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Acronym List
The acronyms below are commonly used in the Peace Corps and throughout this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFR</td>
<td>Africa Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA</td>
<td>Europe, Mediterranean, and Asia Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVS</td>
<td>Employee Viewpoint Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSN</td>
<td>Foreign service national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCN</td>
<td>Host country national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCS</td>
<td>Host country staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCSS</td>
<td>Host Country Staff Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAP</td>
<td>Inter-America and Pacific Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSIRP</td>
<td>Office of Strategic Information, Research, and Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>Performance goal in the agency strategic plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC</td>
<td>Personal services contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDH</td>
<td>U.S. direct hires</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

Host country staff have a unique perspective on the Peace Corps’ operations and mission and provide enormous value to the agency. These staff remain in close contact with Volunteers throughout their service, and they are also exempt from the “five-year rule” that applies to nearly all USDH employees. As a result, many host country staff have been serving at their posts for years—and, in some cases, decades—longer than nearly all other agency employees.

The Host Country Staff Survey (HCSS) was introduced in 2014 in order to receive feedback from employees whose work is vital to Peace Corps operations, but whose viewpoints were not otherwise directly available to agency management at headquarters. The data received through the HCSS complements the Peace Corps’ other performance data sources, including the Employee Viewpoint Survey (EVS) of U.S. direct-hire (USDH) staff, the Annual Volunteer Survey, and the Global Counterpart Survey of Volunteers’ primary work partners.

The HCSS is distributed exclusively online to multicultural and/or multilingual respondents. All post staff who were hired as foreign service nationals (FSNs) or personal services contractors (PSCs) were eligible to participate in the HCSS, regardless of whether they were nationals of the host country, the United States, or a third country. In an attempt to reach as many staff as possible, the 2015 HCSS was made available for the first time in three languages: English, French, and Spanish.

Expansion of the 2015 HCSS

In 2014, the HCSS consisted of nine questions. Most questions were drawn from the Office of Personnel Management’s EVS, which is fielded every year to U.S. direct-hire employees in all agencies of the federal government. Particular focus was placed on measuring agency progress on two performance goals (PGs) in the Peace Corps: PG 6.2, which calls for the agency to increase the percentage of Peace Corps Volunteers, U.S. direct-hire staff, and host country staff who report that the agency has an inclusive culture; and PG 9.1, which calls for the agency to increase the percentage of staff who are satisfied with the training they receive to do their jobs.

In 2015, the scope of the survey was expanded slightly to cover additional topics and increase its usefulness to the agency. The revised survey consisted of 14 questions covering the following topics:

- Inclusiveness of the Peace Corps’ culture
- Staff training
- Staff contribution to the Peace Corps’ strategic plan
- Host country impact
- Staff engagement and satisfaction

2015 HCSS Topline Findings

The 2015 HCSS reached a considerably larger percentage of host country staff than it did in 2014. Since the HCSS is still in its infancy, however, this year’s survey results must be viewed with the same degree of caution that was recommended in the 2014 Host Country Staff Survey Report. Given its census approach to surveying staff, participation must continue to grow at posts in order to achieve the kind of robust response rates necessary for providing definitive management insights.

---

1 Please refer to Appendix B for copies of the questionnaire as distributed in English, French, and Spanish.
2 Fifty-two percent of all eligible staff responded to the survey in 2015, compared with 37 percent of all eligible staff in 2014.
3 All findings in this report are based solely on those who responded to the survey. As with all census approaches, the HCSS respondents’ views may or may not represent the views of all host country staff, depending on sample bias and coverage errors. The nature of these factors is unknown to researchers without the completion of additional nonresponse studies.
Despite these limitations, the 2015 HCSS offers valuable observations about Peace Corps operations. Staff who participated in this year’s survey overwhelmingly reported\(^4\) that they were satisfied with their jobs (88%), felt they were doing high quality work (96%), and found their jobs to be more interesting than available alternatives in their area (85%). They also felt that the organizational culture of the Peace Corps is inclusive of diverse people (92%), and that supervisors treat them with respect (87%).

When comparing host country staff who were satisfied with their jobs to those who were less than satisfied, three actionable areas emerge where Peace Corps management may be able to effect positive change. First, steps could be taken to strengthen the perception among host country staff that supervisors take employees’ input into account regarding decisions that affect their work. Second, concrete procedures that regularly assess the training needs of host country staff may result in an improved perception of employees’ ability to develop their skills at the Peace Corps. Finally, additional measures could be taken to strengthen employees’ perception that managers and supervisors work well with host country staff of different backgrounds.

