

PDABT 7/88

**LATIN AMERICA/CARIBBEAN REGION
ACADEMIC SCHOLARS
SUMMARY REPORT
1987/1988**

Assessment of Academic Training Programs

Funded by U.S.A.I.D.

Submitted to

Partners for International Education and Training

Submitted by

Creative Associates International, Inc.

Fall 1989

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	3
FOREWORD	4
THE LATIN AMERICAN/CARIBBEAN ACADEMIC PARTICIPANT	5
SUMMARY OF DATA	6
ACADEMIC REPORT	9
Administration and Background	9
Selection and Meetings in the Home Country	12
Meetings in the United States and Language Training	13
Training Program Data	15
Supplemental Programs	18
Support Services, Advisors, Housing, Travel, and Allowances	18
Social, Cultural, and Recreational Activities	20
Expected Use of Training	22

INTRODUCTION

This Summary Report of the participant assessment of Agency for International Development (A.I.D.) academic training programs was prepared by Creative Associates International, Inc., Washington, D.C., under contract to Partners for International Education and Training (PIET). The findings and conclusions contained in the report are those of the contractor and not necessarily those of PIET or A.I.D.

Background

The primary purpose of the PIET evaluation procedure is to assess the overall training experience of individual or group participants. Since PIET has no mandate to carry out follow-up evaluation, it has focused its efforts on the actual training experience and adjunct activities, or actions, that contribute to the training success: orientations, payment of allowances, housing, level of training, appropriateness of training, and so on.

Just over 200 participants from academic training programs at colleges and universities nationwide returned their questionnaires. This report is a summary of the information provided by the 91 academic participants from Latin American/Caribbean nations who returned the questionnaires. Participants came from 17 countries, and they attended a variety of programs at 60 institutions. The information contained herein is descriptive and not necessarily representative of the majority of academic participants from Latin America/Caribbean or other participating countries.

The Instrument

It is possible to evaluate the quality and impact of training in a number of ways. We believe that the participants themselves are one of the best sources of meaningful data about training programs. Their thoughts, feelings, and suggestions can be used to assess the achievement of overall program goals and objectives and to highlight specific aspects of the training experience that are going well or need improvement. Because exit interviews (one excellent evaluation method) with academic students who attend many colleges and universities are very difficult to schedule, an evaluation instrument was developed and mailed to the participants at the end of their training programs. In some cases participants filled out the form at a PIET office, although there was not always a formalized exit interview. The evaluation instrument is a questionnaire containing 111 questions. A majority of the questions require "yes" or "no" answers. Some of the questions ask participants to rate an aspect of the program on a 1-to-7 scale, while a few are open-ended, allowing the participants to write in their answers.

The following report provides data on 63 of the 111 questions asked in the questionnaire. Questions with responses from fewer than 10 percent of the participants were not included.

For the reader's convenience, data from the questionnaire were summarized using three formats: 1) A description of the African academic participant characterizes the typical student's responses to the most informative evaluation questions in narrative form. 2) A more detailed "Summary of Data" follows, highlighting the most significant data in percentages from questions within each section of the questionnaire. 3) For the reader interested in all of the items, statistics are given on each question, and a box at the end of each section in the report summarizes responses from each question in narrative form.

FOREWORD

This report was prepared by Paul R. Kimmel, Ph.D., Nancy Derr, and Jim Dunn from Creative Associates International, Inc., Washington, D.C., under contract to Partners for International Education and Training.

The authors wish to express their appreciation to Ronald Springwater and Pamela McCloud, both of Partners for International Education and Training in Washington, D.C., for their helpful advice and guidance in developing the evaluation instrument and in putting together the elements of this report.

THE LATIN AMERICAN/CARIBBEAN ACADEMIC PARTICIPANT

The following information provides a normative description of the Latin American/Caribbean student programmed by PIET who graduated from an American university in 1987-1988. The participant will be male, about 31 years old, and probably single. He will come to the United States to increase his knowledge in his field (get a degree) so that he can make a contribution to the development of his country.

He will not be completely satisfied with his pre-departure orientation. He thinks he should have been able to participate more in the planning of his program. He will say he wanted more information about the content of his program.

