

This document was produced by the American International Health Alliance (AIHA) with support from the US Agency for International Development (USAID). This document is part of the EurasiaHealth Knowledge Network at www.eurasiahealth.org.

EurasiaHealth resources are provided free of charge and are freely distributable. An electronic version of this document may be posted on another Web site for non-commercial purposes only, provided that the following conditions are met: the content may not be altered, credit is given to the EurasiaHealth Knowledge Network as the source of the document, notification is sent by e-mail to webmaster@aiha.com, and a reference to the EurasiaHealth Web site (www.eurasiahealth.org) is included in the credit notice. No fees may be assessed for access to EurasiaHealth materials.

AIHA and EurasiaHealth are not responsible for the opinions expressed in this document. The responsibility for the interpretation and use of the material lies with the reader. AIHA and EurasiaHealth disclaim responsibility for any errors, omissions, or other possible problems associated with this document.



This information is made possible by the generous support of the American people through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The contents do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.



**AIHA KABP Participation Survey:
Briefing and Decision Document**
December 29, 1999

I. Overview

This briefing and decision document summarizes the results of the formative phase of the survey development and outlines the plan for the AIHA Survey. The document has been revised over time as a result of input from discussions and interviews held during the planning phase. The document describes the key decisions to be made for any study using a question- answer format. Options are outlined; recommendations are made. Eventually, the document can describe the decisions that have made. It is designed for both a scientific and lay audience, so that all AIHA staff as well as all participants can understand and talk meaningfully about the survey methodology and eventually the survey results.

Why are we conducting the survey?

The health partnership program has had and will continue to have impacts beyond changes in health care delivery and improvements in health outcomes. Participation has professional and personal impacts on the people who participate. For people both from the United States and from the Newly Independent States (NIS) or Central and Eastern Europe (CEE), participation in the health partnership program seems to change how they think about and how they approach their work.

The purpose of the survey is to determine if participation in the AIHA health partnership program has an impact on participants and, if it does have an impact, to describe that impact.

Who is interested in the results?

USAID/Congress
NIS/CEE participants and partners
US participants and partners
AIHA
Other local, regional, and global stakeholders

How will the results be used?

To demonstrate the longer term impacts of the AIHA partnership program
To understand the strengths of the partnership model of foreign assistance
To improve the program and the technical and logistic support to partners
To help current and potential new participants understand the benefits of participation

Note: We need to make it clear that the results will not being used to evaluate the individual partnerships. The purpose of the survey is to understand and improve the general partnership model. The results will have no bearing on existing funding for any

partnership and will not be reported in a way to identify specific partnerships or specific people.

What is the hypothesis? What are our independent (causes) and dependent (effects) variables?

Every study has a hypothesis which shows our prediction of how the independent variable (presumed cause) influences the dependent variables (the presumed effects).

Independent variable ----> Dependent variables

In this study, our hypothesis is that participation in the AIHA partnership program produces, leads to, or causes changes in attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. Our independent variable is participation; our dependent variables are the specific attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors we predict will be affected by participation. Our hypothesis or causal model looks like this:

Participation in extended, bilateral professional exchange --> Changes in attitudes and beliefs

What are the characteristics of the program we are evaluating? How are we defining our independent variable?

We need to identify the essential elements of the participation in this type of partnership program. Essential elements are those that potentially differentiate the AIHA partnership program from other partnerships and exchanges and those that all participants experience to some degree. We need to identify these essential elements so that we can define who the participants will be for our sampling plan, so that we can be sure we have all the relevant dependent variables on our instrument, and so that we can develop appropriate variables to assess the level and intensity of participation for our analyses.

Briefly, we are defining participation as extended, bilateral, professional exchange. Through our discussions we have identified the following essential elements of the participation in the AIHA partnership model:

Institutionally-based bilateral exchange between representatives from health institutions in US and those in NIS/CEE

Practicing professionals who are peers volunteer their time, work side-by-side, and develop long-term relationships

Interaction is organized to solve a complex of health problems through a mutually agreed upon work plan which evolves over time as the needs develop

Interaction is extended in time and in breadth drawing in participants throughout the partner institutions

Opportunities for information exchange and observational learning through face-to-face visits, meetings, internet and other communication channels and

Technical, logistic, and other support from USAID through AIHA

Aspects like within country and within region exchange, the opportunity for governmental and nongovernmental interaction, and the identification of additional resources may happen with some partnerships and with other AIHA programs, but for the purposes of this study they will not be considered essential.

How are we planning the survey methodology?

Since the AIHA approach is a participatory one and as recommended in the September survey meeting AED held with senior AIHA staff, we are using a participatory approach to plan the survey. Through the Tuesday Group, AED is managing the process in collaboration with AIHA monitoring and evaluation staff and with input from participants and other stakeholders.

During the development phase, we are conducting formative, qualitative research with all types of people to identify content, to discuss benefits, to inform administration decisions, and to identify concerns and methods to address concerns. We have input from:

- 12 US participants from three partnerships
- 23 NIS/CEE participants from two partnerships
- 10 members of the US AIHA staff
- Pilot test and input from 10 participants, 5 from US and 5 from the NIS/CEE
- AIHA Monitoring and Evaluation Steering Committee
- AIHA senior staff

We need to work with the Tuesday Group as to how to get input from:

- USAID
- AIHA regional directors

We recommend that we share this version of the document with the AIHA Monitoring and Evaluation Steering Committee and the partnership coordinators to get their buyin on the research plan.

What is involved in planning a survey?

