

PNAAS-416
In. 39284

PARTICIPANT ASSESSMENT OF
FACTORS RELATED TO
WASHINGTON INTERNATIONAL CENTER
ORIENTATION PROGRAMS

PROFILE REPORT

February 1972

The American University
DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION AND TRAINING RESEARCH INSTITUTE
2139 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007

PREFACE

DETRI Profile Reports have been prepared for complementary programs in (1) English language training, (2) the Washington International Center Orientation Program, (3) Pre-Academic Workshops, and (4) Communications Workshops. Other complementary programs, such as executive management seminars, population/family planning seminars, Title IX seminars, and environment seminars, have not been in existence long enough for DETRI exit interview data to have been gathered on them.

Each Profile Report contains summary data from participants who received exit interviews between November 1968 and September 1971. The information in each report is based on sets of items in the exit interview questionnaire devised specifically to obtain participant assessments of these complementary programs.

The Profiles on the W.I.C. Orientation Program and the Communications Workshops include some information provided by Observation Training Teams. The other Profiles do not, as Team members do not attend the other programs. The Profile on the Pre-Academic Workshops contains information from participants in Academic training programs only, for a similar reason--i.e., they are the only ones who attend these Workshops.

Where appropriate, comparisons of participant responses are made among participants attending complementary programs at different sites, or among participants attending the programs in different years. Any statistical differences found to be significant* in these comparisons are discussed.

*"Significant" means statistically significant. The test used was one at the "1% level of confidence." This means that the differences between the data could have occurred by chance alone less than 1 in 100 times. It is unlikely that such obtained differences are a result of chance alone. It is probable (99 out of 100 times) that the differences obtained are attributable to causal factors--although the causes may not be known.

In the English language training profile, comparisons of the responses of participants from the four world regions are made. In the other Profiles, background characteristics of participants, including the world region they are from, are mentioned only when these contribute to the interpretation of the differences in the other comparisons.

Data in the Profile Reports were obtained by having Academic and Special program participants fill out a printed standardized, structured questionnaire under the supervision of a person trained in its administration. They also receive an oral, unstructured interview conducted by cultural communication specialists on a private, anonymous basis. (Definitions of categories of participant trainees are given in the Glossary.) More detailed information on the instruments and procedures used to collect the exit interview data are included in the Final Report on A.I.D. Participant Training Exit Interview Development Study, December 1967, and the Guide for Users of the DETRI Exit Interview, November 1970.

There is ample evidence that these data are both reliable and valid for the participants interviewed. Tests of (1) the internal consistency of participant responses to the questionnaire, (2) interviewers' estimates of the validity of participants' responses, and (3) comparisons with results of other studies show the data to be technically acceptable. (For more detailed information see the First Annual Report, May 1969, pp. iv-v.)

It must be remembered that the data presented in these reports come only from those participants who had completed their training in the United States, who passed through Washington, D.C., on their return to their home countries, and who appeared at the DETRI exit interview. Participants who depart from Miami, New Orleans, and San Francisco account for losses in data, especially in the case of Latin American participants. Therefore, the information in these reports

does not represent all the A.I.D. participant trainees who departed from the United States. It does, however, represent the most systematically gathered, and most dependable data on the largest group of foreign trainees ever studied. Complementary program managers should consider any differences in participant characteristics between the DETRI participants and those they had in their programs during this time period in reading their report. They must also keep in mind the range in time lag of one month (for some participants in Special training programs) to five years (for some participants in Academic training programs) between the participants' attendance at their programs and the date of the exit interviews, in trying to identify the group of participants reporting on a particular program.

The reader must also keep in mind the perspective of DETRI reports. DETRI's primary purpose is to present the participants' view of their programs. In some cases, participant viewpoints may be in direct contradiction to A.I.D. or other policy. In other cases, these views may not seem to coincide with what actually happened. Nevertheless, the principle followed is that whatever the participant reports to be true for him is what DETRI will report. The participant's beliefs and feelings are his reality and will largely influence his satisfactions with his program in the United States and his attempts to utilize his training in his home country. As such, these beliefs and feelings are an important factor in evaluating and planning training and complementary programs. Suggestions are offered in most reports that are likely to increase the satisfaction of future participants with their program.

These reports were prepared by Paul R. Kimmel of The American University, Development Education and Training Research Institute, under contract AID/csd-2865. The author was ably assisted by William C. Ockey, Herman Sander, Ann Fenderson, Robert McCarthy, Pamela Nash, and Richard Seabrook, also of the DETRI staff.

CONTENTS

<u>Part</u>	<u>Page</u>
Preface	1
I. Observation Training Teams	4
II. Academic and Special Participants' Characteristics	7
III. Difficulties with Washington International Center Program	12
IV. The Washington International Center Lecture Program, Tours, and Home Visits	25
V. Picture of the United States--Before and After .	41

PARTICIPANT ASSESSMENT OF FACTORS RELATED TO THE
WASHINGTON INTERNATIONAL CENTER ORIENTATION PROGRAM

From December 1968 through September 1971, 4975 AID participants in Academic and Special training programs and 1364 Observation Training Team members took part in Exit Interviews at the American University, DETRI. About 88% of the participants in Special training programs, 77% of the participants in Academic training programs, and 65% of the Observation Training Team members reported that they had attended orientations at the Washington International Center (Table 1).

