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ABSTRACT

Investigators: Andrews, M. and Evans, D.

The Overseas Technical Cooperation Impact Study was conducted from 1996-1998. The purpose of this study was to document the impacts of the Polish-American Extension Project (PAEP) on the U.S. participants and their organizations and communities. The PAEP was a joint education project of the U.S.D.A’s Extension Service and the Polish Ministry of Agriculture and Food Economy’s Agricultural Advisory Service. During the period of the project from 1989 to 1995, 70 individuals from 26 states served as technical advisors in local Extension Offices in Poland for at least one, six-month assignment. These individuals, employees of the various state Cooperative Extension Services across the U.S., where the population of the study. This study was conducted to estimate the domestic impact of the Polish-American Extension Project. The specific objectives of the project were to document the characteristics and reactions of the participants to their work in Poland, to assess the personal, family and professional impacts of the experience on participants, to assess the impacts of participation on colleagues, near associates and the extension organization in general, and to estimate the depth of awareness, support and involvement generated in the communities where the participants lived. Three different data collection techniques were used--mailed survey questionnaires to all participants, site visits and interviews with participants and key associates in 10 randomly chosen states, and telephone interviews with 28 community members involved in linkages with Polish peoples and organizations as a result of the PAEP.

The results of this study suggest that the PAEP was a success in strengthening the international interests and competencies of personnel and clientele of the U.S.Extension system. Those benefits included

- Extension staff with new knowledge, attitudes and perspectives that raised their status and functioning within Extension and their communities.

- Family members with new skills and commitments to international involvements.

- Extension organizations with greater experience in interacting with international colleagues and in recognizing the importance of an international dimension for Extension.

- Community members with increased enthusiasm for international interaction and increased awareness and support for an international dimension within Extension and among citizens and government agencies.

The model of sending subject matter specialists and field level agents on international assignments that closely parallel their roles in the U.S. proved very effective. U.S. personal felt comfortable with their assignments and perceived that they were able to contribute to the goals of the project. They also recognized benefits to themselves, their family members and their colleagues. Participants actively integrated their Polish experiences into their work with communities and clientele upon their return. Numerous presentations, linkages, and educational messages were developed to extend the experience to the U.S. A high level of interaction with Poland continues. Citizens and community leaders were found to be extremely supportive of an international dimension for Extension and welcomed interactions with Polish guests and connections. Both citizens and professionals reported high levels of support for international involvements for agencies such as the USDA, and for universities and citizens.
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INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this evaluation was to document the impact of overseas technical assignments on the individuals involved, and on the organizations and communities from which they are based. The population involved in this investigation were the group of extension professionals who participated in the Polish-American Extension Project, and their county and state extension units and communities/clientele.

The Polish-American Extension Project (PAEP) began in 1990 and ended in 1996 with a primary objective of improving the structure of Polish agriculture with the goal of increasing agricultural production efficiency and improving rural quality of life (Yeutter in Bahn, 1997). The project was established as a joint educational project of the United States Department of Agriculture’s Extension Service (USDA-ES) and the Polish Ministry of Agriculture and Food Economy’s (MAFE) Agricultural Advisory Service. Between 1990 and 1995, more than 100 American Extension professionals representing 31 land grant universities traveled to Poland to work in this project. Over the period of the project, 70 Extension professionals representing 26 states served one or more six-month assignments as advisors. This group and their states/communities became the population for this study.

The Polish-American Extension Project was selected as the study focus for several reasons. This project was successful and serves as an exemplary overseas technical assistance program. Bahn (1997) found overwhelming success of this project in meeting its objectives in Poland in his follow-up evaluative study of program impact. The provincial level project created a foundation for a progressive Extension system in Poland by changing the mentality of Extension workers and clientele. The project stressed agricultural economic and market education and led to positive growth in clientele through changes generated within the Polish Extension system.

Due to the success of this project in Poland, it may serve as a model for similar technical assistance projects in the future. There are many anecdotal reports of the domestic impacts and implications of this undertaking for U.S. professionals. The documentation of these impacts has important implications for the future of international cooperation projects that would be lost without this study. Thus the purpose of this study was to document the impacts of the PAEP on the U.S. participants and their organizations and communities.
Purpose of the Project

The primary objective of the Polish-American Extension Project (PAEP) was to improve the structure of Polish agriculture with a goal of increasing agricultural production efficiency and improving rural quality of life (Yeutter in Bahn, 1997). There were three focusing factors of this international assistance effort for the Polish Extension System:

- Development of Extension organizational and methodological skills to plan and implement educational programs that were client derived.
- Building understanding of economic principles and development of skills necessary for management, marketing and agribusiness development.
- Targeting of assistance to the local provincial level rather than the ministerial or national level to assure local emphasis and applicability (Bahn, 1997).

Participants of the five-year Polish-American Extension Project consisted of Extension agents and specialists from the United States who were placed in provincial-level agricultural Extension offices (ODRs) for assignments lasting six months. Although assignments were originally designated as six-month assignments, fifteen participants chose to stay on for successive six-month terms for a total duration of one year, and two participants stayed for 18 months. Team members worked collaboratively with Polish Extension counterparts in one of Poland’s 49 provincial ODR offices to plan, design, develop, implement and evaluate Extension programming. A personal hands-on approach was emphasized for attaining the educational objectives of the project (Bahn, 1997; Ragland, 1993, 1995).

Because the nature of the project focused on improved agricultural productivity, the majority of participants were chosen to represent agriculture and farm management expertise. Extension field-experienced agents were often paired with campus-based specialists and the team provided expertise on farm management, agricultural technologies and Extension methodologies. However as the project unfolded, a wider variety of extension expertise was found to be useful. U.S. staff with expertise in other Extension program areas such as 4-H youth development, family and consumer sciences, and community development were recruited to provide assistance as determined via localized needs assessments.

Team members were housed either within rural communities or in ODR rooms or apartments. This enabled the U.S. Extension participants to become involved with a wide variety of people from the local community apart from the ODR work environment.

Public Perceptions of Foreign Assistance

Numerous studies and surveys have been conducted in the U.S. to learn more about public thinking and sentiment regarding international assistance. A number of United States citizens are reported to question involvement with foreign nations and people. Such an isolationist view of the world is reflected in feelings that the U.S. has enough domestic problems and situations that should be addressed, and not enough time or resources are devoted to these causes. Many contend that the resources, time and effort spent globally could be better spent at home. In actuality, the United States spends the least percent of gross national product of all highly developed countries for international development projects (Holsti, 1996).
Many surveys have found a consistent pattern in which the lesser-educated segments of the public were also the least likely to support an active international role for the U.S. Conversely, higher education is strongly correlated with support for cooperative internationalism (Holsti, 1996). These findings serve to justify the notion that the more one understands and is aware of international issues the greater one will realize the need for global involvement and cooperation.

**Agricultural Benefits from Development**

United States farmers, like other citizens, question what they gain from international development efforts and assistance. To many agricultural producers, these efforts simply add competitive supply to the worldwide market causing further deterioration of commodity prices. Farmers also have a need to understand the ramifications of cooperative international development assistance. Numerous authors have documented the positive effects of development for increased world trade and enhanced U.S. exports.

Hunger does not build commercial markets; neither does population growth by itself. Purchasing power builds markets. When poor people get more income, the first thing they do is spend it to upgrade their diets. Large numbers of hungry people without purchasing power aren’t a commercial market; they’re just large numbers of hungry people. The key to rapid broad-based income growth in most poor countries is success in agriculture fostered by agricultural development assistance. (Paarlberg, 1991, p. 10)

Exports generate over half of the gross national product for United States agriculture. Developing countries account for about half of all of United States agricultural exports, and this is progressing the quickest in the developing countries with the most rapid growth in per capita income (Bissell, 1991). Although most of these countries are expanding their agricultural output at a rapid rate, the demand for more and better food is outstripping their production capacity. These countries are becoming middle-class countries that can afford the luxury of being cash export markets with the U.S. and other developed countries. Eastern Europe and many former Soviet states are another potential market for U.S. exports.

According to Baize (1991), it is perfect reasoning to combine international agricultural trade and development assistance, since international trade policies are directly linked to national growth. With adequate maturation, “countries could grow what they could produce most efficiently and export their surpluses to other nations with different comparative advantages. In turn, countries could import what they could not produce efficiently” (Baize, 1991, p. 17). Approaching agricultural development in such a way would provide the world with an abundance of affordable food and fiber as well as to foster productivity and cooperation among countries.

As noted by Schumacher (1998), another advantage of cooperative development programs is the tremendous advantage it provides for agricultural research. The United States has been able to hold down agricultural production costs through research and improved technologies such as better varieties of crops. Cooperative arrangements are necessary to keep these doors open for research and development. Many crops grown in the United States, such as corn, wheat, soybeans, and many others depend on foreign sources of germplasm; “germplasm from which to select desirable characteristics such as dwarf stature, resistance to insect pests and diseases, day-length insensitivity and high yield potential” (Bissell, 1991, p. 3). These germplasm resources are only available through cooperative efforts.
Much of the agricultural development assistance work from USAID, USDA and others focuses on increased agricultural production, nutritional intervention and improved living conditions that increase the income of the poor and expand the availability and consumption of food (Bissell, 1991). Within this mission, agriculture is a perfect form of assistance from the U.S. The United States is a world leader in agricultural, biological, technological and economic research and education. Through these cooperative development activities, countries acquire knowledge of and positive identification with U.S. institutions, products and trade (Lipton & Manchester, 1992; Le Heron, 1993; Weber & Poley, 1990).

**Development Cooperation**

In recognizing the disconnect between a public perception questioning development assistance and the realities of the social, economic and security benefits of development assistance, a rethinking of the format of development assistance was proposed. This basic paradigm shift was acknowledged in the report, *New Challenges New Opportunities: U.S. Cooperation for International Growth and Development in the 1990’s* (Smuckler, Berg & Gordon, 1988). Within this new development cooperation model of assistance a number of guidelines were proposed to ensure “cooperation,” “sustainable development” and “mutual benefit” with international endeavors.

1. Programs and projects need to be established for a long-term perspective. Much of the work and educational need within developing countries cannot be thoroughly addressed with short-term projects. The authors note that for “advanced situations we need to encourage long-term linkages and networks.” These efforts will go a long way to assure high levels of success, educational impact and return benefit to the educational provider.

2. International programs and development cooperation should include and involve people from all levels: public, private and volunteers. This also means heterogeneous involvement from the United States and abroad in development and implementation. This broad-based approach helps to assure success by involving more groups and ideas in order for a sense of ownership to be established and sustained.

3. Programs should be designed with flexibility to meet the diverse needs of the intended audience, and projects should work in ways that would “strengthen the growth of pluralism” in developing nations. This translates into involvement of numerous non-government organizations, private-sector entities and other pertinent units as appropriate in planning and implementing cooperative programs. Other points made include: programs should be both “bilateral and multilateral” depending upon the actual needs and circumstances; and programs need to reflect a strong “commitment for cooperation for development.” As programs are developed, the U.S. should involve and include all stakeholders in planning, developing and implementing international programs and projects.

A number of authors have written about mutual cooperation and mutual benefit from international programs and projects. Reciprocity must be considered as international programs are planned and implemented. Each partner should expect results that will be capable of serving their own best interests (Smuckler, Berg & Gordon, 1988; Schuh, Kellogg & Paarlberg, 1987; Lavery & Schuh, 1991; Moore, 1987; Mook, 1994a, 1994b).

These principles of broad-based involvement, flexibility in programming and strong linkages with stakeholders were all fundamental elements of the PAEP. Thus this project can be considered one of the first large-scale technical assistance projects in the “development cooperation” mode.
METHODOLOGY OF STUDY

This study was conducted to determine the domestic implications of the Polish-American Extension Project (PAEP). Specific objectives included:

- Documentation of the demographic, professional and international backgrounds of participants, the nature of the work accomplished in Poland, and the character and international experience of the units from which they were based.
- Assessment of personal, family and professional impacts of the overseas experience on participants.
- Assessments of the impact of the experience on colleagues and near associates as to their support for technical cooperation and, in general, U.S. foreign assistance.
- Estimation of the depth of awareness, support and involvement with the overseas assignment within the home institution/organization and communities of participants.
- Documentation of the extended involvement of participants, colleagues, community members/groups and constituents in continuing interactions with Poland, including any social, cultural or economic endeavors that have benefited Polish colleagues or a larger cross-section of Americans.

The population for this study were the 70 individual Extension professionals from 26 states (Figure 1; Appendix A) who served one or more six-month assignments. Three different data collection procedures were used to gather details leading to a better understanding of the domestic effects of an international technical assistance project. These included a mail survey, a set of site visits and telephone interviews.

The primary design was a descriptive case study to systematically describe the domestic implications of the Polish-American Extension Project on participants, near-associates, the extension organization and local communities. A mixed-method design was utilized in which quantitative methodologies (a mail survey of participants and a telephone survey of secondary contacts) was used in conjunction with qualitative methodologies (semi-structured on-site interviews). Data analysis proceeded sequentially: the preliminary analysis of the survey data provided a foundational basis for the subsequent development of interview questions and analysis of the resulting qualitative data. Also the survey provided names of secondary contacts; individuals or organizations that were linked with Polish interests during or after the PAEP assignment, who became the sample for the telephone interviews.

Mailed Survey

The overall purpose of the survey questionnaire was to document the perceptions of the effects of this overseas technical cooperation experience on the U.S. professionals involved in the project and from their point of view, on the families, coworkers, associates, organizations and communities in contact with the participants. Sections of data from the questionnaire helped explain subsequent integration of an international dimension into Extension units and educational programming. The complete set of 70 participants was targeted for this questionnaire in order to obtain the most comprehensive data. Names and addresses were obtained from the International Office of USDA-CSREES. These were verified with participant lists from the Polish PAEP Headquarters in Warsaw, Poland.
Figure 1. Map of Home States of American Extension Professionals.
Survey Instrumentation and Measures

A mail questionnaire was designed to document participant and unit characteristics and attitudes, and to identify involvement beyond the actual assignment. It also was intended to determine the extent of associate and community awareness and involvement in the overseas assignment. An open-ended section was included for participants to provide names and addresses of key contacts or linkages. These contacts would be interviewed later in the study process to document economic, political, social or cultural linkages between U.S. and Polish people or organizations.

The questionnaire instrument was reviewed by an expert panel of university faculty for content and face validity. The instrument was then pilot tested among a group of individuals who had knowledge of international technical assistance programs. Input received from the pilot test group and the expert panel was incorporated into the survey instrument.

The questionnaire instrument and study procedures were submitted and cleared for use by both Michigan State University and The Pennsylvania State University’s Office for Human Subject Clearance (Appendix B).

Survey Data Collection

Introductory letters were sent from the Program Specialist of USDA’s Office of International Extension Programs (Appendix C) to state level Extension administrators for the 26 states that had participants in the PAEP program. This letter served as a means of informing and gaining support for the PAEP follow-up study at a state administrative level. The actual questionnaire was sent to the 70 PAEP participants with an informing and encouraging cover letter (Appendix D).

The 19-page questionnaire consisted of the following major sections: work and living environment; perceptions about the international experience; respondent and home Extension unit characteristics while in Poland; characteristics of the U.S. Extension unit and community while in Poland; nature of the assignment in Poland; the U.S. international Extension climate; reentry and adjustment; output and visibility; and key linkages (Appendix E).

It was estimated that the instrument would require about 35 minutes for completion. This was considered a long questionnaire for survey research. Yet, the study team judged that there would be a high completion rate since the majority of the population appeared to be highly committed to the success of the PAEP project. Forty (57%) questionnaires were returned by the requested date. Addresses were corrected for ten questionnaires undeliverable by the U.S. Postal Service, and they were re-sent. Initial follow-up telephone calls were made to additional fifteen non-respondents and a second round of follow-up phone calls were made to nine individuals to remind them and encourage participation. Two individuals stated that they would not be completing the questionnaire for various personal reasons and one individual was on sabbatical leave and inaccessible. Thus the final count included 67 returns for a 97 percent return rate!

Survey Data Analysis
Completed questionnaires were reviewed for completeness, accuracy and quality of data. Data were then coded and entered into a preset SPSS quantitative analysis program. Basic statistical analyses were conducted for observation of frequencies, percentages, means, modes and standard deviations as a method of data examination. Later alpha reliability tests, t-tests, Friedman tests, and analysis of variance were used to analyze the data.

Qualitative data from the questionnaire were entered into a WORD document and categorized for subsequent content and critical incident analysis. Data were reviewed an additional time for completeness and accuracy.

**On-Site Visits**

A selection of on-site interviews were planned as a means of complimenting the survey data. The on-site visits also provided access to family members and near-associates who could broaden and supplement the perceptions of participants for a more accurate assessment of impacts.

**On-Site Visit Sample**

Eight states (33%) were selected at random from lists of participating states, stratified by region. Thus two states per region were selected. Within the selected states a purposeful sample of participants were targeted to represent a diverse sample across states. The sampling frame (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994) was established around the factors of male/female, single/multi-term assignment, program focus, and county/state staff. Geographical dispersion was also taken into account when there were opportunities to conduct on-site visits for more than one PAEP participant.

In all states, the on-site interviewees included PAEP participants, spouses, near-associates and representatives of the county and state administration of Extension. Near-associates were defined as those who had close personal or professional relationships with PAEP participants--coworkers, office support staff, county advisory committee members or clientele representatives. In essence, interviews were conducted with individuals who had knowledge of the individual’s participation in the PAEP and who could provide a broader knowledge of the local implications and impact resulting from PAEP participation. For university-level participants, near-associates were categorized as peer Extension faculty; non-faculty department staff and a family member. In all cases, administrators were included such as the dean or associate dean of Extension; dean or director of international programs; program leaders or middle level managers of Extension (if applicable) and immediate supervisors or department chairpersons of the target participants. During this overseas technical assistance project, USDA provided funding to enable either county or state programmatic assistance to minimize domestic educational voids. A special attempt was made wherever possible to interview individuals who served in such backfill capacities to obtain a picture of county programmatic perspectives during actual PAEP participation. For each of the on-site visits, an attempt was made to interview a total of eight to ten individuals from among those identified. Priority was given to conduct actual face-to-face interviews with those selected, but telephone interviews were utilized where and when necessary. Across the eight states, 100 persons were interviewed.

**On-Site Interview Instrumentation and Methodology**

The on-site visits were conducted by members of the research team. Each team member visited at least two states. Preliminary letters (Appendix F) were sent to the State Extension
Directors of the eight states prior to conducting the on-site visits. This letter served to provide notice and support for the upcoming visits. Included with this letter was a consent form to be signed and returned by the state directors allowing the on-site visits to occur.

A semi-structured interview guide was developed to assure consistency of data between and among sites and interviewers. The format also enabled flexibility for response elaboration to facilitate gathering data along a broad spectrum of issues. Seven different interview guides were developed for the following categories of interview participants: PAEP participants, directors and administrators, immediate supervisors, coworkers, support staff, community representatives, and family members (see Appendix G). Key indicators defined on the interview guide included: knowledge and awareness of the PAEP assignment; its impact on the participant; participants’ resultant impact on Extension or the community; secondary spin-off effects from PAEP participation; international Extension leadership practices of support, visibility, and involvement. Each interview participant was asked about the importance of international involvement among citizens, universities and the USDA. And also of interest were linkages that had occurred and resultant economic, social, or cultural impact or implications that could be connected to the PAEP.

On-Site Interview Process

Actual participants for the overt interviews were identified through consultation with PAEP participants by identifying those individuals who met the established criteria. Personal contact via phone calls was established with each interview participant, when possible, to verify schedules and to elicit rapport and cooperation. In addition, the confirmation provided an estimate of the time required for the interview and a brief description of the project.

A summary report of each state visit was developed by the team member to integrate findings across categories of interviewees. Formative and summative evaluation meetings were conducted with the team to share observations and for debriefing; thereby, ensuring that ideas and data were interpreted and recorded in a uniform and clear manner (see Appendix H).

On-Site Visit Data Analysis

A systematic process was established to study the qualitative data. The process consisted of four steps--analysis, interpretation, judgment, and recommendations.

Prior to data analysis, sites and interviewees were identified by code to ensure anonymity. Analysis of the data consisted of bringing order to the data display and organizing it into patterns and categories. Data were reduced into manageable categories utilizing a cut and paste method of organizing data into categories based on type of response and respondent classification.

Data interpretation involved assigning meaning and significance to the data; defining descriptive patterns, associations and linkages. This involved finding common themes that emerged from the data and employing logic in determining similarities and dissimilarities.

From these common themes, major and minor themes emanated that were used for assigning judgment and then, subsequently, recommendations. As themes emerged from the data, a number of parallel concerns along with similarities and dissimilarities were identified. These themes provided a comprehensive view among the interviewees regarding domestic linkages, implications and impact from overseas technical assistance.
Limitations of Study

As with all research relying on self-report data, this study has its limitations. The investigators utilized steps identified by Patton (1990) and Lincoln and Guba (1985) to overcome potential sources of bias resulting from qualitative research.

1. Subjective or sampling bias of the reported findings may effect the generalizability of the research. There is a potential for “halo effect” data from near-associates who desire to provide “good” data. There may also be subjective bias on behalf of the researcher as to how the data were interpreted which may influence the findings. The team established joint awareness and sensitivity to this issue to help minimize its impact.

2. An audit trail was utilized to record every step of the research process for documentation and to enable replication of the research.

3. Triangulation was utilized between participant questionnaire findings and within states among interviewees to substantiate findings and conclusions.

4. The investigators relied on the regular help and advice of others throughout the process to validate and verify steps taken and conclusions drawn. Others included the research team, university faculty, and staff from the USDA-CSREES International Office.
RESULTS

Demographic and Descriptive Characteristics of Participants and their Extension Units and Communities

Participation in the PAEP was voluntary. Position announcements were sent to all states and distributed in various ways within states. Some organizations were more proactive in sending announcements to select individuals and inviting participation, other organizations just responded when interest was shown. This recruitment process resulted in very different patterns of participation across the extension system and in a cadre of participants from very diverse backgrounds with differing sets of attributes.

Profile of Participants

The participants in this study were the group of extension professionals who worked in Poland for six months or more on assignments in individual ODR offices. This population was very well represented in this study. Out of 70 possible respondents, 67 persons contributed to the study (96% response rate) by providing data through the mail survey questionnaire. Of those participating, 78 percent were males and 22 percent were females. Married participants accounted for 73 percent; while 27 percent were separated, divorced, widowed or single. In total, 41 of the 48 married participants had family members accompany them on the assignment. Additionally, 69 percent of participants had visitors from the U.S. while on assignment. The group was very well educated as 54 percent of the participants had or were in the process of obtaining a Masters degree, 43 percent had or were in the process of obtaining a Doctorate degree, and only 3 percent represented professionals with Bachelor degrees (Table 1). This educational distribution would be typical of extension professionals given that both campus and field-based staff were involved. The group represented a wide range of ages, although the majority (61%) was 50 or older. The average time of employment with extension was 19 years and ranged from one to forty years (Table 1).

Demographics of Participants’ Extension Unit and Locality

The majority of the participants (60%) were county-based while 40 percent were university-based. The rural-urban mix of their home unit was slightly more likely to be rural with 39 percent representing rural areas, another 39 percent representing mixed rural and urban areas, with 15 percent representing urban areas (Table 2).

Geographic job coverage ranged from 1/3 state coverage, 1/3 county coverage, and 1/3 district, regional or multi-county coverage. The position breakdown of participants’ immediate supervisors reflects the geographic coverage of their roles: 35 percent reported to regional directors; 35 percent reported to department heads; 18 percent reported to county extension directors; and 5 percent and 8 percent respectively reported to a dean for extension or an “other” category. Agriculture (74%) was the primary extension program responsibility due to the nature of the PAEP. Other program responsibility areas included family and consumer sciences at 8 percent; community development at 8 percent; natural resources at 3 percent; 4-H and youth at 2 percent; and other areas approximately 5 percent (Table 2). As far as can be documented, this project included the largest number of female and non-agriculturally trained personnel of any international technical assistance project organized within the Land Grant System.
Table 1. Demographic and Educational Characteristics of Polish-American Extension Project Participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated/Divorced/Widowed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Educational Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters in progress or completed</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate in progress or completed</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Participant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Employment with Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean = 19.22; SD = 9.35; Min.=1; Max. = 40; Mode = 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Demographic Characteristics of Polish-American Extension Project Participants’ Assigned Extension Unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assigned Extension Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic department</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative unit</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Unit Demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly rural</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly urban</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Job Coverage of Participant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-county</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District or region</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Program Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H and Youth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of Immediate Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Extension Director</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Director</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Head</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean for Extension</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents described the characteristics of the local communities from which the participants lived and worked as moderately responsive to international involvements. Generally 55 percent of the communities were judged to be slightly to somewhat identified by the ethnic backgrounds of the population, and 68 percent could be considered slightly to somewhat economically stressed. A mix of global awareness was noted among home communities. Only 7.5 percent felt that their communities were very open to global issues and international involvement; whereas, 66 percent were perceived to be somewhat open or neutral and 28 percent were somewhat or very closed (Table 3).

Prior International Interests and Experiences of Participants

The group of Extension professionals who participated in PAEP varied in their past international experiences and interests. Overall they could be considered to have limited international experience. Over half of the group reported having traveled abroad (53%) and less than half (42%) indicated that they had lived or worked abroad. For the majority, this was their first in-depth international experience. When combining ratings of extensive and some, individuals rated their prior experiences and interests as follows; interest in international activities (87%) was widespread, although participation in professional development about international activities (58%) was more limited. Interest in developing foreign language skills (51%) was rather high although only 24 percent indicated that they had foreign language skills.

A modest number had experience in hosting exchange groups in the U.S. (39%), and in programming with extension audiences about international issues (39%), although fewer reported participation in civic, professional, church or social groups with international interests (28%). Less than one quarter of the group included foreign nationals in extension programming (22%) or had experience in traveling with or chaperoning extension groups aboard (15%). In general, these professionals were motivated and interested in international activities, but had little international experience (Table 4).

International Exposure of Extension Units

The Extension professionals who participated in the PAEP came from communities and Extension units with limited international experience. The overall rating for the experience of the Extension unit with international activities had a mean of 1.93 on a four-point scale, meaning that only a few (2-5) instances of international exposure had been realized. The types of international exposure included some experience with hosting visitors and involving international students in programming and a few experiences of involving youth in international exchanges, staff taking international assignments and receiving announcements or reports of international activities. Extension units were not likely to receive staff development activities or resources related to international interests. Respondents judged that on the average, approximately 1/3 of the professional staff in the county units were internationally involved (Crargo, 1998, pp. 46-48).

These estimates of limited international experience were verified by administrators during the on-site interviews. “There has been a moderate level of involvement in international projects. For the most part, projects have included only state and regional specialists. County agents are not usually involved.” “Until our county agent went to Poland, there was very limited activity of any Extension agents in international programs.”
Table 3. Demographic Characteristics of Polish-American Extension Project Participants’ Locality during the Assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of ethnic identity of the participants’ local community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree of local community economic stress</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not evident</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of global awareness among the local community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very open and aware</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat open and aware</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral, equally open and closed</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat closed</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very closed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. International Interests and Experiences of American Extension Professionals Prior to Participation in the Polish/American Extension Project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of Interest and Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest in international activities</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other experience in traveling abroad</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in developing foreign language skills</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in professional development about international activities</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience living and working abroad</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience hosting exchange groups in the U.S.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in civic/professional/church/social groups with international interests</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign language skills</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of foreign nationals in extension programming</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience in traveling with or chaperoning extension groups abroad</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scores could theoretically range from a low of 1 to a high of 4.
Nature of Assignment in Poland: Similarity of Roles

When participants were asked to rate the degree to which their role in Poland compared to their stateside role in Extension, most responded that their roles were similar (mean of 3.34 to 3.43 on a 4-point scale). Most similar were the **people skills required, the degree of autonomy and independence and the technical skills required**. Less similar were **content area responsibilities and client groups served** (means of 3.11 to 2.70 on a 4-point scale). Participants provided a list of the typical roles that they assumed in Poland. These roles would be similar to roles of extension agents in the U.S. however, in Poland, agents often were stretched. In Poland they assumed responsibilities independently for activities that others would assist with or undertake in their offices at home. These roles included:

- Program development and evaluation including strategic and annual program planning processes and establishing advisory groups.
- Educator roles such as serving as advisors, mentors or consultants to staff or clientele.
- Production of educational programs, news articles, fact sheets and media releases.
- Computer training and software development.
- Developing marketing plans, business analysis training, business plan development, product promotions and working with cooperatives.
- Teaching about extension methods, teaching methods and demonstration design.
- Conducting leadership and administrative training.
- Building linkages with other educational, research or business related groups.
- Assisting in organizing a variety of programs in areas such as youth development, family living, nutrition, home based business, horticulture, agricultural based tourism, community development, volunteerism, family financial management, water quality or community leadership development.