Planning a survey consists of making inter-related decisions about four method components:

Sampling - whom will we ask?

Instrument - what will ask?

Research design - how will we analyze the data?

Administration procedures - how will we ask?

Reporting and dissemination - how will we share results?

The decisions are inter-related. The goal is to achieve the methodology that is the best way to answer the priority questions, with the best possible scientific rigor, given the available resources and the research context.

II. Sampling

In developing the sampling plan, we need to decide who, how many, and how. The sampling plan determines which population we can generalize the results and how sure we are that what we find describes this entire population.

What type of sampling frame should we use? Probability or convenience?

We strongly recommend some form of probability sampling frame rather than a convenience sampling plan. We recommend a multi-stage sampling frame: at stage 1 we will select partnerships; and at stage 2 we will sample respondents from partnerships. If we use a probability sampling frame, we will be able to say that the results generalize to all participants in our defined universe. We will be able to answer questions from skeptics who think that only the committed have responded.

If we use a convenience sample, we will only be able to talk about the results for those who have answered. Skeptics will claim that only the committed have responded and results are biased. A survey with a convenience sample is not much better than anecdotal evidence.

From which partnerships will we sample respondents? What is our universe of partnerships?

One option is to sample respondents from all AIHA supported partnerships which were formed under the new cooperative agreements, say during 1999. This would mean sampling respondents from about 30 (?) partnerships, about 8 (?) of which have people/institutions who have participated before.

A second option is to sample respondents from all partnerships which have ever been supported by AIHA. This would mean sampling respondents from about 80 (?) partnerships.

A third option is to sample respondents from all recently formed partnerships and from a subset of partnerships formed earlier.

When we began the survey planning process, AIHA was mainly interested in new partnerships. More recently, it has become that clear that a report on the first round of

partnerships would be valuable. Thus, we recommend sampling representatives from all partnerships, the second or third option.

To inform this decision and to identify the first stage of the sampling plan, we created a database of eligible partnerships with key information about the partnership (region, location, signing institutions in the partnership, status, beginning date of partnership, ending date of partnership, type of partnership, name of US coordinator, name of NIS/CEE coordinator, contact information for coordinators.)

Note: we are recommending excluding initiatives. People who participate only in initiatives will not be included in the sample; people who participate in partnerships as well as initiatives will be included. People who only participate in initiatives do not experience all the elements of the partnership model. In addition, it will be difficult to define the participants and administer the survey.

Who will we survey in each partnership? How do we define the universe of participants we want to talk about?

Currently, we recommend that participants be defined as people who have direct and professional interaction or exchange with participants from the other country either during a face-to-face visit or via email, phone, or some other mediated channel. That is, participants are people who participate in bilateral, professional exchange.

With this definition, the following are potential survey respondents:

- NIS/CEE partnership coordinator(s)
- US partnership coordinator
- Team or task leaders
- Information coordinator
- Administrators and clinical leaders
- People who travel to the partner country for partnership purposes
- People who participate in meetings and trainings during visits in their country by representatives from the partner institutions
- People who communicate with representatives from partner institutions about their professional activities

The following would not be included:

- People who organize tours for visitors but do not interact around professional activities

- People who provide clerical and logistic support to the visits but who do not interact around professional work

- Colleagues of participants who talk to participants about lessons learned but who do not directly interact with representatives of partner institutions

- Friends and family members of participants

- Consultants who participate in trainings who are not volunteering their time

- Patients and community members

- Others who are affected by the partnership but who do not directly participate in the bilateral professional exchange

Note: we considered a number of definitions from very limited (i.e., people who traveled) to more inclusive (i.e., colleagues, friends and family members of participants who do not interact bilaterally). The one we are proposing takes an intermediate definition of participation, concentrating on people who are most likely to experience an impact.

How will we enumerate (list) the participants in the sampling frame and select respondents to complete the survey?

Once we decide the eligible partnerships and the definition of participant, we recommend that we develop a screening protocol for partnership coordinators to name and give key information (name, contact information, occupation, type of involvement, rating of degree of involvement) on specific participants. A draft is attached as Attachment A. It needs input from AIHA with respect to the activities checklist.

We recommend that this form be completed by coordinators and returned to us, that database with the universe of participants be created, that the database be analyzed to determine how many to select from each partnership and/or each type of respondent, that a sample of respondents be selected from this data base, and that we ask this sample to complete the survey.

Note: To assure that we achieve a probability sampling plan, we are recommending that the sample be selected in DC. The coordinators would tend to select those people who are convenient and available. Furthermore, it is critical to have a clear and articulated definition of what constitutes exchange, say in the form of the activities checklist.

What will our sample size be? How many respondents will be available for analysis?

Deciding the size of the sample will depend on three factors: factors that affect how many we can ask (the number of partnerships who are eligible and the number of respondents in each partnership we can and do survey), factors that affect how many will provide data (the return rate, the attrition from Time 1 to Time 2), and factors that affect how many we

need (the reliability and validity of our measures and the size of the impact we expect to have).

Here is one scenario: Sample 10 (5 US and 5 NIS/CEE) respondents from each of 30 partnerships formed in 1999, sending the survey to 300 respondents. With an excellent return rate (70%), sending to 300 means 210 respondents at Time 1. If 8 of the 30 partnerships have some people or institutions who have participated before, our Time 1 analyses comparing people with many years of involvement to those with one year of involvement might be comparing 30 people to 180 people. Assuming similar response rates for US and NIS/CEE, analyses of just US participants would be based on 105 people; those with just NIS/CEE would be based on 105 people. With a successful follow-up at Time 2 rate (60%), the 210 at Time 1 means 126 respondents will be available for the analyses comparing Time 1 to Time 2. Note: this is not a sufficient sample size for correlational analyses at Time 1 and is not great for analyses comparing Time 1 to Time 2.