Table 1

Q. How many participants received an orientation program at the Washington International Center? (Item 40)

RECEIVED ORIENTATION	ACADEMIC		SPECIAL		OBSERVATION TRAINING TEAM	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	76.7	1744	87.7	2372	64.7	882
No	23.3	525	12.3	334	35.3	482
TOTALS	100.0	2269	100.0	2706	100.0	1364

This report is based on Exit Interview information provided by those participants in this group who said they had attended orientation programs at the Washington International Center between January 1966 and August 1971. This includes all Observation Training Team members interviewed after April 29, 1969;

1-

and all but 212 of the participants in Special training programs and 157 of the participants in Academic training programs.¹

Part I of this report provides data from 951 Observation Training Team members on two interview items that are relevant to the Washington International Center orientation programs. Part II provides data on background characteristics of the Academic and Special participants. Parts III-V present questionnaire data from a sample 1421 Special participants and 613 Academic participants on 24 relevant items. This sample was selected to represent the actual proportion of participants in Academic and Special training programs attending the Washington International Center orientations during the five years under consideration.

All of these data are divided into three time segments to show any changes in participant reaction to orientation programs in different years. The first segment of the Academic and Special participant data contains information from participants who reported attending the Washington International Center in 1966, 1967, or 1968. The second segment contains information from participants who reported attending in 1969, and the third segment contains information from participants who reported attending in 1970 or the first nine months of 1971. The three segments of the Observation Training Team data contains information from participants who reported attending the Washington

1 The interview form for Observation Training Team members did not include the relevant items on the Washington International Center orientations until April 29, 1969. The Academic participants who are not included in this report are primarily those who had attended the Washington International Center orientations prior to January 1966. The Special participants who are not included are primarily those who did not indicate the date of their attendance at the Washington International Center on their Exit Interview questionnaires.

International Center in 1969, 1970, and 1971 respectively.

Some of the Special and Academic participants whose responses are presented in this report took part in a special evaluation study of the Washington International Center conducted by DETRI in 1968. They have not been singled out in this report, however, as previous analyses showed that their evaluations of the orientation programs were usually comparable to those of other participants (See page I-6, Orientation of AID Trainees at the Washington International Center, December 1970). The Washington International Center's orientation program was revised early in 1971, in light of some of the results from the special evaluation study. Since only 191 Special participants and 164 Observation Training Team members who reported attending the revised orientation program (between March and September 1971) had received Exit Interviews at DETRI, they have not been analyzed separately in this report. A special report on participants attending the revised program will appear later this year.

PART I
OBSERVATION TRAINING TEAMS

About 40% of the members of the Observation Training Teams reported visiting a Washington International Center host family for home hospitality. This proportion did not change substantially over the three years during which Observation Training Team information on this item was gathered (Table 2).

Table 2

Q. Did the Observation Training Team members visit a Washington International Center host family for home hospitality?

VISITED HOST FAMILY	1969		1970		1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	40.4	139	43.7	139	34.0	53
No	59.6	205	56.3	179	66.0	103
TOTALS	100.0	344	100.0	318	100.0	156

This percentage is significantly² lower than that for participants in Academic and Special training programs (See Tables 39 and 52). This difference is to be expected, since members

² "Significantly" means statistically significant. The test used was one at the "1% level of confidence." This means that the differences between the data from participants in the two groups compared could have occurred by chance alone in less than 1 out of 100 times. It is unlikely that such obtained differences are a result of chance.

of the Observation Training Teams typically have shorter programs at the Washington International Center and often do not speak English. Both of these factors prohibit them from being as easily assigned to a host family as the Academic and Special participants who have more available time and who are usually proficient in English.

Observation Training Team members' ratings of the utility of the Washington International Center's orientations in preparing them for their experiences in the United States were fairly stable over time (Table 3).

Table 3
Usefulness of Washington International Center
Orientation Attended by Observation Training
Team Members

UTILITY RATING	1969		1970		1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
1 (Extremely useful)	34.9	119	33.6	107	33.3	58
2	35.5	121	28.0	89	42.5	74
3	14.4	49	18.6	59	14.4	25
4	5.0	17	9.4	30	4.6	8
5	6.8	23	8.5	27	2.3	4
6	1.7	6	1.6	5	2.3	4
7 (Not at all useful)	1.7	6	0.3	1	0.6	1
TOTALS	100.0	341	100.0	318	100.0	174

It is noteworthy that the team members' Exit Interview ratings of the orientations' utility are significantly higher (on the average) than those of the Academic and Special participants who took part in DETRI's special evaluation study, but about the same as the satisfaction ratings made by these same Academic and Special participants at the conclusion of their orientation programs (see Table 7, p. I-17, Orientation of AID Trainees at the Washington International Center, December 1970). These results are probably due to the fact that the U.S. sojourns of Observation Training Team members are much shorter than those of Academic and Special participants. Thus, their Exit Interview utility ratings are much closer in time to the orientation programs they attended, and are more similar to the Academic and Special participants' end-of-training ratings of satisfaction than their Exit Interview ratings of utility. For reasons unknown, the longer a participant's sojourn in the United States, the lower his rating of the utility of the Washington International Center orientation program. These results suggest that more careful planning and coordination between AID/OIT and the Washington International Center staff to ensure that the orientation programs for Observation Training Teams are specifically suited to the needs and interests of the team members should be particularly productive.

