usefulness to them it can be concluded that the Foreign Student Advisers were perceived as very effective.

This function of counseling and aiding the foreign student is, of course, not the totality of the Foreign Student Adviser's role. This study is restricted to the functions they perform for these foreign students as individuals. Homer D. Higbee's study,¹ which gave an overview of the Foreign Student Adviser's work, listed sixteen services in which Foreign Student Advisers may be involved and he also indicates the degree of involvement in each specific area. (See his table, Table 3.1 of this study).

His study demonstrated that the Foreign Student Adviser has responsibilities in several areas other than giving counseling and guidance to foreign students who seek their help. Their duties may include community and family contacts, planned social activities, organization of formal orientation programs, and other areas which might not be directly concerned with aiding foreign students such as assistance to United States students planning to study abroad.

Thus, this study does not attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of the Foreign Student Advisers in these areas. The responses made by the foreign students were primarily related to their personal contact with the Foreign Student

¹Higbee, op. cit., 1961.

Advisers and their availability and helpfulness to them as individual foreign students.

In the findings of the research by Richard E. Miller in which he studied the significant elements in on-the-job behavior of Foreign Student Advisers--it was concluded that "foreign student advisers tend to be much more effective in areas where they work primarily in direct relationship with people than in areas where they work more with ideas, programs, or organizational structures."¹ The conclusion of this study would support Miller's findings to the extent that foreign students also perceive the Foreign Student Advisers to be effective in these same areas.

2. The geographic origins of the foreign student did not determine whether or not they talked with their Foreign Student Advisers.

The influence of geographic and cultural origins or national origins on students' adjustments and their perceptions of the foreign culture in a cross-cultural educational situation had been demonstrated in a number of earlier studies.² Although no hypothesis was developed

¹Miller, op. cit., p. 229.

²Selltiz, op. cit.; Caelho, op. cit.; Bennett et al., op. cit.; Morris et al., op. cit.

to test the effect that geographic origin might have on whether or not students had interviews with their Foreign Student Advisers, there are several factors which suggested that these two variables might be related. In the geographic regions of South Asia and the Far East there are cultural values and societal structures in which respect for formality, official titles, and authority are extremely important. In the hierarchical structure of traditional Indian society this is especially true.

To visit the office of the person officially designated by the institution as the counselor to foreign students might be considered a duty, an honor, or a privilege by persons from these cultural areas, and they might, therefore, be much more inclined to take the opportunity to visit his office or to take advantage of the services offered by an official designated by the college or university to be their adviser.

AID participants come from the developing nations of the world. There were no students from western European countries or Canada included in the group. Had the sample of students included persons from the regions of The British Isles, Western Europe, Canada, or a grouping which included English speaking countries such as the Selltiz

study¹ utilized, a systematic relationship might have been hypothesized and tested. As it turned out, there were no systematic differences according to geographic region in this study.

3. A major determinant of the usefulness of the Foreign Student Adviser seems to be his availability to the student.

The investigation of the relationship of these two variables demonstrated that there was a statistically significant positive relationship between them. Research done in 1955 had indicated that students who were dissatisfied with the counseling they received also reported that the counselors did not have time to advise them, i.e., were not available.² The hypothesis which this study tested was that the usefulness ratings of the Foreign Student Advisers' help would have a positive relationship with the students' ratings of the frequency of their availability. This hypothesis was confirmed.

A review of the research done in the field of student personnel services in higher education did not reveal any published studies which had attempted to determine

¹Selltiz, op. cit.

²Cieslak, op. cit., p. 103.

the relationship between these two factors. Yet, at Pennsylvania State University, in recent years, evaluations of the effectiveness of counselors in men's dormitories have determined that the students' ratings of the counselors' effectiveness is positively correlated with their ratings of his availability to them.¹ These evaluations done at Pennsylvania State University are similar to the hypothesis which was formulated in this study and the results were also comparable.

4. The U-curve of adjustment was not systematically related to the foreign students' perception of the helpfulness of the Foreign Student Advisers.

The U-curve of adjustment in cross-cultural experiences was hypothesized and refined in earlier studies and reviewed in Chapter III of this study. Previous studies had shown that this adjustment curve with its downward trend during the sixth to eighteenth month of the students' sojourns could have an effect on the students' perceptions of the host country and on their attitudes toward that country as well as their home countries.

The data analysis for this study did not reveal

¹According to personal communication with Dr. Raymond Murphy, Dean of Students at Pennsylvania State University, January 11, 1970.

this effect on the students' perceptions of the helpfulness of the Foreign Student Adviser. This result would tend to confirm the validity of the data collected in that this variable did not have an effect on the responses that the students made and therefore did not alter their responses.

Recommendations

The major findings of this study, and the conclusions drawn from those findings, as well as the constitution of this study itself are the bases for the following recommendations.

The portion of this study which was primarily related to the evaluation of the effectiveness of the Foreign Student Advisers (Subproblem one, two, three) was statistically descriptive. This description was of only one aspect of the Foreign Student Adviser's role, namely, his relationship with the foreign students as individuals who came to the office of the Foreign Student Adviser primarily seeking help and advice. Other duties which Foreign Student Advisers may also perform such as: planning and directing orientation programs, organizing social and cultural activities for the foreign students, assisting United States students planning to study abroad, and community contacts are not evaluated. This description was of only one aspect of the Foreign Student Adviser's role was due to the nature of the available data. Although

the large sample of students interviewed, and the equally large number of Foreign Student Advisers at numerous universities evaluated gives this study unique significance in its breadth of nation-wide coverage, it was not possible to do a study in depth such as the two studies done by Benson and Miller.¹ Thus, it can be recommended that a follow-up study, perhaps using the critical incident technique that both Miller and Benson used, be done in which additional analysis and evaluation of all aspects of the Foreign Student Adviser's position and its duties, from the foreign students' perspective, could be conducted

Since the instrument used for this study, the Participant Evaluation of AID Training Questionnaire, was not designed specifically to evaluate the effectiveness of Foreign Student Advisers, it is also recommended that in the future, any instrument used to determine the effectiveness of Foreign Student Advisers be developed solely for that purpose so that it might be refined and revised to more accurately indicate their effectiveness.

It is finally recommended that future studies in the evaluation of student personnel workers in higher

¹Miller, op. cit.; Benson, op. cit.

education replicate the portion of this study which related the usefulness of the Foreign Student Adviser's help to the amount of time that they were available to the foreign students. If the usefulness of Foreign Student Advisers to their foreign students is related to their availability to the students this same relationship might also be evident in other areas of student personnel work such as in the Office of the Dean of Students or office of the Vice-President for Student Life and in areas of Dormitory Counseling and Academic Counseling. This finding could not only designate a guideline for Student Personnel Administrations to evaluate the effectiveness of their workers, but also indicate a way in which the services might be improved.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF AID INTERNATIONAL TRAINING

Introduction to Appendix A

In order to collect the descriptive statistics, demographic characteristics, and biographical data necessary to complete this study the following selected items were utilized from the Participant Evaluation of AID International Training questionnaire:

<u>Item</u>	<u>Page</u>
36	16
37	16
39	16
90	30
91	30
92	30
121	41
122	41
123	41
124	41
128	41
140	44

EXIT INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE CONTENTS AND INSTRUCTIONS

<u>PART</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
SELECTION PROCESS	1
LANGUAGE INFORMATION	3
PLANNING OF TRAINING	5
ORIENTATIONS BEFORE YOUR TRAINING PROGRAM BEGAN	11
TRAINING PROGRAM	15
LIVING ARRANGEMENTS	23
SOCIAL ACTIVITIES AND SERVICES	28
TRAVEL ARRANGEMENTS	32
MONEY ALLOWANCES	33
SPECIAL COMMUNICATION SEMINAR	34
EXPECTED USE OF TRAINING	36
OVERALL EVALUATION	39
BIOGRAPHICAL DATA	41

This questionnaire is divided into the parts listed above. You will be asked questions about your training experience, from start to finish. Please read all questions carefully, and answer frankly all of those which apply to you. Only through your help can AID improve its international training program for future participants.

The interviewer will give you more instructions before you begin.

June 1967

112

SELECTION PROCESS

The following questions ask about your selection for the AID training program.

1. How did you become an AID Participant?

CARD 1

I was nominated 11N I made a request 11R

2. Who encouraged you to take part in the AID training program?

- (a) No one 12A
- (b) My boss 13D
- (c) Representative(s) of my Government 14C
- (d) AID Representative(s) 15D
- (e) Other (Write in the job title of the person who encouraged you): _____

3. Before you were officially notified of your selection as an AID Participant, did you have any interviews with officials?

NO 16N YES 16Y

(Go to No. 5)

4. Who were these officials?

- (a) AID Representatives 17A
- (b) Home Government Representatives 18D
- (c) Other (Write in job title and location of other official(s) you met with):

The following questions ask about the timing of your selection process.

5. How long was the time between when you applied or were nominated and when you received official notice of your selection as an AID Participant?

Month(s): _____ 19-20

6. How long was the time between when you received official notice of your selection as an AID Participant and when you received notice of the date you were to leave your country?

Week(s): _____ 21-22

7. Was this enough time (your answer to item 6) for you to make necessary arrangements?

NO 23N YES 23Y

8. How long was the time between when you received notice of the date you were to leave your country and the day on which you left?

Day(s): _____ 24-26

9. Was this enough time (your answer to item 8) for you to get ready as you wanted?

NO 27N YES 27Y

10. Before you were officially notified of your selection as an AID Participant, did you have examinations of any kind?

NO 28N YES 28Y

(Go to
No. 13)

11. What were these examinations?

(a) Competitive examinations 29A

(b) Medical examinations 30B

(c) English language examinations 31C

(d) Other (Write in any other examinations you took): _____

12. Did you have special training to prepare you for any of these examinations?

NO 32N YES 32Y

114

LANGUAGE INFORMATION

The following questions ask about your knowledge and use of language in your own country and in the United States.

13. Which language have you used most often since you were 18 years of age? 33-35
 used 2nd most often? 36-39
 used 3rd most often? 39-41
 used 4th most often? 42-44

14. Between the time you were officially selected to be an AID Participant and now, did you have any English language instruction?

NO 45N YES 45Y

*(Go to
No. 17)*

15. Where was this English language instruction given?

(a) In my home country 46A
 (b) In the United States 47B

16. How useful was the instruction for helping you with your training program?

Extremely useful, instruction could not have been better

Not at all useful, instruction could not have been worse

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

115

17. AID Participants have sometimes reported difficulties with the English language during their stay in the U.S. Listed below are some of these difficulties. To what extent was each of these difficulties true for you?

<u>Difficulties</u>	<u>Not true for me</u>	<u>Somewhat true for me</u>	<u>Very true for me</u>
a. Difficulties with slang	<input type="checkbox"/> 49N	<input type="checkbox"/> 49S	<input type="checkbox"/> 49V
b. Difficulties with accent	<input type="checkbox"/> 50N	<input type="checkbox"/> 50S	<input type="checkbox"/> 50V
c. Difficulties with personal conversations	<input type="checkbox"/> 51N	<input type="checkbox"/> 51S	<input type="checkbox"/> 51V
d. Difficulties with teachers' or supervisors' speech	<input type="checkbox"/> 52N	<input type="checkbox"/> 52S	<input type="checkbox"/> 52V
e. Difficulties in getting adequate public services	<input type="checkbox"/> 53N	<input type="checkbox"/> 53S	<input type="checkbox"/> 53V
f. Difficulties with reading class assignments	<input type="checkbox"/> 54N	<input type="checkbox"/> 54S	<input type="checkbox"/> 54V
g. Difficulties with signs and directions	<input type="checkbox"/> 55N	<input type="checkbox"/> 55S	<input type="checkbox"/> 55V
h. Difficulties with numbering systems	<input type="checkbox"/> 56N	<input type="checkbox"/> 56S	<input type="checkbox"/> 56V

i. Other difficulties (Write in): _____

PLANNING OF TRAINING

The following questions ask about the planning of your training program before it actually started at the training site(s).