**Methodology and Data Interpretation: Why We Focus on Global Findings**
This report focuses on global results for two primary reasons. First, global insights provide “the big picture” for how managers can enact positive behaviors to support employee satisfaction and performance. While individual circumstances may vary among staff at different posts, the insights that are received from employees around the world are the ones that are most likely to provide results once they are acted upon at the local level.

Second, although the Office of Strategic Information, Research, and Planning (OSIRP) used all of the tools available to its research team to increase the validity of the HCSS data, some logistical and intercultural limitations persist. Challenges to validity, such as sampling bias, coverage error, and the effects of intercultural interpretation of questions, are magnified at lower levels of reporting,\(^5\) but global-level results can offer insights where respondents display consensus around results.

**Sampling Method: An Attempted Census**
The HCSS attempts to reach all eligible staff, which is a non-random sampling methodology also known as a census. Unlike random sampling methodologies, census approaches cannot ensure with a known degree of confidence that those who respond to a survey are similar to those who do not respond. It is therefore important not to extrapolate the HCSS results to the eligible staff who did not participate in the survey, either because they chose not to respond, because they did not have a valid email address, or because they do not speak the survey’s supported languages of English, French, and Spanish.

In 2015, 52 percent of all host country staff globally responded to the survey, which accounts for 73 percent of all staff with email addresses identified by the research team. While this is a significant

---

\(^4\) In order to improve the validity of the analyses presented in this report and reduce factors such as intercultural response biases, all five-point balanced scalar questions that were asked of respondents have been recoded into summary sentiments. This was achieved by combining the two positive and two negative data points into their own respective categories. For example, the original scale, which included the points “strongly disagree,” “disagree,” “neither agree nor disagree,” “agree,” and “strongly agree” were recoded as “strongly disagree or disagree,” “neither agree nor disagree,” and “agree or strongly agree.”

\(^5\) The researchers investigated job title, job hierarchy, and regional breakdowns in assembling this report but did not find a compelling case for including results at those levels of analysis due to the potential for sample bias and coverage error.
improvement over 2014\textsuperscript{6}—likely due in large part to the survey’s new availability in French and Spanish\textsuperscript{7}—the response rate is still far less than ideal for a census methodology.\textsuperscript{8}

It is hoped that the HCSS response rates and resulting data validity will improve with each administration of the Host Country Staff Survey, as staff become increasingly accustomed to completing the survey over time and as OSIRP’s research team continues to improve its ability to reach the target population.

The HCSS Questionnaire: \textit{Intercultural Surveying}

The HCSS Questionnaire was originally designed as an extension of the EVS and closely retains several questions from that survey. It is notable, however, that those questions were originally designed for a very specific population: English-speaking federal employees who were well-acquainted with American and U.S. government culture. Consequently, the questions on the HCSS might be interpreted differently by—or be more or less sensitive to—host country staff who do not share this same cultural background. This limits the survey’s comparability to Employee Viewpoint Survey results and also complicates comparability when looking at data below the global level.

The issue of cross-cultural comparability is also compounded by translating the survey into multiple languages\textsuperscript{9} and by imperfect coverage of the languages spoken at post. As a result, the nature and extent of the effects of intercultural interpretation of the terms used in the survey is unknown.\textsuperscript{10}

\textbf{2015 Host Country Staff Survey Findings}

\textbf{Overall Satisfaction with Work and Factors that Drive Engagement}

Overall, the Peace Corps employees who participated in this year’s Host Country Staff Survey reported that they were happy with the agency as an employer. About nine in 10 respondents (88\%) agreed or strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their jobs, and nearly all (99\%) reported both that they understood how their work related to the agency’s goals and priorities and that they did high quality work for the agency (96\%). The vast majority of respondents felt that their supervisor treated them with respect (87\%), that they were encouraged to innovate (80\%), and that they had appropriate input into decisions that affected their work (77\%).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{ |p{25cm}|p{2cm}|p{2cm}| }
\hline
\textbf{To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:} & \textbf{\% Agree or Strongly Agree} \\
\hline
Q1. I know how my work relates to the agency’s goals and priorities. (n=1,517) & 99\% \\
\hline
Q6. I do high quality work (n=1,488) & 96\% \\
\hline
Q6. I am satisfied with my job (n=1,493) & 88\% \\
\hline
Q6. My supervisor/team leader treats me with respect (n=1,501) & 87\% \\
\hline
Q6. I feel encouraged to come up with new and better ways of doing things at work (n=1,489) & 80\% \\
\hline
Q6. I have appropriate input into decisions that affect my work (n=1,486) & 77\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Job Satisfaction and Satisfaction with Factors Driving Work Perception}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{6} In 2014, 37 percent of all eligible staff or 55 percent of staff with identified email addresses responded to the survey.