PART II
ACADEMIC AND SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS' CHARACTERISTICS

The first table in this section of the report presents regional data on the Academic and Special participants who reported in their Exit Interviews that they had attended the Washington International Center in the three time segments between January 1966, and September 1971. Table 4 shows that there was an increase over time in the proportions of participants from the Near East-South Asia and from the Far East, and a decrease in the proportions from Latin America and Africa. These changes can largely be explained by changes in the percentages of trainees called-forward from different countries over this time period.³ Cross tabulations of participant reactions to the Washington International Center program by world region do not show any systematic differences in participant reactions on the basis of world region. Two generalizations that can be made from these analyses are that: (1) Latin American participants less often recalled attending most of the Washington International Center lectures and tours, and found the information they received less helpful during their sojourns than did participants from the other world regions; and (2) Near East-South Asia participants less often reported difficulties with their orientation programs than did participants from the other world regions.

Table 5 shows that many more of the participants who went to orientation programs in 1966 through 1968 were Academic

3 Exit Interviews are administered to only slightly more than half of the non-contract AID participants departing from the United States. Participants who depart from ports other than Washington, D.C., account for some of the losses in participants interviewed, especially in the case of Latin American participants.

trainees, while the majority of those who attended after 1968 were in Special training programs. Since Academic training programs usually last two years or more, it is to be expected that more of the participants interviewed in 1969 through September 1971 who recalled orientation programs at the Washington International Center prior to 1969 are likely to be Academic trainees because of the length of their programs. On the other hand, the average U.S. sojourn for participants in Special training programs is about nine months. Therefore, participants interviewed in that calendar year would necessarily have to be in Special training programs.

Table 4

Q. What regions of the world were the Academic and Special participants from?

REGION	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Near East- S. Asia	23.1	310	35.3	409	33.7	418
Far East	32.1	430	34.5	400	39.0	483
Latin America	14.3	192	12.0	139	9.9	123
Africa	30.5	408	18.2	212	17.4	216
TOTALS	100.0	1340	100.0	1160	100.0	1240

Table 5

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

TYPE OF PROGRAM	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Academic	74.9	1008	36.9	428	12.2	151
Special	25.1	337	63.1	732	87.8	1091
TOTALS	100.0	1345	100.0	1160	100.0	1242

Cross tabulations of participant reactions to the Washington International Center orientation programs indicate that there are systematic differences between the Academic and Special trainees. These analyses show that participants in Academic training programs less often recall attending lectures or tours sponsored by the Washington International Center and more often report difficulties with the orientation program than do participants in Special training programs. Because of these differences, it was decided to sample participants so that the proportions of Academic and Special participants attending the International Center in each of the three time segments approximated AID/OIT arrival figures. Therefore, a sample distributed such that about 30% of the participants in each of the time segments were in Academic programs and about 70% were in Special training programs was drawn from the total group of Academic and Special trainees.

When time comparisons were made of the reactions of this sample of participants, only one questionnaire item out of 24 was found to vary significantly. This item is presented as Table 6, which shows that participants less often reported problems with "too many lectures" in the orientation programs over time.

Since none of the remaining 23 questionnaire items showed any significant changes over time for the entire sample, and since differences in the reactions of Academic and Special trainees remained highly significant even within the sample group, the remaining tables in this report are presented separately for Academic and Special participants. This is done to give the reader a clear picture of the reactions of the two different types of participants rather than an "average" set of reactions that does not accurately represent either of them.

Table 6

Q. Did the Academic and Special participants have problems with too many lectures at their orientation program? (Item 45a)

PROBLEM WITH TOO MANY LECTURES	1966- 1968		1969		1970- SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	63.5	306	71.3	755	75.8	391
Some	26.6	116	22.7	208	20.4	91
Much	9.9	35	6.0	57	3.8	16
TOTALS	100.0	467	100.0	1020	100.0	498

PART III
DIFFICULTIES WITH WASHINGTON
INTERNATIONAL CENTER PROGRAM

This section of the report deals with ten "difficulties" which represent the major problems with the Washington International Center orientation programs that participants have reported in their Exit Interviews. The purpose of asking about these problems is to elicit information that can be used to improve future orientation programs. All participants are asked to decide whether or not each of these difficulties was a problem for them.

Special Participants

Tables 7 through 16 show the answers of the sample of participants in Special training programs to each of the ten difficulty items. Only one of these items ("too many lectures") (Table 7) showed a significant change over time. As in Table 6, fewer of the participants report this problem with the more recent programs than they did with earlier programs. Two other items which showed much improvement (although not statistically significant change) over time were problems with "lecturers' English being hard to understand" (Table 9), and problems with "important topics being omitted" (Table 13). None of the ten difficulties became more prevalent over time for the Special participants.

The three difficulties most often reported by participants in Special training programs are "too few visits with American families" (Table 15); "the group attending their orientation program being too different in cultural backgrounds" (Table 12); and "too few tours" (Table 16).