What Extension professionals liked best about their assignment included in rank order:

- Their ability to take personal initiative (means of 4.6 and 4.3 on 5 point scale).
- The orientation provided in Washington D.C. and Warsaw (means of 3.97 and 3.84 on a 5 point scale).
- The support of U.S. counterparts and U.S. technical resources (means of 3.88 and 3.82 on a 5 point scale).

Ease of Working in Poland

Participants found it relatively easy for them to work with Polish counterparts, translators and administrators (means of 4.00 to 4.47 on 5 point scale), but more difficult to work with local leaders in Polish communities (mean of 3.75 on 5 point scale). Concerning the ‘openness to change’ of Polish people, participants rated local families (mean 3.42 on 4 point scale) as more open to change than Polish Extension ODR staff (3.10) or local officials (2.98).
Participant Satisfaction

Participants were extremely satisfied with their assignment on the Polish-American Extension Project. Of a possible ten-point satisfaction scale ranging from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (neutral) to 10 (very satisfied), respondents rated the assignment 9.29 or very satisfied. Most participants (48%) rated the experience 10, and another 42 percent rated it 9, demonstrating an extremely high rate of participant satisfaction with the international assignment (m = 9.29/std. dev. 1.02). Written comments, anecdotal reports, and data obtained from random on-site visits serve to substantiate these findings. Their satisfaction was reflected in the large number who would take another international assignment (51% responded definitely), and who would recommend an international assignment to others (85% responded definitely).

Generally participants felt that they were successful in their work in Poland. Based on mean ratings in descending order, participants felt most successful in: modeling and sharing of skills (mean of 3.56 on a 4 point scale), contributing to programming (3.52), creating a climate for change (3.37), introducing innovations (3.31), and enhancing staff creativity (3.16).

Support, Visibility and Interactions with Local Units

Participants were generally satisfied with the level of support for the international assignment received within the United States among family, friends, colleagues and their organizations. Mean scores from a five-point satisfaction scale, revealed the following ratings (from highest to lowest): family and friends, 4.69; USDA staff in Washington, DC, 4.42; local U.S. citizens, 4.33; community members (churches and civic groups), 4.02; state extension systems, 3.99, and; colleagues in the home office, 3.95 (Table 5). It is interesting to note that the Extension organization itself, both at the state and county level were perceived to be less supportive than family, friends and clientele!

In terms of barriers or negative pressures a similar pattern was noted. The overall rating across five items had a mean of 1.73 (s.d .64) on a five-point scale, meaning there was only slight negative pressure. Barriers were more likely to be perceived as coming from peers, colleagues and administrators rather than from family, clientele or local supporters. Often times these perceived negative pressures resulted from concerns for program coverage. As most Extension offices across the U.S. had experienced severe downsizing, these concerns might be justified. The mean averages to barriers from lowest to highest, based on a five-point scale were: family, 1.52; extension supporters, 1.68; clientele, 1.71; extension administration, 1.86, and; peers and colleagues, 1.92. The greatest standard deviations were also observed among extension administration (1.18), and peers and colleagues (1.26) depicting variable pressures and attitudes for PAEP participants within the organization (Table 6). In general participants felt that their organizations were supportive but not proactive or encouraging.

These perceptions that the organization was ambivalent about international assignments can be verified in participant interviews. For instance, participants remarked, “I really don’t think [our Extension administration] gives a lot of thought to international.” “I would say my colleagues were somewhat indifferent to it, supportive but indifferent.” “I think most people [Extension staff] are more concerned about local issues and see international activities very distant and very unimportant.” Among coworkers these same themes were repeated. “I think a lot of people are indifferent, don’t care one way or the other. I say the majority are positive.” “It is essential to be positive. We are living in a global society, we owe it to our clientele.” “There were mixed feelings. You had some people that thought he should’ve been back here taking care of business here. But, then, you know there were people out in the community that thought it was real good.”
Table 5. Participant Satisfaction with Domestic Support for the International Assignment in Poland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family and Friends</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA staff in Washington, DC</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local U.S. Citizens</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community members (church, civic groups, etc.)</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Extension System</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues in home office</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean computed on a scale that ranged from 1 = Not at all satisfied; 2 = Somewhat satisfied; 3 = Slightly satisfied; 4 = Satisfied; to 5 = Very satisfied.

Table 6. Level of Perceived Barriers, Pressures and Negative Attitudes toward Participation in the Polish-American Extension Project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Slight</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peers and colleagues</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension administration</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clientele</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Ñ</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension supporters</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Ñ</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean was computed from the five-point scale of 1 = None; 2 = Slight; 3 = Some; 4 = Moderate; and 5 = Very much -- perceived barriers, pressures or negative attitudes.
Even Extension administrator comments during the on-site interviews reflected mixed messages. “The contributions of universities to these programs is not generally recognized.” “I think the experiences of an individual that went on an international trip would be good if they could apply some of those experiences back in the county or local area. That would make it a positive experience.” “It offers our faculty an opportunity to experience different parts of the world. It helps to build the reputation of the University.” “We’re just trying to reorganize and getting ourselves together, and we’ve had so much downsizing and things. I don’t think we have a stable enough base in some ways to start into it [international programming].” “[I’m] between positive and indifferent. I guess it would be what an individual would desire. I think it is a positive thing…if you desire to do that type of Extension work.”

Factors Concerning the Participation in an International Assignment

A number of factors were listed in the questionnaire reflecting attitudes within the U.S. Extension system concerning the participation in an international assignment. A rating scale of five points reflected very negative attitudes (1) not sure or neutral (3) very positive attitudes (5). Mean ratings suggest that most factors fell within a neutral to positive attitude. Most positive was guaranteed continued employment and benefits upon return (mean of 4.48) followed by slightly positive attitudes such as viewed as enhancing professional development and having pride in being selected (means of 3.93 and 3.92 respectively). The international experience was perceived as providing value to the whole organization (mean 3.63) and as enhancing career opportunities (mean 3.44) at a slightly positive level. Some slightly negative attitudes also were perceived: an assignment as inhibiting your career or inhibiting local extension programming (means of 2.75 and 2.73, respectively). At least these negative attitudes were identified as being negative! However the item, valued in performance appraisal (mean 3.05) was viewed as neutral or not sure, thus reflecting the potential ambivalence of the organization toward the international assignment. Interviewees also noted this ambivalence, in that the international assignment was not considered in professional performance reviews. One participant noted during the on-site interviews, “It [the international assignment] was considered “dead time” by my former supervisor. It didn’t count towards anything. Since that time I have included the project in a promotion package.” However another participant noted, “That international work and recognition… I think was a significant part of why I received the promotion.” “ We were in a transition period and I was just not present and accounted for. Not negative, not positive, just total indifference.” However, recognition of this void was mentioned by one administrator, “I think revision of the evaluation instrument will give us an opportunity to be sure that these kinds of things are a part of the acknowledgment system on a yearly basis. So I think we are making improvements.”

Importance for Extension to Support International Efforts

A scale that has been used in other studies was inserted in the questionnaire to inquire as to the importance for Extension systems to provide support for international involvements. The overall mean for this four item scale was 3.28 (s.d. 0.61) between somewhat important and very important, a very high rating overall. Based on the combined percentage of those noting an important or very important role for Extension, the largest percent recognized the importance for Universities to participate in international exchanges and cooperation (91%). A slightly lesser percent noted the importance of clarifying public awareness of the University’s role in international activities (81%). Finally, the incorporation of international dimensions into regular programming (72%) and preparing agents for work in developing countries was viewed as important by 69 percent. All of these ratings were higher than reflected in an eleven-state survey of extension field staff conducted in 1986 (Andrews & Lambur, 1986). Differences of 4 to 14 percentage points existed, with this group of participants having higher ratings than the general population of agents in 1988.
Community and Organizational Awareness of the International Assignment

Awareness or visibility of the international assignment was variable. Most awareness was among the organization and close associates. There was less awareness perceived the further removed one was from the organization. Based upon a five-point overall awareness scale mean values consisted of 3.60 (s.d. .86) or somewhat to moderately aware. Individual items were rated as highly aware--immediate office or department, 4.64; slightly less aware were extension clientele, 3.74, and the entire extension system, 3.59. Extension advisory groups and leaders, 3.43, and professional associates outside Extension, 3.22 were rated the next most likely to be aware and lastly, local citizens and community groups, 2.95 were rated slightly aware (Table 7).

Awareness of the international assignment was primarily via self-promotion and the organizational grapevine whereas Extension initiated actions and local media was used less. Mean values of methods utilized derived from a three-point utilization scale are: participant, 2.65; grapevine, 2.34; immediate extension office, 2.50; entire Extension system, 2.03, and the local media, 1.98 (Table 8). Participants perceived the ease of gaining visibility about the assignment as being easy (mean of 2.99 on 4 point scale), but that it depended on their own initiative. Office and organizational initiative in gaining visibility was rated at 2.16 or between “not very” and “some” extent of involvement.

Extent of Interaction while on Assignment

While participants were on the international assignment, a moderate amount of communication and interaction occurred with their home units (Table 9). This consisted of e-mail, fax, telephone, and surface mail. Extent of interaction and its actual initiation varied among individuals as noted through the questionnaire. A five-point scale of extent of interaction with people back home was used to quantify this effort. The overall scale had a mean of 3.12 (s.d. .74) indicating a level of “some” on a 5-point scale. The highest rated area pertained to taking slides and notes for explaining the international assignment to U.S. clientele. A mean of 4.36 indicated a very high level of interaction in this area. Means for the categories, receiving resources when requested (3.49) and receiving communication or responses from the Extension organization (3.15) were rated at “somewhat” to “quite a bit”. Ratings of “little” to “some” interaction were reserved for involving colleagues in the work in Poland and sending newsletter or news release material for audiences back home (means of 2.92 and 2.62). The least interaction came from Extension office initiated communications (2.20)! Although actual interactions were limited, most participants and administrators were satisfied with the level of interaction. One coworker noted, “There could have been more interactions, but we were both busy and didn’t need any extra work. If we would have planned more interactions, we probably would have carried it out.” And another noted, “I’d say almost on a weekly basis we communicated primarily through FAX. He would FAX a question, I would obtain information and FAX it to him.” Thus patterns of interaction and support varied.

Accommodation, Coverage and Reentry

Examination of the difficulty or ease of accommodating to the participants’ absence and making arrangements for domestic program coverage revealed mostly positive response (Table 10). Participants felt that it was relatively easy for the office and family to accommodate to their absence (mean of 2.15 and 2.10 on 4-point scale). Coworkers and support staff also verified that through cooperation, the office managed. “Our staff has always been a very cooperative staff. We all kind of pitched in to do what was needed while he was gone.” The area confirming the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate office or department</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension clientele</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire Extension system</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension advisory groups and leaders</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional associates outside extension</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local citizens and community groups</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Value for Level of Awareness computed from a five-point scale of 1 = None; 2 = Slight, 3 = Some; 4 = Moderate; and 5 = Very much.

Table 8. Means and Standard Deviations Depicting Information Sources Utilized to Inform Others about the Polish-American Extension Project International Assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The participant</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The grapevine</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Extension office</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire Extension system</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local media</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Information source value computed from a three-point scale of 1 = None; 2 = Some; and 3 = Very much.
Table 9. Interaction and Communication between the Local Extension Unit and the Polish-American Extension Project Participant while on Assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Took slides and notes for explaining the assignment to U.S.A. clientele</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to receive resources when requested</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant received communications or responses</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant initiation of communication or requests</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of U.S.A. Extension colleagues during the assignment</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared newsletters or news-releases for U.S.A. use while on assignment</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension organization initiated communication</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean for interaction and communication computed from a five-point scale of 1 = Not at all; 2 = A little; 3 = Somewhat; 4 = Quite a bit; and 5 = Very much.

Table 10. Level of Difficulty or Ease Regarding Communication and Arrangements for the Polish-American Extension Project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Very Difficult</th>
<th>Difficult</th>
<th>Easy</th>
<th>Very Easy</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to attain family support for the assignment</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating with clientele and local supporters about the assignment</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating with the extension organization about the assignment</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranging domestic program backfill</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean for ease or difficulty was computed from the four-point scale of 1 = Very difficult; 2 = Difficult; 3 = Easy; and 4 = Very easy.
greatest difficulty was arranging for program backfill, as 29 percent of the respondents felt this
difficult or very difficult. The remaining 71 percent felt it was easy or very easy. The mean
response for this category was 2.89 on a four-point scale. Coverage or backfill was an issue of
broad concern to both participants and administrators. A greater discussion of this topic is included
later in the report. Upon return, participants again felt that it was relatively easy to reenter their
positions in the U.S. (mean 2.00); 75 percent of the participants returned to their same positions;
10 percent to another location in Extension; 7.5 percent returned and retired.

Assessments of Personal, Family and Professional Impacts

There was unanimous agreement from among the participants that positive effects
resulted from participation in the international technical assistance project. Participants also
reported significant levels of positive change as a result of participation. Upon project
completion, individuals were highly motivated and reinvigorated, and they had gained
international awareness, knowledge and understanding. This was noted by participants as well
as near-associates who were interviewed. Overall, for many participants the experience was
“life and career changing”!

Personal and Professional Impacts

Participants perceived that involvements in the PAEP had extremely high impacts on
themselves. The mean rating on a 10 point rating scale for personal and professional impacts
was 8.53 with a standard deviation of 1.36. This scale ranged from 0 (no impact) to 5
(moderate impact) to 10 (extensive impact). Thus there was no doubt that participants felt that
the experience was impactful. Though not as extensive, participants felt that there was also
impact on others. Perceived impact upon immediate and extended family was moderately high
(mean of 6.79) while impacts on colleagues and clientele were rated more modestly, at (mean of
5.20) (Table 11).

Participants had an opportunity on the mailed survey to provide qualitative data
concerning impact-on-self. Of 67 participants, 60 and 58, respectively noted that personal and
professional impact had been received. Within the written personal comments, over 15 persons
commented on how the experience has given them a better appreciation and understanding for
other cultures and people. Ten people commented on an increased sense of global awareness
and understanding of international activities and perspectives. There were also repeated
references to the fact that the experience expanded thinking and improved individuals.

Some of the written comments included “Increased my understanding of people and
their motivation, etc.” “I improved self-esteem, and am more patient now with greater
understanding of cultures and people.” “Refreshed, new outlook, excited, reinvigorated.”
“Renewed insights and appreciation for grassroots programming needs. Renewed empathy for
people.”

Positive comments were also received concerning professional impact. Participants
provided comments such as: “Insight how to better help citizens in this country and develop
symbiotic interaction.” “Gave me a broad appreciation for the usefulness of extension
methods.” “Couldn’t wait to get involved again. While back in the U.S., I renewed my
commitment to program development based on expressed needs of clientele.” “Currently
enhanced perception of limits and potential of Eastern Europe” “I now have better time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant personal and professional development</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate and extended family</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues and clientele</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean was calculated from an eleven-point scale that ranged from 0 = No impact; 5 = Moderate impact; to 10 = Extensive impact.

management, planning skills and better educational programming skills.” “Appreciate our system—good and bad including the autonomy we enjoy in programming and networking.” “Better understanding of how to program effectively in different situations.” “Appreciation of international markets.” “Experience has opened additional short-term assignments.” Other comments included better cultural and international awareness and understanding, change in career path, and better appreciation for the United States and its extension system.

There were a few comments of minimal or no professional impact. Only one or two individuals did not perceive benefits.

Types of Personal Change

Based on the survey data, participants reported moderate overall change as a result of their participation in PAEP (mean of 3.09 on a four-point scale). Perceived personal change was measured via a four-point scale (1 = no change; 2 = slight change; 3 = moderate change; and 4 = extensive change). Categories depicting the greatest extent of change were attitudes about Poland as a nation (mean of 3.70); new perspectives about extension’s role in international development (3.54); interest in international activity (3.54); changed attitudes about Polish citizens (3.49); developed new knowledge (3.08); changed self-perception (2.83). Other categories showing lesser amounts of self-perceived change were developed people skills (2.79); new perspectives on U.S. extension (2.76); attitude change about the U.S. (2.63); and enhanced organizational skills (2.58) (Table 12).

In addition, comments from the questionnaire and interviews suggest a wide range of types of change, from improved knowledge, skills and attitudes, to changes in practices and changes in overall view of life. Although some participants described the experience as “life and career changing”, most indicated that the experience was indeed an important time of reflection and perspective-taking—a chance to reevaluate what is important and how to be effective as a change agent. Impact summaries from surveys and interviews are presented in Appendices I and J.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Change</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Slight</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Extensive</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude change about Poland</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New perspectives about extension’s role in international development</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in international activities</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude change about Polish citizens</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed new knowledge</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed self-perception</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed people skills</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New perspectives on United States Extension</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude change about the United States</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced organizational skills</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean was computed from the four-point scale of 1 = No change; 2 = Slight change; 3 = Moderate change; and 4 = Extensive change.
Professional and Organizational Impacts

Participants perceived that the international project created some positive influences on their relationships and careers in Extension. Across most of the categories questioned, ratings were slightly to somewhat positive (Table 13). The greatest influence was noted in the category relationships with clientele and relationships with local community (mean of 3.84 and 3.77 respectively on a 5-point scale). Moderate influences were felt on their position or relationship within Extension and within Professional organizations (mean of 3.63 and 3.60 respectively). The international assignment was perceived to have neutral influence on one's economic well being and career opportunities in Extension (means of 3.34 and 3.21, respectively). Although ratings of influence were modest, there were no perceived negative influences except for effect on health (at mean 2.56).

It can be generalized that participation in the PAEP was viewed as a positive consideration within the Extension organization. Written and interview comments showed that the international assignment served to raise the individual’s recognition and it opened doors and opportunities for them. There was concern expressed by some specialists that it may slow one’s progress towards promotion and tenure. In fact, faculty facing tenure or promotion decisions usually underreported the Polish experience in their documentation. A consistent finding was that Extension personnel did not feel that their Polish experience was considered in performance evaluation processes. To some this was a disappointment; to others it seemed to fit their understanding of how the organization compartmentalized functions and they were not surprised. However, aside from performance appraisals, there was general agreement that the organization was proud of their involvements in PAEP and that being chosen for the project, in and of itself, enhanced the image of the organization. When it was noted that participants returned with renewed enthusiasm, changed attitudes about the importance of extension work and in many cases, renewed commitments to participatory, inclusive programming; the value of participation was further enhanced in the minds of administrators and associates. Formerly, participation might have been considered “good for the participant”; now, it was viewed as “good for the organization”!

Another factor that enhanced the image of participation was the reaction of clientele. While planning for the assignment, Extension administrators and coworkers were slightly apprehensive about local coverage and potential negative feelings from the community due to the absence of key individuals. However, in all interview settings, such concerns were reported as unfounded. Local coverage was not always perfect, and many adjustments were needed, but in general, once the community became aware of the situation, they supported extension’s effort to be involved internationally and were willing to work with the alternative coverage available. In fact, the local support for these international assignments was indeed surprising and appreciated by local administrators.

On the other hand, there were both positive and negative reactions within the Extension organization. Coworkers sometimes questioned the value of colleagues being away so long, given that their workloads increased as a result. However, in most offices, responsibilities were often rearranged and reallocated in ways that gave staff opportunities to assume new roles and to try their hand at developing new skills. This was especially true in the area of county extension administration where opportunities were created that strengthened the teamwork within the office, gave both staff and county officers a chance to work with new people, and helped all staff appreciate some of the subtleties of management. In cases where technical personnel left, often individuals new to extension were temporarily employed, giving them a chance to learn about extension and to test their interests in this work as a career.
Table 13. Percentage Distribution of Self-Perceived Influential Factors as a Result of Participation in the Polish-American Extension Project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influencing Factor</th>
<th>Degree of Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension career opportunities</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension position or relationships</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clientele relationships</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community relationships</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional organization relationships</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants’ family</td>
<td>85.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants’ health</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants’ economic well-being</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearly there were also impacts on coworkers and the organization itself. Especially when multiple staff were involved in Poland, the organizational awareness and impact was even greater than when only one person was involved. The vicarious experience alone was an educational benefit. Coworkers and office staff learned about another culture, another economy, international development and trade issues, and a wide variety of details about Extension. These experiences helped staff to identify with a worldwide system of education and development. It also helped them to recognize the roles of U.S. professionals and organizations in development. It created pride and raised aspirations for international involvements. Statements made by near associates noted, “greater understanding of foreign aid,” “increased knowledge of Poland and the transitions to a market economy,” “helped me learn how to use international communication systems and to feel like a global citizen,” “I was proud that they [Poland] wanted to learn about our 4-H program.”

Negative Feelings

A disappointing fact was that for some participants, the Polish experience came to them late in their careers. As a result they didn’t expect to gain from the experience and rated their own change as small. These modest evaluations often differed from comments made by colleagues and supervisors. Many mature agents were judged to have made significant and positive changes and were viewed as positive role models for others. But if the participant themselves felt that the experience was anti-climatic, it may not have effected their post participation performance significantly.

Another disappointment was feelings of disinterest among colleagues. Some participants returned to new locations or new job responsibilities and quickly became immersed in the day-
to-day tasks of their work, and thus lost the opportunity to share and reflect on the Polish experience. Others noted that there was no interest shown in their experience or that coworkers quickly became saturated with any mention of the experience.

Family Impacts

Those participants who described the experience as being positive for them, personally, usually noted that it had positive effects on their family as well. Some noted that it brought the family closer together, it was an opportunity for the family to live and work abroad together, to learn about and respect a culture different from their own, and it broaden their perspectives. Others, especially those who were separated from their families during their assignment noted negative influences such as being out of contact with the development of their children or grandchildren, missing family celebrations and being absent during times of crisis. Yet whether their personal experiences were positive or negative, general feelings were that participants would probably or definitely consider another international assignment (3.95 on a 5-point scale) and would probably or definitely want to involve their family (4.00 on a 5-point scale).

Spouses unanimously praised the experience. Although living in Poland was extremely stressful and they often regretted their absence from family in the states, spouses generally had very positive perceptions of the impact of the experience on their families. They personally broadened their perspectives, learned new skills, developed confidence and independence, and grew to appreciate the things that they take for granted in the U.S. They reported that their children fared very well; acquired language proficiency, made new friends, learned about cultures and systems very different from their own, and developed global competencies and interests that would affect them throughout their lives. Both spouses related that the experience brought their family closer together, made them stronger and helped them to be more global citizens.

Degree of Integration into ongoing Extension Programs and into Local Communities

Most participants took extensive steps to integrate the international experience into subsequent extension programming. Resultantly, others were able to gain an increased knowledge, awareness, understanding and involvement in international efforts. Positive findings were noted among most interviewees regarding secondary effects to near-associates, the Extension organization and to clientele from the international experience.

Integration into Extension Programming

The questionnaire revealed levels from “some” to “moderate” integration of the PAEP international experience into subsequent United States extension programs. This was accomplished via meetings, presentations, linkages and joint interactions between the U.S.A. and Poland. Levels of activity were measured via a five-point categorical scale based upon the number of interactions that had occurred. Results showed that there was a great deal of communication to clientele and communities through presentations and sharing resources and information. A large proportion (46.3%) provided 16 or more presentations to local groups about the challenges and experiences of their personal international assignment.

Mean categorical values from highest to lowest levels of integration were: presentations to clientele and community groups, 3.82; sharing materials or resources about international programs, 3.37; counseling individuals, 3.28; creating linkages with Poland, 3.05; interactions with people from Poland, 2.97; media communications disseminated, 2.80; educational
programs designed or modified, 2.58; print materials developed, 2.45; input into inservice or professional development, 2.24; supporting community groups with international interests, 2.18, and; serving on international committees, 1.67 (Table 14). Additional written comments on this question included: “Authored and published a book on my experiences.” “(Used with) advising graduate students.” “Overall increased knowledge in leadership and community development”. “Increased confidence”. “Increased skills in curriculum development and training.” “Not something that can be quantified.”

Continuing Interactions with Polish People and Organizations

The positive feelings toward the Polish people that emerged during the PAEP participation continue today with amazing perseverance. Of the entire group, 95.5 percent report some continuing interaction with Polish people. Only 4.5% indicated no further involvement. On a rating scale of 1-4 points a mean of 2.97 was given for interaction during the past year. This rating represents at least 6-10 instances of interaction during the past year for a total of an estimated 344 interactions. These data reflect strong and continuing ties between U.S. professionals and the people with whom they worked and interacted in Poland. One participant authored a book “Tomorrow Finally Came” (Braund, 1998) to describe his professional experiences with the Polish people.

Community Impacts

Levels of impact extended from within the Extension organization to the community level. In all but one state site, there had been attempts to develop social, economic and/or educational linkages. Successful attempts have resulted in a wide cadre of Extension leaders and volunteers, clientele and local citizens with increased interest in international activities and personal commitments to international exchange. These community contacts have created continued personal friendships, international dialogues among individuals in the two countries and exchanges and study tours. One successful linkage resulted in a million-dollar contract for an American business, and many contacts were made with local civic organizations, i.e., Rotary Clubs, Chambers of Commerce and many private businesses.

Clientele were impacted both by the knowledge that their “agent” was on-assignments and by the many presentations delivered by the Extension professionals when they returned. A conservative estimate suggests that 753 presentations were delivered in local communities across the U.S., an average of 11 per participant. If 20 persons attended each of those presentations, 15,000 people would have been reached! In many communities, citizens had the opportunity to visit with and host Polish visitors—an exciting and rewarding experience for most. These personal, hands-on experiences for interaction were even more educational and impactful. They helped to change the climate in communities. One Extension administrator noted in the interviews that “clientele are stepping forward, wanting to participate in international programs”. “They want to be involved when visitors come to the state.” Although not documented statistically, there seemed to be a relationship between the degree of community impact and the degree of interaction between the agent while in Poland with clientele at home. Many Extension professionals sent news letters, wrote newsletter articles or radio scripts, and in other ways shared their evolving experiences with the home community. These interactions evoked great interest in the community--some people would even call the Extension office for more details or predictions of the next communication.
Table 14. Output, Visibility and Integration of the Polish-American Extension Project into the Participants’ Subsequent Extension Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>A Few</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Extensive</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentations to clientele and community groups</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing materials or resources about international programs</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling individuals</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating linkages with Poland</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of interactions with people from Poland</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media communications disseminated</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational programs designed or modified</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print materials developed</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input into in-service or professional development</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting community groups with international interests</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving on international committees</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Levels of interaction and value labels were defined as: (1) None; (2) A Few = 1-5; (3) Some = 6-10; (4) Moderate = 11-15; and (5) Extensive = 16 or more interactions or instances.
Participants with accompanying family members were especially questioned about how the family was coping, and an extended group of well wishers evolved made up of acquaintances from church, school and community organizations. These same people were especially thrilled to hear of the family’s experiences upon their return. Thus speaking engagements were in high demand. Some offices reported those well wishers called the Extension office saying that they didn’t know that Extension was involved internationally. Many residents of Polish ancestry learned about Extension and what it could offer through these communications. Recognition and visibility for both Extension and the conditions of life in Poland were heightened by these communications.