\textsuperscript{7} French and Spanish accounted for 19 percent of the responses to the 2015 survey. See Table A5 for response rates broken out by language.

\textsuperscript{8} Please see Appendix A for tabular data regarding response rates among different classes of staff.

\textsuperscript{9} Translations were completed by the U.S. Department of State’s Office of Language Services and checked by internal Peace Corps employees who were familiar with agency operations and also fluent in the languages employed.

\textsuperscript{10} These constraints could be reduced by cognitively testing the survey translations for wording effects prior to fielding the next survey.
As one would expect, not all participating staff were satisfied with their jobs, and some interesting trends emerge when comparing those who reported being satisfied with their jobs with those who reported being less than satisfied. As shown in Figure 2, less-than-satisfied respondents are on par with satisfied workers regarding their understanding of their role and perception of their work. However, the less-than-satisfied group was five times more likely to disagree or strongly disagree that their supervisor treated them with respect (15 percent, compared to 3 percent of satisfied workers) or that they were encouraged to innovate in their work (21 percent, compared to 4 percent of satisfied workers). The largest gap between satisfied and less-than-satisfied staff who participated in this year’s survey was the extent to which the two groups felt they had appropriate input into decisions that affected their work. Those who reported being less than satisfied with their work were fully six times as likely to disagree or strongly disagree that they had appropriate input into decisions that affected their work (30 percent, compared to 5 percent of satisfied workers).

Comparing Peace Corps Employment with Available Alternatives

The 2015 HCSS introduced a new type of question that asked host country staff to compare several aspects of their job to other jobs that might be available in the area where they lived. The Peace Corps received high marks from participating staff on this question as well: 85 percent of respondents reported that their jobs were more interesting than other opportunities, and three in four reported that the Peace Corps was superior in offering employees the ability to contribute to their community (75%), in the level of respect they received from the community (75%), and in their ability to improve their job skills (73%).

The “satisfied” group includes those who “strongly agree” or “agree” that they are satisfied with their job at Q6 (n=1,324). The “less-than-satisfied” group includes those who “neither agree nor disagree,” “disagree,” or “strongly disagree” that they are satisfied with their job at Q6 (n=169). As with all HCSS data, all findings should be treated with caution as they may not be representative of the population as a whole due to nonresponse and coverage biases.

11 The “satisfied” group includes those who “strongly agree” or “agree” that they are satisfied with their job at Q6 (n=1,324). The “less-than-satisfied” group includes those who “neither agree nor disagree,” “disagree,” or “strongly disagree” that they are satisfied with their job at Q6 (n=169). As with all HCSS data, all findings should be treated with caution as they may not be representative of the population as a whole due to nonresponse and coverage biases.
It is not surprising to find that the host country staff who were less than satisfied with their work were more likely to report that other available positions were more appealing in certain aspects. However, it is noteworthy that the item over which the Peace Corps has the most control—employees’ ability to improve their job skills—was also the item on which less-than-satisfied employees reported being least satisfied.

Figure 4: Peace Corps Compared with Employment Alternatives Among Those Satisfied and Those Less Than Satisfied with their Job

Satisfaction with Job Training
As an area in which the Peace Corps can influence host country staff’s perception of the agency, job training is a foundational cornerstone of the HCSS questionnaire. It is encouraging, then, that two in three respondents to this year’s survey reported being satisfied with the training they received for their present job (66%) and that their training needs were assessed (66%). Further, three in four felt that their supervisors supported employee development (75%) and that they were given a real opportunity to improve their skills (74%).

As when comparing their Peace Corps job to other available opportunities, training aspects were a major differentiator between those satisfied and those less than satisfied with their Peace Corps employment. Strikingly, about four in 10 (39%) of those less than satisfied with their jobs reported that their training needs were not assessed, and more than three in 10 (32%) reported feeling that they were not given a real opportunity to improve their skills at the Peace Corps. Ensuring that training needs are assessed is an area that is well within management’s abilities, would be likely to yield positive changes in employee perception of the agency, and could create a more effective workforce.