Table 7

Q. Did the Special participants have problems with too many lectures at their orientation program? (Item 45a)

PROBLEM WITH TOO MANY LECTURES	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	72.0	233	78.1	557	82.6	289
Some	23.4	76	17.0	121	15.1	53
Much	4.6	15	4.9	35	2.3	8
TOTALS	100.0	324	100.0	713	100.0	350

Table 8

Q. Did the Special participants have problems with too little discussion at their orientation program? (Item 45b)

PROBLEM WITH TOO LITTLE DISCUSSION	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	71.0	228	74.1	523	75.9	265
Some	22.7	73	19.8	140	20.9	73
Much	6.3	20	6.1	43	3.2	11
TOTALS	100.0	321	100.0	706	100.0	349

Table 9

Q. Did the Special participants have problems with the English used by lecturers at their orientation program being hard to understand? (Item 45c)

PROBLEM WITH UNDERSTANDING LECTURERS' ENGLISH	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	74.2	239	80.4	571	83.1	289
Some	24.2	78	17.5	124	15.5	54
Much	1.6	5	2.1	15	1.4	5
TOTALS	100.0	322	100.0	710	100.0	348

Table 10

Q. Did the Special participants have problems with their orientation program being too elementary? (Item 45d)

PROBLEM WITH PROGRAM TOO ELEMENTARY	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	68.4	219	73.5	521	74.0	259
Some	25.3	81	20.7	147	22.0	77
Much	6.3	20	5.8	41	4.0	14
TOTALS	100.0	320	100.0	709	100.0	350

Table 11

Q. Did the Special participants have problems with the group attending their orientation program being too large? (Item 45e)

PROBLEM WITH GROUP TOO LARGE	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	71.7	230	73.3	518	73.3	255
Some	21.5	69	19.9	141	21.6	75
Much	6.8	22	6.8	48	5.1	18
TOTALS	100.0	321	100.0	707	100.0	348

Table 12

Q. Did the Special participants have problems with the group attending their orientation program being too different in cultural backgrounds? (Item 45f)

PROBLEM WITH DIFFERENCE IN CULTURAL BACKGROUNDS	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	52.6	170	58.0	409	57.3	200
Some	29.4	95	27.0	190	30.1	105
Much	18.0	58	15.0	106	12.6	44
TOTALS	100.0	323	100.0	705	100.0	349

Table 13

Q. Did the Special participants have problems with some important topics being omitted at their orientation program? (Item 45g)

PROBLEM WITH OMISSION OF TOPICS	1966- 1968		1969		1970- SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	66.5	206	73.7	519	77.6	270
Some	28.0	87	21.0	148	19.0	66
Much	5.5	17	5.3	37	3.4	12
TOTALS	100.0	310	100.0	704	100.0	348

Table 14

Q. Did the Special participants have problems with the subject matter at their orientation program being sometimes inaccurate? (Item 45h)

PROBLEM WITH INACCURATE INFORMATION	1966- 1968		1969		1970- SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	79.9	202	81.0	565	83.4	287
Some	16.6	42	17.2	120	15.1	52
Much	3.5	9	1.8	13	1.5	5
TOTALS	100.0	253	100.0	698	100.0	344

Table 15

Q. Did the Special participants have problems with too few visits with American families during their orientation program? (Item 45i)

PROBLEM WITH TOO FEW VISITS	1966- 1968		1969		1970- SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	49.1	155	54.7	386	54.6	190
Some	26.9	85	22.6	159	28.2	98
Much	24.0	76	22.7	160	17.2	60
TOTALS	100.0	316	100.0	705	100.0	348

Table 16

Q. Did the Special participants have problems with too few tours during their orientation program? (Item 45j)

PROBLEM WITH TOO FEW TOURS	1966- 1968		1969		1970- SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	60.6	192	65.8	465	64.8	226
Some	28.4	90	23.2	164	26.1	91
Much	11.0	35	11.0	78	9.1	32
TOTALS	100.0	317	100.0	707	100.0	349

Academic Participants

There were no significant changes in the sample of Academic participants' reactions to any of the ten difficulties over time. The problem of "too many lectures" did (as in Table 6) decrease in prevalence over time (but not significantly) from 1966 through September 1971 (Table 17). The only other difficulty which became steadily less prevalent over time for the Academic participants was "subject matter at the orientation being sometimes inaccurate" (Table 24).

The three difficulties most often reported by Academic participants were "the group attending the orientation program being too different in cultural backgrounds" (Table 22); "too few visits with American families" (Table 25); and "some important topics being omitted" (Table 23).

Table 17

Q. Did the Academic participants have problems with too many lectures at their orientation program? (Item 45a)

PROBLEM WITH TOO MANY LECTURES	1966 1968		1969		1970- SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	54.9	73	64.5	198	68.9	102
Some	30.1	40	28.3	87	25.7	38
Much	15.0	20	7.2	22	5.4	8
TOTALS	100.0	133	100.0	307	100.0	148

Table 18

Q. Did the Academic participants have problems with too little discussion at their orientation program? (Item 45b)

PROBLEM WITH TOO LITTLE DISCUSSION	1966- 1968		1969		1970- SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	58.6	78	62.8	189	58.8	87
Some	28.6	38	26.2	79	32.4	48
Much	12.8	17	11.0	33	8.8	13
TOTALS	100.0	133	100.0	301	100.0	148

Table 19

Q. Did the Academic participants have problems with the English used by lecturers at their orientation program being hard to understand? (Item 45c)

PROBLEM WITH UNDERSTANDING LECTURERS' ENGLISH	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	69.9	93	69.9	214	70.9	105
Some	24.8	33	28.1	86	25.0	37
Much	5.3	7	2.0	6	4.1	6
TOTALS	100.0	133	100.0	306	100.0	148