In looking back, the student will be very satisfied with the total academic program. He may have added remedial courses and English language training, and he probably felt some frustration with the amount of reading he was assigned to do, but on the whole, he will feel that the training was relevant. He will express satisfaction with the amount of support he received from the staff at the academic facility and especially from his faculty advisor.

The participant will express dissatisfaction with the amount of money allowances he received, and he may have had problems with his housing arrangements. He will have visited American citizens in their homes, and talked to Americans about life in the United States and in his country. He will report that the relations he has had with American citizens (even if he experienced some form of discrimination) were important to his total training experience.

The academic participant probably felt homesick and lonely some of the time, and he experienced some difficulties adjusting to American culture and being accepted by Americans. Despite these difficulties, he will express satisfaction with the program and highly recommend it to someone of a similar background.

The participant also will report the desire for follow-up support and services from U.S.A.I.D. Upon returning to his country, he will want to receive some printed materials, such as professional magazines. He will want help getting equipment and training fellow workers. He will express the desire to remain in contact with others who have participated in similar programs.

SUMMARY OF DATA

Administration and Background

A total of 91 participants from Latin American/Caribbean countries returned questionnaires. The largest group of students came from Costa Rica (21), the second largest group came from El Salvador (19), and the third largest group came from the Dominican Republic (9). Fifty-nine of the participants were male, and the average age was 31 years. While 40 percent of the participants were married, 53 percent of them came without family members. Thirty percent brought either a wife or a husband; 19 percent brought children. The participants attended 60 different universities and majored in 50 fields of study.

Selection and Meetings in the Home Country

Participants felt that their professional and educational qualifications were most important to their being chosen to attend this program. Twenty-four percent said they did not attend a meeting in their home countries before coming to the United States, and 79 percent said they wanted to participate more in the planning of their academic programs. Sixty-four percent said they had enough time to prepare for the trip, but 66 percent said they did not receive enough information about their academic program before leaving their countries. Fifty-seven percent wanted more information about the content of the program. The level of satisfaction with program planning in the home country experienced by the participants was low.

Meetings in the United States and Language Training

Half of the participants attended an orientation program about the United States at the Washington International Center (W.I.C.). Fifty-two percent said they thought the W.I.C. orientation accurately portrayed the United States, while 32 percent felt that W.I.C. depicted the United States too favorably. Many of the participants (61%) met with representatives from their sponsoring programs. They felt this meeting was somewhat helpful, as were the W.I.C. orientations and the orientations at their academic facilities. Most of the participants received some English language training. The English language training in the United States was rated as more useful than the English language training in their home countries.

Training Program

Participants said the main reasons they took part in this program were to increase their general knowledge in their fields and to contribute to the development of their countries. Visiting the United States was viewed as the least important reason.

Participants reported some difficulties with the classroom training. Fifty-five percent said they received too much assigned reading, while 47 percent said there were too many quizzes, tests, and papers. Forty-one percent found the subject matter too specific, and 40 percent felt there was too little discussion.

Forty percent of the participants reported taking part in training outside the classroom, which they felt was moderately relevant. However, 80 percent of them said that too little time was spent on non-classroom training.

Some of the participants reported changes in their academic programs. The most common changes were lengthening the program (22%) and changing major field (17%). Nine percent said they added remedial courses. Participant satisfaction with the total academic program was moderately high. The applicability of the training to their experience, career plans, and home country conditions was also moderately high.

Supplemental Programs

Forty-seven percent of the participants attended an A.I.D.-sponsored mid-winter seminar program. The mean ratings of satisfaction given to this program and the seminar in management training for development (attended by 4 percent) were moderate.

Support Services, Advisors, Housing, Travel, and Allowances

All of the participants said they knew how to contact their Partner's representative. Participants said they were satisfied with the communication between themselves and the Partner's representatives. Satisfaction with the receipt of allowances and with travel arrangements was also high. Seventy-nine percent said they got help from members of the staff at the academic facility, and they found the help to be useful. Based on several questions, it was clear that some of the participants (27%) felt that their money allowances were not sufficient. Participants were moderately satisfied with their housing arrangements. Eighty percent of the participants knew that PIET was the source of funds that paid tuition, fees, and allowances.