Another scenario: Sample 10 respondents (5 US and 5 NIS/CEE) from 30 partnerships formed in 1999 and from 30 partnerships formed before 1999 for a sending sample for 600. Assuming we locate and get data from 70% from both types of partnerships, those formed during 1999 and those formed before 1999, we would have data from 420 for the Time 1 analyses. Analyses comparing those with many years to those with one year might be comparing 210 to 210 people.

Sampling 10 from each partnership (5 US and 5 NIS/CEE) is a minimum. We recommend that more be sampled if possible.

III. The Instrument

The survey instrument contains the items and questions that represent the dependent variables of the study, the attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors that we predict will change as a result of participation. It also needs to assess basic demographic and other characteristics of the sample and to describe the type and amount of participation experienced by the respondent. A critical factor that influences the rigor and believability of the study is the reliability and validity of the items and scales used to assess the variables. A study is more believable and more able to stand up to scrutiny from skeptics if it uses items and scales which are based on solid concepts and shown to be reliable and valid. A study's results can be questioned if the items and questions are just sit-behind-the-desk items.

What content should we assess? What types of changes might occur?

Based on our discussions with participants and AIHA staff, we expect changes in the attitudes and beliefs of participants in the following domains:

Leadership/management/decision-making style
Problem solving and critical thinking style

Empowerment/self-efficacy
Locus of control
Support for foreign assistance
Views of US and NIS/CEE
Openness toward other cultures
Democracy and civil society attitudes

Note: this content focuses on changes in individuals. During our formative research, participants found it hard to come up with organizational and institutional changes. Other methodologies (case studies) are better suited to assess organizational and systems changes. However, it is important to note that many of the changes in the individuals affect how they function within their health institutions and thus indirectly point to organizational impacts.

Note: this content focuses on general changes that might be seen in all types of participants. It does not cover specific technical knowledge and skills (e.g., how to do a particular medical procedure; how to run a neonatal unit; how a nurse treats a patient). More formative research with each type of respondent would be needed to get at all of these specific technical changes; furthermore, at this point, it would be difficult to determine what the changes might be expected by the new partnerships.

What other questions will be included?

Items to describe the social and demographic characteristics of the survey respondents
Items to assess the type and level of participation in the AIHA partnership program
Items to assess control variables such as degree of exposure to the West
Open-ended items to assess changes that we can't predict at the moment
Open-ended items to elicit comments on AIHA support

How many different modules or questionnaire versions will we use?

We recommend that US and NIS/CEE participants get the same questionnaire. It became clear during the formative research that if we have different versions, people will wonder why they are getting different questions than others. Some sections will be more relevant to the US respondents; others to the NIS/CEE respondents.

We recommend that we have the same questionnaire for all types of participants (e.g., administrators, nurses, doctors). We are focusing on the types of changes that are more general rather than specific to the various professions involved. Having modules for each of the various types of participants would involve more formative research, would mean making many predictions about specific changes that would be difficult for new types of participants (police officers), would require a sufficient large sample size of each type for meaningful analysis, and would make administration and analysis complex. If AIHA wants different modules for different types of participants, AED will need to know which types and will need access to 5 to 10 participants from each type.

How did we develop items?

We adapted established scales that have been pretested, validated, and have norms.
We adapted items used in other survey research that have been pretested and have norms.
Develop own items based on formative research, pretest and validate items

We are searching the literature for scales and items to assess the domains we identified in the formative phase. We have found some good ones.

Attachment B provides a draft of the instrument with recommended items and scales for the dependent variables as well as the other questions to assess demographic characteristics and the control variables. It is annotated with an explanation of the source and rationale for each set of items and scales.

How should we deal with different languages?

The M & E Steering Committee clearly recommended that we have a rigorous translation procedure. That is, we translate and then back translate into each NIS/CEE language needed.

Which languages do we use?

Of the initial list of several languages, the AIHA senior staff decided on just two.

English
Russian

Note: We piloted the basic agree/disagree format in Russian as well as English during the Annual Conference. The pilot versions are available upon request.

IV. Research Design and Analysis Plan

The type of design determines how much we can say about the presumed cause of the changes we observe, how strongly we can say that the changes observed are due to participation rather than to other factors. In our meetings, it became clear that there are a number of potential alternative hypotheses for the differences we might observe. For example, the changes we find over time could be due to trends like globalization, the further opening up of the NIS/CEE, or professional developmental changes in the participants. Differences we find between groups of people could be due to selection factors. Those who choose to participate in the AIHA partnership program and those who choose to participate intensely in the program are likely to be different from those who do not participate or who participate less intensely.

We cannot do a true experimental design where people are randomly assigned to either the treatment group (participants) or control group. However, there are several potential research designs and analysis plans.

How could we determine impact? How could we analyze the data?

There are several possible approaches to analysis. Each has advantages and disadvantages.

In a *descriptive analysis*, impact is not assessed or tested just described as respondents reflect on the changes that happened to them. Survey respondents are asked with an open-ended question “how have you changed?” Changes reported by survey respondents are content analyzed, categorized, and reported systematically and quantitatively. For example with decision-making style as the dependent variable, we would be able to say that 30% of the respondents reported that the decision-making style had changed to a more collaborative one.