Public Opinions about International Involvements

One of the interests of Extension administrators of technical assistance programs such as the PAEP, is in understanding the level of public support for such endeavors or for U.S. foreign assistance in general. This issue was documented in this study through the inclusion of three rating questions in the on-site interviews. Foreign assistance was defined as “importance for citizens, universities or USDA to be involved in international cooperative development projects like the Polish-American Extension Project”. A five-point rating scale was verbalized, 5 being very important, 3 being fairly important and 0 being not important. Ratings for each respondent category were summarized and compared within and across respondent group. Generally, all ratings were very positive ranging from 4.1 to 4.9! The nonparametric Friedman test was used to determine differences across groups. No significant differences were noted cross respondent groups for the three types of involvements except for the group considered coworkers. Coworkers had lower ratings, as compared to the other respondent groups, to the importance of university involvements and USDA involvements, but no differences on citizen involvement (see Table 15). Within groups, there were no significant differences in ratings of the importance for citizens, universities or USDA. These results support the concept that involved and educated citizens are supportive of U.S. investments in cooperative assistance. It was predicted that Extension administrators would be most supportive and perhaps citizens least supportive; however, this was not the case. Troubling, however, were the lower ratings given by coworkers. Perhaps the strains of providing coverage and the other indications of indifference are a reality that Extension needs to explore.

Linkages Resulting from Secondary Contacts

The establishment of linkages between Polish and U.S. colleagues and citizens was not an expected outcome of the PAEP. However, due to the nature of Extension’s method of working with people on many different levels at once, many linkages evolved. When talking with returned participants and community members, it became evident that these personalized linkages were valued products of the project. Therefore documenting perceived benefits from these linkages became an objective of this study.

One question in the mailed questionnaire inquired about how participants integrated their experience into their ongoing extension work in the U.S. Within this multi-itemed question was an item asking for an estimate of the number of instance whereby the participant “created or maintained linkages in Poland.” Five response categories were provided with ranges of number of instances in each. If the midpoint of each category was used as the frequency of linkages and then the frequencies were multiplied by the number of participants responding with that category, a rough estimate of the number of linkages could be derived. These estimates are presented in Table 16. Based on these calculations a conservative estimate of the number of linkages established is 531 or an average of 8 linkages per participant. This is a considerable expansion in the number of people or organizations involved in Poland because of this technical assistance project!
Table 15. Results of Friedman Test of Rank Differences across groups on Ratings of Importance of Citizen, University and USDA Involvements in Cooperative Assistance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Ranks</th>
<th>Mean Ratings</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Test Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Importance of Citizen Involvement:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator ratings</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Chi Square 8.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant ratings</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>df 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker ratings</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sig. .140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor ratings</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family ratings</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Reps’ ratings</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Importance of University Involvement:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator ratings</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Chi Square 13.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant ratings</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>df 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker ratings</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sig. .018*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor ratings</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family ratings</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Reps’ ratings</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Importance of USDA Involvement:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator ratings</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Chi Square 15.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant ratings</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>df 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker ratings</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sig. .008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor ratings</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family ratings</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Reps’ ratings</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant at .05 level of significance

Table 16. Estimates of Outputs: Number of Linkages and Presentations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequentencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating Linkages</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X0</td>
<td>X3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X0</td>
<td>X3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The midpoint of each rating category was used to estimate number of instances.*
To learn more about these linkages, a description was needed. In both the mailed survey questionnaire and during the on-site interviews, participants in the PAEP were asked to identify persons or organizations in the U.S. with whom they referred or connected to Polish people or organizations. It was the desire of the evaluation team to contact a sampling of these individuals to further describe the type of linkage and its value to the participants. Perhaps it was because of the length of the questionnaire, or the nature of the request that demanded information not readily available, in either case, few linkages were identified. This was a disappointment to the evaluation team as they themselves were aware of linkages that were not identified. During the site visits, those participants involved were queried about linkages and often very rich descriptive information was conveyed. But in some cases participants could not recall the names or addresses of the people involved or they choose not to reveal names, as intended impacts may not have materialized. For example in one business contact, even after a visit to Poland, the U.S. Company chose not to consummate a deal. Thus the actual list of contacts for information about linkages included only 50 names. Of these 50 referrals, 28 were available to be interviewed by phone and asked to comment on their experiences. The majority of these linkages were of the social or cultural nature.

Results of Telephone Interviews with Secondary Contacts

The unanimous opinion of those interviewed was that their experiences in interacting with Polish people were extremely positive. Words such as “very positive”, “definitely positive,” “an eye opener,” and “very important” were common references in response to the question, “How would you describe these interactions?” Comments included: “It gives us new perspectives. It rejuvenates your thought processes.” “It creates more awareness between both countries.” “It’s good for both sides.” “It gives you confidence to go out and meet other cultures.” “It brought the Polish Americans together.” “It helps create understanding. We benefit from looking at the possibilities of developing new products.”

When asked, “What do you think you learned or gained from these interactions?” respondents noted the following:

- Satisfaction from helping people
- Learning about cultures, peoples and history
- Broadening world views and international competencies
- Expanding insights about the interactions of environments and people’s behavior
- Appreciation for differences
- Increased knowledge of international markets, business transactions and difficulties in maintaining labor and product supplies

This sample of involved citizens were also asked the three rating questions concerning the importance of international involvements for citizens, universities and USDA. Overall ratings were very high ranging from 4.8 for citizens, 4.8 for universities and 4.7 for USDA (on a five-point scale). There were no significant differences across any of these three groups. Interesting though, these ratings from citizens confirm the high ratings given by community representatives during the on-site interviews. Those ratings averaged 4.7, 4.6 and 4.7, respectively for citizen, university and USDA involvement. Thus both those citizens involved through linkages and those aware and supportive of extension have high regard for broad-based U.S. involvements in foreign assistance and international cooperation.
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Polish-American Extension Project (PAEP) can be considered a success. It was viewed by both participants and near associates as having a sustaining impact on the people involved and secondarily to many colleagues, family members and community residents who became involved through contact with the original participants. However, the impacts of the project on the American’s involved can be considered serendipitous. The concept of mutual benefits flowing from international cooperation was merely an idea at the time of project design and implementation. As was reported in this study, the fundamentals of mutuality were present in the design of the project, but the careful orientation and implementation of actions to ensure mutuality were not developed. It was only through the personal initiative of individuals and the nature of Extension’s relationship with its publics, that benefits to U.S. organizations and communities evolved. Based on the experiences from this project, future projects can be even more impactful!

Community Anticipation and Awareness

In hindsight, the importance of continuing contact with the home office and community while on assignment was underestimated and overlooked. As one of the first projects in the technical cooperation rather than technical assistance mode, greater effort should have been spent in preparing participants and county offices for potential contributions back home. But in fact little of that was done. The questionnaire data suggests that most communications between the participant and their home office rested on the initiation of the participant. Highest ratings for continuing contact occurred in preparing slides and notes for explaining the assignment and receiving resources requested. Office staffs confirm that they were more than happy to respond to requests and were proud of their ability to maintain contact. But unless the participant initiated communications, little interaction resulted. Colleagues and county offices needed guidance in realizing the opportunities and benefits of continuing contact and visibility with the public.

On the other hand, in a number of cases, both colleagues and clientele were brought into the project through visits or exchanges while the participant was in Poland or shortly thereafter. In these cases, strong bonds of collaboration began that have continued and often expanded. For example an exchange of professional Home Economists in the U.S. and Poland evolved in two states that brought a number of other agents into the international arena for the first time and created awareness and visibility for international programs in numerous communities across the states and provinces involved. The strong involvement of 4-H agents, leaders and youth in several states created a strong network of interested persons that resulted in a number of opportunities for youth exchanges, interactions and linkages. Professionals in one state developed a quarterly newsletter about the Polish 4-H program to maintain these networks. That newsletter “Polish 4-H Connections” has a circulation of over 1500. Many individuals in this network are providing personalized assistance to the Polish 4-H Foundation in both fund raising and in programming support. Over $100,000 has been collected and donated to the Polish 4-H Foundation over the past five years through these efforts. These expanded networks of professionals and citizens involved in Poland’s development are testaments to the strength of the Extension system in encouraging participation and creating opportunities for involvement.
Family Issues

In the majority of families (61%), family members lived in Poland or visited (69%) while the participant was on-assignment. Three spouses who did not live in Poland described the experience as stressful or lonely. But even for the spouses who accompanied their mates, living in Poland had its ups and downs. Looking back, these spouses report that the experience was a wonderful growth enhancing time. But the language barriers, lack of information about consumer issues in Poland, and difficulties of finding one’s way in a new community were stressful. Both spouses who stayed at home and those who lived in Poland learned to be more responsible, resourceful and independent.

Living in Poland was a special treat for children. Polish neighbors and associates were especially welcoming of children and helped to integrate them and their parents into the daily life of the community. Most children who attended school learned to speak Polish easily. In fact they often served as translators for their struggling parents! Older children have been motivated to do more international travel or to choose career paths with an international emphasis. Some children have returned to Poland on their own, or invited Polish friends for various stays in the U.S. Generally these families are now more embedded in the international life of their communities.

In commenting on the difficulties of living in Poland, spouses often questioned the project’s policies. Although they were welcomed by the Warsaw staff to attend social events, they were treated as outsiders in all professional interactions. There was a cost to the family in bringing family members to Poland and there remained a cost in having them live in Poland. Spouses also noted that they rarely had help from the project in translating, transportation or seeking information. They really had to rely on themselves or the good will of their neighbors and friends. In many ways, the project did not seem to fully appreciate the support provided by family members and probably never anticipated the importance of family member involvement in subsequent impacts on U.S. communities. The fact that it was often the spouse, not the participant who maintained communications with the home community is often overlooked. One coworker captured this contribution by noting, “I think his wife sort of kept us up-to-date more, you know [about] how things were going for him and all.”

Organizational Climate Supporting International Activities

Clearly there is a realization that Extension is a part of the international mission of the Land Grant System and that operationalizing that mission needs greater attention. Currently there exists a disconnect between the organizational rhetoric and reality. On a continuum between very supportive and proactive on one end, to laissez faire in the middle, to discouraging on the opposite end, extension organizations visited during the site visits could be arrayed across the spectrum. With the exception of only one or two states, all states gave the impression of supporting an international dimension, but had no concrete evidence to backup the assertions. Qualitative data from the interviews suggests that few policies and structures are in place concerning international activities within Extension. Participation in international assignments, as well as international programming is treated on an individual basis and depends on self-initiation. Generally, there is no one person assigned for leadership at the state level. And many state administrators just assume that others in the organization are looking after these concerns. Attitudes that international assignments are “junkets” still remain in some organizations. And the concept of having a responsibility to provide global information and education to the citizens of the state is often interpreted as “staying competitive in international markets”. Given these realities, it is surprising that as many states sent personnel to participate
in the PAEP and that their participation had such positive effects in the states! Perhaps these data can reinforce the emerging voices of those interested in strengthening organizational commitments and involvements in internationalizing Extension.

**Backfill**

Within the PAEP, salaries for participants were reimbursed to the states. Therefore monies were available to hire alternative personnel to cover for the absent professional. The term used for this process of providing coverage is referred to in this document as “backfill.” Surprisingly, several sites did not hire persons to backfill the vacant positions. In some cases it was felt that no qualified persons were available for that period of time, and in other cases, county administrators were unaware that monies were available. In these instances, other colleagues or volunteers assumed the work of the person on assignment. In some cases they were reimbursed for their extra work, in other cases they were not. Three of the sites visited did hire alternative personnel--retirees, skilled volunteers, new professionals or graduate students. Generally programs continued and clientele were not inconvenienced. In many of these situations, the alternative hire grew in skills and competence and thus viewed the experience as very positive. Most immediate supervisions noted that orienting, training and monitoring these individuals new to their roles was time consuming but generally manageable. The concept and experience with backfill or coverage was not new to most supervisors. This is an ongoing administrative issue as staff turnover and redeployment is an ongoing feature of Extension work. Some of the variation in the way backfill issues were addressed in regard to PAEP participation stemmed from severe budget tightening. Many organizations were reorganizing, shifting personnel and reallocating duties. In some of these cases the PAEP assignments were treated as part of this ongoing activity. However, unanimously, respondents in the interview process recognized the importance of backfill to maintain continuity of programming and prevent stress and overload that punishes home personnel when others are on assignment!
CONCLUSIONS

Following are a summary of the findings of this evaluation study.

1. The technical cooperation model of development assistance operationalized in the Polish-American Extension Project (PAEP) can be considered an appropriate and dynamic model that indeed produced benefits for both Poland and the U.S.

2. The Polish-American Extension Project was successful in having strong and positive impacts on U.S. participants, families, near-associates, their Extension organizations and their communities.

3. The 70 participants in the PAEP were mature and experienced Extension professionals from both county and campus based locations.

4. The PAEP participants were highly motivated and interested in international activities, but had little international experience.

5. The Extension county units of the PAEP participants had limited prior international exposure.

6. The Extension roles assigned in Poland were similar to their roles in the U.S.

7. Participants found it relatively easy, although challenging, to work in Poland.

8. Participants were extremely satisfied with their work in Poland.

9. Participants felt that they were successful in their work in Poland.

10. Participants were generally satisfied with the level of support received for taking the international assignment, however they felt that their families, friends and clientele were more supportive than their Extension colleagues and the Extension organization.

11. Participants felt both positive and negative pressures within their Extension organizations and high degrees of ambivalence.

12. Participants were highly supportive of the international dimension in Extension; more highly supportive than a comparison group of county agents surveyed in 1986.

13. Awareness and visibility for the international assignment was variable, more likely limited to near associates, and dependent on self-initiation.

14. Participants and organizational colleagues were satisfied with the moderate level of interaction and communication while on assignment, but reported that communications could have been improved.

15. Although county offices accommodated very well in managing in the absence of the participant, issues of coverage or program backfill were of concern to everyone.

16. There were unanimous feelings and extremely high ratings for the impact of the experience on participants, personally and professionally. These impacts included changes in knowledge, attitudes, perspectives and behaviors. They and their colleagues recognized
significant changes in their demeanor and performance. The experience was viewed as an important time of reflection and perspective-taking.

17. Participants perceived the international experience created positive influences on their stature in the organization and community.

18. Participants were slightly disappointed in the reactions of peers and coworkers, labeling them as being indifferent.

19. Participants were also disappointed in that it was not readily apparent that their experiences in Poland were taken into account in performance appraisal.

20. Participants and spouses noted the impact of the experience as being stressful but very positive for their families.

21. Participants indicated that they would consider another international assignment and would clearly want to involve their families.

22. Participants took extensive steps to integrate the experience into subsequent Extension programming through presentations, the sharing and development of materials, individual counseling and creating linkages between the U.S. and Poland.

23. An amazing high level of interaction with Polish people and organizations continues today.

24. Over 15,000 citizens in communities throughout the U.S. benefited from increased awareness and knowledge of Poland and conditions of life and agriculture in Poland as a result of post-participation presentations.

25. Citizens and community leaders were extremely supportive of the international project and of Extension’s role in it.

26. Over 500 linkages between U.S. and Polish interests were established by participants. These linkages were important personal experiences whereby citizens gained knowledge and appreciation for international involvements.

27. Participants in linkages reported very positive views about their interactions and about the learning value of their experiences.

28. Based on three rating scales, citizens and professionals in Extension are extremely supportive of international involvements for USDA, Universities and citizens. Only coworkers differed in having slightly lower ratings for the importance of international cooperative assistance involvements for USDA and Universities.

**Recommendations**

It has been acknowledged that the PAEP has had tremendous impacts on the U.S. Extension system and the local communities from which participants were based. The following recommendations attempt to highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the project and the systems involved so as to improve future projects of this nature and to strengthen the international dimension within Extension. These recommendations were voiced in many different ways by the participants and interviewees contacted.
Structure of International Technical Assistance Programs

The technical cooperation model which has expectations and strategies to ensure mutual benefits is appropriate in the Extension setting and should be applied in future international projects. In fact, this model is a natural for Extension as the embeddedness of Extension personnel in their communities creates access for widespread educational and economic benefits.

The experience from PAEP suggests the following strengths:

1. That the six month assignment (with opportunities for extension) is an appropriate period of time.

2. National recruitment within the Land Grant System that brings professionals together from diverse locations and backgrounds is valued by both participants and hosts.

3. Orientation, such as was provided in Washington D.C. and Warsaw for both participants and family members is necessary and useful.

4. The management style employed in the PAEP that encouraged autonomy and flexibility was appreciated.

5. The project benefited from strong linkages and access to the U.S. Embassy in Poland, other U.S. Agencies and public and private organizations. These relationships removed barriers and mobilized resources in support of the project.

6. The continuation of positions and benefits within Extension during the assignment was essential to accessing participation.

7. The potential for this model to have a positive impact beyond the immediate participants, to U.S. coworkers and audiences is extensive.

The project and model could be strengthened by the following:

1. The impact of the model in the U.S. could have been strengthened with clear expectations and guidance for communications and interactions with local communities during the assignment. Local offices could benefit from briefings or orientation about their role in supporting interactions and visibility in the community.

2. Preparations for reentry could be strengthened. New found knowledge and experiences need to be recognized and integrated into ongoing roles. Plans for sharing and dissemination should be developed with broad input from local interests.

3. Communications and logistics from USDA could be improved. The partnership between USDA and the Land Grant System needs to be strengthened to insure adequate support for the recruitment, transition and follow-up activities that facilitate benefits to local communities.

4. More open system-wide announcements of opportunities, greater lead time for personal and professional preparation, including the identification of backfill arrangements, more timely acknowledgment of assignments and access to travel documents and clearer understandings of shared responsibilities all could improve the transitions and ultimately the working relationships that influence a strong supportive climate for international programming.
5. Financial support that is actually available for state and local program support is critical for sustaining enthusiasm and participation.

State Extension Organizations: Structures and Practices to Support Internationalization

The Land Grant System is a unique and valuable resource for International cooperation efforts and to bringing international knowledge and information back to communities in the U.S.

1. Extension personnel are embedded in communities across the landscape and thus can readily involve the public in international educational activities.

2. The PAEP experience showed that even Extension professionals with limited international experience could be successful in accomplishing project objectives in Poland and in impacting positively on their state and local organizations and publics.

3. Participants themselves gained valuable experiences that changed knowledge, attitudes, skills and perspectives, deepened appreciation for the basic values and principles of Extension work and helped individuals recognize the uniqueness of the U.S. Extension model.

4. The participation of county staff in an international project generated interest, acceptance and enthusiasm within the Extension organization for further professional involvements in international activities. Participation in PAEP often stimulated interest in international programs among volunteers and community members as well.

5. Participants gained increased credibility and esteem in the eyes of clientele. They became role models and resources for local communities who used their expertise and experiences to expand international awareness, appreciation and linkages.

The experience of the PAEP project also suggests that the state and county Extension organizations were not as prepared as would be desired in supporting the smooth and effective mobilization of international assignments.

1. Greater clarity of expectations and roles was needed between USDA and State Extension organizations.

2. Institutional and organizational development for the international dimension in Extension is needed

3. International assignments for Extension county and campus staff should be continued and increased.

4. A broad range of expertise in available in Extension that is not always used in the international arena. Opportunities should be created for professionals with expertise in family and consumer sciences, 4-H and youth work, community development, tourism, small and home based business development and others.

5. Opportunities for in-service and professional development in the areas of international trade and development would be useful in developing the international competencies of Extension staff.

6. Clarity of mission, structure and operational procedures within Extension for international programming would improve morale and enlarge participation.
7. Factors should be built-in for performance and professional growth from international assignments.

Family Involvement and Support

The PAEP project made provisions so that family members could accompany participants during the assignments. The value of their participation in the PAEP project may have been underestimated or overlooked. Families served important support functions in Poland and were primary contacts to extend information and linkages to local communities.

1. Family members contributed directly to the success of the PAEP project by serving as volunteer teachers, community spokespersons and support systems for PAEP participants.

2. Family members, because of their ties to local schools, churches and other community organizations, served as primary conduits for the sharing of information about life in Poland and in creating linkages between Polish and U.S. interests.

3. Some elements of the PAEP project that could be improved to support and facilitate family involvement include:

4. Access to language instruction and greater information on Polish culture, customs and daily living conditions.

5. Assistance in locating housing, schooling and other services.

6. Access to translators for family business needs.

7. Inclusion of family members in in-country staff meetings and activities.

8. Financial support for transportation and living expenses of family members.

Summary

The Polish-American Extension Project can be considered a success in both building a client-driven, market-oriented Agricultural Advisory Service in Poland and in strengthening the international interests and competencies of personnel and clientele of the U.S. Extension system. In an era of technical cooperation, all parties involved in technical assistance should reap benefits. For the U.S., those benefits included:

1. Extension staff from 26 states with new knowledge, attitudes and perspectives that raised their status and functioning within Extension and within their communities.

2. Family members with new skills and commitments to international involvements.

3. Extension organizations with greater experience in interacting with international colleagues and in recognizing the importance of an international dimension for Extension.

4. Community members with increased enthusiasm for international interaction and increased awareness and support for an international dimension within Extension and among citizens and government agencies, in general.
The model of sending subject matter specialists and county Extension agents on international assignments that closely parallel their roles in the U.S. proved very effective. U.S. personnel felt comfortable with their assignments and perceived that they were able to contribute to the goals of the project in Poland. They also recognized benefits to themselves, their family members and their colleagues. Participants actively integrated their Polish experiences into their work with communities and clientele upon their return. Numerous presentations, linkages, and educational messages were developed to extend the experience to the U.S. A high level of interaction with Poland continues and at least 15,000 citizens in communities throughout the U.S. have increased their knowledge of Poland as a result. Citizens and community leaders were found to be extremely supportive of an international dimension for Extension and welcomed interactions with Polish guests and connections. Over 500 linkages between U.S. and Polish interests emerged, many with lasting impacts on those involved. Both citizens and professionals in the Extension organization reported high levels of support for international involvements for agencies such as the USDA, for universities and for citizens.
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HOME STATES OF AMERICAN EXTENSION PROFESSIONALS
Home States of American Extension Professionals

1. Alabama
2. Georgia
3. Hawaii
4. Illinois
5. Indiana
6. Kansas
7. Kentucky
8. Maryland
9. Michigan
10. Minnesota
11. Montana
12. Nebraska
13. New Hampshire
14. New Mexico
15. New York
16. North Carolina
17. Ohio
18. Oklahoma
19. Oregon
20. Pennsylvania
21. South Carolina
22. Tennessee
23. Texas
24. Virginia
25. Washington
26. Wyoming
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HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVAL FORM
STATE CONSENT FORM
SITE VISIT

Your State Extension Service has been randomly selected to participate in the site visit phase of the evaluation study, the Overseas Technical Cooperation Impact Study, commissioned by USDA. The purpose of this study is to document the impacts, both positive and negative, on the participants involved in the Polish-American Extension Project, and to assess the depth and breadth of costs and benefits that participation has had on organizations and communities in the United States.

As administrative officer for your Extension Service, your consent to participate permits a representative of our evaluation team to interview staff and cooperators in your state. However, even with your organizational consent, individuals may choose to participate or not. Individual participation is strictly voluntary. Both at the individual and state level, you may choose to withdraw at any time or may choose to refuse to answer any question without penalty.

Please note that individual's identities will be kept strictly confidential. No names or identifiers will be associated with any information recorded, and only group (site and state) results will be summarized and reported. Site and state names will not be reported as such, rather each site and state will be given a code and only descriptive data will identify the group.

We thank you in advance for your cooperation. Your signature below indicates that you have read this consent form and agree for your state extension service to participate in the site visits.

___________________________________ _______________________
Name                                                               Date

___________________________________
State
PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM
SITE VISIT

You have been selected to provide information to the Overseas Technical Cooperation Impact Study, commissioned by USDA. The purpose of this study is to document the impacts, both positive and negative, on the participants involved in the Polish-American Extension Project, and to assess the depth and breadth of costs and benefits that participation has had on organizations and communities in the U.S.

Your organization has agreed to participate in this study. However, your participation is strictly voluntary. You may choose to withdraw at any time or may choose to refuse to answer any question without penalty.

Please note that your identity will be kept strictly confidential. No names or identifiers will be associated with any information recorded, and only group results will be summarized and reported at each site.

We thank you in advance for your cooperation. Your signature below indicates that you have read this consent form and agree to participate in the study.

_________________________  _______________________
Name                                                               Date
FORM B

FORMAT FOR PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY
PROTECTION OF HUMAN RESEARCH SUBJECTS

Brief description of the proposed study. Since 1990, more than 100 employees from 31 cooperating Land-Grant university systems have participated in the CSREES' Polish-American Extension Project. The goals of the project were to improve the living standards of Polish farmers and consumers by promoting the emergence of a strong, effective, and economically successful private sector in Poland's agriculture and the Extension system. This joint educational project of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Polish Ministry of Agriculture and Food Economy's Agricultural Advisory Services was a pioneering effort in staff and organizational development utilizing people-to-people approach and hands-on learning while doing.

The overwhelming success of the project in reaching its objectives in Poland is well documented. The individuals involved as well as the stakeholders at national, regional, and local levels all attest to the profound changes brought about by the modeling and guidance of the U.S. personnel. But equally important to our national economy and social-political development, is the ability of practitioners such as these, to communicate and gain support from the American public for technical cooperation. The question is how has the U.S. benefited from technical assistance involvement in Poland? Thus, the purpose of this evaluative study is to document a range of impacts, both positive and negative, on the participants involved in the overseas technical cooperation, and to assess the depth and breadth of benefits that participation has had on the organizations and communities in the U.S. from which they are based.

Qualification of the investigators. Dr. Donald E. Evans is associate professor in the Department of Agricultural and Extension Education, The Pennsylvania State University. He has a Ph.D. degree in industrial education. He is familiar with survey type of research, and has completed several research projects that dealt with agricultural and extension education, international agriculture, farming in Pennsylvania and youth development.

This study will be conducted jointly by Dr. Rama Radhakrishna, Research Associate and two graduate students—Nick Place and Nancy Crago in the Department of Agricultural and Extension Education, College of Agricultural Sciences, The Pennsylvania State University.

Requirements for subject population. The population for the proposed evaluative study will be all project participant and extension units involved in the project (N=114). In addition, approximately 40 individuals, both professional colleagues and community supporters associated with the participants, will be identified. These individuals will be interviewed via telephone.

How subjects will be recruited for the study. Descriptive survey research methods will be used to collect data for the study. The subjects will be contacted through mail and telephone. A cover letter and a questionnaire will be mailed to each of the subjects.

Random on-site visits will be conducted with PAEP participants and near-associates to gather comprehensive qualitative data to build upon the questionnaire. Contact will be made via phone with follow-up confirmation letters.

Methodology utilized. Those in the population will be contacted through on campus or at their home/apartment addresses by mail. They will be asked to complete a questionnaire that contains...
six sections. Those selected for on-site interviews will participate in a semi-structured interview process. Each interview will take 30 to 45 minutes.

*Personnel, materials/equipment, and other resource requirements.* The personnel involved in the study will be Dr. Evans, Dr. Radhakrishna, Nick Place and Nancy Crago. Materials needed will consist of names and addresses of project participants, a printed questionnaire, a cover letter and a return addressed envelope.

*Procedure for obtaining informed consent.* The subjects will receive a cover letter outlining the purposes and objectives of the study. In addition, guidelines for completing and returning the questionnaire will also be indicated in the letter. No signed informed consent form will be used. The subject's participation in the study is strictly voluntary The purpose of using code numbers in the questionnaire will be explained in the cover letter. All data obtained will be held strictly confidential.

*Potential risks for the subjects.* There are no physical, psychological, or social or legal risks to the subjects included in the study.

*Methods which would reduce or eliminate potential risks.* Complete anonymity will be applied. At no time will names be attached to data. Coding will be utilized to ensure confidentiality.

*Potential benefits to the subjects and/or society of the proposed research.* The potential benefits from the study are: 1) it provides an ideal opportunity to document the impacts of overseas technical cooperation on the people, institutions and opinions of the American public; 2) it will also provide a needed source of information on the evolution of public sentiments toward foreign assistance; 3) it assists in evaluating state and local extension organizational policies and strategies toward internationalization of extension; 4) it helps in legislative reviews and address accountability concerns of local, state and national policy makers; and 5) serves as a yardstick for universities and extension organizations regarding overseas technical cooperation.