18. As far as you know, was your training program planned in detail before you reached your first training site?

NO 57X YES 57Y

(Go to No. 22)

19. Which of the following items of information about your training program were part of this plan?

- (a) Objective(s) of training 58A
- (b) Name and location of training site 59B
- (c) Training program contents 60C
- (d) Length of time of training program 61D
- (e) Time allotted to each part of training program 62E
- (f) Training reports required 63F
- (g) Person(s) to inform about training program problems .. 64G
- (h) How training is planned to be used upon return to home country 65H
- (i) Other (Write in any other items that were part of the plan): _____

117

20. Do you know who (individuals and agencies) participated in the planning of your training program?

NO ^{56N} YES ^{56Y}

(Go to
No. 22)

21. How would you describe the participation of each of the following persons in this planning?

Persons	No	Some	Much
	Participation	Participation	Participation
a. Myself,	<input type="checkbox"/> ^{57N}	<input type="checkbox"/> ^{57S}	<input type="checkbox"/> ^{57M}
b. My boss	<input type="checkbox"/> ^{68N}	<input type="checkbox"/> ^{68S}	<input type="checkbox"/> ^{68M}
c. AID representative in my home country..	<input type="checkbox"/> ^{69N}	<input type="checkbox"/> ^{69S}	<input type="checkbox"/> ^{69M}
d. Someone else in my home country	<input type="checkbox"/> ^{70N}	<input type="checkbox"/> ^{70S}	<input type="checkbox"/> ^{70M}
e. AID Program De- velopment Officer in the U.S.	<input type="checkbox"/> ^{71N}	<input type="checkbox"/> ^{71S}	<input type="checkbox"/> ^{71M}
f. Other Program Officers in the U.S.	<input type="checkbox"/> ^{72N}	<input type="checkbox"/> ^{72S}	<input type="checkbox"/> ^{72M}
<i>(Write in which agency):</i> _____			
g. Personnel at the training site(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> ^{73N}	<input type="checkbox"/> ^{73S}	<input type="checkbox"/> ^{73M}
h. Other <i>(Write in the job and location of anyone else who participated):</i> _____			

22. Did you want to participate in the planning of your training program?

NO 74N YES 74Y

23. Were any changes made in your training program before you reached the first training site?

NO 75N YES 75Y

(Go to
No. 28)

24. Who suggested the changes?

CARD 2

(a) Myself 11A

(b) My supervisor 12B

(c) AID representatives in my home country 13C

(d) Someone else in my home country 14D

(e) AID Program Development Officer in the U.S. 15E

(f) Other Program Officer in the U.S. 16F

(g) Personnel at the training site(s) 17G

(h) Other (Write in the job and location of anyone else who suggested changes): _____

28. AID Participants have sometimes reported difficulties with the planning of their training program. Listed below are some of these difficulties. To what extent was each of these difficulties true for you?

Difficulties	Not true for me	Somewhat true for me	Very true for me
a. Not enough personal participation in the planning	<input type="checkbox"/> 25N	<input type="checkbox"/> 25S	<input type="checkbox"/> 25V
b. Not enough participation by supervisor(s) in the planning	<input type="checkbox"/> 26N	<input type="checkbox"/> 26S	<input type="checkbox"/> 26V
c. Lack of information on the training program content.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 27N	<input type="checkbox"/> 27S	<input type="checkbox"/> 27V
d. Lack of information about training site(s).....	<input type="checkbox"/> 28N	<input type="checkbox"/> 28S	<input type="checkbox"/> 28V
e. Training plan not suited to conditions in my home country.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 29N	<input type="checkbox"/> 29S	<input type="checkbox"/> 29V
f. Training plan not suited to my previous training	<input type="checkbox"/> 30N	<input type="checkbox"/> 30S	<input type="checkbox"/> 30V
g. Training plan not suited to expected use of training	<input type="checkbox"/> 31N	<input type="checkbox"/> 31S	<input type="checkbox"/> 31V
h. Not enough time allowed for training	<input type="checkbox"/> 32N	<input type="checkbox"/> 32S	<input type="checkbox"/> 32V
i. Training plan not completed in time.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 33N	<input type="checkbox"/> 33S	<input type="checkbox"/> 33V
j. Training plan too rigid; did not allow for change	<input type="checkbox"/> 34N	<input type="checkbox"/> 34S	<input type="checkbox"/> 34V
k. Other difficulties (Write in):		

120

28. How satisfied were you with the planning of your training program?

Extremely satisfied, planning could not have been better

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

Not at all satisfied, planning could not have been worse

35

30. Write in the ideas you have for improving the planning of future training programs for AID Participants with objectives similar to yours.

121

ORIENTATIONS BEFORE YOUR TRAINING PROGRAM BEGAN

The following questions ask about the kinds of information given you before you began your training program.

31. Which of the following places, if any, gave you orientations before you began your training program?

(a) U.S. AID Mission in my home country 36A

(b) U.S. AID in Washington, D.C. 37B

(c) Other participating U.S. Government agency 38C
(Write in name of agency):

(d) Washington International Center 39D

(e) Pre-University Workshop 40E
(Georgetown University, George Washington University or University of Hawaii)

(f) A formal orientation for international students at a training site 41F

(g) Other *(Write in any other place where you received an orientation):*

THE REST OF THE QUESTIONS IN THIS SECTION APPLY ONLY TO THOSE PLACES YOU VISITED (AS CHECKED ABOVE).

122

32. At which of the places you visited did you hear about each of the following topics?
 (If you did not hear about any of these topics, leave blank all of the boxes in that row.)

Topics	U.S. AID Mission in home country	U.S. AID in Washington, D. C.	Other U.S. Government Agency	Washington International Center	Pre- Univ. Workshop	A formal University Orientation	Other Place (Write in)
(a) Travel & visa arrangements	<input type="checkbox"/> 42A	<input type="checkbox"/> 43A	<input type="checkbox"/> 44A	<input type="checkbox"/> 45A		<input type="checkbox"/> 46A	<input type="checkbox"/> 47A
(b) Sickness & accident insurance . .	<input type="checkbox"/> 43B	<input type="checkbox"/> 44B	<input type="checkbox"/> 45B	<input type="checkbox"/> 46B		<input type="checkbox"/> 47B	<input type="checkbox"/> 48B
(c) Money available from AID	<input type="checkbox"/> 44C	<input type="checkbox"/> 45C	<input type="checkbox"/> 46C	<input type="checkbox"/> 47C		<input type="checkbox"/> 48C	<input type="checkbox"/> 49C
(d) AID rules on use of cars	<input type="checkbox"/> 45D	<input type="checkbox"/> 46D	<input type="checkbox"/> 47D	<input type="checkbox"/> 48D		<input type="checkbox"/> 49D	<input type="checkbox"/> 50D
(e) AID rules about families	<input type="checkbox"/> 46E	<input type="checkbox"/> 47E	<input type="checkbox"/> 48E	<input type="checkbox"/> 49E		<input type="checkbox"/> 50E	<input type="checkbox"/> 51E
(f) AID rules on medical care	<input type="checkbox"/> 47F	<input type="checkbox"/> 48F	<input type="checkbox"/> 49F	<input type="checkbox"/> 50F		<input type="checkbox"/> 51F	<input type="checkbox"/> 52F
(g) AID rules about extending time . .	<input type="checkbox"/> 48G	<input type="checkbox"/> 49G	<input type="checkbox"/> 50G	<input type="checkbox"/> 51G		<input type="checkbox"/> 52G	<input type="checkbox"/> 53G
(h) AID Exit Interview(s) and Evaluations	<input type="checkbox"/> 49H	<input type="checkbox"/> 50H	<input type="checkbox"/> 51H	<input type="checkbox"/> 52H		<input type="checkbox"/> 53H	<input type="checkbox"/> 54H
(i) Practical facts for getting along in the U.S.	<input type="checkbox"/> 50I	<input type="checkbox"/> 51I	<input type="checkbox"/> 52I	<input type="checkbox"/> 53I	<input type="checkbox"/> 54I	<input type="checkbox"/> 55I	<input type="checkbox"/> 56I
(j) Kinds of U.S. social activities . .	<input type="checkbox"/> 51J	<input type="checkbox"/> 52J	<input type="checkbox"/> 53J	<input type="checkbox"/> 54J	<input type="checkbox"/> 55J	<input type="checkbox"/> 56J	<input type="checkbox"/> 57J
(k) Ways of life in the U.S.	<input type="checkbox"/> 52K	<input type="checkbox"/> 53K	<input type="checkbox"/> 54K	<input type="checkbox"/> 55K	<input type="checkbox"/> 56K	<input type="checkbox"/> 57K	<input type="checkbox"/> 58K
(l) Education in U.S. universities . .	<input type="checkbox"/> 53L	<input type="checkbox"/> 54L	<input type="checkbox"/> 55L	<input type="checkbox"/> 56L	<input type="checkbox"/> 57L	<input type="checkbox"/> 58L	<input type="checkbox"/> 59L
(m) Operation of the U.S. Government	<input type="checkbox"/> 54M	<input type="checkbox"/> 55M	<input type="checkbox"/> 56M	<input type="checkbox"/> 57M	<input type="checkbox"/> 58M	<input type="checkbox"/> 59M	<input type="checkbox"/> 60M
(n) Economic facts about the U.S. . .	<input type="checkbox"/> 55N	<input type="checkbox"/> 56N	<input type="checkbox"/> 57N	<input type="checkbox"/> 58N	<input type="checkbox"/> 59N	<input type="checkbox"/> 60N	<input type="checkbox"/> 61N
(o) Religious life in the U.S.	<input type="checkbox"/> 56O	<input type="checkbox"/> 57O	<input type="checkbox"/> 58O	<input type="checkbox"/> 59O	<input type="checkbox"/> 60O	<input type="checkbox"/> 61O	<input type="checkbox"/> 62O
(p) Race relations in the U.S.	<input type="checkbox"/> 57P	<input type="checkbox"/> 58P	<input type="checkbox"/> 59P	<input type="checkbox"/> 60P	<input type="checkbox"/> 61P	<input type="checkbox"/> 62P	<input type="checkbox"/> 63P

CARD 3

12

123

33. AID Participants have sometimes reported difficulties with the presentation of information before their training program began. Listed below are some of these difficulties. Which of these difficulties, if any, do you think reduced the usefulness of the information given by the various places you visited?