In a *correlational analysis*, impact of participation is assessed or measured by comparing those who have participated a long time or more intensively to those who have participated a shorter time or less intensively. Taking type of decision-making style as the dependent variable, we would predict that those who have participated more intensively have a more collaborative style than those who have participated less intensively.

In a *time1- time 2 analysis*, impact is assessed by comparing the strength of attitudes and beliefs held at Time 1 (e.g., January, 2000) to the strength of attitudes and beliefs held at a later Time 2 (e.g., January, 2001). For example, we could assess decision-making style at Time 1 and determine if it became significantly more collaborative and participatory at Time 2.

Within the time 1 - time 2 design, we could have either cross-sectional, longitudinal, or rolling approaches. In a longitudinal approach, we would identify a sample of participants from each partnership (say 10), interview them a time 1, develop a tracking data base so we can locate these people at the later time, and interview them one year later. In a cross-sectional design, we would identify which type of people we want to interview (partnership coordinator, information coordinator, task leader, one person who traveled a lot, one person who traveled a little, one person who participated in their own country, one staff, support person) and a procedure someone can follow to enumerate and select the respondents. This procedure is followed at Time 1 and then again at Time 2. In a rolling approach, participants would take the survey as they are identified as participants.

Note: Initially AIHA wanted at Time 1 - Time 2 design and this analysis has many strengths. However, our formative research has revealed a number of logistical issues with this design. To be effective, one needs to know who the participants are at Time 1.

According to recent estimates, the majority of people have not yet participated in January, 2000 and are only identified potentially. A longitudinal approach requires either a confidential or unique identifier data collection procedure. A cross-sectional approach is less appropriate for assessing changes in individuals. With a rolling design, the length of time for each participant will be different and the definition of participant is not well controlled. To be successful, these issues with a Time 1 - time 2 will need to be worked out.

In a *case-control analysis*, impact is assessed by comparing the strength of attitudes and beliefs held by people who participant in the programs (case) to the strength of attitudes and beliefs held by people who are similar but who do not participate (control). Participants could be asked to nominate someone who is like them but who has not participated in the AIHA program. A protocol would be developed to help the case respondent identify a control respondent who is like them but who is unlikely to be directly affected by the program (perhaps someone in a different city).

What design or combination of research designs should we use?

Since a true experiment is not possible, we recommend some form of combination design that will allow triangulation. We want to be able to conduct multiple analyses to test for the impact of participation. If we find an impact no matter which way we do the analysis, we can be more sure that the differences we observe are due to participation not to other factors, such as, global trends.

Option 1: Descriptive analysis at one time period

Option 2: Correlational analysis at one time period

Option 3: Time 1 - Time 2, reporting only after Time 2

Option 4: Case-Control at Time 2 only

Option 5: Time 1 - Time 2 combined with correlational analysis, reporting on correlational analysis at Time 1 and change analysis at Time 2

Option 6: Time 1 - Time 2 combined with correlational and descriptive analysis, reporting on correlational analysis at Time 1, change analysis at Time 2, and the descriptive analysis at Time 1, Time 2, or both

Option 7: Option 6 adding Case-Control at Time 2

Option 8: Correlational and descriptive at Time 1 with Case-Control at Time 2

We need to consider resources, feasibility of getting responses, alternative hypotheses, sample size, logistic issues and other factors in deciding among these options.

At this point, we recommend Options 6 or 8. AIHA will be able to provide AID with reports on the impact of the first phase of the project with the correlational and descriptive analyses of Time 1 data. During the enumeration of the sampling, data collection and analysis of Time 1 data, we may find that the issues with the time 1 - time 2 analysis have been resolved and the analysis is viable. If a time 1 - time 2 analysis is not viable, the case respondents could be asked to identify control respondents at Time 2.

Beyond the main impact analyses, what other analyses will we do?

We recommend comparing those who were sent the survey with those who actually returned to survey to determine the nature of any response bias. We can compare them on the information contained in the screening protocol.

We recommend descriptive analyses that describe the respondents in terms of their demographic and social characteristics and of the degree of participation. This will allow us to describe the respondents of the survey and may allow AIHA to provide AID with a description of who participate in the AIHA partnership program.

We recommend reliability and validity analyses of the items and scales to determine how well they were adapted to this research context.

V. Administration Procedures

Appropriate administration procedures are needed to gain full cooperation of the respondents, to encourage a high response rate and truthful responses, and to ensure that the survey improves the relationship between AIHA and the partners rather than jeopardizes it.

What will we name the survey?

We need a better name. In the proposal, we use the term KABP survey or Knowledge, Attitudes, Beliefs and Practices Survey. This describes a type of approach but not the topic and reason of the survey. It is confusing.

Transformation survey?

Participation survey?

The Perceptions of Participants about Partnership Program (PPPP) survey?

We recommend a session to develop a name and logo that will better explain the purpose of the survey and encourage participation.

How should we educate people about the survey and its purpose?

We recommend we educate the participants about the survey and its purpose before we send it out. We should use multiple AIHA channels. This can be done through this briefing sheet as well as a one-pager with frequently asked questions and talking points.

We recommend that the survey be accompanied by a cover letter that explains its purpose.

We recommend that regular reporting be done updating participants on the progress of the survey (e.g., how many people have responded, highlights of preliminary results).

We recommend a report on the formative phase as a first step.

We recommend a meeting with partnership coordinators to get them on board. They are essential to enumerating the list of participants, to getting a high response rate, and to using the data at the local level.