*How to protect against risk during study. Storage of data.* Individual data will not be released to anyone, and they will be held in absolute confidence. Though each questionnaire is coded with an identification number to verify returned questionnaires, these numbers will not be used to identify individual responses. All results will be analyzed and reported in group or tabular form, therefore no responses will permit the identification of any participant.
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SAMPLE LETTER TO STATE EXTENSION DIRECTORS
REQUESTING STUDY PARTICIPATION
June 23, 1997

State Extension Director
State Cooperative Extension Service
Address
City, State, Zip

Dear Salutation:

From local extension boards to university administrators to the U.S. Congress, people are increasingly asking the same question concerning foreign assistance: “What's in it for the U.S.?” A survey going out soon to personnel from your university who took part in USDA’s Polish-American Extension Project (PAEP) should soon help all of us answer that question better.

From 1990 to 1996, our International Programs office coordinated the PAEP - a technical assistance effort that drew upon the tremendous resources of the U.S. Cooperative Extension System to aid in restructuring and revitalizing the extension service in Poland. More than 100 extension professionals from 32 land-grant university systems collaborated to make this a very successful and sustainable development effort.

The success of the PAEP in assisting the Polish extension system has been documented, but little has been reported concerning the impact that participation in this project has had on the Americans who served overseas, many of whom referred to their assignments as the highlight of their career. Nor has adequate consideration been given to the effect that this experience has had on the individuals’ institutions, their co-workers, community, and clientele.

This survey is one component of a study we are undertaking in cooperation with The Pennsylvania State University and Michigan State University to measure the benefits to the U.S. that result from programs abroad. Using the PAEP as a case study, this assessment will take an in-depth look at the impact that working overseas had on U.S. extension personnel and how that experience helped them to make a difference here in the U.S.

We hope that the ensuing results will provide evidence in support of the argument that international development assistance truly is a mutually beneficial activity and the investment that we make, both in terms of time and money, will continue to pay off for years to come.

We are enclosing a list of project participants from cooperating universities nationwide. The majority of these individuals served on 6-month assignments at provincial-level agricultural advisory centers in Poland. The survey will be sent to these people within the next couple of weeks. We will send you the results of the study when it is finished later this year. In the meantime, please contact our office if you have any questions or comments concerning this study or our international program activities.

Thank you for your support in the past. We are confident that this study will help reaffirm your belief in international participation and provide you with valuable documentation to use when considering the merits of such involvement in the future.

Sincerely,

Michael J. McGirr
International Programs Specialist

enclosure
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SAMPLE LETTER TO PAEP PARTICIPANTS
REQUESTING QUESTIONNAIRE PARTICIPATION
September 5, 1997

Dear Colleagues:

A group of Extension evaluators from Michigan State University and The Pennsylvania State University have contracted with the International Programs Office of CREES-USDA to conduct an evaluation to document the potential impacts in the U.S. from your involvement in the Polish-American Extension Project. The purpose of this study is to assess the costs and benefits of participation for the individual, the CES organization and the communities from which the participants are based. These results will help Extension and other non-governmental organizations provide better information on the kinds of benefits that can result from investments in overseas technical cooperation. The total group of Extension personnel on assignment in Poland from 1990-95 will be asked to participate in this study.

The enclosed survey asks you to provide information about yourself; your assignment in Poland and in Extension prior to your involvements overseas; the nature of your interactions with family, peers, and community representatives while on assignment; perceptions of how the experience has affected you and others close to you; and ways in which you are using the experience in your Extension work at home. We will also be sending a similar questionnaire to your immediate Extension supervisor and eight of you will be contacted to host a site visit so that we can talk with a larger group of your colleagues and clientele. We are also asking you to provide the names and addresses of people in the U.S. that you assisted in linking with people and communities in Poland. We hope to interview a group of these secondary contacts to document their involvements overseas.

The questionnaire will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. We recognize the value of your time and ask that you help us in the hope that the information that you and others provide can help us better document the costs and benefits of Extension involvements internationally. This study has importance to Extension in helping to identify how we can better support personnel in overseas assignments, and it has importance to USAID and other organizations involved overseas in helping to document how such involvements affect U.S. people, institutions, and communities.

Although your participation in this study is important, we also want you to know that it is entirely voluntary. You may choose not to participate at all. You also have the right to refuse to answer any question. However, we would appreciate your participation and answers to all questions in order to minimize the amount of missing information that makes data difficult to analyze. All responses will be kept strictly confidential. The identification number attached to this survey will be used to assist us in keeping tract of responses and response rates. No names will be associated with any of the data. Your voluntary agreement to participate in this study will be indicated by completion and return of this questionnaire. If you choose not to participate, please return the questionnaire, and we will not send another.

We would appreciate receiving your completed questionnaire by September 30, 1997. Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Mary P. Andrews, Director
International Extension Programs
Michigan State University

Donald E. Evans
Agricultural and Extension Education
The Pennsylvania State University
Listed below are statements relative to the work environment in Poland. Indicate your level of satisfaction with the support received. Use the following scale for your response.

A. **How satisfied were you with the general support received from:**

1. Your Polish extension counterparts and their office staff
2. The Polish ODR system in general
3. Your American team member
4. Your other U.S. counterparts
5. The U.S.D.A. staff in Washington
6. The U.S. headquarters staff in Warsaw
7. Your colleagues in your home office in the U.S.
8. Your state extension system in the U.S.
9. Local citizens in the U.S. with whom you worked
10. Local citizens in Poland with whom you worked
11. U.S. church, civic groups and others in the community
12. U.S. family and friends

B. **Generally how easy or difficult was it for you to work with:**

1. Your Polish supervisors/administrators
2. Your Polish extension counterparts
3. The local leadership in your Polish communities
4. Your translators
**SECTION II: PERCEPTIONS ABOUT YOUR INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE**

**A.** Below are statements regarding your international experiences/interests prior to taking the Polish assignment. Indicate the extent to which you had these experiences by checking a response. Your:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Slight</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Extensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Degree of interest in international activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Prior participation in professional development about international activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Prior programming with extension audiences about international issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Prior experience in living and working abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Prior experience in traveling with or chaperoning extension groups abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Prior experience in hosting exchange groups to U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Prior experience in traveling abroad other than above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Degree to which foreign national was included in extension programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Prior civic, professional, church or social group participation because of their international interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Foreign language skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Prior interests in developing foreign language skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B.** To what extent did you change as a result of your assignment in Poland with regard to the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>No Change</th>
<th>Slight Change</th>
<th>Moderate Change</th>
<th>Extensive Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Developed new knowledge or technical information</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Enhanced organizational skills</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Developed skills of working with people</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Changed attitudes about Polish citizens</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Changed attitudes about Poland as a nation</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Changed attitudes about America and Americans</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Developed new perspectives on extension's role in international development</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Your perspective on U.S. extension</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Increased interest in international activities</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Changed perception of self</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Please comment on the value of the experience as you now review it:
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

C. What influence did you experience of living and working in Poland have on the following aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Influence</th>
<th>Negative Influence</th>
<th>Positive Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slight Negative Influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Career opportunities in extension o o o o o
2. Position or relationships in extension o o o o o
3. Relationships with your clientele o o o o o
4. Relationships with your local community o o o o o
5. Position or relationships in professional organizations o o o o o
6. Your family o o o o o
7. Your health o o o o o
8. Your economic well being o o o o o
9. Please comment on any concerns you may have about the influence of your Polish assignment on your:

   Career: __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________
   Family: __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________

D. If you were asked to take another international assignment, would you take it?
   o Definitely
   o Probably
   o Would consider it
   o Would depend on ..... ________________
   o Would not consider it

E. Would you want your family involved (regardless if your family accompanied you to Poland or not) in another international assignment?
   o Definitely
   o Probably
   o Would consider it
   o Would depend on ..... ________________
   o Would not consider it
F. Would you recommend an international assignment to others in Extension?
   o Definitely
   o Probably
   o Would consider it
   o Would depend on .....
   o Would not consider it

G. How would you rate your overall satisfaction with your Polish assignment?
   Very Dissatisfied          Neutral          Very Satisfied
   0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

SECTION III: RESPONDENT AND HOME EXTENSION UNIT
CHARACTERISTICS WHILE IN POLAND

RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS

A. Your Gender:
   o Male                o Female

B. Your Current Marital status:
   o Married
   o Separated/Divorced/Widowed
   o Single

C. Your Age:
   o 20 - 29 years
   o 30 - 39 years
   o 40 - 49 years
   o 50 - 59 years
   o 60 - 69 years
   o Over 69 years

D. Your Highest Education Level:
   o Bachelors
   o Masters in progress
   o Masters completed
   o Ph.D./D.Ed in progress
   o Ph.D./D.Ed completed

E. Your major for the highest degree: ________________________________

F. Ethnic Identity:
   o White
   o Black
   o Latino
   o Asian American
   o Native American
CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUR U.S. EXTENSION UNIT
AND COMMUNITY WHILE IN POLAND

A. Your home Extension unit is:
   o a county office
   o an academic department
   o an administrative office/unit

B. Your home unit is primarily:
   o rural
   o urban
   o mixed
   o not applicable

C. Heritage of the local communities with which you work:
   o very much identified with ethnic backgrounds
   o somewhat identified with ethnic backgrounds
   o slightly identified with ethnic backgrounds
   o not at all identified with ethnic backgrounds

D. Degree of economic stress evident in your local communities:
   o very stressed
   o somewhat stressed
   o slightly stressed
   o not evident

E. Nature of general citizen or community awareness of global issues:
   o very open, aware of potential of global interdependence
   o somewhat open and aware of the potentials of global interdependence
   o neutral, equally open and closed
   o somewhat closed, concerned about global competition
   o very closed, concerned about global competition

F. Your primary area of program responsibility (Check one):
   o agriculture
   o family and consumer sciences
   o 4-H and youth
   o community development
   o natural resources
   o other: __________________________

G. Your geographic job coverage:
   o county
   o multi-county
   o district
   o region
   o state
H. Title of your immediate supervisor:
   o county extension director
   o regional director
   o department/district head
   o dean for extension

I. Nature of funding for your position:
   o federal and/or state
   o local
   o part of each
   o Other (grants, project funds, etc.)

J. Total number of professional staff in the local office/department/unit: _______

K. Total number of support staff in the local office/department/unit: _______

L. Number of total staff in local office/department/unit with international experience: _______

M. Your years of employment with Extension: _______

N. Your years of employment in the extension role which you were in when you went to Poland: _______

SECTION IV: NATURE OF ASSIGNMENT IN POLAND

A. Length of your assignment in Poland
   o less than 6 months
   o 6 - 12 months
   o 13 - 18 months
   o 19 months or more

B. To what extent was the nature of your work in Poland similar or different from what you were doing in the U.S. regarding:

   1. Content area responsibilities
   2. Technical skills required
   3. People skills required
   4. Degree of autonomy and independence
   5. Clients groups served

   Somewhat Different
   Very Much Different
   Somewhat Similar
   Very Much
   Similar
   |
   |
   |
   |
   |

   o o o o
C. *How would you evaluate the openness to change in Polish settings:*

1. Acceptance of local families to you and your work
   - Very Closed
   - Closed
   - Open
   - Very Open

2. Acceptance of local officials to new ways of doing things
   - Very Closed
   - Closed
   - Open
   - Very Open

3. Acceptance of ODR staff to new ideas and ways of doing things
   - Very Closed
   - Closed
   - Open
   - Very Open

D. *To what extent do you feel that you were successful in your ability to contribute to the following? Your ability to:*

1. Contribute to the Polish Extension Program
   - Not at all Successful
   - Slightly Successful
   - Somewhat Successful
   - Very Successful

2. Model and share skills with other
   - Not at all Successful
   - Slightly Successful
   - Somewhat Successful
   - Very Successful

3. Introduce innovations
   - Not at all Successful
   - Slightly Successful
   - Somewhat Successful
   - Very Successful

4. Create a climate for continuing change
   - Not at all Successful
   - Slightly Successful
   - Somewhat Successful
   - Very Successful

5. Enhance staff creativity
   - Not at all Successful
   - Slightly Successful
   - Somewhat Successful
   - Very Successful

6. Please comment on your ability to make a difference:

   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

E. *Please rank-order the program responsibilities you had in Poland by placing 1 for primary responsibility, 2 for secondary responsibility, etc. Place a "0" if you had no responsibility in that area.*

   Rank
   
   o agriculture
   
   o family and consumer sciences
   
   o 4-H and youth
   
   o community development:
     - Agro tourism
     - multi-functional development
   
   o natural resources
   
   o other: ____________________________________________

F. *What extension responsibilities did you have in Poland? Please list major roles.*

(Examples include radio programs, newsletters, advisory groups etc.)

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
G. Did any family members accompany you on your assignment?
   o   NO       o   YES
   If YES,       WHO and Relationship to YOU?       HOW LONG?
                           ____________________________
                           ____________________________

H. Did anyone from the U.S. visit you while you were on assignment in Poland?
   o   NO       o   YES
   If YES,       WHO and Relationship to YOU?       HOW LONG?
                           ____________________________
                           ____________________________

Listed below are statements that describe the nature of your work in Poland. Please respond to each item using the scale provided.

I. To what extent did the following exist:

   1. the orientation in Washington prepared you for your work in Poland o o o o o o
   2. the orientation in Warsaw prepared you for your work in Poland o o o o o o
   3. your role in Poland changed over time o o o o o o
   4. you were able to take personal initiative in defining the use of your time o o o o o o
   5. you were able to take personal initiative in setting your program agenda o o o o o o
   6. you felt challenged by the technical needs of your assignment o o o o o o
   7. you felt challenged by the setting and cultural context of your assignments o o o o o o
   8. the structure and direction provided to accomplish your roles o o o o o o
   9. availability of resources in Poland to get the job done o o o o o o
  10. the relevancy of U.S. resources (technical information) to Poland o o o o o o
  11. the ability of you and your U.S. partner to work together appropriately o o o o o o
12. What was most helpful in getting you oriented to go and adjusted to your work in Poland?

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

J. *How easy or difficult was it for you to get support to take the assignment in Poland in terms of:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Difficult</th>
<th>Difficult</th>
<th>Easy</th>
<th>Very Easy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To get specific information about the international assignment</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To work through the lines of authority concerning approval to leave of absence</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To get the paper work necessary for travel</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To arrange replacements/coverage for my U.S. position</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To communicate to the extension organization about your assignment</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To communicate to your clientele and local supporters about your assignment</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Family support to your assignment</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

K. *What attitudes did you perceive that your U.S. Extension organization personnel had toward you taking the international assignment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Negative Attitude</th>
<th>Slightly Negative Attitude</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Slightly Positive Attitude</th>
<th>Very Positive Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pride in your selection</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Viewed as enhancing your professional development</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Value to the whole organization</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Viewed as a career enhancing opportunity</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Viewed as inhibiting your career</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Valued in performance appraisal</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Viewed as inhibiting local extension programming</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. University guaranteed continuation of employment and benefits upon return</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Organization was concerned about potential negative political impacts</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
L. **To what extent were there perceived barriers/pressures/negative attitudes toward your taking the assignment:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slight</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. From administrators in Extension</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. From local peers and colleagues</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. From family</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. From clientele</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. From local Extension supporters</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M. **While on assignment in Poland, how would you characterize your interaction with people back home? To what extent:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A Little</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Quite a Bit</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Did you initiate communications/requests to your Extension organization</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Did you receive communications/responses from your Extension organization</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Did your Extension organization or office initiate communications request to you</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Were you able to get resources/information when requested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Did you involve any U.S. Extension colleagues during your work in Poland? (sought advice, shared resources communicated directly with Polish counterparts)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Did you send any newsletter or news releases to be used with Extension audiences back home</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Did you take slides and notes specifically for the purpose of explaining your assignment in Poland to U. S. Extension and other audiences</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION V: THE U.S. EXTENSION CLIMATE

**A. How important do you think it is for the state Extension organizations to provide support for campus and field staff to:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Moderately Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Prepare themselves for work in developing countries  
2. Incorporate international dimensions into regular extension programming  
3. Clarify public awareness of the University’s role in international programs and potential impacts on the state  
4. Participate in international exchanges and cooperation

**B. Describe your immediate Extension Unit’s (county/office/department from which you left to go to Poland) level of experience with**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>A Few (2-5)</th>
<th>Some (6-9)</th>
<th>Many (10 +)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Individuals on international assignments before  
2. Individuals who have traveled internationally as part of their extension role before  
3. Existence of internationally-oriented programs  
4. International dimension mentioned in unit’s plans of work  
5. Hosting of international visitors  
6. Involvement of adult clientele on international exchange/tours  
7. Involvement of youth clientele on international exchange/tours  
8. Evidence of announcements or reports of international activities  
9. Involvement of foreign students/guests in unit’s professional activities  
10. Staff development activities and resources available for international interests
SECTION VI: RE-ENTRY AND ADJUSTMENT

A. Upon your return to the United States, did you return to the same position?
   - YES
     - returned to the same position in Extension
     - returned to the same location with very different duties
   - NO
     - took a new position in Extension
     - left Extension for a position in: ________________________
     - retired

B. If you took a new position in Extension, what changes occurred, i.e., change in rank, position, location, and program responsibilities?
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

C. How would you rate your office's ability to accommodate during your absence?
   - Very easy
   - Easy
   - Difficult
   - Very difficult

D. How would you rate your immediate family's ability to accommodate to your absence?
   - Very easy
   - Easy
   - Difficult
   - Very difficult

E. How would you rate the ease of your adjustment to your assignment in Poland?
   - Very easy
   - Easy
   - Difficult
   - Very difficult

F. How would you rate the ease of your reentry back to the United States?
   - Very easy
   - Easy
   - Difficult
   - Very difficult
G. How were you received back in the U.S. upon re-entry? What was the level of interest and appreciation for your experience?

____________________________________________________________________

H. What was most helpful to you in re-entry to your personal and professional life in the U.S.?

____________________________________________________________________

I. Please rate your perceptions of the overall impact of the Polish assignment on you personally and professionally:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Moderate Impact</th>
<th>Extensive Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J. Please comment on how this international assignment has had an impact on you:

Personally: ______________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

Professionally: __________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

K. Please rate your perceptions of the overall impact of the Polish assignment on your immediate and extended family:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Moderate Impact</th>
<th>Extensive Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L. Please comment on how this international assignment had an impact on your:

Immediate Family: __________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

Extended Family: __________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

M. Please rate your perceptions of the overall impact of the Polish assignment on your colleagues and clientele:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Moderate Impact</th>
<th>Extensive Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N. Please comment on how this international assignment had an impact on your:

Colleagues: ______________________________________________________________________

Clientele: ______________________________________________________________________
SECTION VII: OUTPUT AND VISIBILITY

A. In trying to document how your Polish assignment has been integrated into your work back home, please estimate the number of instances you used your Polish experience in situations like the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of:</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Presentations to clientele or community groups</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Educational programs designed or modified</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Media communications disseminated</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Print materials developed</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Input into inservice/professional development</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Serving on international committees/commissions</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Counseling with individuals</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Creating/maintaining linkages in Poland</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Supporting community groups with international interests</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sharing materials/resources about international programs</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Other:</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Please estimate the number of interactions that you had with people and groups in Poland. In the past year, how many interactions have you had?

- None
- 1-5
- 6-10
- 11-15
- 16 or more

C. We want to document how broadly aware people were, internal and external to the Extension organization, about your assignment in Poland. Please estimate the level of awareness during your assignment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of awareness</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Slight</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Within your immediate office/department</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Within the whole Extension system</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Among professional associates outside the system</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Among Extension advisory groups and local leaders</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Among your Extension clientele</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Among local citizens and community groups</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. *To what extent were the following involved in informing other about your assignment?*

1. Your immediate extension office
2. The larger extension system
3. The local media
4. Yourself
5. The grapevine
6. Other: ____________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION VIII: KEY LINKAGES

There have been numerous anecdotal reports about linkages formed among groups or individuals in connection with the Polish-American Extension Project. Linkages have been reported among schools, civic groups (Kiwanis, Rotary, Homemakers, etc.), extension groups, businesses, farmers, and numerous others. Linkage purposes such as economic, political, cultural, and social have also been reported. If you had an opportunity to establish linkages either during or after your assignment, please note the group/individual, purpose, contact person and address. * We would like contact a select number of these individuals/groups by telephone or via on-site visit to learn more detailed information about these linkages. Please circle a response and fill in the information required for each of the four factors--group, purpose, contact and address.

Group/Individual:
Purpose: Economic, Political, Social, Cultural, Other:
Contact:
Address:

Group/Individual:
Purpose: Economic, Political, Social, Cultural, Other:
Contact:
Address:

Group/Individual:
Purpose: Economic, Political, Social, Cultural, Other:
Contact:
Address:

Group/Individual:
Purpose: Economic, Political, Social, Cultural, Other:
Contact:
Address:

Group/Individual:
Purpose: Economic, Political, Social, Cultural, Other:
Contact:
Address:
Thank you very much for your cooperation and participation in this study. Please return the completed survey in the envelope provided. Thanks again.

Dr. Donald E. Evans  
The Pennsylvania State University  
Department of Agricultural and Extension Education  
323 Agricultural Administration Building  
University Park, PA 16801

Code No. ________

This publication is available in alternative media upon request.

The Pennsylvania State University is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to programs, facilities, admission, and employment without regard to personal characteristics not related to ability, performance, or qualifications as determined by University policy or by state or federal authorities. The Pennsylvania State University does not discriminate against any person because of age, ancestry, color, disability or handicap, national origin, race, religious creed, sex, sexual orientation, or veteran status. Direct all inquiries regarding the nondiscrimination policy to the Affirmative Action Director, The Pennsylvania State University, 201 Willard Building, University Park, PA 16802-2801: Tel. (814) 865-4700/V, (814) 863-1150/TTY.
Appendix F

SAMPLE LETTER TO STATE EXTENSION DIRECTORS REQUESTING ON-SITE VISIT PARTICIPATION
January 8, 1998

State Extension Director
State Agricultural Extension Service
Address
City, State, Zip

Dear Salutation,

You are aware that the USDA International Programs Office has commissioned an evaluation of the impact of the *Polish-American Extension Project*. Penn State and Michigan State staff are collaborating in conducting the evaluation. Of the 26 states who participated in sending Extension personnel to Poland, your state was randomly chosen as one of eight states to receive site visits. I am writing to request your approval of involving «state» in this phase of the evaluation study.

We predict that a site visit would include 2-3 days of evaluation staff presence in your state, starting in February or March, 1998. We would want to interview key state administrators (Directors, Deans, Directors of International Programs, Assoc. Extension Directors, and Regional Directors or Department Chairs, depending on the role of target participants). If more than one staff member was involved from your state, we would choose one or two staff members for in-depth visits on-site. We want to talk with administrators, co-workers and support staff in the participant's office, and if from a county setting, would contact one or two local county administrators, advisory committee members and representatives of clientele groups. All interviewees would be advised ahead of time of our interests in interviewing them and would sign a permission form, indicating their consent to be included.

Our intent is to estimate the impact of the experience on the organization, the staff, and the community from which the participant was based. An outline of the types of questions/issues to be explored during the site visit is attached. Also attached is a permission form asking for your signature as an indication of your approval of involving your state in the site visit process. If you have any questions or concerns about such participation, don't hesitate to contact Don Evans (814-863-7069), Mary Andrews (517-353-9890), or Mike McGirr, at CSREES (202-690-1255). We anticipate working with individual participants, in consultation with their supervisors, in selecting an appropriate time for the visit.

We hope you can agree to be a part of this phase of the study. Please return the attached permission form as soon as possible. Thanks in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Mary P. Andrews  Donald E. Evans
Michigan State University  The Pennsylvania State University
Appendix G

ON-SITE INTERVIEW GUIDE
SITE VISIT INTERVIEW FORM
PARTICIPANT

Code Identifier of Site/State: _____________________________________________
Dates of Site Visit: ____________________________________________________
Interviewer Name: ____________________________________________________

Hello! My name is ____________________________________________from____________________________.

I am part of the research team studying the impact of the Polish/American Extension Project on the American participants as well as the communities and organizations they represented. You have been selected for this interview because you were a participant of the USDA Polish/American Extension Project. We have selected only eight of the states for site visits for the purpose of follow-up interviews.

Your input will be used to help us add richness and depth to the information obtained from the survey instruments. Two underlying purposes of the study are to learn more about organizational leadership practices of the Extension organization that may have influenced the impact on Americans’ participation and to identify socio-cultural or economic linkages formed as a result of Extension staffs’ participation in the project. Your input will be combined with what is learned from other interviews to provide information that may be used by the USDA to further improve its programs.

Your answers and comments are confidential. Nothing you say will be identified with you personally to ensure confidentiality. Your signature on the consent form indicates your consent for this interview. With your permission, this interview will be recorded only to ensure completeness and accuracy. Do you have any questions before we begin?

1. Thinking about your overall participation in the Polish/American Extension Project, how would you describe its significance in your life?
   - No Significance
   - Moderate Significance
   - Great Significance

2. How has your participation positively and/or negatively influenced your career?
   - What career or job changes have occurred?
   - What new skills do you have?
   - How do you use these skills in your career?
   - How have relationships with clientele and community organizations changed?
   - What kinds of professional organizations with international interests have you joined?

3. How did your colleagues react to your participation in the project?
   - Coworkers?
   - Clientele?

4. Was your participation in the Polish/American Extension Project considered in your subsequent performance appraisal?

5. What programs do you do differently now and why? Addition of international dimension?
6. Do you believe your participation has affected your motivation toward conducting your Extension programs? In what way?

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

7. Do you think there is an ideal time in one’s career to participate in an international assignment? Please explain.

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

8. Were there differences in your working environment in Poland and your working environment in the U.S.? If yes, what do you think contributed to this? Self? American leadership in Warsaw? Polish colleagues?

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

9. (For multiple term participants) Were there any differences between your first and second assignment? Please describe how these differences affected your satisfaction with your assignment.

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

10. How has your participation in the Polish/American Extension project influenced you? Your family? Others you know? Please describe the changes that have occurred.
    Level of interpersonal relationships?
    World view?
    Attitude toward America?
    Attitude toward American participation in foreign assistance projects?
    Perception of global issues?
    Degree of flexibility?
    Level of independence?
    Level of understanding of different cultures and different people?

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

11. Have you encouraged others to develop social, cultural, or economic linkages? Please identify these linkages and describe them.
    - Linkages
    - Exchanges
    - Partnerships
    - International interaction

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

12. How would you describe your university Extension administration’s attitude toward your participation in the Polish/American Extension Project?

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

13. How would you describe your immediate supervisor’s attitude toward your participation?

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

14. What leadership practices of your university Extension system influenced the professional/personal impact on your participation in the project? Please describe.

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
15. What changes in Extension leadership practices should be made to expand the impact on Americans’ participation in Extension international education efforts?

- administrative support for international education
- leadership for international education
- identification of international opportunities for administration, staff, faculty, clientele
- orientation to international assignments
- selection process for participation established
- reward structure for international education participation (merit adjustment, tenure, promotion, peer recognition)
- financial support for participation
- policies and procedures to facilitate participation in international efforts
- committee for internationalization efforts
- organizational culture that expects international activity
- regular visitation of scholars from other countries
- cultural interactions between staff and scholars from other countries
- exchange programs institutionalized
- staff development opportunities
- inservices on international issues for staff
- programs on internationalization issues for clientele

16. Please respond to the following questions by using a rating scale of 1 to 5 (1 = Not Important to 5 = Very Important):

A. Importance for U.S. citizens and organizations to be internationally involved?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Important</td>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Importance for universities to be involved in international cooperative development projects like the Polish/American Extension Project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Important</td>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Importance for the USDA to be involved in international cooperative development projects like the Polish/American Extension Project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Important</td>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Do you have any recommendations to the university Extension organization for facilitating back-fill positions?