Table 20

Q. Did the Academic participants have problems with their orientation program being too elementary? (Item 45d)

PROBLEM WITH PROGRAM TOO ELEMENTARY	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	57.1	76	64.1	195	61.5	91
Some	30.8	41	26.3	80	26.4	39
Much	12.1	16	9.6	29	12.1	18
TOTALS	100.0	133	100.0	304	100.0	148

Table 21

Q. Did the Academic participants have problems with the group attending their orientation program being too large? (Item 45e)

PROBLEM WITH GROUP TOO LARGE	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	62.4	83	64.5	196	60.1	89
Some	30.8	41	23.0	70	23.7	35
Much	6.8	9	12.5	38	16.2	24
TOTALS	100.0	133	100.0	304	100.0	148

Table 22

Q. Did the Academic participants have problems with the group attending their orientation program being too different in cultural backgrounds? (Item 45f)

PROBLEM WITH DIFFERENCE IN CULTURAL BACKGROUNDS	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	46.6	62	42.7	129	51.3	76
Some	36.1	48	39.1	118	29.1	43
Much	17.3	23	18.2	55	19.6	29
TOTALS	100.0	133	100.0	302	100.0	148

Table 23

Q. Did the Academic participants have problems with some important topics being omitted at their orientation program? (Item 45g)

PROBLEM WITH OMISSION OF TOPICS	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	56.2	73	55.3	163	57.4	85
Some	32.3	42	35.6	105	34.5	51
Much	11.5	15	9.1	27	8.1	12
TOTALS	100.0	130	100.0	295	100.0	148

Table 24

Q. Did the Academic participants have problems with the subject matter at their orientation program being sometimes inaccurate? (Item 45h)

PROBLEM WITH INACCURATE INFORMATION	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	62.3	88	69.7	209	75.0	108
Some	23.6	30	26.3	79	22.9	33
Much	7.1	9	4.0	12	2.1	3
TOTALS	100.0	127	100.0	300	100.0	144

Table 25

Q. Did the Academic participants have problems with too few visits with American families during their orientation program? (Item 45i)

PROBLEM WITH TOO FEW VISITS	1966- 1968		1969		1970- SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	53.0	70	51.6	157	49.3	72
Some	22.7	30	25.0	76	29.5	43
Much	24.3	32	23.4	71	21.2	31
TOTALS	100.0	132	100.0	304	100.0	146

Table 26

Q. Did the Academic participants have problems with too few tours during their orientation program? (Item 45j)

PROBLEM WITH TOO FEW TOURS	1966- 1968		1969		1970- SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
None	62.4	83	53.3	161	60.1	89
Some	24.1	32	29.5	89	29.1	43
Much	13.5	18	17.2	52	10.8	16
TOTALS	100.0	133	100.0	302	100.0	148

Conclusion

Participants in Academic and Special training programs have different reactions to their experiences at the Washington International Center. The Special participants less often reported difficulties with the orientation programs, especially those which took place in 1970 and 1971. The Academic participants, on the other hand, are more critical of the orientation programs and do not show any consistent lessening of these difficulties over time. The Academic and Special participants agreed that difficulties with "too many lectures" at the orientation programs are less prevalent currently, and that there should be more visits with American families and more conducted tours during the program at the Washington International Center.

Another difficulty often reported by both types of participants is that "the group attending their orientation program was too different in cultural backgrounds." It is possible that the reasons underlying this difficulty are different for the two types of participants. Some of the participants in Academic training programs probably dislike being in large groups from varied educational and cultural backgrounds that inhibit discussions and limit the amount of information that can be provided at the Washington International Center. This would account for the fact that the Academic participants often list the problem of "important topics being omitted" as one of the major difficulties with the programs. Some of the participants in Special training programs, on the other hand, would probably prefer a more homogeneous audience so that information could be covered more carefully. It is likely that the variety of participants attending the orientation programs causes them some difficulties in comprehending everything that is being said. This is especially likely to be true for Special participants from the Far East who reported difficulty with "the English used by the lecturers" significantly more often than participants from other world regions.

PART IV
THE WASHINGTON INTERNATIONAL CENTER LECTURE PROGRAM,
TOURS, AND HOME VISITS

Academic and Special participants are asked in the Exit Interview questionnaire whether they recall having heard the eight lectures that were presented during the Washington International Center's five-day orientation program; going on the four conducted tours; and receiving home hospitality. Both Academic and Special participants more often recalled hearing lectures on customs and daily life (Tables 27 and 40) in the United States, and on U.S. education (Tables 32, and 45) than on any other topics. There were no statistically significant differences between the percentages of Academic and Special participants recalling these two lectures. On all of the other lectures, significantly more of the Special program participants recalled hearing about the topics than did participants in Academic training programs.

There were no statistically significant changes in the recall of lectures over time for either the Academic or the Special program participants. Academic participants more often tended to recall lectures at programs held more recently, while the percentages for the Special participants showed very little change over time, with the exception of the lecture on civil liberties and race relations in the United States (Table 47).

The tours that Academic and Special participants most often reported going on were those to Mt. Vernon (Table 38 and 51) and to Capitol Hill (Tables 35 and 48). The percentages of both Academic and Special participants who reported having had visits to U.S. high schools showed significant increases over the three time periods (Tables 36 and 49). This increase was especially pronounced among the participants in Special training programs. (This was the only tour which was significantly more often recalled by them.) There has also been an increase in the number

of participants who reported having had a tour of Washington community during their orientation programs (Tables 37 and 50).