CARD 4

13

Difficulties	U.S. AID Mission in home country	U.S. AID in Washington, D.C.	Other U.S. Government Agency	Washington International Center	Pre- Univ. Workshop	A formal University Orientation	Other Place (Write in)
a. Information not specific enough	<input type="checkbox"/> 11A	<input type="checkbox"/> 12A	<input type="checkbox"/> 13A	<input type="checkbox"/> 14A	<input type="checkbox"/> 15A	<input type="checkbox"/> 16A	<input type="checkbox"/> 17A
b. Not enough information presented	<input type="checkbox"/> 18B	<input type="checkbox"/> 19B	<input type="checkbox"/> 20B	<input type="checkbox"/> 21B	<input type="checkbox"/> 22B	<input type="checkbox"/> 23B	<input type="checkbox"/> 24B
c. Too much information presented	<input type="checkbox"/> 25C	<input type="checkbox"/> 26C	<input type="checkbox"/> 27C	<input type="checkbox"/> 28C	<input type="checkbox"/> 29C	<input type="checkbox"/> 30C	<input type="checkbox"/> 31C
d. Information not accurate	<input type="checkbox"/> 32D	<input type="checkbox"/> 33D	<input type="checkbox"/> 34D	<input type="checkbox"/> 35D	<input type="checkbox"/> 36D	<input type="checkbox"/> 37D	<input type="checkbox"/> 38D
e. Not enough discussion	<input type="checkbox"/> 39E	<input type="checkbox"/> 40E	<input type="checkbox"/> 41E	<input type="checkbox"/> 42E	<input type="checkbox"/> 43E	<input type="checkbox"/> 44E	<input type="checkbox"/> 45E
f. Not able to understand speaker(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> 46F	<input type="checkbox"/> 47F	<input type="checkbox"/> 48F	<input type="checkbox"/> 49F	<input type="checkbox"/> 50F	<input type="checkbox"/> 51F	<input type="checkbox"/> 52F
g. No printed material	<input type="checkbox"/> 53G	<input type="checkbox"/> 54G	<input type="checkbox"/> 55G	<input type="checkbox"/> 56G	<input type="checkbox"/> 57G	<input type="checkbox"/> 58G	<input type="checkbox"/> 59G
h. No pictures or films	<input type="checkbox"/> 60H	<input type="checkbox"/> 61H	<input type="checkbox"/> 62H	<input type="checkbox"/> 63H	<input type="checkbox"/> 64H	<input type="checkbox"/> 65H	<input type="checkbox"/> 66H
i. No former AID Participant(s) took part in the program	<input type="checkbox"/> 67I	<input type="checkbox"/> 68I	<input type="checkbox"/> 69I	<input type="checkbox"/> 70I	<input type="checkbox"/> 71I	<input type="checkbox"/> 72I	<input type="checkbox"/> 73I

j. No difficulties with this agency's presentation	<input type="checkbox"/> 74J	<input type="checkbox"/> 75J	<input type="checkbox"/> 76J	<input type="checkbox"/> 77J	<input type="checkbox"/> 78J	<input type="checkbox"/> 79J	<input type="checkbox"/> 80J

124

34. At which of the places you visited did you get the most helpful information, if any, about each of the following topics?
 (Check only one place for each topic; this means only one box in each row across the page should be marked.)

Topics	U.S. AID Mission in home country	U.S. AID in Washington, D. C.	Other U.S. Government Agency	Washington International Center	Pre- Univ. Workshop	A formal University Orientation	Other Place (Write in)	No helpful information given on this topic
a. Practical facts for getting along in the U.S.	<input type="checkbox"/> 11A	<input type="checkbox"/> 11B	<input type="checkbox"/> 11C	<input type="checkbox"/> 11D	<input type="checkbox"/> 11E	<input type="checkbox"/> 11F	<input type="checkbox"/> 11G	<input type="checkbox"/> 11H
b. Kinds of U.S. social activities	<input type="checkbox"/> 12A	<input type="checkbox"/> 12B	<input type="checkbox"/> 12C	<input type="checkbox"/> 12D	<input type="checkbox"/> 12E	<input type="checkbox"/> 12F	<input type="checkbox"/> 12G	<input type="checkbox"/> 12H
c. Ways of life in the U.S.	<input type="checkbox"/> 13A	<input type="checkbox"/> 13B	<input type="checkbox"/> 13C	<input type="checkbox"/> 13D	<input type="checkbox"/> 13E	<input type="checkbox"/> 13F	<input type="checkbox"/> 13G	<input type="checkbox"/> 13H
d. Education in U.S. Universities	<input type="checkbox"/> 14A	<input type="checkbox"/> 14B	<input type="checkbox"/> 14C	<input type="checkbox"/> 14D	<input type="checkbox"/> 14E	<input type="checkbox"/> 14F	<input type="checkbox"/> 14G	<input type="checkbox"/> 14H
e. Operation of U.S. Government	<input type="checkbox"/> 15A	<input type="checkbox"/> 15B	<input type="checkbox"/> 15C	<input type="checkbox"/> 15D	<input type="checkbox"/> 15E	<input type="checkbox"/> 15F	<input type="checkbox"/> 15G	<input type="checkbox"/> 15H
f. Economic facts about the U.S.	<input type="checkbox"/> 16A	<input type="checkbox"/> 16B	<input type="checkbox"/> 16C	<input type="checkbox"/> 16D	<input type="checkbox"/> 16E	<input type="checkbox"/> 16F	<input type="checkbox"/> 16G	<input type="checkbox"/> 16H
g. Religious life in the U.S.	<input type="checkbox"/> 17A	<input type="checkbox"/> 17B	<input type="checkbox"/> 17C	<input type="checkbox"/> 17D	<input type="checkbox"/> 17E	<input type="checkbox"/> 17F	<input type="checkbox"/> 17G	<input type="checkbox"/> 17H
h. Race relations in the U.S.	<input type="checkbox"/> 18A	<input type="checkbox"/> 18B	<input type="checkbox"/> 18C	<input type="checkbox"/> 18D	<input type="checkbox"/> 18E	<input type="checkbox"/> 18F	<input type="checkbox"/> 18G	<input type="checkbox"/> 18H

14

122

35. *Write in the ideas you have for improving the orientations for future participants.*

TRAINING PROGRAM

Your actual training has consisted of classroom education, on-the-job work experience, observation visits, or some combination of these training methods. In the following six pages, questions are asked about each of these kinds of training. Answer only those questions that apply to the kind or kinds of training you received.

TRAINING PROGRAM

CARD 6

36. What academic institution(s) did you attend?

	Name of Institution You Attended	Your Major Field of Study	Number of Months You Attended
(a) 1st Institution	<input type="text"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> 11-15	<input type="text"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> 16-19	(a) <input type="text"/> 20-21
(b) 2nd Institution	<input type="text"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> 22-26	<input type="text"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> 27-30	(b) <input type="text"/> 31-32
(c) 3rd Institution	<input type="text"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> 33-37	<input type="text"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> 38-41	(c) <input type="text"/> 42-43

37. What type of student were you?

(a) Graduate student 48A

(b) Undergraduate student 48B

(c) Non-degree student 48C

38. Did your training program include a plan for you to earn an academic degree in the U.S.?

YES 47Y NO 47N

39. Did you earn an academic degree in the U.S.?

NO 49W YES 49Y

(Go to
No. 41)

40. What degree(s) did you earn?

(a) BA/BS 49A

(b) MA/MS 500

(c) Ph.D. 51C

(d) Other (Write in other degree): _____

127

41. Did you have a Faculty Advisor to help you with your academic program at the institution where you had most of your training?

NO ^{52N} YES ^{52Y}

(Go to No. 45)

42. Did he help you arrange your course schedule?

NO ^{53N} YES ^{53Y}

(Go to No. 45)

43. How often did he help you arrange your course schedule?

- Every school term ^{54E}
- Most school terms ^{54M}
- A few school terms ^{54F}

44. How useful was the help he provided?

- Extremely useful, his help could not have been better

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
- Not at all useful, his help could not have been worse

7

⁵⁵

45. Did you receive any informal help in arranging your course schedule from students, faculty or others?

NO ^{56N} YES ^{56Y}

(Go to No. 48)

46. Who provided the informal help?

- (a) Other foreign students ^{57A}
- (b) U.S. students ^{58N}
- (c) Faculty and staff ^{59C}
- (d) Other (Write in any others who gave informal help):

128

47. How useful was the informal help?

Extremely useful, help could not have been better ...

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

Not at all useful, help could not have been worse ...

60

48. After you began your academic training did you ask for it to be changed in any way?

NO 61N

YES 61Y

(Go to
No. 50)

49. What kind(s) of change did you ask for?

(a) Change in academic institution

62A

(b) Change in major field of study

63B

(c) Change in length of program

64C

(d) Other (Write in any other change): _____

50. After you began your academic training was it changed in any way?

NO 65N

YES 65Y

(Go to
No. 52)

51. What kind(s) of change was made?

(a) Change in academic institution

66A

(b) Change in major field of study

67B

(c) Change in length of program

69C

(d) Other (Write in any other change): _____

52. Were any field trips arranged for you as part of your academic education?

NO ^{69N} YES ^{69Y}

(Go to
No. 54)

53. How useful were the field trips in terms of your training objectives?

Extremely useful, trips could not have been better

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

Not at all useful, trips could not have been worse

⁷⁰

54. Did you have courses in which instruments and equipment were used?

NO ^{71N} YES ^{71Y}

(Go to
No. 57)

55. Were these instruments and equipment similar to instruments and equipment now available in your home country?

YES ^{72Y} NO ^{72N}

(Go to
No. 57)

56. Do you expect such instruments and equipment will be available in your home country in the near future?

NO ^{73N} YES ^{73Y}

120

57. AID Participants have sometimes reported difficulties with their academic training. Listed below are some of these difficulties. To what extent was each of these difficulties true for you?

<u>Difficulties</u>	<u>Not true for me</u>	<u>Somewhat true for me</u>	<u>Very true for me</u>
a. Courses too simple	<input type="checkbox"/> 11N	<input type="checkbox"/> 11S	<input type="checkbox"/> 11V
b. Courses too advanced	<input type="checkbox"/> 12N	<input type="checkbox"/> 12S	<input type="checkbox"/> 12V
c. Instruction too theoretical.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 13N	<input type="checkbox"/> 13S	<input type="checkbox"/> 13V
d. Instruction too detailed	<input type="checkbox"/> 14N	<input type="checkbox"/> 14S	<input type="checkbox"/> 14V
e. Not enough lecturing	<input type="checkbox"/> 15N	<input type="checkbox"/> 15S	<input type="checkbox"/> 15V
f. Not enough discussion	<input type="checkbox"/> 16N	<input type="checkbox"/> 16S	<input type="checkbox"/> 16V
g. Too much assigned reading	<input type="checkbox"/> 17N	<input type="checkbox"/> 17S	<input type="checkbox"/> 17V
h. Not enough assigned reading	<input type="checkbox"/> 18N	<input type="checkbox"/> 18S	<input type="checkbox"/> 18V
i. Too many courses unrelated to major field	<input type="checkbox"/> 19N	<input type="checkbox"/> 19S	<input type="checkbox"/> 19V
j. Too much duplication of subject matter in different courses	<input type="checkbox"/> 20N	<input type="checkbox"/> 20S	<input type="checkbox"/> 20V
k. Other difficulties (<i>Write in</i>):	_____		

131

58. How useful were the courses you attended in terms of your training objectives?

Extremely useful, courses could not have been better

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

Not at all useful, courses could not have been worse

21

59. We have divided academic training into the educational techniques listed below. As you look back upon your training objectives and the academic program you have just finished, what changes would you recommend in the educational techniques used?