__________________________________________________________________

Thank you for this interview. The information you provided will be very helpful as we continue to develop future international dimensions of the Extension program.
SITE VISIT INTERVIEW FORM
DIRECTORS/ADMINISTRATORS

Code Identifier of Site/State: _______________________________________________
Dates of Site Visit:_______________________________________________________
Interviewer Name:_______________________________________________________

Hello! My name is ______________________________________ from ____________________________.

I am part of a research team studying the impact of the Polish/American Extension Project on the American participants as well as the communities and organizations which they represent. As part of the study, we would like to learn more about the leadership practices of the Extension organization that may have influenced that impact. You were selected for this interview because you are a leader at one of the universities that had one or more participants in the USDA project.

It is important for us to learn about your involvement with the development of an international dimension in Extension and your leadership policies and practices toward participation in international Extension education programs. Your input will be combined with the input from other interviews to provide us with information that can be used by USDA to improve its programs.

Your answers and comments are confidential. Anything you say will not be identified with you personally to ensure total confidentiality. Your signature on the consent form indicates your approval for this interview. With your permission, this interview will be recorded only to ensure completeness and accuracy. Do you have any questions before we begin?

1. To your knowledge, what is the history of involvement of your university Extension in international education projects/assignments?
   - kinds of programs supported - technical assistance, people-to-people, etc.?
   - kinds of persons participating and how identified
     - administrators, faculty, county agents, clientele?
   - degree of involvement, etc.?
   ____________________________________________________________________

2. Is your university Extension doing anything to encourage the development of an international dimension? _____Yes _____No
   What do you think are the reasons for this?
   - commitment in mission statement, strategic plan (in writing)?
   - integrated in practice into teaching, research, and service, or treated separately?
   - structure to reward staff development and accomplishments?
   - professional development/training for staff in internationalization efforts?
   - interaction with faculty and scholars from other cultures?
   - exchange programs/visits?
   - study/research abroad for faculty and scholars from other cultures?
   - technical assistance projects?
   ____________________________________________________________________

3. Does your university Extension view international assignments as positive?
   _____Yes _____No. Please explain.
   ____________________________________________________________________
4. Are there any university Extension policies (or practices) associated with the international involvement of Extension staff?  ____Yes  ____No. Please describe.

5. How easy or difficult was it for the university to accommodate the involvement of Extension staff in the Polish/American Extension Project?
- value to unit?
- general attitudes toward international activities?
- coverage?
- political impacts?
- university procedures?

6. Did leadership for the Polish/American Extension Project differ from leadership for other international educational efforts? How?
- Individual person identified to provide leadership?

7. How were you involved with the leadership for the Polish/American Extension Project?

8. Now that the participants have returned, have you noticed any impact of their involvement on Extension? staff? supporters? Please describe.
- change in international dimension?
- linkages formed?

9. Please respond to the following questions by using a rating scale of 1 to 5.
   A. How important is it for universities to be involved in international Extension cooperative development projects like the Polish/American Extension Project?
      1  2  3  4  5
      Not Important Somewhat Indifferent Important Very Important

   B. How important is it for the USDA to be involved in international Extension cooperative development projects like the Polish/American Extension Project?
      1  2  3  4  5
      Not Important Somewhat Indifferent Important Very Important

   C. How important is it for U.S. citizens and organizations to be involved in international education programs?
      1  2  3  4  5
      Not Important Somewhat Indifferent Important Very Important

Thank you for this interview. The information you provided will be very helpful as we continue to develop future international dimensions of the Extension program.
SITE VISIT INTERVIEW FORM
IMMEDIATE SUPERVISOR

Code Identifier of Site/State: _______________________________________________
Dates of Site Visit:_______________________________________________________
Interviewer Name:_______________________________________________________

Hello! My name is _______________________________ from____________________________.

I am part of a research team studying the impact of the Polish/American Extension Project on the American participants as well as the communities and organizations which they represent. An underlying part of the study is to learn more about organizational leadership practices of the Extension organization that may have influenced that impact. You were selected for this interview because you were the supervisor of the unit where the participant worked.

It is important for us to learn about your perceptions on the impact of the Polish/American Extension Project, the Extension organization, and their community. In addition, it is important to learn about your Extension organization’s policies and practices regarding participation in international education programs. Your input will be combined with the input from other interviews to provide information that can be used by the Extension system to improve the international dimension of Extension education programming.

Your answers and comments are confidential. Nothing you say will be identified with you personally to ensure confidentiality. Your signature on the consent form indicates your consent for this interview. With your permission, this interview will be recorded only to ensure completeness and accuracy. Do you have any questions before we begin?

1. What kind of programming coverage occurred while your participant was on assignment?
   ______________________________________________________________________

2. To what extent was it easy or difficult to arrange for this coverage?
   ______________________________________________________________________

3. On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = Very Dissatisfied to 5 = Very Satisfied), how satisfied were you with the arrangement made to cover for your participant’s work in the assigned unit? Please explain.
   1 Very Dissatisfied  2 Somewhat Dissatisfied  3 Indifferent  4 Satisfied  5 Very Satisfied
   ______________________________________________________________________

4. Were there sensitivities to placing this position in jeopardy if it were vacated for an international assignment? Please describe.
   - funding?
   - clientele relations?
   ______________________________________________________________________
5. How would you describe your state Extension organization’s attitudes and policies toward international assignments?
- encouragement/discouragement or incentives/disincentives to apply?
- ease or difficulty of access to information about international assignments?
- clear or ambiguous policies or lines of authority concerning approval to leave?
- ease or difficulty of handling paperwork?
- ease or difficulty in arranging a replacement or coverage?
- forthright or cautious communication to clientele or local authorities?
- clear or ambiguous policies or lines of authority concerning approval to leave?
- ease or difficulty of handling paperwork?
- ease or difficulty in arranging a replacement or coverage?
- forthright or cautious communication to clientele or local authorities?
- sense of pride or burden in staff participation?
- view of value only as a professional development experience vs. value to whole organization?
- degree to which international experiences are viewed as career enhancing vs. damaging or stalling?
- degree to which performance overseas is considered in personnel appraisal/salary upon return?

6. What was the nature of communications between you and the local Extension unit? During the assignment? Did you personally communicate with the participant during the assignment?

7. On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = Not Important to 5 = Very Important),
A. How would you rate your satisfaction with the level of interaction between the participant and the local Extension unit during the assignment?


B. How would you rate the level of interaction between the participant and the state Extension organization during the assignment?


8. If you were to do this again, what changes would you make in the level or type of interaction with staff on international assignments?

9. How easy or difficult was it to accommodate the participant upon re-entry?
- getting caught up with the workload?
- accommodating to changes in role expectations?
- appreciation for any changes in role expectations?
- attitudes (positive and negative) of peers and associates?
- level of interest expressed in international experiences?
- amount of time spent on Polish business?
- formal or informal recognition for international work?
10. Please describe any changes (positive or negative) noted in the participant that you think are a result of their international experience.
   - knowledge
   - skills
   - processes
   - attitudes
   - maturity
   - interests/aspirations
   - sensitivities
   - new perspectives
   - interactions with clientele/community
   - programming

11. Overall, on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = Not Important to 5 = Very Important), how would you rate the impact of the experience on the participant’s career and performance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Important</td>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Do you think there has been an impact on others in the immediate Extension organization? Please describe any changes (positive or negative) related to the international experience evident in his/her peers and associates.

13. Do you think there has been an impact on the community or Extension clientele? Please describe any changes (positive or negative) related to the international experience evident in the Extension clientele or the community leadership?

14. How broadly aware were people, inside and outside the Extension organization, that a staff person had taken an assignment in Poland?

15. How did others come to know about the assignment? (from Extension, from you, from the individual, etc.)?
   - before leaving?
   - during the assignment?
   - upon return?

16. How would you describe your state Extension system’s experience with international assignments/activities prior to the Polish/American Extension Project?

17. Have there been any changes in the state Extension system’s involvement in international educational activities since that time?
18. How would you describe the organizational commitment to international programming in Extension?
- Great deal of commitment and active support
- Commitment but not much action
- Neutral, depends on the individual and the situation
- No commitment and no action
- Discouragement

19. What advice would you have for future international projects/involvements? Do you think there is anything that should be done differently? Please explain.

20. Would you consider this experience with the Polish/American Extension Project to be successful? In what ways?

21. Using a rating scale of 1 to 5 (1 = Not Important to 5 = Very Important), please indicate how important you think it is:
   A. for universities to be involved in international cooperative development projects like the Polish/American Extension Project.
      1 2 3 4 5
      Not Somewhat Indifferent Important Very
      Important Important Important Important Important
   
   B. for the USDA to be involved in international cooperative development projects like the Polish/American Extension Project.
      1 2 3 4 5
      Not Somewhat Indifferent Important Very
      Important Important Important Important Important
   
   C. for U.S. citizens and organizations to be internationally involved.
      1 2 3 4 5
      Not Somewhat Indifferent Important Very
      Important Important Important Important Important

22. Would you like to see more action toward supporting international dimensions in Extension in your state? ( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) Undecided
    If yes, what should be done?

23. Do you have any recommendations to the university Extension system for facilitating back-fill positions?

Thank you for this interview. The information you provided will be very helpful as we continue to develop future international dimensions of the Extension program.
Thank you for participating in this interview. The purpose of this interview is to obtain information about the domestic impact of the Polish/American Extension Project on the participants and associates. An underlying purpose of this study is to obtain information that can be systematically integrated into international USDA Extension programs. You were selected for this interview through association with a PAEP participant.

It is important to us to find out your thoughts and comments about the interactions that you have had with the PAEP participant or project. Your input will be combined with the input from other interviews to provide information that can be used by the USDA Extension system to improve the international dimension of Extension education programming. Please be as specific as possible in your responses and in describing examples.

Your answers and comments are confidential. Nothing you say will be identified with you personally to ensure confidentiality. With your permission, this interview will be recorded only to ensure completeness and accuracy. Your signature is needed on the consent form to indicate your consent for this interview. Do you have any questions before we begin?

1. Please describe the nature of your interactions with the participant while in Poland.  
   Communications  
   Exchange of materials  
   Exchange of ideas  
   Exchange of programming inputs  
   Linkages to Polish people

2. What did you learn through association with the PAEP participant?

3. What did others learn from association with the PAEP participant or with the project?

4. How easy or difficult was it to adapt to the absence of the participant?  
   To the reentry of the participant?

5. Please describe the general climate and attitudes of the office and community toward international involvement? Is it:  
   Proactive and positive?  
   Negative?  
   Indifferent?
6. What has changed as a result of the participation in this international project?
   Personally or professionally for participant or near associates?
   Working environment?
   Community?
   International perceptions, values or attitudes?

7. To your knowledge, have there been any local secondary effects as a result of this participation?
   Linkages?
   Exchanges?
   Partnerships?
   International interactions?

   If yes, would you please provide contacts and addresses of these linkages, exchanges, or interactions?

8. Please respond to the following questions by using a rating scale of 1 to 5
   (1 = Not Important to 5 = Very Important):
   A. Importance for US citizens and organizations to be internationally involved?

      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
      |---|---|---|---|---|
      | Not Important | Somewhat Important | Indifferent | Important | Very Important |

   B. Importance for universities to be involved in international cooperative development projects like the Polish/American Extension Project?

      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
      |---|---|---|---|---|
      | Not Important | Somewhat Important | Indifferent | Important | Very Important |

   C. Importance for the USDA to be involved in international cooperative development projects like the Polish/American Extension Project?

      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
      |---|---|---|---|---|
      | Not Important | Somewhat Important | Indifferent | Important | Very Important |

9. What do you believe the purposes of international technical assistance programs are? Are there benefits we should expect in return?

10. Do you have any recommendations to the university Extension system for facilitating back-fill positions?

11. Do you have any final comments or suggestions in regards to Overseas Technical Assistance Programs such as the Polish/American Extension Project?

Thank you for your help and assistance! The information you provided will be very helpful as we continue to develop future international dimensions of the Extension program.
SITE VISIT INTERVIEW FORM
SUPPORT STAFF

Thank you for participating in this interview. The purpose of this interview is to obtain information about the domestic impact of the Polish/American Extension Project on the participants and associates. An underlying purpose of this study is to obtain information that can be systematically integrated into international USDA Extension programs. You were selected for this interview through association with a PAEP participant.

It is important to us to find out your thoughts and comments about the interactions that you have had with the PAEP participant or project. Your input will be combined with the input from other interviews to provide information that can be used by the USDA Extension system to improve the international dimension of Extension education programming. Please be as specific as possible in your responses and in describing examples.

Your answers and comments are confidential. Nothing you say will be identified with you personally to ensure confidentiality. With your permission, this interview will be recorded only to ensure completeness and accuracy. Your signature is needed on the consent form to indicate your consent for this interview. Do you have any questions before we begin?

1. Please describe the nature of your interactions with the participant while in Poland.
   Communications
   Exchange of materials
   Exchange of ideas
   Exchange of programming inputs
   Linkages to Polish people

2. What did you learn through association with the PAEP participant?

3. What did others learn from association with the PAEP participant or with the project?

4. How easy or difficult was it to adapt to the absence of the participant? To the reentry of the participant?

5. Please describe the general climate and attitudes of the office and community toward international involvement? Is it:
   Proactive and positive?
   Negative?
   Indifferent?
6. What has changed as a result of the participation in this international project? 
   Personally or professionally for participant or near associates? 
   Working environment? 
   Community? 
   International perceptions, values or attitudes? 

7. To your knowledge, have there been any local secondary effects as a result of this participation? 
   Linkages? 
   Exchanges? 
   Partnerships? 
   International interactions? 

   If yes, would you please provide contacts and addresses of these linkages, exchanges, or interactions? 

8. Please respond to the following questions by using a rating scale of 1 to 5 
   (1 = Not Important to 5 = Very Important): 
   A. Importance for US citizens and organizations to be internationally involved? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   B. Importance for universities to be involved in international cooperative development projects like the Polish/American Extension Project? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   C. Importance for the USDA to be involved in international cooperative development projects like the Polish/American Extension Project? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. What do you believe the purposes of international technical assistance programs are? 
   Are there benefits we should expect in return? 

10. Do you have any recommendations to the university Extension system for facilitating back-fill positions? 

11. Do you have any final comments or suggestions in regards to Overseas Technical Assistance Programs such as the Polish/American Extension Project? 

Thank you for your help and assistance! The information you provided will be very helpful as we continue to develop future international dimensions of the Extension program.
SITE VISIT INTERVIEW FORM
COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES

Code Identifier of Site/State: _______________________________________________
Dates of Site Visit: ______________________________________________________
Interviewer Name: ______________________________________________________

Thank you for participating in this interview. The purpose of this interview is to obtain information about the domestic impact of the Polish/American Extension Project on participants and associates. An underlying purpose of this study is to obtain information that can be systematically integrated into international USDA Extension programs. You were selected for this interview through association with a PAEP participant.

It is important to us to find out your thoughts and comments about the interactions that you have had with the PAEP participant. Your input will be combined with the input from other interviews to provide information that can be used by the USDA Extension system to improve the international dimension of Extension education programming. Please be as specific as possible in your responses and in describing examples.

Your answers and comments are confidential. Nothing you say will be identified with you personally to ensure confidentiality. With your permission, this interview will be recorded only to ensure completeness and accuracy. Your signature is needed on the consent form to indicate your consent for this interview. Do you have any questions before we begin?

1. Can you recall when you learned of the individual’s participation in the Polish/American Extension Project? What was your reaction?
__________________________________________________________________

2. Were you involved in any way while the participant was on assignment?
   Communications?
   Interactions?
   Linkages?
   Press releases?
   Visits?
__________________________________________________________________

3. How many people throughout the community knew about the international assignment?
__________________________________________________________________

4. Now that the participant has returned, do you think it was a good experience?
   Did the community or others benefit?
   Did the participant benefit?
   Did Extension benefit?
__________________________________________________________________

5. How easy or difficult was it for Extension to adapt to the absence of this participant, as well as to reentry?
__________________________________________________________________
6. Please describe the general climate and attitude of the community toward international involvement? Is it:
   Proactive and positive?
   Negative?
   Indifferent?

7. To your knowledge, have there been any local secondary effects as a result of this participation?
   Linkages?
   Exchanges?
   Partnerships?
   International interactions?

If yes, would you please provide contacts and addresses of these linkages, exchanges, or interactions?

8. Please respond to the following questions by using a rating scale of 1 to 5 (1 = Not Important to 5 = Very Important):
   A. Importance for U.S. citizens and organizations to be internationally involved?
      1  2  3  4  5
      Not Somewhat Indifferent Important Very Important
      Important
   B. Importance for universities to be involved in international cooperative development projects like the Polish/American Extension Project?
      1  2  3  4  5
      Not Somewhat Indifferent Important Very Important
      Important
   C. Importance for the USDA to be involved in international cooperative development projects like the Polish/American Extension Project?
      1  2  3  4  5
      Not Somewhat Indifferent Important Very Important
      Important

9. What do you believe the purposes of international technical assistance programs are? Are there benefits we should expect in return?

10. Do you have any recommendations to the university Extension system for facilitating back-fill positions?

11. Do you have any final comments or suggestions in regards to Overseas Technical Assistance Programs such as the Polish/American Extension Project?

Thank you for your help and assistance! The information you provided will be very helpful as we continue to develop future international dimensions of the Extension program.
SITE VISIT INTERVIEW FORM
FAMILY MEMBERS

Code Identifier of Site/State: _______________________________________________
Dates of Site Visit: ______________________________________________________
Interviewer Name: ______________________________________________________

Thank you for participating in this interview. The purpose of this interview is to obtain information about the domestic impact of the Polish/American Extension Project on participants and associates. An underlying purpose of this study is to obtain information that can be systematically integrated into USDA international Extension programs. You were selected for this interview through association with a PAEP participant.

It is important to us to find out your thoughts and comments about the interactions that you have had with the PAEP participant or project. Your input will be combined with the input from other interviews to provide information that can be used by the USDA Extension system to improve the international dimension of Extension education programming. Please be as specific as possible in your responses and in describing examples.

Your answers and comments are confidential. Nothing you say will be identified with you personally to ensure confidentiality. With your permission, this interview will be recorded only to ensure completeness and accuracy. Your signature is needed on the consent form to indicate your consent for this interview. Do you have any questions before we begin?

1. Please describe the nature of your interactions with the participant while in Poland.
   Communications
   Exchange of materials
   Exchange of ideas
   Exchange of programming inputs
   Linkages to Polish people

2. What did you learn through association with the PAEP participant?

3. What did others learn from association with the PAEP participant or with the project?

4. How easy or difficult was it to adapt to the absence of the participant?
   To the reentry of the participant?

5. Please describe the general climate and attitudes of the office and community toward international involvement? Is it:
   Proactive and positive?
   Negative?
   Indifferent?

__________________________________________________________________
6. What has changed as a result of the participation in this international project? 
   Personally or professionally for participant or near associates? 
   Working environment? 
   Community? 
   International perceptions, values or attitudes? 
   
7. To your knowledge, have there been any local secondary effects as a result of this 
   participation? 
   Linkages? 
   Exchanges? 
   Partnerships? 
   International interactions? 
   
If yes, would you please provide contacts and addresses of these linkages, exchanges, 
   or interactions? 

8. Please respond to the following questions by using a rating scale of 1 to 5 
   (1 = Not Important to 5 = Very Important): 
   
   A. Importance for US citizens and organizations to be internationally involved? 
      
      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
      |---|---|---|---|---|
      | Not Important | Somewhat Important | Indifferent | Important | Very Important |
   
   B. Importance for universities to be involved in international cooperative development 
      projects like the Polish/American Extension Project? 
      
      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
      |---|---|---|---|---|
      | Not Important | Somewhat Important | Indifferent | Important | Very Important |
   
   C. Importance for the USDA to be involved in international cooperative development 
      projects like the Polish/American Extension Project? 
      
      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
      |---|---|---|---|---|
      | Not Important | Somewhat Important | Indifferent | Important | Very Important |

9. What do you believe the purposes of international technical assistance programs are? 
   Are there benefits we should expect in return? 

10. Do you have any final comments or suggestions in regards to Overseas Technical 
    Assistance Programs such as the Polish/American Extension Project? 

Thank you for your help and assistance! The information you provided will be very helpful as we 
continue to develop future international dimensions of the Extension program.
Appendix H

ON-SITE VISIT SUMMARIES
Site #1

This state was randomly selected to be visited as part of the on-site review component of the study. This state had several county and campus based participants who served six months or longer in Poland. Within the state, twelve interviews were conducted. The interviews included two randomly selected participants of the Polish-American Extension Project (PAEP), one administrator, two co-workers, three support staff, two community representatives, and two family members. The two PAEP served only a six-month assignment in Poland.

Organizational Context

This state has a very large extension system. The university has a strong history of international programming including the extension system. The administration was very proud of the extensive involvement in international extension activities. There are general policies and infrastructure that includes extension in the leadership and organization of extension international programming. It is inclusive. There is general support for extension education programming as part of the total organization of international programs for research, teaching and extension.

This university was very supportive of faculty and staff participation in the Polish American Extension Project. It was reported that the organizational leadership understood and promoted involvement. The university had general policies, guidelines and procedures to assist faculty and staff during their participation. Overall, the organization had a history of extensive involvement in international programming; therefore, an experience factor that was helpful to initiate any new projects and to prepare individuals to participate in the international programs.

There was excellent support for the participants in their home units. The faculty members received strong support from the department chair and the county agent had total support from county director and co-workers. There was a very high respect for both individuals in the county. The community had a good knowledge of the extension agent’s participation during and after the Polish experience. The extension agent provided materials for the county newsletter during the six-month assignment in Poland and presented several programs for clientele groups after returning. Both the county and regional offices reported little difficulty accommodating the extension agent’s absence. It was mentioned that a back fill was not provided and that other county and area agents had to provide additional extension program support. This did create some extra work for co-workers but they did not have a problem doing so. There was no skepticism towards international assignments. Everyone placed a high value on an international experience as an excellent professional development opportunity. The other co-workers expressed an interest in international assignments and they looked forward to a similar opportunity. The Polish American Extension Project was viewed favorably and with many positive comments.

Organizational Impact

The participant experiences had some impact on the organization. The participants were self-motivated and creative. When they returned, they provided their co-workers and clientele knowledge of Poland. This effort was supported by the organization. They provided an international experience for others who could not travel abroad. some plans were underway to develop 4-H youth exchanges and volunteer exchanges with Poland. Many of the county volunteers had previous experience hosting international exchange persons.

Overall, the organization had encouraged participants to share their experience with others. The participants reported that the knowledge learned during their participation was very useful for their extension education programs. They reported using the Polish agricultural situation to enhance their workshops and programs. Both participants said the international experience was rewarding and beneficial.
Personal, Family and Community Impact

The participants were very complimentary about their participation in the Polish American Exchange Project. Their family members also spoke very highly of the experience. Both spouses indicated that it was a rich experience for their families. However, it was difficult being separated for six months. Both participants and their spouses considered this a major opportunity: total life changes, opened new doors of opportunity, changed feeling towards the United States, broadened horizons and vision of the world.

Throughout the interviews with co-workers, support staff and community representatives, it was reported that they could see a difference in the participants after they returned. They viewed things better and had a very positive attitude about others and extension programs. One community representative who was a superintendent of a public school reported that the participant, who was an elected school board member, shared his experience during official board meetings which helped to focus the board on the issues. The superintendent indicated that the school and community learned plenty from the participant; it already had an impact on the participant and the school.

Future Projects

It was clear that the extension system gained from the participation in the Polish American Extension Project. The participants were pleased and professionally supportive of their international experiences. They were appreciative of the USDA orientations in Washington and Warsaw. They did recommend that a better re-entry program needs to be developed. It was somewhat difficult to return to the United States after six months abroad. It was recommended that a re-entry orientation would be helpful to maximize the value of the international experience.

The participants also recommended that the state should use the back fill funding to provide support as intended. When a back fill is not provided, especially at the county level, it places stress on the system. It is unfair to expect others who have full-time responsibilities to also cover for their co-worker who is representing the university on an international assignment.
Site #2

This state was randomly selected to be a part of the site-visit component of the Overseas Technical Cooperation Impact Study. Within the state, three staff members had served in Poland; however, only one still remained on-staff. Therefore the region and county from which the one participating agent was located served as the host sites for the interviews. The participating agent was a female generalist. She served as home economists in her state, but while in Poland she contributed to all program areas, especially community development. She spent two six-month assignments in Poland during the early 1990’s. Within the state, a total of seven interviews were conducted to serve as the data source for this summary. Individuals in the following roles were interviewed: Director of Extension, Regional Director, Associate Director for the Program Area, Co-worker, Support Staff Member, Community Representative and the Participating Agent.

Organizational Context

This state can perhaps be considered typical of other state extension systems. Although the University has a strong history of international involvements, the extension system is not particularly involved. There are neither policies nor infrastructure within extension to support an international dimension. As one respondent noted, “there is no commitment within the organization toward an international component, but there are people within the system who care and can make things happen.” The Extension System could be characterized as supportive, but not aggressive. Each opportunity for an international assignment is handled on an individual basis. Senior administrator’s report trying to accommodate to individual requests and in recognizing benefits, at least for the participant, of international assignments.

The extension system in this state was in massive reorganization and downsizing at the time of the Polish-American Project. In fact this reorganization was one of the factors that influenced the placement of the target agent. Her position was being reconfigured and she would be moving from a county to an area responsibility. Because of the upheaval that would take place, anyway, it was considered an ideal time to be away on an international assignment! But these same forces also created an opportunity for the leverage of resources. A proposal was developed by the Regional Director and Associate Director to use some of the salary savings from this assignment to help other staff travel to Poland. Thus in the first six months two additional administrators conducted site visits in Poland and in the second six months an exchange program was established to send and receive six home economists in Poland and the U.S. This creative use of resources provided an opportunity for many more people from the state to benefit from the project.

Organizational Support

There seemed to be universal support, both within the organization and in the community for this agent to participate in this international project. However such unlimited support was reported as being granted because of the respect and admiration accorded the person. She was a senior agent with strong community involvement and excellent performance. Respondents noted that some people assume that international assignments are “perks” associated with long service or even “junkets” with no expectation of benefits for the organization or clientele. These attitudes were not expressed in relation to this agent, whose history of international programming support and open involvement with clientele served to set her assignment off as being different from other experiences. People anticipated that the community would learn from her experience and thus rightly anticipated correspondence during her absence and a wide variety of presentations upon her return. However, that such a difference in expectations existed, signals that skepticism toward international assignments is rather the norm, and that little value is associated with such assignments to the system or the community.

Generally both the county and area office reported little difficulty in accommodating to the agent’s absence. In both cases, transitions were occurring anyway and expectations were in flex. A back-fill person was hired part-time to handle some of the programming responsibilities of
the new role and also was available to support the county to some extent. The person hired in this back-fill role was a graduate student who gained a great deal from the experience. She not only learned about extension and grew to admire this career possibility; she also gained useful skills that served to support her graduate program and encouraged her to continue toward her Ph.D.!

Communications and interactions between the agent and the local and area office were not planned. However newsy letters were circulated among the staff regularly and reports were placed in the internal communication tool for the organization so that many within the system were aware of the agent’s work in Poland. Local clientele often inquired about her work and learned much from her letters. The Homemakers groups were the most knowledgeable about her work and anticipated studying Poland as part of their international program activities. Because the Polish colleagues were considering developing a youth program, the local office sent a great deal of literature about 4-H to the agent in Poland. Local volunteers knew of this request and were excited to learn more about youth programming in Poland. Thus in spite of overarching organizational changes, a great deal of communication and interaction between the agent in Poland and the local extension office emerged. The interest and enthusiasm created from this correspondence served the community well when the Home Economics Exchange occurred upon the agent’s return. A large number of local volunteers, clientele and extension supporter eagerly came forward to host the polish guests.