How should we administer the survey?

It is vital to be able to explain the context and the reason for the survey. Face-to-face contact with someone who is well trained to understand the purpose and the rationale is important. We heard during the formative phase that we needed good training for survey administrators and we need to establish trust.

The type of administration may need to be different for the US and the NIS/CEE participants.

A number of administration mechanisms have been proposed:

- Email
- Mail
- Telephone
- Through AIHA regional offices
- Through partnership coordinator
- Using video tape to explain purpose

We recommend working through the partnership coordinators.

How will the data be collected?

We recommend using scannable forms or scannable answer sheets.

How will we protect the privacy of the respondents?

We must communicate clearly how the results will be reported and used (i.e., so that individuals and individual partnerships are NOT identified and cannot be identified).

No matter how we distribute, we should give each respondent an envelope they can use to mail back to AED. The results cannot go to AED through AIHA.

Will we use confidential or anonymous procedures?

Under confidential procedures, the name will be attached to the survey when AED receives it. AED will immediately create a code for the survey, remove the name from the responses, and keep the list of names and codes in a separate but locked file. The file linking names and codes will be destroyed at the appropriate date.

Under anonymous procedures, the respondent will remove his or her name from the survey before they return it to us. We will need to find some way to know if that person returned a survey so that we can do call-back to remind people to complete.

A unique identifier could be created so that the respondent creates the code that matches themselves. For example, we could create a six- digit code with middle initial, date of birth, first initial of city of birth. The respondent creates that code each time they do the survey.

If a longitudinal design is selected, we will need to use confidential or unique identifier procedures so that we can match data gathered from Time 1 to the Time 2 data.

Note: If we collect the name of the partnership on the instrument, no matter whether we use anonymous or confidential or unique identifier procedures, it may be possible to link the data to the person.

What response rate are we aiming for and how should we try to insure it?

We recommend that you aim for a high response rate, 70 to 80%. This will require a tracking and call back mechanism with resources available so that AIHA can follow-up with respondents. We recommend a minimum of three call backs. Telephone surveys in the United States typically conduct at least three call-back to ensure that the probability sampling plan is achieved.

We recommend that educational incentives be provided to ensure timely and complete responses and to reduce the staff time needed for call-back. An incentive can be a cost effective way to achieve a adequate or excellent response rate. The incentives could be in the form of a lottery; they could be given on an individual or a partnership basis. For example, respondents who return their survey in 30 days could be eligible for a drawing for the incentive. Or on a partnership basis, all partnerships with a 90% return rate could receive an extra trip to the annual conference, to the partner country, or to an initiative meeting.

VI. Reporting and Disseminating Results

We recommend analysis, reporting, and dissemination mechanisms that help realize the participatory nature of the process. Participants might want additional analyses of their particular hypotheses.

What types of reports will we write?

This will depend on the research design. The minimum is one report with an executive summary that shows the top line results. Some designs allow for reports at both Time 1 and Time 2. Some designs will be longer reporting on the multiple analyses.

In addition, if the sample size is sufficient within each region, we might want to consider reporting just descriptive results (not impact results) separately by region so that each region can see where they stand on the attitudes and beliefs.

We do not recommend reporting results by partnership. The data will not be valid with such as small sample size; the results might be sensitive.

How we will get input on the meaning of the results?

We recommend an interpretation workshop during which presents the preliminary results of the impact analyses and gets input from participants and AIHA staff to help interpret the results.

How will we share the results?

At a minimum, there will be a report with an executive summary. Other documents can be developed to support additional dissemination.

We recommend additional dissemination, such as:

- Articles in CommonHealth
- Presentations at annual conference
- Articles in other publications including academic and peer-reviewed publications
- Presentation at other conferences
- Through partnership coordinator to stakeholders using one-page overview of key results

Attachment A

**Attachment A
Screening Form**

Partnership Coordinator: Please complete the following information on each of the people who have participated in the partnership program.

Partnership:

Name of representative:

Contact information:

Work address of representative:

Telephone number:

Email address:

Gender:

Duties in the partnership:

Position/occupation:

How long has the representative been involved in the partnership program?

How many trips to the partner country has this person made for the partnership program?

Please check off the activities that this representative has participated in:

Ever In the past year

_____	_____	meet the delegation
_____	_____	gave a presentation to the delegation
_____	_____	gave a training or workshop
_____	_____	participated in a training or workshop
_____	_____	corresponded with representative via email, mail, telephone
_____	_____	hosted visitor at their home
_____	_____	trip to the partner country for partnership purposes
_____	_____	trip to annual conference

[need to review these activities and decide which will be considered direct, bilateral, professional exchange]

Please give a rating of how intensely this person participated in the partnership program.

Attachment B

AIHA Participation Survey - Annotated Version
December 29, 1999
Attachment B

[This draft instrument is annotated with comments as to the source of the scales and items. It is too long at the moment. The scales and items need to be prioritized. Then it needs to be reordered and reformatted so that it can fit on scannable forms and be shorter with more columns on a page.]

The health partnership program has had and will continue to have impacts beyond changes in health care delivery and improvements in health outcomes. Participation has professional and personal impacts on the people who participate. For people who participate both from the United States and from the Newly Independent States (NIS) or Central and Eastern Europe (CEE), participation in the health partnership program seems to change how participants think about their work and how they perceive the world.

The purpose of the survey is to determine the impact of participation in the AIHA health partnership program on participants. The results will be used to improve the partnership program, to help AIHA provide support to the partners, and to help USAID understand the strengths of the partnership approach to foreign assistance.