Social, Cultural, and Recreational Activities

The majority of the participants (54%) said they participated regularly in student or community clubs. Eighty-six percent said they visited U.S. families in their homes. All but six of the participants said they discussed life in the United States with U.S. citizens. Ninety-five percent of the participants said they attended informal activities in the United States, usually with both American and other international students. Sixty-seven percent of the participants said they had the opportunity to make presentations about their home countries to U.S. citizens. Participants rated the importance of personal friendships with U.S. citizens to their total experience moderately high. Forty-two percent of the participants reported experiencing some kind of discrimination during their stay in the United States.

Participants experienced some personal problems in the United States. Fifty-seven percent reported difficulties with the climate; 36 percent said they had some difficulties with the food. Forty-five percent said they had some difficulties adjusting to American culture. Sixty-four percent of the participants reported feeling some homesickness, and 62 percent indicated some feelings of loneliness. Thirty-seven percent said they did not feel accepted by people in the United States. When asked if they felt welcome in the United States, their ratings were moderate.

Return and Overview

Eighty-four percent of the participants said they planned to call on U.S.A.I.D. on their return. Sixty-eight percent of those participants said they would like to receive more materials such as professional magazines; 68 percent mentioned the need for seminars and conferences; 65 percent said they could use help getting equipment; 64 percent mentioned that A.I.D. could help students keep in touch with each other; and 57 percent said A.I.D. could provide more training to fellow workers.

Sixty-six percent rated the social and the training aspects of their U.S. program as equally important. When asked to rate their feelings about the total experience in the United States, the ratings were relatively high ($M=1.8$). Ninety-eight percent of the participants said they would recommend their academic program to others with similar backgrounds.

ACADEMIC REPORT

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PARTICIPANT TRAINING ADMINISTERED BY PARTNERS FOR INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Partners for International Education and Training (PIET) sends each of its academic participants an evaluation questionnaire to complete at the end of his or her training program in the United States. This report is a summary of the information provided by the participants from Latin America/Caribbean who have returned the questionnaires to date. The report presents a detailed summary of the participant responses by repeating the key questions and providing either percentages of yes and no answers, or the mean (M) of the scale ratings given by the participants. Additional explanations are given where necessary.

Administration and Background

1. The participants who provided information for this report came from the following countries:

N=91

Costa Rica (21)*	Jamaica (4)	Bolivia (2)
El Salvador (19)	Ecuador (3)	St. Kitts-Nevis(1)
Dominican Republic (9)	Belize (2)	Barbados (1)
Guatemala (8)	St. Lucia (2)	Columbia (1)
Honduras (7)	Haiti (2)	Peru (1)
Grenada (6)	Panama (2)	

2. The average age of the participants in this report is 31 years.

N=89

3. Males = 59; Females = 32

N=91

4. Single = 60% Married = 40%

N=91

5. Some of the participants were accompanied by dependents:

N=91

Wife = 25% Husband = 4% Child = 19% No one = 52%

*() indicates the number of participants from each country.

6. Participants attended the following U.S. colleges and universities: N=60

- Tennessee Technical University
- North Carolina A&T State Univ.
- Springfield College
- Auburn University
- University of South Carolina
- Harvard University
- John Brown University
- Texas Southern University
- Harding University
- University of Nebraska
- University of Southern California
- George Washington University
- University of Central Florida
- Southern Illinois University
- University of Pennsylvania
- Monterey Institute of Int'l Studio
- Fisk University
- Colorado State University
- Texas A&I University
- University of Iowa
- University of Michigan
- University of Lowell
- Rutgers University
- Georgia Institute of Technology
- Maine Maritime Academy
- University of Illinois
- University of Delaware
- Cornell University
- University of Texas/El Paso
- Alabama University
- Albion College
- Alma College
- Western Michigan University
- Tulane University
- University of Bridgeport
- American Graduate School of Int'l Manag.
- Santa Clara University
- Barry University
- Western Illinois University
- Georgetown University
- Golden Beacon College
- Kent State University
- Michigan State University
- Syracuse University
- Amarillo College
- University of New Mexico
- National University
- Adelphi University
- Eastern Illinois University
- Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
- University of Detroit
- Indiana University
- Ohio State University
- University of North Carolina/Chapel Hill
- Catholic University of America
- American University
- Ball State University
- Oregon State University
- Tuskegee University
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology

7. Participants majored in the following fields: N=50

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|
| -Public Health | -Administration Development | -Tropical Medicine |
| -Fisheries | -English | -Industrial Engineering |
| -Secondary Math Education | -Sports Medicine | -Biostatistics |
| -Accounting | -Finance | -Public Administration |
| -Chemical Engineering | -International Management | -Business Management |
| -Computer Programming | -Economics | -Industrial Engineering |
| -Pubic Policy | -Chemistry | -Resource Economics |
| -Agribusiness Economics | -Microbiology | -Health Ed/Commun |
| -Natural Science Management | -Construction Management | -International Law |
| -Information & Comm. Science | -Health Systems Management | -Linguistics |
| -Plant & Soil Science | -Engr Tech.& Policy | -Robotics & Control |
| -Trans Logistics Mgt/Mrkt | -Air Cond & Refrigeration | -Physical Therapy |
| -Electrical Engineering | -Int'l Public Administration | -Accounting |
| -Vocational,Tech & Adult Ed | -Career Occupation&Ed | -Hydraulics |
| -Water Resource Planning&Mgt | -Electric Power Engineering | -Music |
| -Personnel & Employee Relations | -Epidemiology | -Physical Education |
| -Computer Information Systems | -Music Performance | |

Summary: A total of 91 participants from 17 Latin American/Caribbean countries returned questionnaires. The largest group came from Costa Rica (21), the second largest group came from El Salvador (19), and the third largest group came from the Dominican Republic (9). Fifty-nine of the participants were male, and the average age was 36 years. Sixty percent of the participants were single. The participants attended 60 universities and majored in 50 fields of study.

Selection and Meetings in the Home Country

Participants were asked to rate (on a 1-to-7 scale) the importance of five considerations in the decision to send them on this academic training program. The mean rating (M) for each consideration is provided.

1. Question: How important was each of the following considerations in choosing you to attend this training program? (1= very important, crucial to selection; 7= not at all important)
 - Professional and educational qualifications: M=1.6 N=86
 - Personal abilities: M=2.0 N=83
 - Needs of present job: M=2.9 N=85
 - Language ability: M=4.1 N=84
 - Personal contacts: M=5.5 N=82

2. Question: Did you attend a meeting about your program before coming to the United States?
N=90
NO: 24 % YES: 76 %

3. Question: Did you want to participate more than you did in the planning of your academic program?
N=90
NO: 21 % YES: 79 %

4. Question: How many days advance notice did you receive before leaving your country?
N=86
Average number of days = 32

5. Question: Was this enough time for you to get ready?
N=86
NO: 36 % YES: 64 %

6. Question: Did you receive enough information about your academic program before you left your country?
N=90
NO: 66 % YES: 34 %

7. Participants reported wanting more information primarily about some aspects of the program.

N=91

The content of the academic program: 57 %

Goals of the academic program: 39 %

Description of my academic location: 34 %

8. Question: How satisfied are you with the program planning carried out in your country? (1= extremely satisfied; 7= not at all satisfied)

N=90

M=3.5

Summary: Participants felt that their professional and educational qualifications were most important to their being chosen to attend this program (M=1.6). Personal contacts were least important (M=5.5). Thirty-four percent said they did not attend a meeting in their home countries before coming to the U.S.; 66 percent said they did not receive enough information about their academic program before leaving; and 79 percent said they wanted to participate more in the planning of their academic programs. Sixty-four percent said they had enough time to prepare for the trip. Participants wanted more information about the content of the academic program (57%) and goals of the academic program (39%). The mean rating of satisfaction with program planning in the home country experienced by the participants was 3.5.

Meetings in the United States and Language Training

1. Question: Did you go to an orientation program about the United States at the Washington International Center (W.I.C.)?

N=91

NO: 51 % YES: 49 %

2. Question: How useful was the orientation you received at W.I.C.? (1= extremely useful; 7= not at all useful)

N=46

M=3.0

3. How does the W.I.C. view of the United States compare with your current view?

N=44

W.I.C. was more favorable: 32 %

Impressions are the same: 52 %

W.I.C. was less favorable: 16 %

4. Question: Before your training program began, did you meet with a representative from Partners for International Education and Training, the African-American Institute, AMIDEAST, the Asia Foundation, or the Experiment in International Living?