The only part of the Washington International Center program that did not show an increase in participation over time for either Academic or Special participants was visits to host families for home hospitality (Tables 39 and 52). In light of this result, it is not surprising that the difficulty most often reported by participants was that of "too few visits with American families." With the exception of some of the participants from Latin America, participants who did not receive home hospitality from a Washington International Center host family mentioned this as a problem with the orientation program.

Table 27

Q. Did the Academic participants remember hearing the lecture at the Washington International Center about customs and daily life in the United States? (Item 42a)

HEARD ABOUT CUSTOMS	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	81.9	118	86.8	276	86.1	130
No	18.1	26	13.2	42	13.9	21
TOTALS	100.0	144	100.0	318	100.0	151

Table 28

Q. Did the Academic participants remember hearing the lecture at the Washington International Center about the land and people of the United States? (Item 42b)

HEARD ABOUT LAND AND PEOPLE	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	59.7	86	68.5	218	70.9	107
No	40.3	58	31.5	100	29.1	44
TOTALS	100.0	144	100.0	318	100.0	151

Table 29

Q. Did the Academic participants remember hearing the lecture at the Washington International Center about U.S. government and politics? (Item 42c)

HEARD ABOUT GOVERNMENT	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	64.6	93	65.1	207	69.5	105
No	35.4	51	34.9	111	30.5	46
TOTALS	100.0	144	100.0	318	100.0	151

Table 30

Q. Did the Academic participants remember hearing the lecture at the Washington International Center about the family and community? (Item 42d)

HEARD ABOUT FAMILY	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	56.2	81	63.5	202	68.2	103
No	43.8	63	36.5	116	31.8	48
TOTALS	100.0	144	100.0	318	100.0	151

Table 31

Q. Did the Academic participants remember hearing the lecture at the Washington International Center about religious life in the United States? (Item 42e)

HEARD ABOUT RELIGIOUS LIFE	1966- 1968		1969		1970- SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	58.9	79	53.8	171	64.9	98
No	45.1	65	46.2	147	35.1	53
TOTALS	100.0	144	100.0	318	100.0	151

Table 32

Q. Did the Academic participants remember hearing the lecture at the Washington International Center about education in the United States? (Item 42f)

HEARD ABOUT EDUCATION	1966- 1968		1969		1970- SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	69.4	100	71.4	227	75.5	114
No	30.6	44	28.6	91	24.5	37
TOTALS	100.0	144	100.0	318	100.0	151

Table 33

Q. Did the Academic participants remember hearing the lecture at the Washington International Center about the economy of the United States? (Item 42g)

HEARD ABOUT ECONOMY	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	58.3	84	56.3	179	66.2	100
No	41.7	60	43.7	139	33.8	51
TOTALS	100.0	144	100.0	318	100.0	151

Table 34

Q. Did the Academic participants remember hearing the lecture at the Washington International Center about civil liberties and race relations in the United States? (Item 42h)

HEARD ABOUT RACE RELATIONS	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	63.9	92	66.7	212	72.2	109
No	36.1	52	33.3	106	27.8	42
TOTALS	100.0	144	100.0	318	100.0	151

Table 35

Q. Did the Academic participants go on the Capitol Hill Tour during their orientation program? (Item 43a)

HAD CAPITAL HILL TOUR	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	63.9	92	70.7	225	73.5	111
No	36.1	52	29.3	93	26.5	40
TOTALS	100.0	144	100.0	318	100.0	151

Table 36

Q. Did the Academic participants have a visit to a U.S. high school during their orientation program? (Item 43b)

HAD HIGH SCHOOL VISIT	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	19.4	28	19.8	63	32.4	49
No	80.6	116	80.2	255	67.6	102
TOTALS	100.0	144	100.0	318	100.0	151

Table 37

Q. Did the Academic participants have a tour of the Washington community during their orientation program? (Item 43c)

HAD TOUR OF WASHINGTON	1966- 1968		1969		1970- SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	25.7	37	32.1	102	36.4	55
No	74.3	107	67.9	216	63.6	96
TOTALS	100.0	144	100.0	318	100.0	151

Table 38

Q. Did the Academic participants go on the Mount Vernon tour during their orientation program? (Item 43d)

HAD MOUNT VERNON TOUR	1966- 1968		1969		1970- SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	77.8	112	78.0	248	85.4	129
No	22.2	32	22.0	70	14.6	22
TOTALS	100.0	144	100.0	318	100.0	151

Table 39

Q. Did the Academic participants visit a Washington International Center host family for home hospitality? (Item 44)

VISITED HOST FAMILY	1966- 1968		1969		1970- SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	48.3	69	56.8	180	55.0	83
No	51.7	74	43.2	137	45.0	68
TOTALS	100.0	143	100.0	317	100.0	151

Table 40

Q. Did the Special participants remember hearing the lecture at the Washington International Center about customs and daily life in the United States? (Item 42a)

HEARD ABOUT CUSTOMS	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	88.4	298	89.2	653	88.9	313
No	11.6	39	10.8	79	11.1	39
TOTALS	100.0	337	100.0	732	100.0	352

Table 41

Q. Did the Special participants remember hearing the lecture at the Washington International Center about the land and people of the United States? (Item 42b)

HEARD ABOUT LAND AND PEOPLE	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	79.2	267	78.6	575	77.6	273
No	20.8	70	21.4	157	22.4	79
TOTALS	100.0	337	100.0	732	100.0	352