<u>Educational Techniques</u>	<u>More Needed</u>	<u>Less Needed</u>	<u>About Right Amount</u>
a. Lectures	<input type="checkbox"/> 22M	<input type="checkbox"/> 22L	<input type="checkbox"/> 22R
b. Seminars	<input type="checkbox"/> 23M	<input type="checkbox"/> 23L	<input type="checkbox"/> 23R
c. Laboratory or shop work	<input type="checkbox"/> 24M	<input type="checkbox"/> 24L	<input type="checkbox"/> 24R
d. Individual research	<input type="checkbox"/> 25M	<input type="checkbox"/> 25L	<input type="checkbox"/> 25R
e. Field trips	<input type="checkbox"/> 26M	<input type="checkbox"/> 26L	<input type="checkbox"/> 26R

f. Other (Write in any other change in educational technique(s) you recommend):

60. How satisfied are you with the academic education you received?

Extremely satisfied, academic program could not have been better

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

Not at all satisfied, academic program could not have been worse

27

132

61. *Write in the suggestions you have for improving the academic education of future Participants who will have the same training objectives you had:*

133

LIVING ARRANGEMENTS

62. Did you get any help in finding housing at your training site?

CARD B

NO 11N YES 11Y

(Go to
No. 65)

63. Who helped you in finding housing?

- ✓ (a) AID representatives 12A
- (b) Other sponsoring agency officials 13B
- (c) Officials at the training site 14C
- (d) COSERV volunteers 15D
- (e) Other Americans 16E
- (f) People from my country 17F
- (g) People from other countries 18G

64. In general, how useful was the help that you got?

- Extremely useful, help could not have been better 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- Not at all useful, help could not have been worse 7 19

65. Which of the following people stayed with you at any of the places at which you lived in the U.S.?

- (a) My family 20A
- (b) AID trainees from my country 21B
- (c) AID trainees from other countries 22C
- (d) Foreign nationals who were not AID trainees 23D
- (e) U.S. students 24E
- (f) Other U.S. citizens 25F
- (g) No one, always stayed alone 26G

124

66. Which of the following types of housing did you have at the place where you stayed the longest time in the U.S.?

- (a) Hotel 27A
- (b) Motel 28B
- (c) YMCA-YWCA 29C
- (d) Room in private home 30D
- (e) Dormitory 31E
- (f) Apartment 32F
- (g) House 33G

67. How long did you live in this housing?

- Less than 30 days 34A
- 1 to 4 months 34B
- 6 to 12 months 34C
- More than 12 months 34D

175

68. AID Participants have sometimes reported difficulties with their housing arrangements. Listed below are some of these difficulties. To what extent was each of these difficulties true for you?

<u>Difficulties</u>	<u>Not true for me</u>	<u>Somewhat true for me</u>	<u>Very true for me</u>
a. No information about available housing	<input type="checkbox"/> 15N	<input type="checkbox"/> 15S	<input type="checkbox"/> 15V
b. Cost too great	<input type="checkbox"/> 16N	<input type="checkbox"/> 16S	<input type="checkbox"/> 16V
c. Below desired living standards	<input type="checkbox"/> 17N	<input type="checkbox"/> 17S	<input type="checkbox"/> 17V
d. Landlord troublesome	<input type="checkbox"/> 18N	<input type="checkbox"/> 18S	<input type="checkbox"/> 18V
e. Too far from training... site	<input type="checkbox"/> 19N	<input type="checkbox"/> 19S	<input type="checkbox"/> 19V
f. Too far from business and social areas	<input type="checkbox"/> 20N	<input type="checkbox"/> 20S	<input type="checkbox"/> 20V
g. Inadequate transportation ..	<input type="checkbox"/> 21N	<input type="checkbox"/> 21S	<input type="checkbox"/> 21V
h. Undesirable location	<input type="checkbox"/> 22N	<input type="checkbox"/> 22S	<input type="checkbox"/> 22V
i. Separated from people I wanted to live with	<input type="checkbox"/> 23N	<input type="checkbox"/> 23S	<input type="checkbox"/> 23V
j. Too much noise (or other disturbances)	<input type="checkbox"/> 24N	<input type="checkbox"/> 24S	<input type="checkbox"/> 24V
k. Not able to eat as I wanted	<input type="checkbox"/> 25N	<input type="checkbox"/> 25S	<input type="checkbox"/> 25V
l. Other difficulties (<i>Write in</i>):			

136

69. How satisfied were you with your living arrangements during the time you have been in the U.S.?

Extremely satisfied, living arrangements could not have been better

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

Not at all satisfied, living arrangements could not have been worse

7

70. What would be the one most important factor you would look for in housing if you were training again in the U.S.?

		47-48
--	--	-------

SOCIAL ACTIVITIES AND SERVICES

The following questions ask about the experiences you may have had outside your programmed training activities in the United States.

71. Did you join any formal organizations in the United States, such as student or community clubs or professional societies?

NO 49-51 YES 49-51

(Go to No. 73)

72. What was the name of the organization(s)?

(a) _____

--	--	--	--

 50-52

(b) _____

--	--	--	--

 53-55

(c) _____

--	--	--	--

 56-58

137

73. Were there any formal organizations you wanted to join but were not able to?

NO 59N YES 59Y

(Go to
No. 75)

74. What was the name of the organization(s) you were not able to join?

a. _____ 60-62

b. _____ 63-65

75. Were there any social or recreational activities organized for AID Participants?

NO 66N YES 66Y

(Go to
No. 80)

76. Did you participate in any of these activities?

NO 67N YES 67Y

(Go to
No. 80)

77. What kinds of activities did you participate in?

- (a) Visits to American homes 68A
- (b) Dances 69B
- (c) Parties 70C
- (d) Picnics 71D
- (e) Other (Write in any other activities):

78. By whom were these activities arranged?

- (a) Program advisors 72A
- (b) Church groups 73B
- (c) COSERV 74C
- (d) University officials 75D
- (e) Other students 76E
- (f) Washington International Center
Volunteers 77F
- (g) Other (Write in any other groups which
arranged activities):

138

79. How enjoyable were these activities?

CARD 9

Extremely enjoyable, activities could not have been better

Not at all enjoyable, activities could not have been worse

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

80. Did you participate in any other informal activities?

NO 12N

YES 12Y

(Go to
No. 82)

81. What kind of informal activities?

(a) Playing sports

 13A

(b) Acting in plays

 14B

(c) Singing in groups

 15C

(d) Playing in bands

 16D

(e) Dancing

 17E

(f) Other (Write in any other activities): _____

82. Were there any informal activities you wanted to participate in but were not able to?

NO 18N

YES 18Y

(Go to
No. 84)

83. What were those activities?

a. _____ 19-20

b. _____ 21-22

139

84. Did you have any personal friendships with Americans?

NO 23N YES 23Y

(Go to
No. 87)

85. What kinds of Americans?

- (a) My teachers 24A
- (b) University staff other than my teachers 25B
- (c) Students 26C
- (d) Farmers 27D
- (e) Businessmen 28E
- (f) AID representatives 29F
- (g) Other public officials 30G
- (h) My job training instructors 31H
- (i) Other (Write in any other kinds of Americans): _____
- _____

86. Did these friendships contribute directly to improving your training experiences?

NO 32N YES 32Y

87. Did you know where to go to get any medical, legal or counselling services that you might have needed?

NO 33N YES 33Y

(Go to
No. 90)

88. Did you use any of these services?

NO 34N YES 34Y

(Go to
No. 90)

89. Which of these services did you use?

(a) Medical 35A

(b) Legal 35B

(c) Counselling 37C

(d) Other (Write in any other kinds of
services you used): _____

90. Did you ever talk with a Foreign Student Advisor or Job Trainee Advisor?

NO 38N YES 38Y

(Go to
No. 93)

91. How often was he available to help you?

Always available 39A

Usually available 39U

Sometimes available 39S

92. How useful was any help he provided?

Extremely useful, help could not have been better ...

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

Not at all useful, help could not have been worse

141

93. AID Participants have sometimes reported difficulties during their stay in the United States. Listed below are some of these difficulties. To what extent was each of these difficulties true for you?

<u>Difficulties</u>	<u>Not true for me</u>	<u>Somewhat true for me</u>	<u>Very true for me</u>
a. Not knowing expected manners	<input type="checkbox"/> 41N	<input type="checkbox"/> 41S	<input type="checkbox"/> 41V
b. Weather too hot	<input type="checkbox"/> 42N	<input type="checkbox"/> 42S	<input type="checkbox"/> 42V
c. Weather too cold	<input type="checkbox"/> 43N	<input type="checkbox"/> 43S	<input type="checkbox"/> 43V
d. Food distasteful	<input type="checkbox"/> 44N	<input type="checkbox"/> 44S	<input type="checkbox"/> 44V
e. Feeling homesick	<input type="checkbox"/> 45N	<input type="checkbox"/> 45S	<input type="checkbox"/> 45V
f. Feeling lonely	<input type="checkbox"/> 46N	<input type="checkbox"/> 46S	<input type="checkbox"/> 46V
g. Being sick	<input type="checkbox"/> 47N	<input type="checkbox"/> 47S	<input type="checkbox"/> 47V
h. Dealing with dishonest people	<input type="checkbox"/> 48N	<input type="checkbox"/> 48S	<input type="checkbox"/> 48V
i. Dealing with rude or unfriendly people	<input type="checkbox"/> 49N	<input type="checkbox"/> 49S	<input type="checkbox"/> 49V
j. Lacking sufficient time for unprogrammed activities	<input type="checkbox"/> 50N	<input type="checkbox"/> 50S	<input type="checkbox"/> 50V
k. Not enough money for recreational activities	<input type="checkbox"/> 51N	<input type="checkbox"/> 51S	<input type="checkbox"/> 51V
l. Not enough money to return hospitality	<input type="checkbox"/> 52N	<input type="checkbox"/> 52S	<input type="checkbox"/> 52V
m. Racial discrimination against me	<input type="checkbox"/> 53N	<input type="checkbox"/> 53S	<input type="checkbox"/> 53V
n. Racial discrimination against others	<input type="checkbox"/> 54N	<input type="checkbox"/> 54S	<input type="checkbox"/> 54V
o. Other difficulties <i>(Write in):</i>			

142

94. Did you feel comfortable and welcome in the United States?

Extremely comfortable, always felt welcome

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

Not at all comfortable, never felt welcome

TRAVEL ARRANGEMENTS

95. AID Participants have sometimes reported difficulties with their travel arrangements. Listed below are some of these difficulties. To what extent was each of these difficulties true for you?

<u>Difficulties</u>	<u>Not true for me</u>	<u>Somewhat true for me</u>	<u>Very true for me</u>
a. Traveling alone, no companionship	<input type="checkbox"/> 55N	<input type="checkbox"/> 56S	<input type="checkbox"/> 56V
b. Traveling alone, no help or information	<input type="checkbox"/> 57N	<input type="checkbox"/> 57S	<input type="checkbox"/> 57V
c. Not being met at airport(s) or depot(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> 58N	<input type="checkbox"/> 58S	<input type="checkbox"/> 58V
d. No arrangements made for lodging	<input type="checkbox"/> 59N	<input type="checkbox"/> 59S	<input type="checkbox"/> 59V
e. Trips too long and tiring	<input type="checkbox"/> 60N	<input type="checkbox"/> 60S	<input type="checkbox"/> 60V
f. Trips too short, no opportunity to see country	<input type="checkbox"/> 61N	<input type="checkbox"/> 61S	<input type="checkbox"/> 61V
g. Other difficulties (Write in):			

143

MONEY ALLOWANCES

96. AID Participants have sometimes reported difficulties with the money allowances they received from AID. Listed below are some of these difficulties. To what extent was each of these difficulties true for you?