N=89

NO: 39 % YES: 61 %

5. Question: How useful was the orientation you received at this meeting?

N=57

M=2.7

6. Question: Did you attend an orientation program at your academic facility?

N=91

NO: 33 % YES: 67 %

7. How useful was the orientation you received at your academic facility? (1= extremely useful; 7= not at all useful)

N=56

M=2.7

8. Question: How useful was any English language instruction you received?

In the United States: M=2.2 N=52

In your home country: M=2.8 N=25

Summary: Half of the participants (49%) attended an orientation program about the United States at W.I.C. The participants rated the orientation's usefulness at M=3.0. Fifty-two percent said they thought W.I.C. portrayed the U.S. accurately, while 32 percent felt that the W.I.C. orientation to the U.S. was too favorable. The W.I.C. orientation received a mean utility rating of 2.7. Many of the participants (61%) met with representatives from their sponsoring programs and rated this meeting at M=2.7. The 67 percent of the participants who attended an orientation at their academic facility rated it at M=2.7. Those participants who received English language training in the U.S. rated the training at M=2.2, while language training received in their home country was rated M=2.8.

Training Program Data

1. Participants were asked to rate the importance of the following reasons for taking part in this program: (1= extremely important to me; 7= not at all important to me)

-Increasing general knowledge in your field:	<u>M=1.3</u>	N=87
-Contributing to the development of your country:	<u>M=1.3</u>	N=89
-Obtaining an academic degree:	<u>M=2.0</u>	N=87
-Getting a new or different job in your country:	<u>M=3.0</u>	N=85
-Making professional contacts in the United States:	<u>M=3.2</u>	N=84
-Visiting the United States:	<u>M=3.6</u>	N=88

2. Question: Did you have a faculty advisor who helped you in arranging your course schedule at the institution where you had most of your academic training?

N=86

NO: 2 % YES: 98 %

3. How useful was the faculty advisor? M=3.6 N=86

4. A.I.D.-sponsored participants have sometimes reported difficulties with their classroom training. Participants in this evaluation noted the following difficulties:

-Too much assigned reading:	<u>55</u> %	N=88
-Too many quizzes, tests, and papers:	<u>47</u> %	N=90
-Subject matter too specific:	<u>41</u> %	N=76
-Too little discussion:	<u>40</u> %	N=80
-Courses too advanced:	<u>37</u> %	N=89
-Subject matter too abstract:	<u>32</u> %	N=87
-Testing procedures misunderstood:	<u>26</u> %	N=88
-Different courses duplicate material:	<u>24</u> %	N=85
-Courses too simple:	<u>22</u> %	N=85

5. Question: How relevant to the goals of your academic program were your courses at the institution where you received most of your academic training? (1 = extremely relevant)

N=90
M=2.0

6. Question: Did your academic program include any training outside the classroom?

N=85
 NO: 60% YES: 40%

7. Question: How relevant to the goals of your academic program was the training you received outside the classroom? (1 = extremely relevant)

N=37
M=2.2

8. Question: How well was time divided between classroom and non-classroom training?

	<u>Just Right</u>	<u>Too Little</u>	<u>Too Much</u>	
Classroom	<u>82</u> %	<u>2</u> %	<u>16</u> %	N=80
Non-classroom	<u>19</u> %	<u>80</u> %	<u>1</u> %	N=69

9. Some of the participants reported changes in their academic programs. The changes most commonly made are listed below in order of most common first:

- Lengthened program: 22% N=80
- Switched major field: 17% N=82
- Added English language training : 13% N=85
- Transferred to another school: 10% N=83
- Added remedial courses: 9% N=80
- Shortened program: 7% N=80

10. Participants were asked to rate the applicability of their academic program to three issues: (1= extremely applicable; 7=not at all applicable)

- To personal career plans: M=1.7 N=91
- To prior training and experience: M=1.8 N=89
- To home country conditions: M=2.4 N=90

11. Question: How satisfied are you with your total academic program? (1= extremely satisfied)

N=91 M=2.0

12. Question: How did the participants compare themselves to other international students at their schools with regard to:

	<u>Better</u>	<u>Same</u>	<u>Worse</u>	
Grades	<u>51 %</u>	<u>49 %</u>	<u>0 %</u>	N=87
Health	<u>43 %</u>	<u>54 %</u>	<u>3 %</u>	N=87
English	<u>47 %</u>	<u>50 %</u>	<u>3 %</u>	N=88
Adjustment	<u>59 %</u>	<u>36 %</u>	<u>5 %</u>	N=88
Friends	<u>41 %</u>	<u>54 %</u>	<u>5 %</u>	N=87

Summary: Participants felt that the most important reasons for taking part in this program were to increase their general knowledge in their fields (M=1.3), to contribute to the development of their countries (M=1.3), and to obtain academic degrees (M=2.0). Visiting the United States was viewed as the least important reason (M=3.6). Ninety-eight percent of the participants said that they worked with a faculty advisor in arranging their schedule. The advisors received a mean utility rating of 3.0.