[Insert description of anonymous or confidential procedures.] Although we will know your names, your answers will be confidential. We will only report aggregate results.

Please ask us if you have any questions. If you have no questions, please complete the survey. Please read each statement and circle the number for your response.

For some statements, we want you to read the statement and indicate whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with the statement.

There are no right or wrong answers to these questions. We just want to find out your perceptions. Do not spend too much time. Just give the response that comes to your head first.

Date

Please enter the date you complete this survey.

Day of the month _____ Month of the year _____ Year _____

Name of partnership

Please write in the name of your current partnership.

Leadership and organizational style - [These are sample items from a 50-item, 10 subscale instrument called the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire which is used to assess how people function in organizations. The various subscales tap the dimensions of changes in decision-making style uncovered in the formative research. We recommend it over the other leadership scales because it can be used with people at all levels in an organization and it reflects how people behavior in organizations rather than their personality. We have written for the complete set of items. The author is sending us a packet with complete information on the subscales.]

For each statement, please choose the statement that best describes your opinion.

I pay attention to what others say when we are talking.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Somewhat agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Somewhat disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree

I have a clear set of priorities.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Somewhat agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Somewhat disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree

I make points in strikingly clear and even unusual ways.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Somewhat agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Somewhat disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree

I sometimes don't notice how others feel.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Somewhat agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Somewhat disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree

I am extremely dependable.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Somewhat agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Somewhat disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree

I often find it desirable to change or alter my position.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Somewhat agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Somewhat disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree

I recognize others' strengths and contributions.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Somewhat agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Somewhat disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree

I show that I really care about other people.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Somewhat agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Somewhat disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree

I worry a lot about the possibility of failing.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Somewhat agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Somewhat disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree

I find ways to get everyone fully committed to new ideas and projects.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Somewhat agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Somewhat disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree

I can see clear effects resulting from my action.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Somewhat agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Somewhat disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree

I have found that no one person can make very much of a difference in how this organization operates.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Somewhat agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Somewhat disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree

I think that the real value of power is in being able to accomplish things that benefit both the organization and its members.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Somewhat agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Somewhat disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree

I believe that some of the most significant aspects of my position are the little "perks" that demonstrate my

importance to the organization and its members.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Somewhat agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Somewhat disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree

I focus on clear short-term goals rather than being concerned with longer-range aims.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Somewhat agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Somewhat disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree

I think about how the plans and programs I've developed in my own unit might be expanded to benefit the entire organization.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Somewhat agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Somewhat disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree

I have not generally been able to help the organization attain its goals.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Somewhat agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Somewhat disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree

I try to express and support a set of basic values about how people should work together in this organization to solve common problems and reach shared goals.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Somewhat agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Somewhat disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree

I strive to take actions to reach goals rather than contributing to keeping things the way they are.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Somewhat agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Somewhat disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree

I help others understand that there is often little we can do to control important factors in the environment.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Somewhat agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Somewhat disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree

Internal-External Locus of Control [This is a often used scale to assess whether people believe that outcomes are under their own control (that their actions can influence) or outside of their control (that their actions cannot influence). People from different cultures differ on this orientation; this orientation can change when a person's environment and experiences changes. The formative research revealed that after the partnership experience participants felt that their actions could make a difference.]

For each of the following pairs of statements, please circle the one statement that best describes your opinion.

- 1.a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them. (Filler)
- 2.a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
b. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.
- 3.a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.
b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.
- 4.a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.
b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.
- 5.a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
b. Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.
- 6.a. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.
- 7.a. No matter how hard you try some people just don't like you.
b. People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.
- 8.a. Heredity plays the major role in determining one's personality.
b. It is one's experiences in life which determine what they're like. (Filler)
- 9.a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
b. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.
- 10.a. In the case of the well prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.
b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.
- 11.a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.
- 12.a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
b. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.
- 13.a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow. (Filler)
- 14.a. There are certain people who are just no good.
b. There is some good in everybody.

- 15.a. In my case getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.
- 16.a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
- 17.a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand nor control.
b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.
- 18.a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
b. There really is no such thing as "luck". (Filler)
- 19.a. One should always be willing to admit mistakes.
b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.
- 20.a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
b. How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.
- 21.a. In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.
- 22.a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.
b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.
- 23.a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
b. There is a direct connection between how I study and the grades I get.
- 24.a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
b. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are. (Filler)
- 25.a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.
- 26.a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.
- 27.a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.
b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character. (Filler)
- 28.a. What happens to me is my own doing.
b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.
- 29.a. Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.
b. In the long run the people are responsible for bad government on a national as on a local level.

Professional Style - [These items are from several subscales of the International Personality Item Pool (IPIP), which is based on prior developed scales used to measure differences in personality. Here we have listed items from four subscales we might want to use: Assertiveness (a), Competence (c), Independence (i), and Generates Ideas (g), to assess changes in thinking and problem solving style. We have also rewritten the introduction to

stress how the respondent behaves in the work situation. For brevity, we have formatted it in a checklist style. Alternatively, respondents could rate each statement as to how accurately the statement describes themselves in a work situation from very accurate to very inaccurate.]

Below are listed a number of adjectives. Please check those that describe how you are in your work situation”.