<u>Difficulties</u>	<u>Not true for me</u>	<u>Somewhat true for me</u>	<u>Very true for me</u>
a. Unable to maintain usual standard of living	<input type="checkbox"/> 1.21	<input type="checkbox"/> 1.23	<input type="checkbox"/> 1.27
b. Not enough money for books and training material	<input type="checkbox"/> 1.31	<input type="checkbox"/> 1.35	<input type="checkbox"/> 1.37
c. Too little per diem <u>while traveling</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1.41	<input type="checkbox"/> 1.45	<input type="checkbox"/> 1.47
d. Not enough money for other <u>program</u> expenses	<input type="checkbox"/> 1.51	<input type="checkbox"/> 1.55	<input type="checkbox"/> 1.57
<i>(Write in items below):</i>			

e. Not enough money for other <u>personal</u> expenses	<input type="checkbox"/> 1.61	<input type="checkbox"/> 1.65	<input type="checkbox"/> 1.67
<i>(Write in items below):</i>			

97. Did you find your per diem too small in any of the cities where you stayed?

NO 1.71 YES 1.73

(Go to No. 99)

98. In which cities?

a. _____ 1.8 7.3

b. _____ 1.8 7.4

c. _____ 1.8 7.5

144

SPECIAL COMMUNICATION SEMINAR

99. Did you attend a Special Communication Seminar?

CARD 10

NO 11N YES 11Y

(Go to
No. 107)

100. Where was the Communication Seminar that you attended?

(a) Michigan State University Seminar at (Write in 12A
location): _____

(b) Other (Write in any other location): _____

101. Was any of the subject matter of your training program repeated in the
subject matter of the Communication Seminar?

NO 13N YES 13Y

(Go to
No. 103)

102. What was repeated?

14-15

103. What do you believe was the purpose of your attending the Communication
Seminar?

16-17

145

104. AID Participants have sometimes reported difficulties with the Communication Seminar. Listed below are some of these difficulties. To what extent was each of these difficulties true for you?

<u>Difficulties</u>	<u>Not true for me</u>	<u>Somewhat true for me</u>	<u>Very true for me</u>
a. Too many lectures	<input type="checkbox"/> 18N	<input type="checkbox"/> 18S	<input type="checkbox"/> 18V
b. Subject matter not specific enough	<input type="checkbox"/> 19N	<input type="checkbox"/> 19S	<input type="checkbox"/> 19V
c. Instruction too detailed	<input type="checkbox"/> 20N	<input type="checkbox"/> 20S	<input type="checkbox"/> 20V
d. Too much repetition of material	<input type="checkbox"/> 21N	<input type="checkbox"/> 21S	<input type="checkbox"/> 21V
e. Not enough discussion	<input type="checkbox"/> 22N	<input type="checkbox"/> 22S	<input type="checkbox"/> 22V
f. Lack of social activities	<input type="checkbox"/> 23N	<input type="checkbox"/> 23S	<input type="checkbox"/> 23V
g. Other difficulties (<i>Write in</i>): _____			

105. How much of the subject matter covered in the Communication Seminar do you think you will be able to use in your work at home?

All	<input type="checkbox"/> 24A
Almost all	<input type="checkbox"/> 24B
Most	<input type="checkbox"/> 24C
Some	<input type="checkbox"/> 24D
Little	<input type="checkbox"/> 24E

103. How much do you think the ideas you got from the Communication Seminar will help you use your training when you return home?

Extremely helpful, ideas could not have been better

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

Not at all helpful, ideas could not have been worse

EXPECTED USE OF TRAINING

The following questions ask about any ideas you may have about using your training after you return to your home country.

107. Do you expect to use any of your AID training to instruct people or change projects in your home country?

NO YES

(Go to No. 109)

108. To which of the following work activities do you expect to apply the AID training you have received?

- (a) Training others in specific work skills 27A
- (b) Academic teaching 29B
- (c) Initiating new projects 29C
- (d) Changing on-going projects 30D
- (e) Other (Write in any other work activity):

109. How much of your AID training do you expect to use right away on your job?

- None 31N
- A little 31L
- Some 31S
- A great amount 31G

110. How much of your AID training do you expect to use eventually on your job?

- None 32N
- A little 32L
- Some 32S
- A great amount 32G

111. Is there a specific job you will take when you return to your home country?

NO 33N YES 33Y

(Go to
No. 115)

112. Is this the same job you had before you came to the U.S.?

NO 34N YES 34Y

(Go to
No. 115)

113. Do you think that your job responsibilities will be changed
as a result of your AID training?

NO 35N YES 35Y

(Go to
No. 115)

114. Were these changes planned for
you before you began your AID
training?

NO 36N YES 36Y

115. AID Participants have sometimes reported they expect to have difficulties in using their training. Listed below are some of these difficulties. To what extent do you think each of these difficulties may be true for you?

<u>Difficulties</u>	<u>Not true for me</u>	<u>Somewhat true for me</u>	<u>Very true for me</u>
a. Lack of equipment, tools, or facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> 37N	<input type="checkbox"/> 37S	<input type="checkbox"/> 37V
b. Lack of money.	<input type="checkbox"/> 38N	<input type="checkbox"/> 38S	<input type="checkbox"/> 38V
c. Lack of time	<input type="checkbox"/> 39N	<input type="checkbox"/> 39S	<input type="checkbox"/> 39V
d. Lack of qualified staff	<input type="checkbox"/> 40N	<input type="checkbox"/> 40S	<input type="checkbox"/> 40V
e. Lack of help from my immediate supervisor.	<input type="checkbox"/> 41N	<input type="checkbox"/> 41S	<input type="checkbox"/> 41V
f. Lack of support from higher officials.	<input type="checkbox"/> 42N	<input type="checkbox"/> 42S	<input type="checkbox"/> 42V
g. Resistance to changing ways of doing things.	<input type="checkbox"/> 43N	<input type="checkbox"/> 43S	<input type="checkbox"/> 43V

h. Other difficulties (Write in): _____

116. Could the U.S. AID Mission in your home country help you to use your training after you return to your home country?

NO 44N YES 44Y

(Go to 117. How? _____
 Na. 118) _____

OVERALL EVALUATION

118. In this questionnaire you have answered questions about the following parts of the AID training program. For each part, check how much change, if any, you think the part needs to make it better.

	<u>Needs Much Change</u>	<u>Needs Some Change</u>	<u>Needs No Change</u>	<u>No Knowledge of This</u>
a. Selection of Participants	<input type="checkbox"/> 45M	<input type="checkbox"/> 45S	<input type="checkbox"/> 45N	<input type="checkbox"/> 45K
b. Language Training	<input type="checkbox"/> 46M	<input type="checkbox"/> 46S	<input type="checkbox"/> 46N	<input type="checkbox"/> 46K
c. Planning of Training	<input type="checkbox"/> 47M	<input type="checkbox"/> 47S	<input type="checkbox"/> 47N	<input type="checkbox"/> 47K
d. Orientations Before Training Program	<input type="checkbox"/> 48M	<input type="checkbox"/> 48S	<input type="checkbox"/> 48N	
e. Program(s) at Training Site(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> 49M	<input type="checkbox"/> 49S	<input type="checkbox"/> 49N	
f. Living Arrangements	<input type="checkbox"/> 50M	<input type="checkbox"/> 50S	<input type="checkbox"/> 50N	
g. Social Activities	<input type="checkbox"/> 51M	<input type="checkbox"/> 51S	<input type="checkbox"/> 51N	
h. Travel Arrangements	<input type="checkbox"/> 52M	<input type="checkbox"/> 52S	<input type="checkbox"/> 52N	
i. Money Allowances	<input type="checkbox"/> 53M	<input type="checkbox"/> 53S	<input type="checkbox"/> 53N	
j. Communication Seminar	<input type="checkbox"/> 54M	<input type="checkbox"/> 54S	<input type="checkbox"/> 54N	<input type="checkbox"/> 54K

119. Your experience in the United States may be divided into two kinds: (a) technical or subject matter training, and (b) social and personal experiences, not directly a part of technical training. Which of these two kinds of experience has been relatively more important to you?

Technical or subject matter training SST

Social and personal experiences SST

120. HOW SATISFIED WERE YOU WITH YOUR TRAINING PROGRAM AS A WHOLE?

EXTREMELY SATISFIED, TRAINING PROGRAM COULD NOT HAVE BEEN BETTER

NOT AT ALL SATISFIED, TRAINING PROGRAM COULD NOT HAVE BEEN WORSE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

The questions in this section deal with biographical information, schooling, work experience and travel.

CARD 11

121. What country were you born in?

 11-13

122. What is your present age? _____ 14-15

123. Sex: Male 16M Female 16F

124. Marital status:

Single 17S Married 17M Other 17O

(Go to
No. 126)

125. Number of children: _____ 18-19

126. Number of brothers and sisters: _____ 20-21

127. What is (was) your father's usual occupation?

 22-24

128. Beginning with your first year of formal schooling, how many years of education did you have before beginning this AID training program? Years: _____ 25-26

129. What was the highest degree, certificate, or diploma you earned before this trip?

Name of Highest Degree,
Certificate or Diploma

27-29

My Major Field of Study

30-33

The Year I Received This Degree,
Certificate or Diploma

34-35

152

130. By whom were you employed at your last two jobs in your home country?

If you have held no jobs, write "no job" in the first block (a) below. If you have held only one job, describe it in (a) and write "no job" in the second block (b).

	Name of Business or Agency Where I Work(ed)	My Job Title	Number of Years I Was Employed
(a) Job held at departure	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> 36-37	(a) <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> 38-40	(a) <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> 41-42
(b) Job held prior to Job a. above	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> 43-44	(b) <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> 45-47	(b) <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> 48-49

131. Before this trip, have you taken any trips lasting one month or more outside your home country?

NO 50N

YES 50Y

(Go to
No. 135)

132. How many months (total) had you spent outside your home country?

Months: _____ 51-52

133. How many countries had you visited?

Number: _____ 53-54

134. What was the major purpose of your longest trip?

- Education 55D
- Technical training 55T
- Employment 55M
- Visiting 55V

135

135. Before this trip, have you ever visited the United States?

NO 56X YES 51Y

(Go to
No. 139)

136. How many months (total) had you spent in the United States before this trip?

Months: _____ 57-58

137. How many states had you visited?

Number: _____ 59-60

138. What was the major purpose of your longest visit before this trip?

- Education
- Technical training
- Employment
- Visiting

139. How large was the place where you lived most of the time before you were 11 years of age?

- Under population of 500 62A
- 500 to 1,999 62B
- 2,000 to 24,999 62C
- 25,000 to 99,999 62D
- 100,000 to 499,999 62E
- 500,000 to 999,999 62F
- Over population of 1,000,000 62G

154

140. How large was the place where you lived most of the time after you were 18 years of age?

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----|
| Under population of 500 | <input type="checkbox"/> | 63A |
| 500 to 1,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> | 63B |
| 2,000 to 24,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> | 63C |
| 25,000 to 99,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> | 63D |
| 100,000 to 499,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> | 63E |
| 500,000 to 999,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> | 63F |
| Over population of 1,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> | 63G |

105

APPENDIX B

The American University DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION AND TRAINING RESEARCH INSTITUTE AID Exit Interview Project

STANDARD INTRODUCTION FOR ACADEMIC AND SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS

Good morning (afternoon). My name is _____.

It's my pleasure to welcome you to the Development Education and Training Research Institute of The American University. The American University, as you may know, is a private educational institution, one of the 5 major universities in Washington, D.C. Neither the University nor our Institute is a part of A.I.D. or of any other government agency. AID has asked us, as an independent organization, to hold an exit interview with participants like yourselves who have completed AID training programs and are leaving from Washington, to go home. Have all of you read about our exit interview on this sheet with the map? (HOLD UP) [IF NECESSARY: Have any of you been told about the purpose of the exit interview and the way we conduct it?] (PAUSE--PROBE IF NECESSARY TO DEVELOP DIALOGUE.)

So that all of you may know more fully what to expect, I want to tell you (more about) the purpose of our interviews with you and the way they are carried out.