Organizational Impact

This one agent’s experiences did not really impact the organization to any great extent. However the importance of her international involvement to the organization cannot be underestimated. Not only did she usher-in the concept that Home Economists could serve internationally (and an additional agent thus became involved), but her involvement opened a window of opportunity for a number of people to visit her in Poland and to become involved with Poland through the Home Economics Exchange. There were strong and consistent reports about the value of the exchange as a mechanism to expose many people—agents, organizational leaders, community members, youth—to Poland and the lifestyles, values and changes occurring there during this unprecedented moment in history. The Exchange generated interest throughout the organization and the community. Participation as one of the travelers was a very sought-after opportunity for home economists. And hosting the Polish guests was very well received in the community. The agent’s reports and the visits of other localities prepared the community with ideas and questions so that the hosting experience was rich and fulfilling. Interactions with Polish agents and families continue to this day! Memories and stories continue to circulate in the community.

Personal, Family and Community Impact

As was noted earlier, the organization was undergoing massive organizational changes just prior to and during the agent’s Polish assignment. It was a time of stress and upheaval. Being gone during the height of the upheaval was a mental health break—a chance to channel energies to other pursuits. The participating agent welcomed the change in routine and felt that it helped her to put things in perspective—to reassess priorities and reconnect to the fundamental values of extension. It was a rejuvenating experience that helped her to return to the U.S. with a positive and enthusiastic attitude.

Although the participating agent was a single person, both a sister and a number of friends visited her while in Poland. These people would not have visited Poland but for her presence there. Thus a number of people became aware of Poland and the challenges of her history and current circumstances because of this agent. Likewise, due to her presentations to a variety of community groups and the hosting of Polish guests in the small towns of this state, a larger sphere of people have been exposed to Poland and have gained respect and interest in her people.
Future Projects

Two recurring themes for recommended changes emerged from the interviews at site #2. One theme involves the lack of organizational infrastructure to serve international interests. Greater visibility of opportunities, better planning for how assignments can reinforce programming, and better lines of communication between USDA and states were recommended. The second theme involves the choice of participants in international assignments. Generally there was agreement that the old attitudes of “perks” and “junkets” needs to change. The organization needs to be careful in who one chooses for international assignments. With little in the way of organizational structure or precedent to guide and support participants, it is left to the individual to seek ways to leverage the experience so that a broader set of people or programming is involved or impacted. Thus, strong, respected staff should be involved who are innovative and unwavering in their valuing of international programming.
Site #3

Site #3 was one of eight states randomly selected for on-site interviews as a component of the Overseas Technical Impact Study. The participant was a married, male Agricultural Economics Specialist who was based at a regional research and extension center. At the time of the assignment, he was in a regional center outside of a large city, and upon his return he transferred to a regional center in a rural area. The follow-up interviews were all conducted on a face-to-face basis.

Among the nine people interviewed there were: the University Executive Associate Director, the Associate Director for Agricultural Sciences, the Department Head for Agricultural Economics, the Extension Program Leader for Agricultural Economics, the District Extension Director (immediate supervisor), two Coworkers (regional 4-H specialist and the Extension communication specialist), one family member (wife), and the participant himself.

Organizational Context

Site #3, on the Extension level, has had minimal experience with international programs in the past and has a cautious approach to these programs. Most international projects done previously have been self-initiated and the agent involved must be "a good performer in good standing." Some members of the county staff have been involved with joint livestock programs along the border of another country. There was an ongoing project with Russia and the college that had involved some state specialists. Most programs are started on the request of the recipient country.

The state appeared to have a very cautious approach to international extension programming. It was heard many times, particularly from administrators, that the primary clientele were the state taxpayers. Therefore, there was not a heavy emphasis placed on international involvement. There are some international projects occurring, but most of these are self-initiated, and there appeared to be little done proactively to get more people involved.

International work at this site was viewed as staff development and there are little, if any, rewards except for small awards in some cases for the staff involved. Sometimes, because of the time away from work, it seems to some to be almost a negative experience to be involved. The interest level is very high though, despite possible negative consequences.

Organizational Support

The organizational approach that emerged was if someone finds and develops an international project proposal, it would be considered. The individual must be in good standing and be able to handle this “extra” workload on top of their current responsibilities. They do not want to see a backing-off of domestic program expectations, as these things still need to get done. They are careful in regards to who participates in international projects. The person must be a good performer in good standing. These international efforts are primarily viewed as personal and professional development.

There has been very little international activity on the part of county staff as most have only dealt with state or regional faculty and specialists. The primary reason for this was the point of the state taxpayer expecting county staff to provide educational help and resources in their county. This does not seem likely to change for some time even-though this was deemed necessary by the participant and a fellow coworker at the regional center.

The participant received a positive welcome home from his coworkers. They were supportive and as a whole felt a sense of pride for his participation. Overall, the other workers felt it was very important for the Extension office to be involved in an international program because of the increasing global access and worldwide communication. Another plus of programs like this
is the idea of constructive and preventative education to alleviate major problems or issues in the future. Lastly, it can be used to develop allies, open borders, and develop markets.

One member of the support staff was so interested in the participant’s work with the Polish American Extension Project that she applied for an international assignment in St. Petersburg, but, unfortunately, she was not selected.

There was communication that occurred during the assignment between the participant and fellow coworkers and friends at Site #6, and this was mostly e-mail and phone calls that took place. The participant did bring a scrapbook and slides back from Poland, both of which he showed to others. It was expressed by the participant and coworkers that there were no clear guidelines for communication and this is an area that could be improved upon in future projects. This would have served to improve the possibilities for communication and secondary involvement among others.

When the participant left for Poland many were informed, mostly through Extension newsletters and upon his return there were news articles also. The participant leaving did cause some problems for the other Extension workers such as having to cover his program responsibilities or a lessening of the program occurring. Both cause an additional strain and sometimes an imposition on others. Overall, it was felt that “the difficulty is in breaking the normal chain of how things are done.” There did appear to be a slight amount of resentment among county agents. It was felt that this may have stemmed from less support that they would have received in the field and that they have few chances for such international project participation.

**Organizational Impact**

Based upon the participant’s subsequent presentations and interactions with others, the organization as a whole (particularly within the two regional research and extension centers) was made aware that people in Poland are much more globally aware than United States’ citizens, and they tend to know much more of their own history. A large number of the participant’s coworkers learned of the Polish customs, etc. through the participant and the information he brought back. At least one coworker became interested in and pursued an international project. His wife was also involved on a lesser level with informing others of their experiences.

On the county level, there was some resentment towards the international program because it was not open to county agents. These international projects should be open to county agents. This would help to educate more people and would enrich the county Extension’s educational work. It would provide international awareness and understanding along with a tremendous professional development opportunity. It would also allow for a much larger pool of people to pick from to go on international assignments. Some citizenry think that to have county agents involved in the international programs would be detrimental because of the extended period of time they would be gone from their job.

**Personal, Family and Community Impact**

The participant felt that he had benefited immensely, both personally and professionally, from his experience in Poland. His coworkers felt he has taken on new challenges since his return. He also has a different perspective on how he approaches his job. His working environment in Poland was very similar to Site #6 but the technology was less advanced. This difference was not major and was simply worked around.

In the past, the participant has had other international experiences. He lived and worked in Africa for six years. He also was involved with a farmer-to-farmer exchange program in both Kurkistan and Nigeria. These different opportunities have led him to have a deep respect for other countries and their ways of life. He feels these international programs will lead to improved trade, and he was "extremely happy" he participated in the Poland Project. Since his return from the PAEP, he has taken on more leadership roles on a statewide and national basis with programs such
as Federal Crop Insurance, the American Society of Farm Managers and Rural Appraisers, and a Risk Management Program in eight states.

The participant's wife stayed in Poland through all but two weeks of the program. She felt that she benefited from this experience and learned a lot about Poland. She enjoyed the small village and the freedom it gave her. The people were very hospitable and she made friends easily.

Overall, in the community there was an increased awareness of international issues and some involvement by farmers and ranchers. The extent of community impact was not as great as some other sites because of the urban location. In many cities it is more commonplace to have people on international assignments as compared to more rural areas. This may be a factor in the extent of subsequent secondary involvement.

Future Projects

From the comments among everyone involved with the Polish-American Extension Project, it was clear that the international program was a success. There are some points, though, that could be improved upon for future international extension projects.

First, there needs to be incentives for faculty to become involved with these types of Extension programs. From an increase in salary, to a career elevation, to statewide recognition and support, something should be given for faculty participation. This also addresses the problem with inadequate inclusion of staff. With the implementation of incentives, other staff may be more supportive and keep communication lines open for better learning opportunities all the way around.

These types of international projects should be open and advertised to county agents. This would help to educate more people, and it would enrich the county Extension's educational work. It would provide international awareness and understanding for dealing with clientele along with a tremendous professional development opportunity. For the organization, this results in reinvigorated and motivated staff who develop a strong commitment toward Cooperative Extension.

There needs to be more time to plan for these types of trips for the office and coworkers as well as the participating agent. With adequate planning it is easier to foresee any concerns or problems that may arise. Also, during this lead-time the participant and their family members need to become familiar with the language. A basic understanding would help to expedite interaction and learning with the other country, in this case Poland.

Lastly, some felt that six months is not long enough to make an impact on the country. Either longer programs need to be looked into or with increased lead-time more work could be done ahead of time so the on-site work could be more intense and focused.
This state was randomly selected as one of the eight state sites where interviews would be conducted as part of the Overseas Technical Cooperation Impact Study. There were six participants from this state in the Polish/American Extension Project, three females and three males. Five were county based Extension professionals and one was university based. Program areas represented were family and consumer sciences, community development, agriculture, and agricultural economics. Since the time of their participation in the project, three of the persons have retired. Two sites were chosen for interviews, the county where the female home economist works and the university, where one agricultural economist, who now also works at the regional level, is located. The agricultural economist had served two six month assignments in Poland early in the project and the home economist served one six month assignment toward the end of the project. A total of 12 interviews were conducted in this state. Interviewees were the two American participants, the Dean and Director of Cooperative Extension, the Associate Dean and Director of International Programs, a regional supervisor, a county Extension director, two co-workers, one support staff, two family members and one community representative.

Organizational Context

The university in this state has a long history of international involvement in technical programs, training and workshops, institutional building, and undergraduate and graduate training for internationals. It is located in an international community and is close to many agencies and private sector organizations involved in international activities and the administration views this as an advantage for them. There is an international office within the College of Agriculture and a Dean for International Programs, as well as other international offices on campus. International is part of the mission statement, and the college and the university have internationalized the curriculum and activities and are introducing new international courses. International is woven into the strategic plan as part of research, teaching and service. Until recently, participation in international programs previously was predominately faculty, but the administration says they have tried to increase the amount of involvement of field staff within Extension and want to continue to encourage them to participate. However, given the large number of Extension field staff, few have had the opportunity to do international to the same extent as campus based faculty have. Administration believe it is sometimes more difficult to recruit Extension field staff because they don’t have the linkages with overseas counterparts. Lack of funding was one reason given for not encouraging more international involvement of Extension field staff. One administrator noted that, like other Extension organizations, this Extension organization has also undergone downsizing and budget cuts in recent years and administration must consider how to cover ongoing activities and initiatives for these kinds of leaves.

Organizational Support

Support for international involvement of Extension field staff is described as supportive but not encouraging. Little has been done in the past to encourage field faculty, but administration feels they need to do more. International opportunities are now announced using the electronic mail system which goes to all counties. Participation is self-initiated, but the regional director doesn’t know of anyone being turned down who has requested an assignment. The home economist received the announcement about the Polish/American Extension Project from her regional director who knew of her interest in international and supported her participation. Support for faculty is viewed as more encouraging. Initially the supervisor of the agricultural economist, who had just assumed the role as department head, was very negative, but became supportive after communicating with the participant while he was on assignment. No back-fill was hired to fill the faculty vacancy, even though the participant served two assignments. The supervisor noted he was not aware that there had been a salary savings and didn’t know enough to ask at the time. A person was hired as a back-fill for the county position. This was a local person, familiar with the county 4-H program, and both staff and clientele seemed very satisfied with her work.
Participation in the project was viewed as professional development and as a benefit more to the individual than to the organization, although benefits were noted to the university from faculty participation. Neither participant believed it was considered as part of annual performance reviews.

Communication was informal. Supervisors and regional directors had no expectation of regular communication from the participants. The county Extension professional usually initiated communication to the local office and clientele through FAX and letters and occasional e-mail. The county agent sent regular reports to the regional director, who shared information about the assignment with other home economists in the state. She had communicated to her clientele about her assignment before leaving and clientele were supportive of and kept informed about her assignment through letters. The agent’s spouse, who had stayed behind, also served as a communication link between the participant and the local office and community. The agricultural economist’s participation was less noticeable in the university community where international involvement was more common.

Organizational Impact

The university based Extension professional’s participation had significant impact on the organization. He returned to his position and motivated several of his colleagues to become interested in and participate in international assignments. He has done several additional international assignments, bringing recognition to the university and the Extension organization. This was the first time a family and consumer science agent was involved in an international assignment. Her regional director made sure her assignment was announced in the organization’s newsletter. Staff and clientele were interested in learning about her assignment during her assignment and when she returned she was asked to do many presentations. She noted she was told by the organization she could do presentations if they were requested, but not to announce that she would like to do them. Yet the community representative interviewed said she thought it was important for Extension to pass the information onto the clientele, that they need to get something out of Extension’s involvement. The family and consumer science agent created a short term opportunity to return to Poland and take another family and consumer science agent with her. Although several Extension agents initially expressed interest in an international assignment, when the opportunity was created, no one chose to participate. This was a disappointment for her.

Personal, Family and Community Impact

Both participants described their participation as having great significance in their life. Their interest in international activities has increased and both have had additional international experiences since their assignment in the project. The first agent said the experience boosted his career. He noted, “I now “do more workshops, ... do them better..., and more people want them”. He has used several of the programs he developed in Poland in his work at home. The other agent described her self concept as being raised and being more self confident. She noted people at home regard her as a resource for international issues and she feels freer to speak up for herself.

Both of the participants were married, but neither spouse accompanied them on their assignment. The spouse of one agent did visit for six days. Both spouses described it as a lonely time in their life. It was also a very stressful time for the spouse with young children. Family members of the second agent joined him in Poland when he stayed on for a second assignment. Participation in the project brought this family closer together. Since their participation they have become more flexible in family routines. The spouse noted she has developed empathy for both single parents raising children and immigrants living in America.

Both families learned about Poland, its people and the Extension program there. One of the children attended Polish school and learned to speak Polish. Both participants and one of the spouses still communicate with Polish friends. The agricultural economist has been very influential
in motivating colleagues to pursue international activities. Clientele learned about Poland and the project through over 30 presentations given by the family and consumer science agent.
Future Projects

Both participants and family members described the overall experience as very positive. However, the spouse with young children talked about the amount of preparation that had to be done for the family to travel to Poland and having to pull all the money from savings to be able to bring family members together for the second assignment. Because she chose to stay in the community with the children, she felt more isolated from project activities than other spouses who often became involved. These issues which affect the outcomes of participation should be addressed in future projects. When families remained at home this was a source of stress to the participant and family members. Spouses who traveled to Poland often made important contributions to the project. Spouses and children were also a valuable link to becoming involved in community life.

One supervisor, who believed that there were many benefits to Extension involvement in international activities, would like to see more opportunities identified for agents, including the areas of family living and 4-H. She feels these persons have much to contribute, but believes they often cannot commit to a six-month assignment. Another supervisor, who had personal experience in a short term assignment, also believed more persons would be willing to become involved internationally if there were more short term opportunities. However, for the amount of money that is invested in overseas projects, to accomplish the results, he feels it is necessary for participants to be able to commit to a long term assignment. He contributes part of the success of the Polish/American Extension Project to the fact that agents were there for six months.

A backfill was hired to fill the county based participant’s position. This was a person from a 4-H family in the county already familiar with Extension. Everyone seemed satisfied with her ability to maintain the current program and clientele were pleased that the county program continued. No one was hired to fill the position of the university based participant. This participant initially received negative reactions toward his participation from his supervisor, concerned about who would do his work, and from farmers worried about loss of program support. His supervisor noted he was new at that time and he did not realize there were salary savings to hire a backfill. Continuing financial support for hiring of backfills, providing more lead time to hire qualified persons and allowing time for them to transition into the assignment could eliminate negative attitudes toward Extension participation in these developmental assistance programs and maintain the program at home.
Site #5

This state was randomly selected as one of the eight state sites where interviews would be conducted as part of the Overseas Technical Cooperation Impact Study. There was one participant from this state who served one six month assignment as an advisor for the Polish/American Extension Project, although other Extension staff from this state held administrative or specialist roles in the project. The participant was a county based agricultural economist. He was married, but his family did not accompany him for the entire assignment. They joined him in Poland for the last three weeks of his assignment. Nine interviews were conducted at this state site. These included the American participant, the Dean and Director of Cooperative Extension, the Associate Dean and Director of International Programs, a regional supervisor, one co-worker, two support staff, one community member and the participant’s spouse.

Organizational Context

This university’s history of involvement in international activities had been mainly in technical assistance and more recently some training programs. Participants were usually administrators and sometimes specialists and Extension personnel, but not usually performing in an Extension function. Shortly before the Polish/American Extension Project began, administration in the college changed. One administrator noted a decision was made around that time that the university would adopt the concept of mutual benefit and become involved in programs where the college learns as well as gives, in an effort to reduce resentment held by some students and faculty members, clientele, alumni and stakeholders toward the former aid approach, who perceived only the developing country benefited. The Polish/American Extension Project was the first project that was specifically an Extension project.

Support for international education was perceived as mostly verbal and the participant was not aware that it was part of the mission statement. One administrator stated globalization is used in the mission statement and strategic plan for the college, while a second administrator noted he was unsure about Extension. Although Extension was not thought of as a separate unit and perceived to be fairly well integrated, it appeared to be treated separately in conversation about international participation. The reason given was that it was so large.

Organizational Support

Participation in the Polish/American Extension project was viewed positively by administration as an educational experience that was beneficial to the individuals as well as to the university. No policies exist for involvement in international activities. One administrator noted participants are usually the better performing staff and faculty, but there is lots of discussion that takes place. A second administrator described the attitude within Extension as not negative but not really encouraging by going out and trying to talk people into doing international activities. How participation in international is treated varies with individuals. Opinions differed as to how this county agent’s participation was treated, but there was no interruption of benefits.

The participant found out about the Polish/American Extension Project through an announcement sent from the international office over e-mail. He responded to the message and was given permission to go. No one was hired as a back-fill. The workload was picked up by a second agent in that county. One administrator believed salary savings stayed within the unit that generated the savings, in this case the agricultural field Extension unit.

Although persons are to be evaluated on the basis of their assignment, this agent’s participation in the project was not included in his annual performance review. An administrator commented that this has not always consistent when international activity is involved. He contributed this to lack of understanding among peers of really knowing what is involved in international activity more than to lack of appreciation from administration for international work.
No one person was designated to be the contact person for the project at the university level or within Extension. Communication to the local and state Extension unit during the assignment was initiated by the participant and limited to monthly reports to the regional supervisor and FAX messages and news articles to the local unit. The local office occasionally sent requested program materials.

Organizational Impact

Overall, participation in the project was viewed as positive and persons within the organization commented that the participant made many presentations to community groups and organizations upon his return. This served to increase the visibility of Extension in the community as well as increase awareness and acceptance of Extension’s role in international developmental assistance programs. Administrators also contributed some faculty exchanges, trade with Poland, and the accumulation of a grant for a sustainable agriculture program to participation of other faculty in the project. However, comments made by administration, supervisor, and coworkers show that participation in international is still viewed more as a benefit to the individual than to the organization. It is considered as a perk for better performing individuals. The participant believes it is important for others in Extension to become more knowledgeable about international activities and to learn about the benefits of international involvement. He noted that he wanted to share his experiences with others in the organization, and had hinted several times to his supervisor about his interest and willingness to do this, but had never been asked. His supervisor described participation as positively benefiting the individual and saw less benefit to the organization. Yet, when asked about the importance of university involvement in international, this same supervisor commented that these experiences would be good if agents could apply what they learned back in the county or region.

Personal, Family and Community Impact

The participant described his experience as educational and one of the greatest challenges of his career. He feels he is a much better agent because of his experience. His confidence in speaking about international marketing has improved and his communication skills have been sharpened. His interest in international has increased and he and his spouse would like to participate in another international assignment in the future.

Although his family was unable to accompany him for the assignment, they visited him for four weeks. They described the time apart as difficult, but felt the experience strengthened them and made them closer than they were before. Family members grew in appreciation of the Polish people and for the American lifestyle. They became more positive in their attitude toward United States involvement in international assistance programs.

Coworkers and people in the community were generally positive about the agent’s participation. There was a tremendous demand from the community for the participant to share his experiences upon his return. Persons who attended these presentations learned about Poland, the goals of the project and Extension’s role in international activities. The participant was even successful in linking Rotary Clubs in both countries, but this linkage eventually broke down because of not knowing how to communicate successfully with each other.

Future Projects

Administration was pleased with the handling of the Polish/American Extension Project by USDA and described it as excellent. However they believed there would have been more impact on campus if the university had done more than just supply persons to participate. A suggestion was made to explore ways universities could be more partners in the project. An administrator noted that maybe having a person at the university level designated to assume leadership for the project would have helped.

No one was hired as a back-fill to assume the agent’s responsibilities while he was gone. The supervisor and coworker commented they didn’t know it was a possibility. It was noted that
the participant made many preparations in anticipation of his absence and people willingly pitched in to maintain the program in the county. However, the coworker who assumed the agent’s responsibilities while he was gone described it as a major strain for him. This individual expressed some negativeness toward United States involvement in developmental assistance programs and the effectiveness of county agent participation. A community member also noted there were times when it wasn’t easy for the people who had to fill in and do the extra work, because meetings would stack up and have to be rescheduled. Still, this person believed this was a good experience for the participant, Extension and the community. He suggested more agents be made aware of the opportunity and that moneys be provided to hire back-fills for the length of the assignment plus some extra time for training and wrap up. Providing moneys to hire back-fills and using those moneys to fill positions vacated by Extension staff will help prevent the formation of negative attitudes among coworkers and keep the Extension program going at the local level.
Site #6

Site #6 was one of eight states randomly selected to participate in the Polish American Extension Project (PAEP) follow-up study. There was one PAEP participating agent, and he was a single male County Extension employee. He spent six months in Poland as an Agricultural Generalist.

Among those interviewed were twelve individuals in the following positions: the State Director of Extension, a state 4-H Youth Specialist, the Director for University International Programs, the Immediate Supervisor, one Coworker (neighboring County Extension Director), two Support Staff (one current and one former), five Community Representatives (three farmers, an Extension Advisory Committee member, and a county commissioner), one Family Member, and the Participant himself. Most of the interviews were held face-to-face but four were conducted by phone.

Organizational Context

In the past, Site #6 has had little involvement with international extension programs and there has been virtually no leadership in this area until the recent development of an international committee. International involvement had occurred to some extent among state faculty, but very little involvement had ever occurred within Extension.

The current Director of Extension had set up an International Committee to provide overall direction and focus to international involvement (including extension), and some positive leadership was beginning to emerge. But, at the time of the interview she had just accepted another position and would be moving to another university. As a result, it was not known what would come of this international committee and its further development. Currently, the committee is concerned with what it is that the people need locally and what steps can be taken to internationalize Extension programs.

There appeared to be some negative issues and difficulties between the participant and some Extension administrators at the time of the participant’s departure to Poland. Because of this, some people wondered if the trip was used by administration to “temporarily remove someone by administration.” The participant felt this negativity, and this tension in their professional life appeared to have affected their overall experience with the PAEP in a negative fashion – especially in regards to organizational support before, during and after the assignment.

Organizational Support

The participant perceived little support for his assignment from his immediate supervisors and director because of the negative administrative situation. The community, however, seemed to be supportive for the most part and many were indifferent to the whole process at the time of participation. The community representatives who were interviewed stated that they supported the agent’s involvement and felt that it was worthwhile to the participant with some resultant effect to extension and the local community.

There was a limited level of internal jealousy about the participant’s assignment among some coworkers. Also, redistributing the workload within the office became an issue. The County Extension Director from a neighboring county helped out on a regular basis with questions, etc. that arose while the participant was gone. This CED was paid a small stipend during this time, and this served to improve his willingness to help. He also stated that he truly appreciated that he was asked to provide this help. It provided an opportunity for him to grow personally and professionally. The feeling from many interviewees is that there could be problems and difficulties with temporarily filling a position like this from salary savings money due to the extreme ruralness of Site #6.
Communication did occur between the participant with Site #6 during the assignment. There were articles in the Extension newsletters as well as many messages through an informal grapevine. The participant did make telephone calls and send facsimile messages to coworkers, friends, and relatives. The office sent numerous fax messages on clientele questions and administrative issues and the participant responded to these.

Upon his return home there was no formal recognition from the state level which the participant would have appreciated. Locally, there were slide shows and discussions at meetings of his experiences, and these served to provide some personal satisfaction.

When the participant returned to Site #6 his reentry to the work place was somewhat difficult. As compared to the temporary office management during the PAEP, the participant brought with him a sense of less stringent organization and a more relaxed manner in dealing with deadlines and newly established policies that were established during his absence. This served to cause some internal conflict. Some coworkers felt that the office ran smoothly with the temporary office management, and to them it was somewhat calmer because of the lessened tension.

An office assistant felt that she was able to gain greater responsibility and self-confidence while the PAEP participant was gone since she was responsible for day-to-day decisions. The participant’s return as a CED brought back some previous ways of doing business and running the office that some people had worked to change. The Program Assistant left Extension within a short time of the participant’s return.

Organizational Impact

The overall impact on the Extension staff was a better understanding and awareness of Polish agriculture and customs. The program helped to increase Extension's global education and many feel that the global communication needs to continue. There were no significant changes in the programs; rather there was a sense of commitment to international outreach but not much action. Further programs would have to be self initiated and approved among those in extension. County staff had had few international opportunities outside of those that they went after on their own.

People working with the participant upon his return felt his experiences in Poland made him more active in international projects, helped him to talk to more people than before, and overall helped his work. People felt that had the participant had a better relationship with his superiors there may have been a more direct impact on the Extension office and its employees.

Personal, Family, and Community Impact

The trip had significance to the participant and he was "thankful for the opportunity for the experience." He had a better appreciation for global complexities, and it improved his listening skills. While in Poland he dealt with limited resources, the language difference and the technological limits. He had good contact with his Polish colleagues and he felt that many of the problems in the Extension office stemmed from low wages and a lack of resources.

Subsequent to the PAEP, the participant had a Hungarian student come and spend a summer through an exchange program with the university. Another woman and her son also came from Poland from connections made during the PAEP to visit the participant and experience life in the United States.

The son of the participant did visit him in Poland while on assignment for three weeks. He felt his father's transition to Poland and then back to Site #6 went fairly smooth. He also feels that his father now has an interest in international work. The son has a much great appreciation for international issues and involvement. This had also sparked an interest in him to pursue international work.
The attitude of the community was good, but there was no big reaction when the participant returned from Poland, and this was a partial let-down to the participant. The participant's immediate supervisor reacted with indifference and gave negative feedback on his employer's experience in Poland. The experience was not considered in the participant's subsequent performance appraisal, and this, too, was negative for the participant.

Future Projects:

There were three main concerns with the PAEP experience, and these may help to develop and conduct future projects. The first concern dealt with the participation of the individuals. The selection was given with very short notice, and it was for highly specialized people that most Extension offices in this state could not provide.

A couple of interviewees voiced a second concern. They felt that the projects should be longer than six months to have an impact on the home site as well as on the place being visited. For new international programs to be developed more time is needed in order to achieve lasting impact. This would then make it imperative to have someone take over the position of the participant until his or her return.

The last concern was that the participants should have more opportunities to learn the new culture and language prior to leaving on an international assignment. This would serve to improve collegiality among the participant and those in the other country, and it would help the participant become adjusted to another country in a quicker fashion.