Some participants reported difficulties with the classroom training. Fifty-five percent said they received too much assigned reading; 47 percent said they had too many quizzes, tests, and papers; 41 percent reported the subject matter was too specific; and 40 percent mentioned that courses had too little discussion. Classroom training was rated at M=2.0 for relevance to training program goals.

Forty percent of the participants reported taking part in training outside the classroom. Those who did gave the training a mean relevancy rating of 2.2. Eighty percent said that the time spent on the non-classroom training was too little, while 82 percent said the amount of classroom training was just right.

Some of the participants reported changes in their academic programs. The most common changes were lengthening the program (22%) and switching their major fields (17%). Participants rated the applicability of their academic program to: personal career plans (M=1.7), prior training and experience (M=1.8), and home country conditions (M=2.4) .

Comparing themselves with other international students at their schools, almost all of the participants rated themselves the same or better with regard to grades, health, English, and friends.

The mean rating given to satisfaction with the total academic program was 2.0.

Supplemental Programs

1. Question: Did you attend an A.I.D.-sponsored mid-winter seminar program?

N=90

NO: 53 % YES: 47 %

2. Question: How satisfied were you with the mid-winter seminars that you attended?
(1= extremely satisfied)

N=40

M=2.6

3. Question: Did you attend a seminar in management training for development?

N=89

NO: 96 % YES: 4 %

4. Question: How much do you think the ideas you got from the seminar in management training for development will help you when you return home? (1= extremely helpful)

N=6

M=2.0

Summary: Forty-seven percent of the participants attended an A.I.D.-sponsored, mid-winter seminar program. The mean satisfaction rating given to this program was 2.6. The seminar in Management Training for Development, which was attended by 4 percent, was rated at M=2.0.

Support Services, Advisors, Housing, Travel, and Allowances

1. Question: Did you know how to contact the Partner's representative responsible for your program while you were at your academic facility?

N=90

NO: 0 % YES: 100 %

2. Question: In general, how satisfied were you with the communication between you and the Partner's representative? (1= extremely satisfied)

N=90

M=1.8

3. Participants were asked to rate the following support services provided by the Partner's representatives. (1= extremely satisfied)

-Receipt of allowances:	<u>M=1.4</u>	N=91
-Travel arrangements:	<u>M=1.6</u>	N=73
-Response to emergencies:	<u>M=1.9</u>	N=55
-Help with personal matters:	<u>M=2.1</u>	N=82
-Help with program matters:	<u>M=2.1</u>	N=72

4. Question: Did you ever get help from members of the staff at your academic facility?

N=89

NO: 21 % YES: 79 %

5. Question: How useful was the help they provided?

N=71

M=2.1

6. Question: How satisfied were you with your U.S. housing?

N=87

M=2.4

7. Some participants (27%) felt that their money allowances were not adequate. (Based on responses to several questions on allowances)

8. In most cases (80%), participants knew that PIET was the source of funds that paid the tuition, fees, and money allowances. N=90

Summary: All of the participants said they knew how to contact a Partner's representative. Participants said they were satisfied (M=1.8) with the communication between themselves and the Partner's representatives. The mean satisfaction rating with the receipt of allowances was 1.4; the mean rating given to travel arrangements was 1.6, and the lowest rating (M=2.1) was given to help with program matters. Seventy-nine percent said they got help from members of the staff at the academic facility, and they rated the help at M=2.1. Some of the participants felt that their money allowances were not sufficient (27%). Participants gave a mean rating of 2.4 to satisfaction with their housing arrangements. Eighty percent of the participants knew that PIET was the source of funds that paid tuition, fees, and allowances.