- Express myself easily (a)
- Try to lead others (a)
- Automatically take charge (a)
- Know how to convince others (a)
- Am the first to act (a)
- Take control of things (a)
- Wait for others to lead the way (a)
- Let others make the decisions (a)
- Am not highly motivated to succeed (a)
- Can't come up with new ideas (a,g)
- Can handle complex problems (i)
- Think quickly (i)
- Formulate ideas clearly (i)
- Have excellent ideas (i,g)
- Am quick to understand things (i)
- Never challenge things (i)
- Undertake few things on my own (i)
- Let others determine my choices (i)
- Let myself be directed by others (i)
- Do not have a good imagination (i,g)
- Come up with good solutions (c)
- Am full of ideas (c, g)
- Know how to apply my knowledge (c)
- Am easily hurt (c)
- Feel crushed by setbacks (c)
- Excel in nothing at all (c)
- Get confused easily (c)
- Question my ability to do my work properly (c)
- Am easily offended (c)
- Know that I am not a special person (c)
- Quickly think up new ideas (g)
- Have difficulty imagining things.

General Self Efficacy - [Many of the respondents indicated that after participating in the AIHA program they felt more empowered. This scale measures how a person copes with adverse situations, how sure they are that they can act and make a difference. It has been used with a number of different nationalities and has a international manual with psychometric properties.]

For each statement, please choose the one response that best describes how true each statement is in describing you.

I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.

- (1) Not at all true
- (2) Barely true

- (3) Moderately true
- (4) Exactly true

If someone opposes me, I can find the ways and means to get what I want.

- (1) Not at all true
- (2) Barely true
- (3) Moderately true
- (4) Exactly true

It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.

- (1) Not at all true
- (2) Barely true
- (3) Moderately true
- (4) Exactly true

I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.

- (1) Not at all true
- (2) Barely true
- (3) Moderately true
- (4) Exactly true

Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations.

- (1) Not at all true
- (2) Barely true
- (3) Moderately true
- (4) Exactly true

I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.

- (1) Not at all true
- (2) Barely true
- (3) Moderately true
- (4) Exactly true

I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.

- (1) Not at all true
- (2) Barely true
- (3) Moderately true
- (4) Exactly true

When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.

- (1) Not at all true
- (2) Barely true
- (3) Moderately true
- (4) Exactly true

If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution.

- (1) Not at all true
- (2) Barely true
- (3) Moderately true

(4) Exactly true

I can usually handle whatever comes my way.

- (1) Not at all true
- (2) Barely true
- (3) Moderately true
- (4) Exactly true

Openness to people from other cultures - [During the formative research, representatives indicated that they changed their attitudes toward people of other cultures. In our search we only found scales here are specific to particular races, cultures and ethnic groups that are not useful in this context. For example, in the US the scales assessed attitudes toward African-Americans. What is below is modified form of the Bogardus Social Distance Scale which has been used extensively in the past to assess willingness to associate with people of another group. We have presented two different forms. The first asks everyone to rate several cultures and ethnic groups. Here we need to come up with the groups. The second asks each to rate people from their partner country.]

Please give your feelings about each of the following ethnic groups. Please check how willing you would be to have members of each group

	Have as close friends	Have as next door neighbors	Work in same office	Have as citizen of my country	Have as visitor to my country
Americans					
African-Americans					
Russians					
Each partnership country					
Germans					

[Alternatively, we could ask each representative about how they feel just about the people from their partner country.]

Thinking about the people from your partner country. Please tell us how willing you would be to have people from this country close to you in the following ways.

How willing would you be to have a person from this country become a citizen of your country?

- (1) Extremely willing
- (2) Quite willing
- (3) Somewhat willing
- (4) Neither willing nor unwilling
- (5) Somewhat unwilling
- (6) Quite unwilling
- (7) Extremely unwilling

How willing would you be to work with a person from this country?

- (1) Extremely willing
- (2) Quite willing
- (3) Somewhat willing
- (4) Neither willing nor unwilling
- (5) Somewhat unwilling
- (6) Quite unwilling
- (7) Extremely unwilling

How willing would you be to live next to a person from this country?

- (1) Extremely willing
- (2) Quite willing
- (3) Somewhat willing
- (4) Neither willing nor unwilling
- (5) Somewhat unwilling
- (6) Quite unwilling
- (7) Extremely unwilling

How willing would you be to have a son or daughter marry a person from this country?

- (1) Extremely willing
- (2) Quite willing
- (3) Somewhat willing
- (4) Neither willing nor unwilling
- (5) Somewhat unwilling
- (6) Quite unwilling
- (7) Extremely unwilling

Views of US foreign assistance - [These are items from surveys that have been used regularly in the US to assess support to foreign assistance on the GSS and other regular surveys. Norms are available.]

US aid to newly democratic countries improves their chances of success.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Somewhat agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Somewhat disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree

Taking care of problems at home is more important for the US than giving aid to foreign countries.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Somewhat agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Somewhat disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree

The United States should be willing to share at least a small portion of its wealth with those in the world who are in need.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Somewhat agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Somewhat disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree

Do you feel the amount the United States spends on foreign aid is too much, too little, or about right?

- (1) Too much
- (2) Too little
- (3) About the right amount

How people from the US and the NIS/CEE are viewed

People from the NIS have to do their work under difficult circumstances.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Somewhat agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Somewhat disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree

People from the CEE have to do their work under difficult circumstances.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Somewhat agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Somewhat disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree

People in the NIS and CEE trust Americans.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Somewhat agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Somewhat disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree

People from the NIS and CEE have much in common with Americans.