This state had done little to include extension professionals in international projects. The state director of extension knew of this need and was trying to implement steps to correct this through the international committee that she developed. She had hoped that this would still continue after she left her position.
Three counties were chosen within Site #7 to serve as hosts for the site visits. In these settings, the participating agents varied in age, experience and areas of expertise but all three were males. In two settings, the participating agents spent one six-month assignment in Poland, and in one setting the agent spent two six-month assignments in Poland. In all cases, spouses accompanied the agent and in two cases, children also accompanied their parents. In these three counties, associates, office support staff, spouses and even clientele were interviewed. The Dean, Director of Extension, Associate Director of Extension and two Regional Directors were interviewed at the state level. In total, 22 interviews were conducted in Site #7 to serve as the data source for this summary.

Organizational Context

From all reports, Site #7 has had a long and serious commitment to international programming. This commitment is perhaps strongest in the faculty and research ranks but has always included extension personnel. One faculty member mentioned that an international dimension is expected among research faculty. In fact, there is evidence that current leaders expect parity across the land grant university mission, and anticipate that because of the nature of international issues, that extension will play an even larger role in international programming in the future. This commitment is evident in the very large number of staff from Site #7 who participated in the Polish-American Extension Project. Site #7 sent 16 staff to the project, the largest number of any one state! The next largest number sent from any one state was eight persons.

Site #7’s role in international programming is visible and well known. The importance of international programming is articulated by the President, University-wide, and is mirrored within the College and Extension with statements in strategic plans. Both the importance of being an actor in international development and in serving the global education needs of students and residents are articulated. Although no formal written policies govern the conditions under which international programming should be pursued in Extension, there seems to be general agreement across all ranks of personnel that international opportunities are taken seriously and supported proactively. Top administrators noted the balance that must be achieved in serving local and state needs versus international needs. They felt that local stakeholders support international programming when the process of managing assignments is handled well (meaning that coverage is secure and articulated and the rationale for participation is clearly communicated). Although an international dimension is recognized as clearly within the mission of Extension, other elements needed to operationalize this vision are lacking. Administrators noted that domestic programming is weak in this area and that the organizational structure and leadership to provide impetus to this area is not yet in place.

At both the state and local levels, staffs were aware of previous Extension personnel who had traveled abroad and worked with international projects.

Organizational Support

There appears to be a proud history of international involvement’s in Extension and a supportive climate for international programs. All staff, even office support personnel articulated the belief that if a person were offered the opportunity to work internationally, that everyone in the office/organization would pitch-in to support their absence. Offices were proud that they were involved. Agents took the opportunity to work abroad as a natural part of their professional work. One agent noted, “There seems to be a ‘I can do attitude’—we can contribute, we can leave and things will continue. It’s all part of the job.” Repeatedly, interviewees reported the proactive nature in which people were approached to consider an assignment. Administrators, peers and past participants all encouraged others to participate. Although all participants noted the strong support that they received from the Extension administration, there was some sensitivity to the possibility
that the process was not as open as it could have been. Some felt that individuals were “hand-
picked” to consider these Polish assignments.

Generally offices felt that it was easy, although not painless, to manage in the absence of
an agent and to accommodate to their reentry. Coverage while agents participated in the Polish
Project was considered essential. All positions were covered. The methods of coverage varied and
often included more than one arrangement. Methods included staff from adjacent counties
handling calls, new personnel being hired on a temporary basis or existing staff taking on new
roles. When these arrangements worked well, generally attitudes about international assignments
were very positive. But even in the one or two situations the back-fill arrangement was less
than ideal, the attitudes toward the international opportunity were still positive. Staff felt that the
participating agent had the right to leave. It was a privilege to be asked and an organizational
obligation to try to make it happen! On the other hand, change in staff roles and coverage
arrangements are an on-going process in Extension, not just associated with international
assignments. Thus offices were accustomed to disruptions and took these changes in-stride.

Communication between the agent in Poland and the local office and organization was not
planned nor managed. Most administrators admitted that there could have been a more systematic
way to communicate and encourage communications. However, patterns of communication
emerged on their own and seemed to have been satisfying. Most frequently the agent in Poland
would request information or resources which the local office and staff were very willing to
provide. In a few instances, the local office initiated a request to the person on assignment in
Poland, but these occasions were rare. The most regular form of communication came from the
state-level, where announcements and internal communications tools were collected and shared
with all participating agents. Periodic communications initiated by the participating agent in the
form of letters, newsletter material or even taped radio-interviews were very well received and
provided a way for local staff and clientele to participate vicariously with their participating agent
in the international experience. These descriptive communications were often printed in the local
papers or in Extension newsletters and created wide-spread visibility for the international
dimension in Extension. Local residents often called the office to inquire about more recent
updates, and people new to extension were attracted to interact with Extension because of these
“windows into Polish life.” Upon return, these agents were inundated with well wishes and
invitations to speak to groups, as the whole community was involved and aware of their work.

At the time of departure, most often the participating agent, himself informed local leaders
and Extension clientele of his plans to be absent. Generally the entire Extension structure was
open with local clientele about plans and procedures. But there did not seem to be any systematic
policy or procedure involved concerning visibility. In hindsight, it appears that Extension took a
low-key approach, informing those whom needed to know in advance and letting others know in
the course of the routine business of programming and working with the community. In those
cases where the participating agent took a more active role in making announcements or sharing
communications, a broader cross-section of the public became aware of the international
assignment and thus had the opportunity to learn from that experience. Within Extension, likewise
communications were unplanned and ad hoc. Most staff mentioned hearing about who had taken
international assignments from their professional association, not the organization. Regional
Directors seemed to be key persons in disseminating information and creating excitement about
international involvements.

Organizational Impact

Unanimously, from participants to administrators to co-workers, participating in the
Polish-American Project was viewed as positive and beneficial. Everyone felt that participation had
a positive effect on those involved and on the organization as a whole. On a personal level, the
experience was viewed as professionally rewarding and growth enhancing. On the organizational
level, participation offered an element of pride that the organization could send so many qualified
individuals and that their work could contribute positively to developments in another country.
There was also a feeling that individuals were valued for their skills and expertise—both those that
left and those who remained were reinforced for their ability to be flexible and to contribute.
Although it was difficult to ascertain whether or not attitudes had changed as a result of this experience, there definitely seemed to be a broad sense of acceptance of Extension’s ability to contribute internationally. This may be due to the large numbers of staff involved that contribution was not linked with a unique person, but rather with the broad training and expertise of extension personnel in general.
One of the most evident benefits to extension was the increased awareness at the community level of Extension’s mission and work. Until these interviews were conducted, even state administrators were not aware of the unique public relations aspects of this project. It may be because of Poland’s historic significance as a reluctant member and early resister within the Soviet fold, or the broad-based Eastern European ethnicity of the population base in Site #7. But for whatever reason, local residents resonated with the fact that American Extension Agents were working to improve social and economic conditions in Poland. In addition to the slides and stories related by returned agents, a number of Polish groups and guests visited local communities or vice versa. Local staffs relate that learning about Poland and hosting Polish guests has increased local receptivity to international issues and involvements. Greater numbers of families are coming forward to host international youth. Local groups and professionals are more willing to become involved with international guests. Local professionals whose work involves international travel or communications are now looking to Extension for networking support and information about international issues. Entire communities are becoming more globally informed and competent because of these involvements!

One of the benefits identified with the Polish-American Extension Project across the U.S. has been the vast number of linkages and secondary involvements among American and Polish people that were established or assisted by Extension agents while in Poland. In these three instances in Site #7, a few concrete linkages could be identified that were associated with the staff member targeted for the interviews. A larger number of exchanges and visits have transpired since the end of the project, but many of these contacts occurred because of neighboring Extension staff contacts.

In one county an economic transaction was anticipated between a local manufacturer and a Polish group, but the deal collapsed after one or two visits. A more lasting linkage occurred between a school district and a polish youth that came to live with an agent’s family for a school year. This contact created a great deal of interest among families and teachers at the school. A third linkage involved a national youth exchange program. The Site #7 agent put the American administrator of the program in contact with interested Polish partners. In this same county, the Home Economists became involved in hosting Polish Home Economists and later traveled to Poland with a group of peers to provide support to Home Economics programs in Poland. All of these linkages brought a larger group of Americans into contact with international peoples and interests.

Personal, Family and Community Impacts

As noted earlier, all participating agents felt that the experience of living and working in Poland was useful, impactful and beneficial. Some of the benefits reported include changed perspectives about the importance of Extension in social and economic development, realizations of the vast differences between the Soviet and U.S. economic model, increased knowledge of and appreciation of the history of Poland, greater respect for the people of Poland, validation of basic extension methods as being useful regardless of the cultural setting, and enhanced sensitivities to people and listening to peoples’ perspectives. Many agents reported a change in how they approached their Extension role upon return. Some changed there emphases, dropped some programs and gave priority to other programs, or even recognized the ‘big picture’ as being the goal rather than the many details that take one’s attention.

One agent remarked on how he now questions his assumptions. Previously, because of his long-standing experience in the County, he felt he knew instinctively what people needed and wanted from Extension. But after working in a foreign setting where one needed to listen and search out opinions, he realized that he needed to give people a chance to speak for themselves, even here in Site #7! One Regional Director noted that an international assignment is the best sensitivity training that Extension could offer!

Spouses, too, shared very positive reflections on their stay in Poland. However families had difficulties with language barriers and becoming socially integrated into the community that placed greater stress on spouses and children than on the agents. Children, however, seemed to be
catalysts in drawing families into the community. Both school and church contacts provided an expanded entry into the community and Polish lifestyles. The chores of daily living—grocery shopping, laundry, securing health services, etc. was much more time consuming and unpredictable than spouses anticipated. Most enjoyed these challenges, but they also noted that with some additional support, they could have had even richer experiences. Both financial stress and isolation due to language differences created undue burdens on families. One family spent considerable energy in learning the language. All the children and adults became relatively fluent which as very rewarding to them and aided immensely in helping them learn from their surroundings. All three families were very glad that the entire family participated; separating the family for that length of time would have been very stressful and the growing and learning that resulted brought families closer together.

The stories of how families were favored by the Polish people and how interested American audiences were about the exploits of children, wives and families may mean that families can play an important role in overseas projects. Spouses and children not only support the agent’s work in country but also provide different perspectives and possibilities for linkages for the people back home.

Future Projects

From all accounts, the Polish-American Project was viewed as very successful. It had a number of important structural elements that proved to be very useful in garnering local (U.S.) community participation, a secondary, but important impact of the project. For instance, spouse and family participation drew attention to issues of lifestyles and cultural adjustments, critical global competencies. Interaction between agents and their home communities during the assignment attracted widespread attention to Extension and to International Programming.

From an organizational perspective, the broad nature of the work in Poland, often self directed, capitalized on the broad skills and interests of agents. Finding that they had skills, often outside their areas of assignment, and competencies even though they were being applied in another culture was reinforcing and useful to agents. The multi-faceted nature of Extension and its work creates opportunities for generalist, an often under-represented role in international development. The short term assignments were reasonable lengths of time, allowing counties to make adjustment without long term negative consequences, allowing agents and families the chance to try-out new lifestyles without sacrificing too much of their family plans and dreams, and providing a sufficient opportunity to contribute to the programming in Poland.

The Polish-American Extension Project drew personnel from across the U.S. This model was noted as being very useful to the participants and the host country. Extension was viewed as having common elements and staff with common skills across the U.S. The interaction among the Americans was very rewarding—helping to create a sense of community within Extension. It also was a very good role model for Poland, illustrating that collaboration across units can be useful. USDA serving as the facilitator was viewed as appropriate so long as they involved the CES system throughout the planning, execution and follow-up stages.

The experiences of these three families suggest that the role and support given to spouses within the project should be reviewed. Increased financial support, occasional access to translators and greater assistance in integrating into the community are all services that would enrich the experience for families and ultimately the benefits to the U.S.

The benefits to the organization and community of paying greater attention to issues of visibility and communications emerged during these site visits. Only in hindsight did agents and peers realize the potential public relations value of these experiences. Systematizing or providing greater attention to these issues during orientation may increase the value of these interactions across cultures. Likewise, staff who remained at the home office requested some time during orientation to help them predict what might occur and become more attuned to the importance of communications.
This state was randomly selected as one of the eight state sites where interviews were conducted as part of the Overseas Technical Cooperation Impact Study. There were three male participants from this state in the Polish/American Extension Project, two county based and one university based. All the participants had family members. At the time of the project two were married. Since that time the third participant has married. All the participants served one assignment, two early in the project and one in the middle of the project. One site chosen for interviews was at the county level and the second site was at the university level. A total of 15 persons were interviewed. Interviewees were two American participants, the present Associate Director for Cooperative Extension, a retired Associate Director for Cooperative Extension, who had been in this position when Extension was involved in the project, the Associate Dean and Director of International Agriculture Programs, the department chair of the College of Agriculture, three coworkers, two support staff, two family members, and two community representatives. During the interview process, it was learned that the two participants and administration interviewed did not know the third participant and were not aware of his involvement. It was concluded that this person must have represented another university in this state.

Organizational Context

Although the college has a long history of major activity in international program activities and has about 99% of all the funded international projects at this university, activity of Cooperative Extension was described as very limited since the seventies until recently. International involvement which included collaborative research projects and development activities had some Extension components and specialist participation, but generally no agent participation. County based Extension staff often hosted international visitors, but the county agent’s participation in the Polish/American Extension Project was something new in this state. Two factors described as limiting previous Extension involvement in this state were the concern that the jobs of agents and specialists was at home and not somewhere else and the concern of commodities about helping others compete with farmers in the state. It is believed that this has changed in recent years as people become more educated about the global economy.

Organizational Support

The general attitude toward participation was positive and focused on the individuals selected and the timing of the assignment. However, the attitude toward staying for more than one six month assignment was negative. The university based Extension professional was identified by administration and given the opportunity to participate. This individual was influential in identifying the county based Extension professional who participated. Participation was viewed as a positive benefit professionally as well as positive to the organization as a whole, but more so for the university based Extension professional than the county based Extension professional. The university facilitated the paperwork involved and there was no interruption in benefits.

Neither position was back-filled and work was pro-rated among staff and specialists. The general attitude was that it would be nearly impossible to hire someone who could fit into the position for six months to a year. Salary savings did not go to the departments but were kept centrally in the Cooperative Extension System.

Since the time of the Polish/American Extension Project, there has been increased receptivity to participation in international activities. Much of this activity is taking place at the university level. It was noted that announcements of international opportunities are now sent to Extension staff by e-mail. Participation is self-initiated and usually supported, but not outwardly encouraged, especially in the case of county based Extension professionals. Generally it was perceived that first allegiance is to the work to be done at home and that participation in international interferes with accomplishing that.
While administration noted that commitment to international is in the university mission statement, they did not believe the actual wording was in the Extension mission statement. However, administration identified practices within Extension, including hosting of international groups, providing opportunities for interested people to participate, funding of the position Coordinator of International Programs for Extension, and a leadership development training program that includes an international component, that contribute to integrating an international dimension to the program. A negative factor that has influenced Extension’s interest in international was the significant downsizing and financial constraints experienced in recent years.

Organizational Impact

Overall impact on the organization was described as positive. Colleagues and coworkers attending seminars and presentations given by the participants became familiar with the situation in the former Soviet Bloc countries, international Extension work, and Poland and its culture. It was noted that several other faculty and staff have been motivated to develop interests and activities internationally. There have also been exchanges between students, professionals, and clientele groups between this state and Poland.

Other changes were described as being related to one of the individual’s participation in the project. The position of Director of International Programs for Extension has been created and funded by Extension. A yearly international exchange program, involving a cross section of administrators, faculty, community leaders, and farming organizations, has resulted in greater acceptance for Extension involvement in international activities.

Personal, Family and Community Impact

Both participants described their experience as life changing. For the county based Extension professional there was significant personal change, especially in his family life. He noted he and his wife are more conscious of their need to be together. Coworkers and family members described him as more flexible and more patient with himself and others. It took some time for this participant to adjust to his return home, saying he felt a lack of appreciation for his participation. However, both coworkers and community members viewed his participation positively, noting it broadened his perspective on international. The university based Extension professional returned home rejuvenated and highly motivated. He talked about the significant professional impact, and attributed his experience in the project as an important consideration in his promotion to professor and receiving new job responsibilities. His interest in international has increased and he has been described as a catalyst for change toward increased international involvement within his Extension organization.

Although family members did not live in Poland for the entire assignment, each of the participants had one of their children visit them for six weeks. These children developed respect for others and grew in independence. A second child from one family who remained at home during the assignment has since traveled to Poland twice, and lived there independently for three months on her second visit.

Family members who remained at home during the assignment described it as a lonely difficult time. Communication was usually limited to letters as attempts to communicate by phone were not always successful. Even though this time was stressful, family members noted they became more independent, they learned about Poland and its culture, and they became more knowledgeable about world affairs.

Both participants have shared their experiences several times with community groups and organizations. This was an opportunity for community members to learn more about Extension and Extension internationally. One community member described it as a benefit to the community to be able to learn about Poland and its culture and to become more understanding and compassionate for others needs.
The participants made attempts to develop linkages between Chambers of Commerce in the two countries which were not successful, but other linkages resulted in an invitation from this state to Poland offering to host a Polish team during the Olympics, information about business opportunities in the state distributed to companies in Poland and a million dollar contract for an American firm doing business with a company in Poland.

Future Projects

Back-fills were not hired to cover the program areas left vacant during the assignments. It was indicated that normal procedures are for other staff to assume the responsibilities. Coworkers and colleagues picking up these responsibilities described the situation as sometimes challenging and noted that some work just didn’t get done. At the county level, staff covering some program responsibilities talked about having may extra hours of work per week trying to maintain their own program and assume the additional responsibilities. A supervisor suggested salary savings be used to hire graduate students to pick up some of the work or purchase resources that could be used to supplement the person’s absence. Hiring qualified backfills at the county level would help to ensure that county programs would continue, reduce the risk of clientele and coworker dissatisfaction. Increasing participation of county staff in international activities would also be a way for Extension to bring US involvement in developmental assistance programs to the American public, increasing their understanding and acceptance of US participation.
Appendix I

IMPACT SUMMARIES FROM SURVEY
RESULTS OF SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE COMMENTS
CONCERNING IMPACT FOR PARTICIPANTS

Reactions
Enjoyable
Somewhat frustrating at first
Personal satisfaction with accomplishments
Professional asset
No help in career
Great personal experience
Career highlight
Fantastic opportunity
Extremely worthwhile
Very intense and mind broadening
Liberating
Highly valuable experience
Refreshed, reinvigorated

KOSA (Knowledge, Opportunities, Skills, Aspirations)
Understanding of government bankruptcy
Role of price in a market economy
Greater insight into problems in transition economies
Greater insight of foreign government’s influence on citizens/wealth
Greater understanding of life under Communist system
Changed knowledge of Europe and Poland
Greater understanding of Eastern Europe
Learned about the importance of international marketing and international trade
Learned about the importance of international side of adult education
Increased global awareness
Increased self-esteem
Increased self-confidence
Increased tolerance
Increased patience
Learned to adapt to new culture
Developed sensitivity to cultural intolerance
Developed programming skills
Improved skills in problem solving and working with others
Increased skills in writing curriculum and conducting training for adults
Great opportunity to work with professionals in other parts of the world
Opportunity to use language skills
Opportunity to share U.S. extension resources with others
An international experience is the only way to understand the world
Makes a more effective agent
Extension is an excellent tool for teaching democracy
Changed perspective of current job
Changed perspective of U.S. role in world
Changed perspective of what’s important in life
Changed views on family and work
Greater appreciation for family and community
Changed view of media in U.S.
Increased interest in doing international work
Increased interest in more international travel
Increased credibility from colleagues and clientele
Desire to encourage others to participate in international experience
Greater appreciation for America
Greater appreciation for U.S. Extension System
Greater appreciation for Polish people, people of another culture
Broadened outlook

Practices
Changed career/job responsibilities
Accepted slower pace
Changed personal life
Additional travel to Poland
Watch international and Polish news
New and continued correspondence between people in Poland and USA
Continued international assignments with Extension and other organizations
Involvement of others in Extension organization in international activities
Greater personal flexibility and creativity
Enrollment in graduate programs
Authored and published book on experiences
Presentations and publications on experience
Developed and taught six week course on experience
Course development on transition economics
Participation in People to People program
Developed curriculum for training adults in leadership development
Integration of experience into local extension work
Developed and conducted extension study tours
Educational exchanges conducted for adults and youth

Outcomes (SEEC)
Lifetime friendships
Personal relationships
Professional relationships
Expanded work networks
Growth of international dimension in Extension
Job promotion
Advanced degrees
TOP MODEL LEVELS OF IMPACT ON FAMILY MEMBERS

Reactions
Loved the experience
Disappointed about inability to get to grandmother’s birthplace in Poland
Mixed feelings about assignment
Great interest
Tough to be separated
Very stressed
Very positive learning experience
Why would you go?

KOSA (Knowledge, Opportunities, Skills, Aspirations)
Opportunity to work with spouse
Hastened divorce
Appreciation of experience of living in Poland and going to school there
Developed appreciation of opportunity to travel internationally
Increased knowledge of Poland and its culture
Increased knowledge of international work in Extension
Broadened perspective
Increased desire to travel
Developed knowledge of life under Communism
Increased knowledge of freedom in USA
Increased stress in family relationships
Developed stronger family
Increased independence of individual family members
Improved life skills of family members
Increased interest in being involved in additional international work
Increased self-confidence of children
Increased knowledge of global awareness
Developed international interests
Greater appreciation of comforts of USA
Increased stress in managing personal and financial affairs

Practices
Increased international travel of children
Developed educational linkage between school children in Poland and America

Outcomes
Stronger, more competent individuals and families
More globally aware citizens
TOP MODEL LEVELS OF PERCEIVED IMPACT ON CLIENTELE

Reactions
Interested
Wanted to know about experience
Pleased and proud
Supportive
Missed my advice

KOSA (Knowledge, Opportunities, Skills, Aspirations)
Greater understanding of foreign aid
Greater understanding of agriculture in developing countries
Increased awareness of global community
Developed global perspective
Increased respect and credibility for participant’s abilities
Learned about Poland and Eastern Europe and what it was like to change to a free market economy
Increased knowledge of Poland and culture
Increased awareness of global opportunities within Extension
Developed interest in 4-H, leadership, and youth exchange programs

Practices
Read articles about Polish/American Extension Project in newsletter and newspaper
Hosted Polish students for six months
Interactions with visiting Polish guests
Requested presentations about experience
Hosted visiting Polish Extension specialists
Donated money to Polish National 4-H Foundation
Persons interested in foreign travel discussed plans with participant
Went without services for six months
TOP MODEL LEVELS OF PERCEIVED IMPACT ON COLLEAGUES

Reactions
Uninterested
Interested
Envy
Jealousy and resentment
Excited for me
Supportive
Greater respect
Curious
Indifferent

KOSA (Knowledge, Opportunities, Skills, Aspirations)
Interest in taking international assignment
Learned what state and federal Extension were doing internationally first-hand
Increased interest in foreign affairs
Developed broader understanding of the Polish people and their problems
Increased knowledge of Eastern Europe
Learned what it was like to convert a centrally planned system to a free market economy
Gained experience in handling participant’s responsibilities at home
Better understanding of struggles of developing countries
Learned about the Polish/American Extension Project

Practices
Other persons explored international opportunities and took foreign assignments
Carried on programs at home
Correspondence with participant
Direct interaction with Polish people
Hosted visiting Polish agents
Participated in Extension study tour to Poland
Requested participant to do trainings, presentations, publications related to experience

Outcomes
Greater number of persons with international experience
Increased integration of international dimension into Extension program
Appendix J

IMPACT SUMMARIES FROM INTERVIEWS
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS DOCUMENTING REACTIONS FROM INTERVIEWS WITH AMERICAN EXTENSION PROFESSIONALS AND NEAR ASSOCIATES

Participant Reactions
Opportunity
Challenging
Motivating professionally
Resentment
Sometimes frustrating
Great Significance
It was hard work.
Career boosting.
Difficult for spouse left alone
Difficult on family.
Moderate significance
Moderate Significance - It was not a great life-turning event, but it was very rewarding.
Proud of accomplishments
It was life changing.
Six months is a long time.
Most significant.
Very good for the whole family
Very positive experience.
Everyone was encouraging.
Total life changes
It was an opportunity to do what I’ve always wanted to do

Administrator Reactions
Positive
I have heard that people are proud of what he did.
I’m so pleased about this Poland Project.

Supervisor Reactions
Viewed as enhancing by organization
Positive experience for individual
Chance to showcase US Extension
Significant
Positive experience
There was a small level of internal jealousy about his assignment.
You grow personally and professionally from it.
I have a sense of pride - these are people who need our help.”

Colleague Reactions
Major strain
I was thrilled for her

Coworker Reactions
There was an element of dread, not knowing what to expect with an agent being gone for that long.
A very worthwhile learning experience
The clientele probably received more information than we did here at the office. Of course, in my position in ag here in the county, we probably don’t interact as often as we should.
Everyone was pleased for her.
People thought it was a good idea.

Clientele Reactions
Pleased for participant and what results would be
At first we were a little bit worried about how we were going to operate without her. Very informative
I was very thrilled.
It made us very proud that he was a representative.
I do feel that it was a very positive experience for him.
I would say that on a scale of 1 to 10, 10 being positive, it was a 10 level.
It made participant more tolerant of people.
I was thrilled. It was the first international experience for anyone from our office.
We all thought it was OK.