Table 42

Q. Did the Special participants remember hearing the lecture at the Washington International Center about U.S. government and politics? (Item 42c)

HEARD ABOUT GOVERNMENT	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	76.3	257	77.1	564	79.3	279
No	23.7	80	22.9	168	20.7	73
TOTALS	100.0	337	100.0	732	100.0	352

Table 43

Q. Did the Special participants remember hearing the lecture at the Washington International Center about the family and community? (Item 42d)

HEARD ABOUT FAMILY	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	72.4	244	75.4	552	76.4	269
No	27.6	93	24.6	180	23.6	83
TOTALS	100.0	337	100.0	732	100.0	352

Table 44

Q. Did the Special participants remember hearing the lecture at the Washington International Center about religious life in the United States? (Item 42e)

HEARD ABOUT RELIGIOUS LIFE	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	74.2	250	74.4	545	72.4	255
No	25.8	87	25.6	187	27.6	97
TOTALS	100.0	337	100.0	732	100.0	352

Table 45

Q. Did the Special participants remember hearing the lecture at the Washington International Center about education in the United States? (Item 42f)

HEARD ABOUT EDUCATION	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	80.0	270	81.8	599	82.9	292
No	20.0	67	18.2	133	17.1	60
TOTALS	100.0	337	100.0	732	100.0	352

Table 46

Q. Did the Special participants remember hearing the lecture at the Washington International Center about the economy of the United States? (Item 42g)

HEARD ABOUT ECONOMY	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	74.2	250	75.0	549	74.4	262
No	25.8	87	25.0	183	25.6	90
TOTALS	100.0	337	100.0	732	100.0	352

Table 47

Q. Did the Special participants remember hearing the lecture at the Washington International Center about civil liberties and race relations in the United States? (Item 42h)

HEARD ABOUT RACE RELATIONS	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	71.5	241	74.7	547	80.1	282
No	28.5	96	25.3	185	19.9	70
TOTALS	100.0	337	100.0	732	100.0	352

Table 48

Q. Did the Special participants go on the Capitol Hill Tour during their orientation program? (Item 43a)

HAD CAPITOL HILL TOUR	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	77.7	262	80.9	592	78.1	275
No	22.3	75	19.1	140	21.9	77
TOTALS	100.0	337	100.0	732	100.0	352

Table 49

Q. Did the Special participants have a visit to a U.S. high school during their orientation program? (Item 43b)

HAD HIGH SCHOOL VISIT	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	31.4	106	40.0	293	52.0	183
No	68.6	231	60.0	439	48.0	169
TOTALS	100.0	337	100.0	732	100.0	352

Table 50

Q. Did the Special participants have a tour of the Washington community during their orientation program? (Item 43c)

HAD TOUR OF WASHINGTON	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	35.9	121	39.2	287	41.8	147
No	64.1	216	60.8	445	58.2	205
TOTALS	100.0	337	100.0	732	100.0	352

Table 51

Q. Did the Special participants go on the Mount Vernon tour during their orientation program? (Item 43d)

HAD MOUNT VERNON TOUR	1966-1968		1969		1970-SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	81.6	275	86.1	630	87.8	309
No	18.4	62	13.9	102	12.2	43
TOTALS	100.0	337	100.0	732	100.0	352

Table 52

Q. Did the Special participants visit a Washington International Center host family for home hospitality? (Item 44)

VISITED HOST FAMILY	1966- 1968		1969		1970- SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Yes	61.5	206	64.9	473	64.8	228
No	38.5	129	35.1	256	35.2	124
TOTALS	100.0	335	100.0	729	100.0	352

PART V
PICTURE OF THE UNITED STATES---BEFORE AND AFTER

The Academic and Special participants are asked in their Exit Interview questionnaire whether the picture they formed of the United States while attending the Washington International Center orientation was: (1) "more favorable", (2) "generally the same" or (3) "less favorable", than the picture they now have. A majority of the participants (about 59%) said the two pictures of the United States were "generally the same." Participants in Special programs were more likely than participants in Academic training programs to say that the picture was "generally the same." Of those participants who felt the two pictures were different, more felt that they had had a "more favorable" picture (as opposed to a "less favorable" picture) of the United States at the Washington International Center orientation than they did at the Exit Interview.

Participants in Academic training programs showed an increase over time in the proportion reporting that they had "generally the same" picture (Table 54), while the proportion of participants in Special training programs remained relatively constant over time for all of the responses (Table 53). The increase over time in the percentage of Academic participants who said that they had "generally the same" picture at the Washington International Center as at the Exit Interview (Table 54) is probably correlated with their belief that they were receiving more accurate information over time (Table 24). If the information they had received had been found to be inaccurate, it is unlikely that their picture of the United States would have remained the same throughout their U.S. sojourns.

Participants from Africa were more likely to say that their picture of the United States varied from the Washington

International Center orientation to the Exit Interview than were participants from any of the other world regions. It is somewhat surprising that more of the participants did not report that their picture of the United States varied over time, given the changing political, economic, and social conditions in the United States between 1966 and 1971.