The purpose of the exit interview is to help AID

improve their training programs for future participants. You can help us do this by describing in a questionnaire and an oral interview that we will give you, your reactions to the training program you have had. We send this information, combined with the information all other participants give us, to AID for their use in planning and conducting future training programs. Of course, your own program(s) is (are) finished and cannot be changed. However, we get satisfaction--and hope that you will also-- from knowing that we can help improve the participant training program for other people from your country(ies) who will be coming to the United States in the future.

We hope you will give us your true opinions about the good and bad experiences you had during your training programs. We cannot help AID improve training programs unless we send them information which truly represents your opinions. For example, if you stayed in a hotel that you liked, we need to know the name of the hotel so that we can recommend it to AID for future participants. Or, if you stayed in a hotel that you did not like, we need to have the hotel name to tell AID not to send future participants there.

Do you have any questions about the purpose of the exit interview?

You are scheduled to be with us until 12:30 p.m.,

although we will not keep you any longer than it takes to complete the exit interview. During this time we will ask you to take part in 2 or 3 activities. First, we would like all of you to fill out a questionnaire (HOLD UP QUESTIONNAIRE). This will tell us what your training experiences were and your opinions about them. It is not as long as it looks, since you answer only the questions that apply to you. When you have finished the questionnaire, we will provide for each of you an individual conversation with one of our interviewers. The questions in the questionnaire do not ask everything about your own individual program that you may wish to discuss. However, the individual conversation will give you an opportunity to talk about your training program in detail, and to discuss any opinions or experiences you had which you may not be able to put in writing on the questionnaire.

There is an important difference between the questionnaire and the individual conversation. Your name is not related to anything you say in your individual conversation, but the information you write in your questionnaire will be seen by the people in Washington and your home country who have worked on your training program. We send your completed questionnaire to AID's Office of International Training to be looked

at by your Program Officer and by your Program Specialist in another government agency, if you had one. After they have seen your questionnaire, it is sent to the USAID Mission in your country. In contrast, none of the information you give us in the individual conversation goes to AID or to your home country, unless (1) you specifically ask us to make a special report, or (2) it is something you have already written in your questionnaire. Otherwise, the individual, private conversation is completely confidential; your name is not attached to what you have said in any report to AID or your home country.

At various times each year what we have learned from all of these individual conversations and from the questionnaires is put into summary reports and sent to AID with recommendations for improving future training programs. This is a copy of our last annual report (HOLD UP REPORT). In these summary reports, we do not give the names or specific comments of any participant we have talked with. Do you have any questions about the procedures we use in our exit interview? (PAUSE AND ANSWER QUESTIONS.)

Not all of you are concerned with the third part of the exit interview. This (POINT TO VISUAL AID) relates to a special survey we are making of the orientation program at the Washington International Center. Some of you may have already taken part in the first part of this

survey when you attended the WIC orientation. (NOTE PARTICIPANTS.) After you have completed the exit interview questionnaire (HOLD UP) we will ask each of you who have taken part in the first part of this special survey, and each of you who did not attend the WIC orientation program for more than one day to complete this short questionnaire (HOLD UP).

Do you have any questions?

Now I would like to describe the exit interview questionnaire to help you complete it more easily. First, I want to say that this is not a test. The questions ask about what you did as an AID participant and how you felt about these experiences. There are no right or wrong answers. We only want you to tell us your true opinions. We have divided your training experiences into these parts (POINT TO FIRST VISUAL AID) and we ask questions about each part. You can answer most of the questions in the questionnaire by checking the square that has the answer you want to give. In a few questions, however, we ask you to write out your answers. Also, you may write any comments or suggestions you want to make about any question you answer, even if you are not specifically asked to do so in the instructions.

Now I would like to show you 3 different types of questions that you will find in the questionnaire. (POINT TO SECOND VISUAL AID.) (1) This type of question with the

100

red lines is used so that we will not ask you about experiences you did not have. For example, you can see that this question asks if you got any help in finding a place to live where you were training. If your answer is "No," you make a check in the square to the left of the red lines that form a large box around the next group of questions (POINT TO "NO" BOX). Then you go to question 107, as it says below the square. If your answer is "YES," you make a check in the square to the right of the red line (POINT TO "YES" BOX). In this case, you would answer the questions that are surrounded by the red lines because they ask about the kinds of help you got. Is it clear to you how this type of question is used? (PAUSE--ANSWER QUESTIONS.)

(2) Another type of question asks you about difficulties that some participants have experienced during their visit to the United States. For example (POINT TO THIRD VISUAL AID), this question asks about difficulties mentioned and then let us know whether or not they were true for you. For example, (POINT TO THIRD VISUAL AID), we ask you to tell us if American slang was hard to understand. If you feel that this was "not true for you," then you indicate "not true" by checking the first square after the difficulty, and go on to the next listed difficulty. If this was true for you, you are to decide whether it was "somewhat true" or "very true." If it happened on some occasions and not others, or if the situation improved as

you stayed longer in this country, you would check "somewhat true." If it is still a difficulty and has not improved during your stay, you would check "very true for me," the last square in the row. For each difficulty we ask you to check one of the three squares. There is at the bottom of each list a space labeled "other difficulties" (POINT TO VISUAL AID) where you may write in any other difficulty you had, in this topic area, that we have not mentioned in our listing. In this type of question, it is very important that you check a square for each difficulty listed, even if none of them were true for you. In this case, all the squares would be checked "not true for me." Is this type of question clear to you? (PAUSE--ANSWER QUESTIONS.) There are a few questions in the questionnaire that are of this same type, but which do not ask about difficulties.

The third type of question involves a scale that we ask you to use to rate things such as satisfaction or usefulness (POINT TO FOURTH VISUAL AID). There are 7 numbers on the scale. We have described number 1 as "extremely satisfied, things could not have been better." This is the ideal; there could be no improvement of any kind. Each number going from 1 to 7 represents less satisfaction or usefulness until you reach number 7, "not at all satisfied, things could not have been worse." This is the extreme opposite of number 1; everything needed improvement, nothing was satisfactory. We ask you

to place a circle around the one number that represents your feelings about the question asked. Is this type of question clear to you? (PAUSE--ANSWER QUESTIONS.)

I will be here in the room while you are completing the questionnaire; if you have any further questions, please raise your hand and I will come to help. If I happen to be out of the room, make a note of your question and I will help you when I return. There are a few questions in the training program section (POINT TO FIRST VISUAL AID) of the questionnaire that some participants have had some difficulty understanding. I will be nearby when you come to these questions (or will discuss these with you first) to make sure they are clear to you. If you do not want to answer a question for any reason, please let me know so that I can discuss it with you.

When you have finished the questionnaire, please bring it to me. I will go over it to see that all the questions have been answered and then will arrange for the next part of your interview. When your individual conversation is finished, your interviewer will give you this single sheet (HOLD UP) which asks a few questions which will help us improve our exit interview here at American University. After you have finished it, fold it and put it into the box near the Receptionist's desk.

On the cover of the questionnaire (HOLD UP), print your name in the boxes on this line (POINT), leaving one

space between your first and last name. Do not write in any other information on the cover. I will do this later for you. You will notice some very small squares with numbers in red in the questionnaire. Please ignore these. They are instructions for putting the information on IBM cards. Do not hesitate to ask me for help at any time. Thank you.

(PASS OUT QUESTIONNAIRES AND PENCILS.)

164

APPENDIX C

AID TRAINING EXIT INTERVIEW DEVELOPMENT STUDY*

Since the inception of international training programs by the United States Government, the exit interview has been used as an evaluation tool, first with the Marshall Plan programs shortly after World War II, then with the International Cooperation Administration, and since 1961, by the Agency for International Development. The interviews were conducted by program managers either in the foreign aid agency or in other participating government agencies as a part of the final meeting between the participant and the program manager responsible for the participant's program. The final meeting also covered an evaluation of the substance of the participant's training program and provided an opportunity for the tying up of any loose ends on administrative or other matters associated with the participants sojourn in the United States.

Use of the exit interview as an evaluation tool for improving the effectiveness of future training programs is based on a straightforward rationale. While recognizing

*Excerpts from "AID Training Exit Interview Development Study," Washington, D.C.: Development Education and Training Research Institute, 1964, mimeographed, which are pertinent to this study.

the critical importance of other factors in ultimate utilization of the substantive knowledge and skills which participants acquire in their training programs, obviously including the substance itself, the subjective reactions of the participants to their training experiences are major determinants of that utilization. Participants who, on the whole, are more satisfied with their training experiences are more likely to make good use of their technical training than participants who are dissatisfied. In the same way, the participants who view their training experiences positively are likely in the future to evaluate United States foreign policy objectives more objectively and fairly than participants who are disgruntled and negative.

Used as an evaluation tool, the exit interview allows an assessment of the participant's satisfactions and dissatisfactions and the identification of events and experiences which he associates with such evaluative judgments, at a time when his memory of his training program is fresh and his subjective reactions are not leveled or distorted by the passage of time and other events. Program characteristics which are consistently related to positive reactions can be reinforced in future programs, if possible; aspects of programs which are consistently related to negative reactions can be examined for possible change. The interview data can be "banked" for use in subsequent longer term follow-up evaluation studies in which the same kind of

166

analytic process can be employed with training utilization as the yardstick, rather than the participants' evaluative judgments.

An internal management study of the evaluation aspects of the final meeting between the program manager and the participant revealed a number of shortcomings. Evaluation was found to be informal and unstandardized, and the results were not amenable to aggregation which is necessary for an overall evaluation of the total international training program. The major conclusions of the study (Improving the Participant Exit Interview Evaluation Process, September 1960) were:

1. Evaluation is not likely to be performed objectively or impartially.
2. There is no uniformity of approach and only spotty coverage.
3. Insufficient provision is made for dissemination and application of evaluation findings in Washington.
4. There is little indication of utilization of evaluation reports by Missions; some staffs never send evaluation reports to the field.
5. There is excessive duplication of effort; some participants being interviewed several times for essentially the same purpose.
6. The . . . process is expensive, occupying much time in the [foreign aid agency] and participating agencies.

Following the recommendations contained in the staff study, the Agency for International Development Office of International Training (AID/IT) proceeded to develop plans

for centralizing and standardizing the exit interview evaluation process. A questionnaire instrument was developed (Clements/Deuss, 1963) and pretested on a small number of participants (the information content of the questionnaires developed in the present study stems largely from the Clements/Deuss questionnaire). As an evaluation tool, the exit interview is not planned as a substitute for the final meeting of the Program Development Officer (or Program Officer) and the participant. Rather, in addition to coping with the criticisms cited earlier, the exit interview is viewed as a complement to the final meeting, allowing more time in that final meeting to be spent by the PDO on evaluation of the substantive content of the training program and on proper handling of final administrative matters. In this sense, it is recognized that the exit interview is not the only, albeit a major, technique for evaluation of AID/IT programs. Other tools and instruments, such as PDO ratings of training and educational institutions and evaluations by Mission Training Officers are indispensable to overall program evaluation judgments.

For both technical and administrative reasons, AID/IT decided that the exit interview should be conducted by an impartial, independent group and the present development study was programmed.

Exit Interview System Design Requirements

The exit interview system developed in this study was designed to meet the following requirements which were established at the outset of the study in concert with the AID/IT Evaluation Group.

Types of Interview Instruments

For Academic program (enrolled in college or university courses for degree credit) and Special program (on-the-job training, alone or in combination with special classroom and/or observational tour training) participants, two (2) types of instruments are required.

1. A standardized, structured written questionnaire to be completed by each participant under supervision of an interviewer in individual or group sessions. The questionnaire covers all aspects of the training sojourn experience including evaluative judgments on the adequacy of administrative arrangements and satisfaction with accomplishment of technical and non-technical training objectives. Because English language is a requirement for participation in these two programs, the questionnaire is in English with predetermined and precoded response alternatives, requiring an average of one and a half hours to complete.