Family Reactions
Communication was limited and expensive.
Personal communication was tough for me to do without.
It was lonely, but I did feel good about it. It was something she wanted to do. I think if I didn’t
go over it would have been a long, long time to be without her.
If I were a little younger I might be interested in doing it myself.
The only way I survived that six months was because of a greater power than me and I think back
to it now and I can’t imagine trying to repeat it.
When I found out he was leaving I was shocked, but once he got over there I would get a phone
call once a week. It seemed to go well. It’s a rare opportunity not everyone gets.
The communication was horrible.
It was something very important to him that he wanted to do, and I wasn’t going to stand in his
way.
This experience really impacted him positively.
It was a really big gap in my life.
Being apart was very saddening.
It is a long time of separation.
Although it wasn’t a new idea, it was still an adventure.
KOSA (Knowledge, Opportunities, Skills, and Aspirations) SUMMARY
Interviews With American Extension Professionals And Near Associates

Participant
Expanded understanding and knowledge of international trade, international diplomacy
Increased understanding of the U.S. Cooperative Extension System at the national level
Broadened professionally
Increased confidence to discuss agriculture on international level
Improved ability to speak concisely and to listen carefully and to communicate what I really mean
Developed flexibility
Developed cultural tolerance
Greater appreciation for wealth of USA
Greater appreciation for political democracy that we have in this country, the freedom to make choices and decisions
Less patience sometimes with farmers who gripe about everything
Family members developed responsibility, independence, and flexibility
Strengthened family ties
Family members developed appreciation for Polish people
Family members developed appreciation for America
Developed stronger appreciation for the importance of U.S. involvement in foreign assistance.
I can speak up better.
My self-concept is certainly raised.
Boosted most of my career.
It helped me to be more process oriented as I develop my Extension programs.
It helped me to develop systematic ways to develop programs. The assignment also broadened my knowledge in agriculture, management, business management. I developed skills in working with teams, teamwork.
Internally I feel much more secure when I talk about the international scene.
My participation boosted my career.
My skills have improved and I use these skills in my career. I learned to put together programs more quickly.
Really learned to be flexible and to think on your feet.
Changed attitude about America. I am concerned that we are not a good enough example, in the sense that we’re teaching them things that we very well know are not the right thing to do - TV programs, tobacco - I think we’re exporting things like that when we certainly could show a much better side of the United States.
Increased global understanding - I think I came to a surprising realization of how people can get brainwashed - that perfectly normal thinking people could be locked in a box because for a whole generation they had seen nothing other than what was there.
I think it did give me something that makes me freer to just speak up.
Increased knowledge about Poland and Polish people.
Spouse values time together more.
Spouse learned to run a household by self.
Brought family closer together.
Increased awareness of personal relationships and you feel its more important to try to develop the personal relationship.
Developed skills that you learn in trying to communicate with somebody who doesn’t speak your language which carry over to people who speak your language.
Developed world view - more open to problems that most of the world has, the economic problems.
Increased awareness of how much we have here in the United States.
Increased empathy to the problems that other countries have.
My attitude toward America has changed in that I realize we have got to become more internationally oriented and we have got to play our role in helping disadvantaged countries.
My family is much more open to the problems that people in other countries face, much more open to thinking about international issues and so forth.
More broad-minded about global issues than I would have been before, realizing how much we are all tied together. You really learn to be flexible and to think on your feet. My family is more independent because they were without me for five months. I guess I am a little more independent because I lived without my family for five months. Our family can get along without each other a little easier. Opportunity to see another country. I picked up some listening skills. I developed an appreciation for the global situation. I have a better appreciation for global complexities. Instilled some interest in others about international work would like to have that experience as well. I’m maybe a little more conscious of international issues. From previous international participation, he increased his awareness and understanding of how everything comes together, i.e. agriculture, markets, government, etc. globally. Increased confidence in designing and implementing educational curriculum. Gained a better understanding of the development process of educational programs - from needs assessment to develop to design to implementation to evaluation. Increased motivation in conducting programs. It provided a common bond for their family. improved his understanding of others. He is very respectful of other people and other cultures and ideas. Developed skills in coalition building in regards to starting from scratch with programs, and getting involvement from other sectors. I think we’re a lot more conscious of our need to be together. It completely change the direction of my professional life. It changed me as a person on some of the values I held. It made me appreciate the society that I came from, my home, you know, the United States, a lot more than I did before I experienced what it was elsewhere. It allowed me to become a thankful person for the good things that we have. I developed an appreciation for the Polish people. It gave me a new purpose, a new direction. I developed an awareness of some opportunities abroad. Developed personal relationships. Changed perspective about America’s role in world. We are still an arrogant country. Increased interest of colleagues to become involved in international. I was seen as a more complete person, not only by my department but by the college and the entire university committee. I’m current on world issues. I’m a lot more conscious of other perspectives. It was an opportunity for my son to grow. I think my son and I are more able to share. I think it has increased the respect he has of others. My family is certainly cognizant of the world and the fact that there is another segment outside of the United States. I learned to manage and take responsibility for taking care of myself. My wife and children did things here that I normally did, so their level of independence increased. There are people that had no experience and have gotten involved internationally because of my encouragement not only here, but at other campuses. My daughter increased her sensitivity to other people. She wasn’t quite as self-centered. She came back with a lot more of a feeling of thankfulness. I’m a more flexible person now. Daughter learned to be self dependent. I developed a perspective for what is important. It reaffirmed the importance of Extension for limited-resource families. It helped me to see myself in a new light. Changed perspective of United States. Broadened my horizons-world vision.
Improved work results.
Helped other learn about the world.
Better understanding of other cultures for self and family.
Increased flexibility.
Broadened view of Extension.
Learned new approaches to doing things.
Learned about former Soviet Bloc countries.
Learned about Poland’s history and the economic transitions it faced.
Developed sensitivity toward people.
Developed appreciation for own assumptions and views on life.
Learned about Poland and its history.

Administrators
Developed better understanding of different parts of the world.
Participation in seminars on campus and in counties
Broadened ideas.
Gained increased respect in community from clientele.
Developed confidence as professional.
Increased rapport among colleagues within unit.
Increased exposure because of their involvement in these things.
Increased interest among colleagues to participate in international assignment
Increased demand to share some of their experiences both on campus and external to the campus.
Opened up ideas for our Extension agents.
Opened participants’ eyes to how the Extension program works overseas.
All of them want to continue to do a lot of international work whenever there’s an opportunity.
People began to think about internationalization.
Participant developed a rejuvenation of his commitment, a greater appreciation for what we do have leading to this high level of rejuvenation.
His participation helped improve his credibility among his peers.
Participant developed higher level of confidence and competence.
Participant increased enthusiasm and personal energy.
Participant developed professionally.
Participants developed broader perspective of extension.
Clientele learned more about Extension and the international Extension work.
Others developed increased receptivity and interest in international programs as a whole.
Participant was motivated to make dramatic changes in life and perception.
Other faculty who have previously not had activities have come along and wanted and are participating in some international program activities.
Clientele step forward and want to participate, want to do something about it, want to entertain when the visitors come to the state.
They may have caused others to, you know, look favorably upon opportunities out of country, you know, to do similar.
It was a milestone because what it did for professional development activity. That was our benefit I think, that generated continuing interest and incentive for others to participate in activities like that.
Participants developed new world understanding and enthusiasm for Extension.
Participants developed understanding of world issues, ideas, markets.
Increased staff interest in international issues and activities.
Participants added global dimension to work.
Some participants developed subject matter expertise.
Participants developed greater understanding of other cultures.
Increased enthusiasm toward international involvement.

Supervisors
Increased interest in international if it fits into personal and professional plans.
Broadened horizons.
Learned how other countries operate and conduct Extension programs.
One of our participants could never really come back home. They could never come back to 
Cooperative Extension. They kind of lost interest.
Participant increased interest in international economics.
Participant influenced others to consider international participation.
Improved effectiveness of teaching.
Participant developed reaffirmation to extension work.
He has personally strengthened from it.
Increased interest among others in Extension.
Used experience to enhance his programs.
Developed personally and professionally from it.
There was a sense of pride among coworkers and staff in regards to this international assignment.
This was an opportunity for professional improvement for this individual.
People learned more about international involvement.
It was career enhancing for this participant through accomplishing something beyond the normal.
Increased interest level in international from colleagues upon his return.
Increased tolerance to diverse cultures.
Participant developed higher respect for our extension educational system.
He seems to put more emphasis on fundamental things.
Participant developed broader view in regards to internationalism.
Organization changed their listening abilities in regards to what is happening globally.
He is now more aware of international opportunities and is considering participation himself.
It has broadened his experiences and his appreciation for international work.
He developed new perspectives about different cultures.
His people skills improved.
His attitude and interests toward international work were high.
His participation probably changed the way he interacted with clientele and the community.
His participation motivated me to take an international assignment.
The back-fill developed professional experience working in Extension.
People learned about Poland.
Participant learned new approaches to doing things.
Agent improved listening skills.
Agent increased tolerance of others.
Increased sense of pride within organization.

**Colleagues**
Increased knowledge about personal life on an international assignment.
Developed some knowledge about Polish/American Extension Project.
Increased knowledge about Poland and its agriculture.
Increased humility of participant.
Increased stress for coworker who took over program area of participant.
There was no real interchange of ideas or practices that I was promoting or could use.
It kind of confirmed and helped shape my opinion of the agricultural systems.
I learned about Poland.
I learned about some of his programs.
It just appeared that we were much more advanced, we had a lot more technology and that was my 
conclusion.
Participant has inspired other people to look at these opportunities through VOCA, USDA, or 
Winrock.
Well, there’s always some people out there that surprise you, some people are just really frightened 
of travel, and they just aren’t going to do it.. Then there’s a group of people who basically see 
this as an adventure and if it’s convenient, largely will do it as long as their expenses are 
covered. And there are people who have done the free stuff for a long period of time and say 
well, it was fun doing that but to go overseas requires a sacrifice to my family, I have to work 
twice as hard to catch up on my work when I get back, and then they start wanting to do this 
for pay. It ‘s a wonderful experience when you go overseas, but you quickly learn there’s a 
pretty big cost to it and you want to get paid for it.
The community gained a little more knowledge about the people in Poland.
The participant learned a lot and gained self-confidence.
He came back, said hey this was really a lot of fun, you guys ought to try it sometime. With their agriculture it makes me more appreciative of what we have here in this country. I think some of my coworkers have a better appreciation for the culture and the agriculture in other countries. I think he recharged his batteries. He came back motivated, and conveyed a positive image about American agriculture. I learned what they were doing in 4H to the kinds of activities they were doing to help the young people. I gained knowledge of the geography. I learned about 4-H programs and the families as well as the work he did, the economic situation in Poland and other things of interest. Participant approaches job with a different point of view that there are other ways of doing things. Participant became more globally aware. He has taken on new challenges and opportunities. I guess I learned that it’s kind of hard to simply implement or install our systems if you will in their countries because they have not yet developed the legal structure in those countries that we have in the U.S. We learned about the Polish situation there. Colleagues and others learned about Polish culture - family farms, small farms, and the women being real active in the working on farm things. Members of the agricultural economics department within the College of Agriculture really have become more familiar with the current situation in the former Soviet Bloc countries. I think professionally they’ve enhanced their professional status. They have a different or broader perspective than a lot of their coworkers and I think it adds to their credibility. The participant has a deeper appreciation for our community and for our country. Participant became more flexible, less strict. People’s perceptions of international involvement have changed. Participant motivated me to be interested in exploring a shorter term international assignment. I learned about Poland. I developed an appreciation for other cultures. I learned about the Polish Extension service. Others developed an appreciation of American Extension system. Participant grew as a person. Increased interest and enthusiasm for international activities. We learned a lot about Poland. Participant is more accepting of diversity and cultural difference. Participant is more appreciative of volunteer roles in county. Developed appreciation for science and technology available for agriculture. Broadened world view of staff and clientele.

Coworkers
Learned that America, especially the United States where we are, evidently is still far advanced to some of the countries. I guess we do take for granted what we have here and the way we do things. Learned how Extension works in teaching others. Increased knowledge of Polish/American Extension Project. New information about some newer programs they had over there that would be nice to use here, computer programs. Participant heightened his outlook the way things should be done. I don’t see any big changes in colleagues. Increased respect for participant from coworkers and clientele. Increased understanding of clientele and others who saw presentations of work done in foreign assistance programs. We learned a little bit about their small plots or their farming. We learned about the Polish culture - their different practices and different ways of doing things. It opened up people’s thinking and things. I’m not sure of any personal change. She is very internationally minded and I think she fit very well into the program.
It made the community more aware of what the Extension service is doing in their international program and so forth.
I learned how to run the office by myself.
I gained some leadership skills.
I’m a little bit more aware of what goes on now in countries other than ours.
We had no problem at all adapting to the absence, in fact the office went smoother. We were just a lot more calmer and organized. I think when you get an older agent who has been in the community a long time he’s not as flexible so it’s a little more difficult working with him.
I’m extremely independent anyway.
He is open to new ways to do things. Getting out in the world has helped his work back here.
She learned how their agriculture agencies work.
Participant developed a global view.
I learned my situation was apparently very good compared to their situation in Poland
I learned they eat so differently over there, the foods being so different.
I really noticed the people and the way they dressed, and some of the kids, children and stuff.
They seemed like they had a good time with whatever they had to work with.
The colleagues want to do more traveling to other countries.
I learned how they lived over there, and what they ate, and what they wore, all this and that, their customs and things like that, you know.
I feel we are blessed with things that we have, and I know that they don’t have the things we have.
Increased interest in community about Poland and what things were like over there.
It seemed like more people wanted to get involved.
I developed appreciation for the people of Poland.
I learned about the Polish economy.
I learned how to make international phone calls.
I learned how to interact with people who spoke a different language.
Others learned about Poland.
Others developed world view.
People developed awareness of Extension and Poland.
We are more open to international issues and information.
Increased awareness of different lifestyles and ways of living.

Clientele
Increased knowledge of Polish/American Extension Project.
Increased knowledge of Poland and its agriculture.
Participant increased knowledge and gained knew ideas for alternative crops.
Broadened perspective of agent and clientele.
Increased appreciation for American agriculture.
Increased knowledge and interest in benefits to Extension from participation in foreign assistance programs.
We learned how other people live and some of their customs and that kind of stuff.
He brought back to this community, a different community which is a hundred years behind us.
Their cropping practices, their farming practices, their dairy practices told us all about that.
I learned about the school system, which is so different from ours.
I don’t know if the community benefited or not, I never heard anyone say I learned this from him when he came back from Poland. The extension office benefited to some extent, but to how much, I don’t know.
Participant learned about the different methods of farming and dairy.
He gained a great deal personally.
Participant grew in knowledge as to what other people are doing and how they are doing it.
Participant gained a different perspective on what’s going on in the world.
Next time they send someone on an international assignment, this person would like an opportunity to go.
It helped the community to have an awareness level of those people and their culture and all that we did not have before.
It certainly has made us more understanding and compassionate for the Polish people’s needs as well as our own.
It made him a much more understanding person on an international level.
It gave him a broader understanding and knowledge of other cultures than what he initially had. We learned about things that we take for granted in infrastructure, in electricity and water and those things.

I learned that transportation was extremely difficult in Poland. People developed interest and enthusiasm to be involved in international activities. Increased enthusiasm for exchanges.

**Family**

- Gained deep appreciation for America and our conveniences.
- Developed real fondness and empathy for Polish people.
- Increased ability to adapt to foreign culture.
- Developed skills for coping with Polish system.
- Colleagues and clientele developed understanding of the international role of Extension.
- Increased appreciation from colleagues and clientele of work done by participant.
- If he would ever do it again, I would go.
- We’d like to try another international assignment.
- Developed awareness of other countries’ perception about America.
- Developed great appreciation for American lifestyle.
- Learned a lot about Polish history.
- We learned survival Polish.
- Child learned to speak Polish through English classes at school.
- Spouse learned to be flexible.
- Spouse learned to be more patient in trying to figure things out.
- Spouse developed empathy for immigrants in USA who don’t always understand the American language and culture.
- Spouse learned about special education in Poland.
- Spouse increased knowledge of land and people in Poland, farming operations.
- Increased appreciation for the people, conditions in Poland at the present time, the fact that they are making progress slowly.
- Developed empathy for single parents because at least each day that I felt like crud, I could get through one more day and I could see the fact that at the end of six months he’d be back, and I’d have the help and support that I was used to, but for someone who’s been divorced or widowed, trying to raise kids, there’s no end, there’s no light at the end of the tunnel.
- Professionally, I think it has put him onto the track for a lot of other things.
- Spouse would be interested in doing more travel, maybe an international assignment through her own work.
- Participant gained appreciation for things that are happening in the world that she may not have been aware of before.
- I learned a lot about Poland that I didn’t know - the geography.
- I gained a lot more understanding of other cultures.
- Increased recognition of American’s ignorance about other countries.
- Developed interest in some kind of international work after this experience.
- Changed perception of Polish people and how similar they are to Americans.
- Increased anxiety factor, because he was so much further away.
- His father has been more appreciative towards the American agriculture system He’s Participant became more open-minded and made a lot of friends through the program.
- It helped the community to have an awareness level of those people and their culture and all that we did not have before.
- It certainly has made us more understanding and compassionate for the Polish people’s needs as well as our own.
- It made him a much more understanding person on an international level.
- It gave him a broader understanding and knowledge of other cultures than what he initially had.
- We learned about things that we take for granted in infrastructure, in electricity and water and those things.
- I learned that transportation was extremely difficult in Poland.
- Learned many new experiences, local culture, how they viewed life, the different foods.
- Learned history.
PRACTICES SUMMARY
Interviews with American Extension Professionals and Near Associates

Participant
Shared experience with others in community
Sent information to counties which was used in columns and newspaper reports.
Conducted live radio show from Poland in cooperation with Rotary organization.
Developed programs in business management useful for clientele in USA
Adjusted to cultural differences between two countries
Family members traveled to Poland
Worked with Rotary Club in Poland to develop linkages with Rotary in USA.
I’ve been able to this year go and do a presentation in another European country.
I probably did about thirty presentations.
I’ve had other international opportunities.
I talk more about international and the impact that it has on the United States, a little bit maybe about the GATT Agreement.
I have used several programs I developed in Poland here, programs in financial management,
educational programs, computer courses for farmers.
I have done several programs for foreigners. I have also conducted seminars here about agriculture in other countries.
I do more workshops. The workshops are better and more people want them.
Family members traveled to Poland and stayed for five months.
I’ve gone overseas several times and the family has been involved and I guess we don’t have a routine since Poland, we never have a routine like we did before.
There are some people that are writing.
Promoted exchanges between teachers.
I encouraged people to go over and work in Poland.
I helped them make connections to some people here who could provide them with the educational programs that they wanted.
Assumed leadership for a number of state and national programs
He is much more active and willingly takes on active leadership roles and responsibilities.
He has not developed linkages, and this is mostly because of the time factor.
Our son went over for six weeks.
Used linkages developed to try to recruit Polish team to host during Olympics.
Those people have come here, and our people have gone there on exchanges.
I’ve organized study tours.
We tried to link up our Chamber of Commerce and to link up theirs there.
I’m involved in bringing international opportunities to the university we didn’t have before.
I constantly monitor the editorials about Poland.
Two daughters traveled to Poland.
One daughter returned to Poland by herself and live there three months in a small community.
Daughter majoring in architecture in college influenced by Polish colleagues of participant
I tried to develop linkages between the our Chamber of Commerce and a group of Poles we worked with organizing a Chamber there.
Two Polish families that I met in 1991 have vacationed here, have lived in my home, have taken my car two weeks and gone to Florida and sightsee. These were people that I met in Poland, and I’ve seen them every year since, most of the time me going there, but they they’ve been here.
Recruited people for international exchange.
Hosted international students and adults.
Acts as consultant to University.
Assisted local citizen to make contacts in Poland.
Maintain communication with friends in Poland.
Participant and family members did talks and presentations in community.
We set up an exchange program for home economists.
Administrators
Involvement in faculty seminars and mentoring of some of the young faculty that have never gone
More travel of our faculty now of even conferences in that part of the world.
Broadened people’s background.
Increased understanding of their own Extension system and other Extension systems and where
their system fits into this.
Increased exposure to new techniques or technical information that they might never have thought
of on their own.
Opportunity to step back and look at their own program and try to see if there are some
things they can weave into their own program.
Related information to clientele groups and others in Extension.
The participant talked with people about his experiences.
A dozen people or so attended the first meeting of the international committee.
The participant gave presentations to fellow staff and service clubs as a means of knowledge
transfer.
Participant applied new perspectives into educational programs.
Both made trips to various groups, particularly in their locations, civic clubs and most any group
that was interested in talking about it.
participant’s daughter spent some time most recently on a personal basis in Poland.
He just recently as six months ago been in contact with some of the Polish leaders about having
another group of American either students or professors, farmers back in their country.
Through his leadership and his interest and influence a number of faculty and agents have
developed interests and activities internationally.
They presented their experiences, at seminars, at agents meetings, at specialists’ meetings. They
talked extensively to groups.
I know of at least two groups that came here from those provinces that he was working with to see
things here, to meet people and see operationally some of the things.
Participant helped host international guests.
Organized an international group.
Volunteered for additional international assignments.
Speakers at workshops and inservice meetings.

Supervisors
Many programs were presented back in the county, the surrounding counties and then the area
and state level. I’d be afraid to put a number on it. It could have been thirty or more.
Developed different ways of looking at situations that might come up in the county or that may be
faced in the county and perhaps has a different approach to them, because of this experience.
Contacted an editor of the local newspaper and sent some news articles back and had them
published while on assignment.
Presentations were conducted for a lot of different groups, civic groups and I think a staff
conference, presentations at staff conferences, Extension groups. The presentations were both
within Extension and outside as well.
Wrote news articles after return and put it in the newsletters, circular letters.
Groups from Poland have visited in the county.
Invitations from other countries to work or present.
Participant contacted the state association and relayed an opportunity for another home economist
if they were interested.
She did some presentations for community groups she had previously worked with and she used it
as an introduction to get back into the groups.
Colleagues participated in international assignment.
Participant took additional international assignments.
He sent back some news releases in the newspaper, followed up with slide shows when he returned
home.
Shared his experiences with others in community and in Extension.
Presentations made to others at the center.
He shared his experiences with individuals and organizations.
He has “been a catalyst “ for the change in Extension’s interest and involvement in international
efforts.
Change in title and work responsibilities
Some staff and clientele involved in international travel.

Colleagues
Carried additional workload.
A close friend came to either USDA or our state and I had a program out in the state and we spent
the day together looking at it.
She showed us some slides and that type of thing and maybe made some comments about the
project.
Since he knew that I’m the 4-H specialist he was making me aware of the things he was involved in
while he was there.
He gave us some presentations.
He had a scrap book that he brought to the office to show everybody. He had photographs and 4-H
material that they had given him that he had shared with me.
Professionally, he has taken on new challenges and opportunities.
Office became more aware of the people of Poland.
He shared some of his personal experiences with some of the things that, the way life was there in
Poland as compared to what we were experiencing.
He took lots of pictures, made up lots of slide sets.
shared with the people some of his experiences
I know he’s participated in some tours and things, different groups coming in
He has established contact with American industries or individual firms if you will, put them in
contact with people over there requesting certain items of production processes etc.
He’s had some contacts with the people over in Poland.
Participant has taken additional international assignments.
Vacation in Poland.
Other partnerships use his experience.
His children are now involved in international work.
Participant hosted international students.
Others hosted international guests.
County hosted a group of Polish home economists.
Advisory committee member traveled to Poland.
Communication with families in Poland.
County had a 4-H exchange with Poland.
Community hosted Polish home economists.
Participant conducted many presentations, including EFNEP nutrition camp and homemaker
groups.

Coworkers
Participant shared with the community quite a bit with civic groups, farm organizations here as far
as what had been done over there.
Our horticulture agent transferred to another position that last month before the participant
returned, and so that kind of left that one agriculture agent handling all three program areas,
and so I’m sure that put a little bit of stress on his life and everything with handling all the
program areas
We’ve started to implement some of those computer programs here.
She did share with us her experiences and her photos, pictures that she took and slides and she did
present them.
The participant prepared a couple foods for us, a beet soup.
Information would send back from Poland for newsletters.
We had a fellow come over on an exchange program.
He did presentations for community.
Some communications with Poland.
I think he is talking to more people now then what he did before.
The participant’s involvement eventually led to her applying for a six-month international
assignment.
The participant made some interesting presentations to ag groups.
He brought pictures back.
Some of the people he had visited over there came back and we had a little meeting with them. There were a lot of different clubs in town that did get to see about the trip and hear about it from him.

He has friends and colleagues in Poland that he still hears from.
He contacted someone and got some addresses and then, I think the Chamber of Commerce wrote to try to get a team, athletic team to host during the Olympics.
Family now very involved internationally.
Participant’s wife started Master’s Degree.
Participant held staff and community meetings to teach about Poland.
Continued contact with people in Poland.
Youth agent went to Poland and Polish group visited county.
County hosted Polish home economists.
Participant conducted community presentations.
American Extension agents traveled to Poland on Home Economics Exchange program.

Clientele
Participant wrote articles for newspaper.
Clientele read newspaper articles.
She kept us informed through her letters and there were also newspaper articles.
Our club sent her a care package.
Pen-pals were started.
He would call me from Poland, and I would ask him questions about the country.
He would call and I would ask him about the farming part of his stay there, and he would tell me about the pig business, which was the thing we talked about the most.
He would have meetings at the community club, the Kiwanis and of course 4-H, and tell all about it.
He has pictures in his office, and an album which I looked at.
I know that he had a problem with the coordinator (of another agency) and they moved him out of his office, because they needed the room.
I think he gave a presentation to Kiwanis.
Polish friends came over and spent about three to four month’s, visited schools and people’s homes.
He made the rounds at the civic clubs talking about his activities and what he did. Everybody had him to speak.
He had found some companies and some interests, because he came back and talked to me about a couple of things and said these are possibilities for you. And I think we ended up sending some information on our community to a couple of contacts that he said were business people or were involved in the same types of things that I was.
Participant developed friendships.
He came back and told us what he found there and what he saw - things that we took for granted in infrastructure, in electricity and water and those things.
He told me about when he got back about a couple of people there that he dealt with that were in roles similar to mine. And what I did, seems like there was somebody with the Polish Chamber or general council or something, I don’t remember exactly what it was, but we put together, what we do is market our community, and we put together a packet of information on the schools, the community, and what we’re like and the types of companies that we have.
Agent wrote news releases-read them in paper.
Agent communicates with Polish people.
County hosted 4-H exchange.
Kids studied Poland in the International Club.
I hosted Polish Home Economists.

Family
He had to relearn directions and where to find things in town.
Lived in Poland for five weeks.
Rotary talked about sponsoring a person from Poland to come over here. They connected a watts line from the restaurant where we were to the office in Poland and so I got to talk to him and they talked to him about that and put it on the speaker phone.
View world news and weather, especially Poland.
Participant changed focus of doctoral program.
Child developed global awareness.
Participant sent articles to local newspaper.
Family members went to Poland during second assignment. We decided we needed to bring the family back together again and that’s when we pulled the savings out and bought tickets and flew the family over.
We interacted by telephone and then she requested informational resources that I helped provide to her for the project from the Extension office.
Spouse traveled to Poland for six days.
Family toured all over Poland on week-ends.
Wife formed friendships with Polish women.
I got a chance to drive in Poland.
I got to go on a hunting trip and learned about hunting.
We went on a honeymoon trip to the Baltic.
She presented quite a few programs, really, to different groups.
He’s since been to Kazakhstan and back to Poland a couple of times on other types of There is another fellow who was a stamp collector that he worked with and they still exchange stamps.
The children are also involved.
I saw him more because of this project - visited him for three weeks
Relays need for tolerance and understanding to people that he interacts with.
Showed slide presentations to groups
Spouse took a leave of absence from work to take part.
I probably could have taken a leave, but I teach. So, I did not. Our son went over for six weeks.
He wrote lots and lots and lots of letters.
Polish people visited with us.
His middle daughter stayed in Poland for about two months.
His youngest daughter has returned to Poland twice.
COWorkers must have picked up on his positive attitude.
He shared things like that with several groups and people.
I did call Washington once or twice. They were very accommodating.
He’s been over to other countries since then.
International exchange involving clientele.
Established communications between Chambers of Commerce in Poland and America.
We see his interest in the different cultures that he’s been associated with. And so shares them with us, talks about them with the kids, talks about locations on the map, and where we’re headed, and where we’re going.
He had at least one friend in Poland that does business in America because of him being sort of an intermediary, getting them in touch.
Wife returned to college to get Master’s Degree.
Co-workers are hosting international exchange students.
Son plans to study international affairs.
Agent wrote journal articles and did presentations.
Agent conducted teacher inservices.
Family members correspond with Polish people.
Participant published news articles about experience.
OUTCOMES SUMMARY
Interviews of American Extension Professionals and Near Associates

Participant
Better county agent
International dialogue between Polish and American organizations
Correspondence between American and Polish citizens
National recognition for participant
Disruption of county program - when I returned the interim had lost county funding and we had a lawsuit pending.
Changed role in Extension and promotion
It took me quite a while to get back up to speed. I had a couple of years of depression.
Million dollar contract for American business with Polish firm.
Friendships and personal relationships
Growth of international dimension in state extension program
Added international dimension in Extension program.
Culturally aware community
Global communications

Administrators
Improved extension programs
Promoted to professor in the department
Exports of agricultural products to Poland
Participant was instrumental in getting a large grant from the Kellogg Foundation for a sustainable agriculture project that was in some degree modeled on ideas that came out of the Polish project.
More effective agents
Program suffered some temporary setbacks
International dialogue with faculty between both countries.
Trade going on with Poland
Internationalized Extension.
University recognized internationally.
Foreign student enrollment at university.
International dimension increased.
Better educated staff and clientele.
Extension staff with improved performance.

Supervisors
Better informed and better educated community in regards to what is happening half-way around the world.
Growth of international dimension in Extension program.
Better agent.
Improved Extension program.
Increase of characteristics of international dimension in Extension program.
Extension and university internationally recognized.
Better understanding and awareness in community.

Colleagues
Friendships and permanent relationships between countries.
Not aware of any secondary linkages.
International interactions.

Coworkers
Interactions with friends and colleagues in Poland.
Some business contacts and Polish community linkages.
International collaborations with Extension educators.
Clientele
Community is more willing and supportive of the Extension program.
I think it’s fair to say that the Extension Service became more viable in the community even in a greater way than we had recognized it before.

International friendships.

Family
He was in a state of depression I think for about three years.
Promoted to full professor.
Increased international activity on campus.
Polish farmers visited county.
Positive image of Americans as just ordinary people.
New clientele from reading newspaper articles.
Friendships between countries.
People are more tolerant and understanding of other people and countries.
International educational exchange.