Table 53

Q. How did the picture the Special participants formed of the United States while attending their orientation program compare with the picture they had of the United States at the end of their sojourn? (Item 4b)

PICTURE OF U.S. FORMED WHILE ATTENDING WIC	1966- 1968		1969		1970- SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Generally more favorable than the one I now have	21.2	69	21.4	154	20.5	72
Generally the same as the one I now have	65.0	212	63.6	457	65.2	229
Generally less favorable than the one I now have	13.8	45	15.0	108	14.3	50
TOTALS	100.0	326	100.0	719	100.0	351

Table 54

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

PICTURE OF U.S. FORMED WHILE ATTENDING WIC	1966- 1968		1969		1970- SEPT 1971	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Generally more favorable than the one I now have	34.8	49	27.2	84	26.0	38
Generally the same as the one I now have	47.5	67	54.1	167	60.3	88
Generally less favorable than the one I now have	17.7	25	18.7	58	13.7	20
TOTALS	100.0	141	100.0	309	100.0	146

APPENDIX I

GLOSSARY

Academic program participant: a student who had a training program for one or more academic terms in regular curriculum courses in an accredited institution which grants an academic degree, whether or not a degree is the objective and whether or not courses are audited or taken for credit.

Special program participant: a participant whose training included one or more of the following types of training:
(1) courses, seminars, or other organized programs in a specialized field which may result in the award of a certificate or diploma; (2) intensive briefings and instruction on a specific job or group of related jobs with an opportunity for close observation of the work activities, actual work experience, or both; (3) brief visits to offices, businesses, factories, government agencies, or other organizations to observe work processes and activities.

Observation training team participants: trainees who have training programs of short duration, who usually are higher level people, and who learn primarily through observation at a number of facilities usually in a number of cities or other geographic areas.

APPENDIX II

REFERENCES

A.I.D. Participant Training Exit Interview Development Study. Washington, D.C., Office of International Training, Agency for International Development, ARC* Catalog No. 374.013, A 512c, U.S. Department of State, December 1967.

A narrative report which discusses the purpose, scope, and background rationale for the Exit Interview; the requirements for the Exit Interview program; the plan for developing instruments and procedures; technical considerations in constructing instruments, gathering data, and recording results; and reports from DETRI to AID/OIT. (5 Appendices) (Not available for distribution)

Participant Assessment of A.I.D. Training Programs: A Descriptive Statistical Report. Washington, D.C., Office of International Training, Agency for International Development, ARC Catalog No. 374.013, A 512, U.S. Department of State, May 1968.

Descriptive findings from Exit Interviews conducted with 859 Academic and Special participants and 342 Observation Training Team members between July 1967 and February 1968. An overview of these participants' perceptions of, and reactions to, their entire training programs.

Participant Assessment of A.I.D. Training Programs: First Annual Report. Washington, D.C., Office of International Training, Agency for International Development, ARC Catalog No. 374.013, A 512a, U.S. Department of State, May 1969.

Descriptive and analytic findings from Exit Interviews conducted with 1810 Academic and Special participants and 610 Observation Training Team members between July 1967 and September 1968.

*A.I.D. Reference Center, Room 1656 NS, AID State Department, Washington, D.C., 20523.

An overview of these participants' reactions to various aspects of their A.I.D. experience and an examination of the relationship between key responses and training program characteristics. Includes a special intensive analysis of the principal satisfactions of Academic and Special participants. Recommendations. (One Appendix)

Participant Assessment of A.I.D. Training Programs: Second Annual Report. Washington, D.C., Office of International Training, Agency for International Development, ARC Catalog No. 374.013, A 512a, U.S. Department of State, July 1970.

Descriptive and analytic findings from Exit Interviews conducted with 1384 Academic and Special participants and 503 Observation Training Team members between September 1968 and September 1969. (Same format as First Annual Report, above.)

Guide for Users of the DETRI Exit Interview. Washington, D.C., Office of International Training, Agency for International Development, ARC Catalog No. 374.013, A 265f, U.S. Department of State, November 1970.

A narrative handbook to answer questions of those who have received Exit Interview questionnaires and reports and to reassure those who believe participant reactions imply personal criticism. A discussion of common problems raised by users of the Exit Interview with suggestions for reading individual questionnaires and using results in future programming.

Participant Assessment of A.I.D. Training Programs: Status Report Series. Washington, D.C., Office of International Training, Agency for International Development, ARC Catalog No. 374.013, A 512a, U.S. Department of State.

Descriptive findings on selected items from Exit Interviews conducted with Academic and Special participants and Observation Training Team members. Comparisons between most recent participants' perceptions and reactions and those of participants interviewed during previous fiscal years are presented and summarized.

Participant Assessment of Factors Related to Selected USAIDs:
Profile Report Series. Washington, D.C., Office of International Training, Agency for International Development, U.S. Department of State.

Descriptive findings from Exit Interviews conducted with participants from countries which had 125 or more Academic and Special participants and/or 3 Observation Training Teams or more at DETRI. Prepared as separate reports for each USAID. Comparisons between perceptions and opinions of participants from the country being reported on and those of participants from other countries in the same region are made. Overall reactions are analyzed by fiscal year. (Not available for distribution)

Participant Assessment of Factors Related to Selected PASAs:
Profile Report Series. Washington, D.C., Office of International Training, Agency for International Development, ARC Catalog Nos. 374.013, A 512f-m, U.S. Department of State.

Descriptive findings from Exit Interviews conducted with participants programmed by agencies which had 170 or more Academic and Special participants and/or 10 Observation Training Teams or more at DETRI. Prepared as separate reports for each PASA. Comparisons between perceptions and opinions of participants from the agency being reported on and those of participants from other agencies are made. Overall reactions are analyzed by fiscal year. (Not available for distribution)