2. A semi-structured, oral interview to be administered individually to each participant on a private, anonymous basis. The interview provides an opportunity for

the participant to "debrief" himself, a session in which he can express himself in a free and open manner and, if he desires, indulge in a cathartic emotional release of any gripes and complaints concerning his training sojourn about which he might not wish to go on formal record. The interview also allows the participant to express any positive or negative attitudes or beliefs about the United States, his training program, and their relationships to economic and social development in his home country and his own future, and similar matters. Finally, the validity and comprehensiveness of the participant's responses on the formal questionnaire can be directly assessed. The interview is in English, averaging one hour in length.

For Observational Tour Group program participants, a standardized, structured oral interview, to be conducted in a group session with each team of participants, is required. The group interview covers the same content as the formal questionnaire for Academic and Special program participants. At the conclusion of the structured interview, a free "off-the-record" group discussion is conducted by the interviewer to serve the same functions, on a group basis, as the private, oral interview. The interview is conducted in English with participants having an English language facility; interpreters are used for teams whose members do not speak English. The total interview averages two hours with English-speaking teams and two and a half

hours for teams requiring an interpreter.

Participants to be Interviewed

Exit interviews are to be conducted with all participants receiving training in the United States under A.I.D. auspices, including participants programmed through direct Mission contracts with United States institutions. Initial operation of the exit interview system is programmed for participants who pass through Washington, D.C., on their return trip to their home countries. It is estimated that this covers 65 per cent to 70 per cent of all participants who depart annually. As soon as administratively feasible, interviews will be conducted with participants currently departing from Miami, New Orleans, and West Coast locations. (A sampling scheme was considered, but the total participant population will be interviewed to avoid difficult technical problems associated with the representativeness of samples and because economy-of-scale factors do not allow significant reduction in the cost/benefit ratios involved.)

Participant Processing Arrangements

Exit interviews are to be conducted on a continual, year-round basis in order to fit in with established participant departure schedules. The main Washington, D.C. interviewing facility is located to be easily accessible by public transportation from the main AID/IT offices.

One half day of each participant's terminal stay in Washington is programmed by AID/IT for processing through the exit interview prior to the final meeting between the PDO and participant. Two interviewing sessions are conducted daily (morning and afternoon) Monday through Friday of each week. The facility is large enough to handle peak departure loads during July, August, and September, at which time the regular professional interviewing staff is augmented by specially selected and trained part-time interviewers, who also assist as required during the other months.

Feedback Reports to AID/IT

Two types of reports on the interviews conducted are required.

Copies of the questionnaire completed by each Academic and Special program participant and of a written report prepared by the interviewer on each Observational Tour Group interview. Three (3) copies are provided for the AID/IT Program Development Officer (PDO), the Program Officer (PO) in participating agencies or institutions, and the USAID Training Officer in the participant's home country for use in planning future specific programs for participants with similar training objectives. To protect the credibility of the exit interview process in the eyes of the participants, and therefore its usefulness to AID/IT

these reports are not used in the final PDO meeting with participants or in Mission debriefings of participants after their return to their home countries.

Semi-annual, annual, and special reports based on aggregated data from all the interviews conducted. These reports are designed to provide an overall evaluation to AID/IT management for future general program planning and policy formulation purposes. Semi-annual reports provide statistical summaries which describe the experiences and reactions of all participants, as well as for selected groupings of participants (e.g., by region, country, type of training program, length of stay in the United States, age, etc.). Annual reports provide in-depth analyses of the functional relationships among the aggregate data collected (e.g., the relationship between overall satisfaction of participants with their training program and the nature and extent of their participation in planning their programs). Special descriptive or analytic reports are prepared on particular interview content topics or groupings of participants as requested by AID/IT.

INDIVIDUAL, PRIVATE, ORAL INTERVIEW FOR
ACADEMIC AND SPECIAL PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

The individual, private, oral interview was designed to allow the Academic and Special participants to "de-brief" themselves in a cathartic sense and to allow off-the-record expression of attitudes toward their training experience

and the United States and the relationship of these factors to their own careers and social and economic development in their home countries. Given these purposes, it was decided that a semi-structured, informal interview approach designed to engage the participant in a dialogue was the most appropriate interviewing technique. A more structured or formal approach would reduce the rapport needed for a cathartic debriefing, and lead the participant into expressing attitudes whose saliency could not be ascertained. This approach was designed to complement the structured, impersonal questionnaire administration and to provide an atmosphere in which the participant feels comfortable in expressing his opinions and concerns.

Since there are no formal individual interview instruments, the developmental emphasis in this phase of the project was on the interviewing process and the tabulation of responses for cumulative analysis. With this kind of emphasis, the primary technical problems centered around the selection and training of interviewers, the development of interviewing techniques, the length of the interviews, and the recording and coding of interview data.

The Selection of Interviewers

The recruitment of candidates to serve as part-time interviewers was undertaken on a personal contact basis. It was decided that the job and personal requirements for

the individual Interviewers were so specialized that the normal recruitment procedures of placing advertisements and dealing with employment agencies were not appropriate. The technical problem involved in this recruitment was to find highly skilled and motivated Interviewers who had the flexibility in their schedules to work on the irregular basis that the individual interviewing demands. Since the amount of time involved in the job itself was not sufficient to provide an income for the interviewer, it was necessary to recruit people for whom the learning experience and intrinsic interest of the work would provide adequate supplementary compensation to the fiscal emoluments involved.

To locate such people, organizations and agencies that deal with foreign visitors were contacted. These included AID/IT, the placement office at the State Department, and International Visitors Service Council. Washington Opportunities for Women was also contacted when it was learned that this group specialized in the placement of professional women in part-time jobs. The response to these contacts made it clear that women were much more available and interested in this type of employment than men. However, a more balanced interviewing staff was needed, so the local graduate schools and a ministerial association specializing in counseling were approached to increase the number of candidates. From a group of 17 applicants, 3 men and 5 women were selected to supplement the regular

175

DETRI staff as part-time individual Interviewers. (Most of the regular staff members are male.)

The Training of Interviewers

These eight Interviewers plus all the permanent DETRI staff participated in a 3-day interviewer training session immediately prior to the initiation of the actual individual interviewing. The technical problem that was faced in setting up the training session was to design a program that was sufficiently broad in scope to acquaint the Interviewers with the variety of participants they would be interviewing, and yet well enough focused so that they would gain assurance that they could cope with that variety.

This problem was handled by dividing the program into a number of different parts. On the first day, the new Interviewers were acquainted with the other phases of the DETRI exit interview program and introduced to the permanent staff. These introductions were used as models of different "get-acquainted" techniques by Dr. Bryant Wedge, a member of the Technical Advisory Committee, and specialist in cross-cultural communication. Dr. Wedge then conducted a lecture-discussion on models of interpersonal dialogue which provided the Interviewers with a general concept of the phases of an interview and specific suggestions on how to handle the problems inherent in each phase.

177b

On the second day, Mr. Edmund Glenn of the U.S. State Department and Mr. Joseph C. De Mello of the George Washington University Human Resources Research Office carried out a series of simulated interview situations involving the Interviewers in dialogues with a variety of different kinds of foreign nationals. These dialogues were recorded on video-tape and played back immediately for discussion and demonstration purposes. From these demonstrations the Interviewers developed ideas about different cultural styles in thinking and conversation along with techniques for detecting and communicating with people using these styles.

The third day, Mr. Glenn gave a demonstration on rapid note-taking in interview situations, which provided many basic techniques that the Interviewers could adapt to their own style of recording the conversations. (Tape or other recording instruments were rejected for use because of the political sensitivity and invasion of privacy issues.) The training session was concluded with a presentation of the AID/IT information objectives for the individual interviews and specific procedures to be followed in scheduling, preparing for, conducting, and recording the individual interviews. These were presented last in the training program so that they would not dominate the more general information presented in the earlier sessions, and so that they would be most salient in the Interviewers' memories.

177

Further training of interviewers was carried out by holding weekly, 3-hour staff meetings. At these meetings the Interviewers shared their interviewing experiences from the previous week. Problems were discussed and recommendations made for their amelioration in future interviews. Successful interviewing techniques and ideas for improving the entire individual interviewing process were presented and discussed at each meeting. Complete notes were taken at each of these staff meetings. These notes were edited, reproduced, distributed to Interviewers at the next staff meeting, and incorporated into the project archives, so that none of the development of this phase of the program would be lost.

Length of Individual Interviews

The exit interview system design requirements called for the private, individual, oral interviews to be one hour in length. There were two technical problems faced in establishing the length of these interviews. First, the semi-structured nature of the dialogues made the precise timing of an interview almost impossible. Some participants had many relevant concerns and opinions to express and thus would talk for more than one hour. Others had few such concerns and opinions and required less than one hour. A second technical problem concerned administrative restrictions on the length of the individual interviews. Since the participants are scheduled to be at DETRI for

178

4 hours, if they arrive late and/or take an excessive amount of time to complete the questionnaire, there might not be an hour left for the individual interview. Also, the DETRI facility has eight individual interview rooms. These will accommodate 16 participants on any given morning or afternoon, provided at least half of them complete the questionnaire within 2 hours of their scheduled departure time from DETRI. When this does not occur, the individual interviews must be restricted in length so that all the participants can be interviewed.

To deal with the first of these problems, it was decided that when time is available, the participants would be interviewed for as long as the Interviewer feels is required for the participants to express their salient concerns and opinions. (In DETRI's experience to date no individual interview has lasted beyond one hour and 45 minutes.) When participants appear to have few salient concerns and opinions, Interviewers are instructed to ask more direct questions--within the realm of the information objectives for the individual interviews--to be sure that the participant has the opportunity to express himself. When the Interviewer finds there is nothing more to discuss, the interview is terminated. (No individual interview has been shorter than 15 minutes.)

The second technical problem is handled by the Questionnaire Administrator. If he sees that more than eight

174

participants are going to complete the questionnaire after 11 a.m. or 3:30 p.m., he instructs the Interviewers who will be talking with these participants to limit the interviews to approximately 30 minutes. By doing this, the Administrator is assured that interviewing rooms will be available for all the participants who complete the questionnaire within a half hour of the time they are scheduled to leave DETRI.

Since the individual interviewing has been underway, only two Academic and Special participants have not been given an interview. These were participants who completed the questionnaire too late to allow time for the interview.

Data Recording

Since the individual interviews are off-the-record, the Interviewer's note-taking presents a technical problem. Notes are essential for the later reconstruction of the interview, but may detract from the confidentiality of the dialogue if the participant feels he will be quoted.

Interviewers were shown in the formal training sessions how to take notes in a very cryptic manner. It has been found that generally the fewer notes the Interviewer makes the less the suspicions of the participant and the greater the rapport in the interview. Notes are made on yellow legal tablets in a casual but completely open manner. The participant is assured that the interview

is private, both by the Questionnaire Administrator and the Interviewer. The Interviewer explains the note-taking as a means of assisting him to accurately remember what was discussed, so that the feelings of the participant can be combined anonymously with those of other participants. If the Interviewer senses any participant skepticism about the confidentiality of the interview, this is dealt with directly. If necessary, no notes are taken in the interview to reassure the uncertain participant.

As soon as possible after the interview, the Interviewer writes up the dialogue from his notes and memory so that it can be coded and analyzed. The technical problem here is to get the information in a form that does not distort the interview, but that can be easily codified. If the Interviewer tries to categorize this information immediately, he may find that his write-up is not representative of the conversation and thus will be an inaccurate source of data in the analysis.