Social, Cultural, and Recreational Activities

1. **Question:** Did you regularly participate in any student or community clubs?
N=91
NO: 45 % YES: 54 %
2. **Question:** Did you visit any U.S. families in their homes during your training programs?
N=86
NO: 14 % YES: 86 %
3. **Question:** How enjoyable were these visits to U.S. families?
(1= extremely enjoyable; 7=not at all enjoyable)
N=78
M=1.6
4. **Question:** Did you ever discuss life in the United States with U.S. citizens?
N=90
NO: 7 % YES: 93 %
5. Participants were asked with whom they most often went to informal activities.
N=90
41 % most often went in mixed groups.
24 % most often went with other foreign nationals
23 % most often went with U.S. citizens.
8 % most often went with people from their own countries.
3 % most often went alone.
6. Participants were asked to rate these informal activities (1= activities couldn't have been better)
N=91
M=1.7
7. **Question:** Did you make any presentations about life or activities in your country to U.S. citizens?
N=86
NO: 33 % YES: 67 %

8. Question: How important to your total experience in the United States were any personal friendships you developed with Americans?

N=89

M=2.0

9. Question: Did you experience any discrimination against you during your stay in the United States?

N=86

NO: 58 % YES: 42 %

10. Participants were asked to indicate any personal problems they may have had.

64 % said that they experienced some homesickness. N=90

62 % indicated some feelings of loneliness. N=91

57 % had some problems with climate. N=89

45 % experienced some difficulties adjusting to American culture. N=91

37 % said they had trouble being accepted by people in the U.S. N=90

36 % had some difficulties with food. N=90

11. Question: Did you feel welcome and accepted in the United States?

N=91

M=2.4

Summary: Fifty-four percent of the participants said they participated regularly in student or community clubs. Eighty-six percent said they visited U.S. families in their homes. They gave a mean rating of 1.6 to their enjoyment of these visits. All but six of the participants said they discussed life in the United States with U.S. citizens.

Sixty-seven percent of the participants said they had the opportunity to make presentations about life or activities in their home countries to U.S. citizens. Ninety-five percent of the participants said they attended informal activities, rating those activities at M=1.7. Participants gave a mean rating of 2.0 to the importance of personal friendships with U.S. citizens in their total U.S. experience. Forty-two percent of the participants reported some kind of discrimination against them during their stay in the United States.

There were some personal problems. Fifty-seven percent reported difficulties with the climate; 36 percent said they had some difficulties with the food; 45 percent said they had some difficulties adjusting to American culture. Sixty-two percent of the participants reported feeling some homesickness, and 57 percent indicated some feelings of loneliness. Thirty-seven percent said they had trouble being accepted by people in the United States. When asked if they felt welcome in the United States, the mean rating was 2.4.

Expected Use of Training

1. 83 % of the participants said they expected to call on U.S.A.I.D. on their return. N=89

2. Participants were asked in which of the following ways the A.I.D. Mission could help them make best use of the training they received in the United States.
N=74
 - 84 % said they would like printed materials like professional magazines.
 - 68 % mentioned the need for seminars and conferences.
 - 65 % said they could use equipment.
 - 64 % said A.I.D. could help students keep in touch with each other.
 - 57 % said A.I.D. could provide more training to fellow workers.
 - 50 % said they could use technical advisors.

3. Participants were asked to rate the importance of three aspects of their stay in the United States.
N=90
 - 3 % said that social, cultural, and personal experiences were most important.
 - 31 % said the training was most important.
 - 66 % said that the social and the training aspects were equally important.

4. The participants were asked to rate their total experience in the United States on a 1-to-7 scale. (1=extremely good; 7= couldn't have been worse)
N=91
M=1.8

5. Question: Would you recommend your academic program to others with your background?

N=91

NO: 2% YES: 98%

Summary: Most of the participants (83%) said they planned to call on U.S.A.I.D. on their return. Eighty-four percent of those participants said they would like more printed materials such as professional magazines; 68 percent said they would like more seminars and conferences; 65 percent said they could use equipment, and 64 percent mentioned that A.I.D. could help students keep in touch with each other. Sixty-six percent rated the social and the training aspects of the program as equally important. When asked to rate their total experience in the U.S. on a 1-to-7 scale, the mean rating was 1.8. Ninety-eight percent of the participants said they would recommend their academic program to others with similar backgrounds.