- (1) Strongly agree
- (2) Somewhat agree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Somewhat disagree
- (5) Strongly disagree

It takes often takes time to learn to trust people. Thinking about how you feel now, how much would you say that you trust the people you are working with from your partner country? Make how trusting you feel right now. Where 1 means trust not at all and 7 means trust a lot.

The people I am working with from my partner country

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7

I trust not at all

I trust a lot

Participation in the AIHA partnership program [The first is an open-ended item to assess change that may have occurred. The rest are items to assess the length and intensity of participation in the AIHA partnership program. As indicated below, more items are needed to capture the degree of participation.]

In general, how have you changed now that you have participated? Think about all kinds of changes: professional changes, personal changes, social changes, changes in how you think, and changes in how you do things.

About how many years have you been participating in the AIHA programs?

- Less than 1 year
- 1 year
- 2 years
- 3 years
- 4 years
- 5 years
- More than 5 years

In total, how many trips have you made to your partner country for partnership activities?
_____ trips

Thinking about the past 12 months, how many times have you traveled to your partner country and how many other trips have you made outside of your country either for business or pleasure?

- _____ trips to my partner country for partnership activities
- _____ other trips outside of my country for business or for pleasure

How much are you involved in the partnership program?

- (1) Involved on a daily basis
- (2) Very involved
- (3) Somewhat involved
- (4) A little involved
- (5) Involved only through my colleagues, friends, or family

What were your three main activities in the partnership program?

The following is a list of partnership activities. First, check those that you have EVER participated in and then check those you have participated in during the past 12 months.

[need list of common partnership activities, like those in the screening form]

Civic and political participation - [This is a potential control variable as well as one that may change with participation. Many of these items are from the New Democracies Barometer and thus we may be able to find norms.]

How closely do you follow world affairs?

- (1) very closely
- (2) somewhat closely
- (3) a little
- (4) not at all closely

Do you find that people you know ask your opinion about political affairs?

- (1) often
- (2) sometimes
- (3) seldom
- (4) never

How often do you find yourself talking to others about what is happening in countries other than your own?

- (1) often
- (2) sometimes
- (3) seldom
- (4) never

How often do you read the international news section of the newspaper?

- (1) every day
- (2) at least once a week
- (3) about once a month
- (4) a few times a year
- (5) once a year
- (6) less than once a year
- (7) never

How often do watch international news on television?

- (1) every day
- (2) at least once a week
- (3) about once a month
- (4) a few times a year
- (5) once a year
- (6) less than once a year
- (7) never

How often do you listen to international news on the radio?

- (1) every day
- (2) at least once a week
- (3) about once a month
- (4) a few times a year
- (5) once a year

- (6) less than once a year
- (7) never

About how often do you travel to other countries for personal reasons?

- (1) once a month
- (2) a few times a year
- (3) about once a year
- (4) about once every 5 years
- (5) about once every 10 years
- (6) never

Did you vote in the last national election?

- (1) No
- (2) Yes

With which of the following do you most closely identify yourself?

- (1) the world
- (2) the western world
- (3) my country
- (4) the city or community in which I live and work
- (5) the neighborhood in which I live
- (6) other, please specify _____

How proud are you to be a citizen of your country?

- (1) very proud
- (2) somewhat proud
- (3) not very proud
- (4) not at all proud

[We might want to consider items on confidence with various institutions as used in New Democracies and GSS.]

Social and demographic characteristics - [here are items that can be used to describe the general social and demographic characteristics of AIHA participants as well as items that may serve as control variables]

Now we have a few questions about who you are so that we can describe to USAID the general characteristics of people who participate in the partnership program.

Are you male or female?

- (1) Male
- (2) Female

How old are you?

- (1) younger than 20 years
- (2) 20 to 29 years
- (3) 30 to 39 years
- (4) 40 to 49 years
- (5) 50 to 59 years
- (6) 60 or older

What is your highest level of education?

How often do you attend religious services?

- (1) at least every week
- (2) about one a month
- (3) a few times a year
- (4) once a year
- (5) less than once a year
- (6) never

What is your occupation?

- Physician
- Nurse
- Hospital administrator
- [need the most likely categories here]
- Other, please specify _____

As for your own household, how do you rate its economic situation today? [this is from democracies barometer. Alternatively, could use item from GSS, p21.]

- (1) very satisfactory
- (2) fairly satisfactory
- (3) not very satisfactory
- (4) very unsatisfactory

From what country did your ancestors come?

[Some other demographic characteristics to consider are: Race/ethnicity, household size, liberal-conservative, marital status. Note: the GSS and New Democracies Barometer have good items.]

Identification Code

We may be coming back to ask you to complete this survey again in about a year. The purpose will be to see if you have changed some of your attitudes and beliefs. Since we will not have your name, we would like you to create a identification code that we can use to match this survey to the next survey without your name.

- ___ First initial of your first name
- ___ ___ Day of the month of your birth (enter a two-digit number, e.g., 01, for the first of day of the month, 02 for the second day of the month
- ___ First initial of the city of your birth

[may need another code here]

Comments on the partnership program [Questions like the ones below might be included if AIHA wants to assess general comments the representatives have about what AIHA is doing. We recommend that these be at the end.]

What do you like the best about your participation in the AIHA partnership program?

What do you like the least about your participation in the AIHA partnership program?

Do you have any comments you would like to make about the partnership program that could help AIHA do a better job?