Figure 5: Satisfaction with Training Aspects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:</th>
<th>% Agree or Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q4. Supervisors at my post support employee development. (n=1,513)</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. I am given a real opportunity to improve my skills at Peace Corps. (n=1,510)</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. My training needs are assessed. (n=1,508)</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5. How satisfied are you with the training you receive for your present job? (n=1,495)</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Peace Corps’ Culture of Inclusion

Creating a culture of inclusion among Peace Corps host country staff is critical to promoting the agency’s mission. Doing so not only creates an atmosphere conducive to achievement but also embodies Goal Two efforts to provide a positive model of American culture.

Respondents to the 2015 HCSS overwhelmingly viewed the Peace Corps’ organizational culture as inclusive of diverse people. More than nine in 10 respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the Peace Corps’ organizational culture was inclusive of diverse people (92%), and only 6 percent of the respondents who would be most likely to demonstrate negativity—those less than satisfied with their positions—disagreed or strongly disagreed.

---

12 Additional clarifying language shown at Q12: Diversity is a collection of individual attributes that include, but are not limited to, characteristics such as nationality, language, race, color, ethnicity, disability, gender, age, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, socioeconomic status, veteran status, and family structures.
Slightly fewer respondents (79%) believed that the organization’s managers and supervisors worked well with employees of different backgrounds. A large gap exists between those satisfied with their job and those less than satisfied on this point: About one in five of those less than satisfied with their jobs (19%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that their managers and supervisors worked well with employees of different backgrounds, as compared with just 3 percent of those who reported being satisfied with their jobs. Closing this gap through improved post management training in this area could yield positive results for both Goal Two implementation and employee productivity.

Interestingly, when asked to specify where, if anywhere, respondents saw a gap in the Peace Corps’ culture of inclusion, the most often cited attribute of differentiation was disability (12%), followed by language (9%),

### Figure 9: Gaps in the Peace Corps’ Culture of Inclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q13. Where, if anywhere, do you see gaps in the culture of inclusion in Peace Corps? (Select all that apply)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=</td>
<td>1449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability (such as blindness, deafness, not being able to walk, etc.)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National origin / nationality</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race / color</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender identity (personal sense of being a man or woman)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity / ethnic group / tribal identity</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic status (such as being rich or poor)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family structures (such as being single or married and having or not having children)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender or sex (male or female)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran status (experience in the military)</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not see gaps in the Peace Corps’ culture of inclusion</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Peace Corps’ Impact in Host Countries

The 2015 HCSS included a series of new questions aimed at understanding host country staff’s perceptions of the Peace Corps’ impact in the countries where it works. According to those who responded to the survey, the Peace Corps is demonstrating both Goal One and Goal Two impact: 98 percent reported that they believed the Peace Corps has a somewhat or strongly positive effect on people in their country, and 94 percent reported that they themselves had gained a new understanding of Americans during their employment at the Peace Corps. When asked about the nature of that new understanding, 68 percent stated that their overall view of Americans had become more positive, 27 percent stated that their perception of Americans was about the same, 3 percent stated that their opinion had become less positive, and 3 percent reported being unsure.

Respondents to this year’s survey who reported gaining a new understanding of Americans were also asked with whom they shared that new understanding of Americans. Host country staff most often cited coworkers (93%), family members (90%), and friends (85%) as the recipients of this informal Goal Two work.

---

9 Nine percent of those who took the 2015 HCSS in either English (n=1184) or French (n=96) cited language as a gap in the Peace Corps’ culture of inclusion, as compared with 5 percent of those who took the survey in Spanish (n=169).

14 In 2015, this question was asked of all respondents, but the 2014 HCSS asked this question of only those who did not agree that the organizational culture of the Peace Corps was inclusive of diverse people. In 2015, therefore, it is likely that the results included a larger number of people who observed, but did not directly experience, the gaps they reported.
Figure 10: Sharing a New Understanding of Americans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q9. Have you shared the new understanding of Americans that you gained during your employment at Peace Corps with any of the following types of people?</th>
<th>Your coworkers (n=1,376)</th>
<th>Family members (n=1,391)</th>
<th>Friends (n=1,381)</th>
<th>People in the media (n=1,327)</th>
<th>People on social media (n=1,339)</th>
<th>Other people in your community (n=1,366)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

The HCSS is still in its infancy, but its value will increase with each year as the survey continues to expand its response rate. While the results of the survey must continue to be viewed with some caution, the overall perception of the agency among those who responded was very positive. Further, acting on the following three survey findings may yield a more positive and productive host country workforce:

1. Ensure that employees feel they have appropriate input into decisions that affect their work.
2. Implement concrete procedures that regularly assess host country staff training needs.
3. Implement steps to ensure that employees feel managers and supervisors at posts work well with employees of different backgrounds.
Appendix A—Respondent Characteristics