This problem was solved by allowing the Interviewers to write-up their interviews in a narrative style that they feel recaptures the dialogue. When they have finished this write-up, they go over it and put in topic headings that extract from the narrative the issues and experiences that were discussed in the interview.

Data Coding

After the data has been recorded, it must be coded so that aggregate analyses can be carried out. The technical problem here is to put a wide variety of information into a form that is abstract enough to be comparable across participants and specific enough to be understandable and relevant to AID/IT.

It was decided that the Interviewers themselves should do this coding, since they were most familiar with the data. From the topic headings that were used to categorize the narrative write-ups, a common list of 35 topics was drawn up which represented the majority of the issues and experiences discussed in the interviews. This list was reproduced as a code sheet with each topic divided into experiences and attitudes (see Individual Interview Report Form, Appendix A). For each topic discussed in an interview, the Interviewer indicates on this code sheet the participant's evaluation (on a 4-point scale), and his concerns (on a 3-point scale) with his experiences and ideas in this area.

In addition, the Interviewers make general ratings of the participant's feelings about his training institution, A.I.D., and the United States, based on their overall impressions from the interview. These ratings add scope to their more detailed ratings on the topics. Thus, the individual interviews are coded for aggregate analysis in a manner that represents the salient experiences and opinions

182

of the participants at both the specific and general levels of interest to AID/IT.

SUPPORTING DEVELOPMENT TASKS

In addition to the technical problems associated with the development of instruments and procedures, there were technical problems to be faced in the reproduction of instruments for distribution to AID/IT, and the storage of data for semi-annual and annual analyses.

Reproduction of Instruments--Questionnaires

There are several ways of making image copies of the questionnaires, but none of them have been developed to handle the scale of reproduction needed; i.e., three copies each of 2,500 +, 46-page questionnaires annually. All of the available office reproduction techniques were investigated and found to be too expensive and time-consuming for this job. A system was required that could reproduce the items on the instruments in a standard way and integrate the answers of each participant.

It was decided that the most efficient and least costly means of handling this task was-to program the questionnaire for electronic data processing in such a way that the IBM equipment could print out the questions and answers for each participant. Although the initial programming cost for such a system is quite high relative to other means of reproduction, the use of this system over time will

reduce the cost per questionnaire to a figure lower than that required by any other technique.

Reproduction of Instruments--Tour Group Reports

The job of reproducing Tour Group reports is not as extensive as that of reproducing questionnaires, i.e., three copies each of 100 +, 24-page reports. Thus, it was not economically feasible to program the tour reports for reproduction by IBM equipment.

Since the tour reports are typed by DETRI staff members, it was decided to use multiple-copy, pressure-sensitive paper for the typing of the final reports. This paper eliminates the need for carbon paper. An original and three copies are produced by typing the original. For the convenience of AID/IT the three copies are color-coded.

Data Storage

In order to carry out aggregate analyses of the data collected for the semi-annual and annual reports, it is necessary to store the information for as long as a year at a time. In addition, it is desirable to have back-up copies of the data in case the original information is accidentally lost or destroyed.

DETRI keeps for one year the original copies of the questionnaires filled out by the Academic and Special participants, a copy of the final report on each of the Tour Groups, and the code sheets for each individual interview.

160

Since the analysis of the Tour Group and individual interview data will be done internally by the DETRI staff, no other system of data storage is required.

The data from the questionnaires, however, are too extensive to be analyzed internally. They must be handled by computer. Since IBM cards are already punched to provide the participants' answers for the computer reproduction of the questionnaires, the data are in a form that can easily be stored and later fed into an analytic computer program. All that is required is to transfer data from the punched cards to a magnetic tape that is stored at the computer facility. The program built for the reproduction of the questionnaires was designed to make this transfer. The magnetic tape thus produced provides back-up data on all the processed questionnaires.

58

BIBLIOGRAPHY

186

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Cormack, Margaret L. An Evaluation of Research on Educational Exchange. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of State, 1962.
- Crabbs, Richard F. and Frank W. Holmquist. United States Higher Education and World Affairs: A Partially Annotated Bibliography. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1968.
- Institute of International Education and the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs. Research in International Education. 11th Edition. Washington, D.C.: NAFSA, 1969.
- U.S. Department of State, Policy Review and Coordination Staff. Summaries of Evaluation Studies of the Educational and Cultural Affairs. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of State, 1967.
- U.S. Department of State, Policy Review and Coordination Staff, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. International Education and Cultural Exchange. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of State, 1963.
- Walton, Barbara J. Foreign Student Exchange in Perspective. Washington, D.C.: The Office of External Research, U.S. Department of State, 1967.

Books on Foreign Students and Higher Education

- Cieslak, Edward C. The Foreign Student in American Colleges: A Survey and Evaluation of Administrative Problems and Practices. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1955.
- DuBois, Cora. Foreign Students and Higher Education in the United States. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1962.
- Gardner, John W. AID and the Universities. New York: Education and World Affairs, 1964.

Higbee, Homer D. The Status of Foreign Student Advising in the United States Universities and Colleges. East Lansing, Michigan: Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, Michigan State University, 1961.

Metraux, Guy S. Exchange of Persons: The Evolution of Cross-Cultural Education. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1952.

Books on Foreign Students' Perceptions of the United States

Beals, Ralph L. and Norman D. Humphrey. No Frontier to Learning: The Mexican Student in the United States. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1960.

Bennett, John W. et al. In Search of Identity: The Japanese Overseas Scholar in America and Japan. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1959.

Coelho, George V. Changing Images of America: A Study of Indian Students' Perceptions. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958.

Lambert, Richard D. and Marvin Pressler. Indian Students on An American Campus. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota, 1958.

Morris, Richard T. et al. The Two-Way Mirror: National Status in Foreign Student Adjustment. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1960.

Scott, Franklin D. The American Experience of Swedish Students: Retrospect and Aftermath. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1956.

Selltiz, Claire, et al. Attitudes and Social Relations of Foreign Students in the United States. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1964.

Sewell, William H. and Oluf M. Davidsen. Scandinavian Students on an American Campus. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1963.

Books on Foreign Student Advising

Eigbee, Homer D. The Status of Foreign Student Advising in the United States Universities and Colleges. East Lansing, Michigan: Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, Michigan State University Press, 1961.

Moore, Forrest S. "Trends in Counseling the Foreign Student," in E. G. Williamson, (ed.) Trends in Student Personnel Work. Minneapolis, Minnesota: The University of Minnesota Press, 1949, pp. 183-190.

Putman, Ivan, Jr. The Foreign Student Advisor and His Institution in International Student Exchange. New York: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1964.

Publications of the Government, Learned Societies, and Other Organizations

Bureau of Social Science Research. Social Science Perspectives on Training for Development: Report and Recommendations of a Workshop and Conference on Non-technical Aspects of the AID Participant Training Program. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Social Science Research, 1965.

Clements, F. E. World-wide Evaluation of Participant Training: Summary of Principal Findings and Primary Recommendations for Action. Washington, D.C.: Agency for International Development, U. S. Department of State, 1966.

_____, and A. E. Gollin. Evaluation of the Technical Training Program in United States Foreign Aid. Washington, D.C.: Agency for International Development, U.S. Department of State, 1964.

Foreign Students in the United States. A Report from the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs. A survey conducted by Operations and Policy Research, Inc., Washington, D.C., 1966.

Gollin, A. E. and B. Sensenig. Participant Training in the Far East: Regional Report of an Evaluation Survey. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Social Science Research, 1966.

_____. Participant Training in Latin America: Regional Report of an Evaluation Survey. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Social Science Research, 1966.

_____. Participant Training in Near East and South Asia: Regional Report of an Evaluation Survey. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Social Science Research, 1966.

_____. Participant Training in North Africa: Regional Report of an Evaluation Survey. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Social Science Research, 1966.

Oberg, Kalervo. Culture Shock and the Problem of Adjustment to a New Cultural Environment. Washington, D.C.: Foreign Service Institute, U.S. Department of State, 1958.

Preston, H. O. Operations of the A.I.D. Participant Training Program. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Social Science Research, 1965.

U.S. Department of State, Agency for International Development. Participant Handbook. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of State, 1966.

U.S. Department of State, International Cooperation Administration. Staff Study: Improving the Participant's "Exit Interview" Evaluation Process. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of State, 1960.

U.S. Department of State. "International Information and Cultural Series," Publications Number 6689, No. 59, 1951.

_____. "International Information and Cultural Series," Publications Number 6710, No. 60, 1958.

Periodicals

Bardis, P. D. "Social Distance Among Foreign Students," Sociology and Social Research, XLI (November, 1956), 112-174.

190

- Coelho, George Victor (issue editor). "Impact of Studying Abroad," Journal of Social Issues, XVIII, No. 1 (1962) entire issue, 1-90.
- Davis, James M. "Foreign Student Adviser: A New Profession?" Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Service, CCCXXXV (May, 1961).
- _____. "Is Too Much Being Done for the Foreign Student?" Institute of International Education: News Bulletin, XXXIII, No. 3 (November, 1937), 6-12.
- Forstat, Reisha. "Adjustment Problems of International Students," Sociology and Social Research, XXXVI, No. 1 (1951), 25-30.
- Gardner, John W. "The Foreign Student in America," Foreign Affairs, XL, No. 4 (July, 1952), 640.
- Kiell, Norman. "Attitudes of Foreign Students," Journal of Higher Education, XXII, No. 4 (April, 1951), 188-194.
- Loomis, C. P. and E. A. Schuler. "Acculturation of Foreign Students in the United States," Applied Anthropology, VII (Spring, 1948), 17-34.
- Lyngaard, Sverre. "Adjustment in a Foreign Society," International Social Science Bulletin, VII, No. 1 (1955), 45-51.
- NAFSA Newsletter, Vol. XXI, No. 5 (February 1970)
Washington, D.C.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.
- The NAFSA Directory 1967-68. Washington, D.C.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs; 1860 19th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20009.
- Open Doors 1969. New York: The Institute of International Education, 1969.
- Peterson, James A. and Martin H. Neumeyer. "Problems of Foreign Students," Sociology and Social Research, LII (1948), 787-792.
- Smith, Brewster M. (issue ed.) "Attitudes and Adjustment in Cross-Cultural Contact; Recent Studies of Foreign Students," Journal of Social Issues, XII, No. 1 (1956), 1-70 entire issue.

Smith, Brewster M. "Some Features of Foreign Student Adjustment," Journal of Higher Education, XXVI, No. 5 (May, 1955), 231-241.

Woodyatt, Philip C. "We Are So Kind . . .," International House Quarterly, XIX, No. 1 (Winter, 1955), 10.

Doctoral Dissertations, Unpublished Papers and Reports

"AID Participant Training Exit Interview Development Study," Washington, D.C.: The American University Development Education and Training Research Institute, 1967.

Benson, Gerald A. "On-The-Job Behavior of College and University Foreign Student Advisers as Perceived by Knowledgeable Faculty Members." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1968.

Little, Gerald H. "An Analytical Study of Problems of Participants in the Technical Assistance Program of the Federal Government." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, The American University, Washington, D.C., 1970.

Miller, Richard E. "A Study of Significant Elements in the On-The-Job Behavior of College and University Foreign Student Advisers." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1968.

Books for Methodology

Arensburg, Conrad M. and Arthur H. Niehoff. Introducing Social Change: A Manual for Americans Overseas. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1965.

Cantril, Hadley. The Pattern of Human Concerns. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1965.

McCullough, Celeste and Locke Van Atta. Statistical Concepts. New York: McGraw Hill and Co., 1963.

1970