The research team worked in cooperation with the Office of the Chief Financial Officer and the Office of the CIO to assemble a survey distribution list that was as complete as possible. However, the distribution list was limited by the fact that not all host country staff are supplied with email addresses and there is currently no central list or database of host country staff that includes email addresses. Despite the best efforts of all three offices, email addresses for only 2,085 of all 2,950 eligible staff (71%) were available for distribution of the survey. The HCSS received responses from 1,530 staff, for a response rate of 73 percent of reachable staff and 52 percent of all eligible staff.
### Table A1: Response Rates by Geography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sample Responses</th>
<th>Sample Members</th>
<th>Sample Response Rate</th>
<th>Population Members</th>
<th>Population Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GLOBAL</strong></td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>2085</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>2950</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENIN</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOTSWANA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURKINA FASO</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMEROON</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMOROS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHIOPIA</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAMBIA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHANA</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUINEA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENYA</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESOTHO</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERIA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MADAGASCAR</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALAWI</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOZAMBIQUE</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAMIBIA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWANDA</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENEGAL</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIERRA LEONE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH AFRICA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAZILAND</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANZANIA</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOGO</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGANDA</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAMBIA</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBANIA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMENIA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZERBAIJAN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURMA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMBODIA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINA</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDONESIA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JORDAN</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOSOVO</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KYRGYZ REPUBLIC</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACEDONIA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOLDOVA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONGOLIA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOROCCO</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPAL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILIPPINES</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THAILAND</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMOR LESTE</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKRAINE</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A1 (Continued): Response Rates by Geography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sample Responses</th>
<th>Sample Members</th>
<th>Sample Response Rate</th>
<th>Population Members</th>
<th>Population Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IAP</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELIZE</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLOMBIA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSTA RICA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMINICAN REPUBLIC</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASTERN CARIBBEAN</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECUADOR</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL SALVADOR</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIJI</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUATEMALA</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUYANA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMAICA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEXICO</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICRONESIA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICARAGUA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANAMA</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARAGUAY</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERU</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMOA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONGA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VANUATU</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A2: Response Rates by Vendor Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor Type</th>
<th>Sample Responses</th>
<th>Sample Members</th>
<th>Sample Response Rate</th>
<th>Population Members</th>
<th>Population Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Service Contractor, Long Term</td>
<td>1336</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Service National</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Service Contractor (1099), Long Term</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Service Contractor Short Term</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Note: Netted to protect respondent confidentiality)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A3: Response Rates by Contract Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Source</th>
<th>Sample Responses</th>
<th>Sample Members</th>
<th>Sample Response Rate</th>
<th>Population Members</th>
<th>Population Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCN_POST</td>
<td>1452</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>2823</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US_POST</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCN_POS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Note: Netted to protect respondent confidentiality)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A4: Response Rates by Job Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Sample Responses</th>
<th>Sample Members</th>
<th>Sample Response Rate</th>
<th>Population Members</th>
<th>Population Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driver/Mechanic</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Manager</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCMO/PCMC</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Assistant</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language &amp; Cross Cultural Facilitator</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Specialist</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program And Training Specialist</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Specialist</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Director/Manager</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Services Assistant</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashier</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program &amp; Training Assistant</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Assistant</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APCD</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptionist</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Security Coordinator</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Assistant</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Service Specialist</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language &amp; Cross Cultural Coordinator</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Specialist</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitor</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Analyst</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Security Assistant</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Trainer</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics Coordinator</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Assistant</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Support/Services Assistant</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guard</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Administrative Officer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Secretary</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS Coordinator</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voucher Examiner</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homestay Coordinator</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Management and Operations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Coordinator</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Pool Coordinator</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program &amp; Training Secretary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Security Officer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Training Manager</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail Clerk/Messenger</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Manager</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Clerk</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCMO/PCMC, Part-Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Note: Netted to protect respondent confidentiality)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A5: Respondents’ Language Used to Take the Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Sample Responses</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Non-English Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B—The 2015 HCSS Questionnaire in English, French, and Spanish

The 2015 Host Country Staff Survey was designed in English, then translated into French and Spanish by the Department of State’s translation services in order to increase the number of staff that could be reached. These three versions of the survey are included in this appendix.

HCSS Questionnaire as Distributed in English

Questionnaire for the 2015 Host Country Staff Survey

We are very pleased to offer you the opportunity to participate in the Peace Corps’ 2015 Host Country Staff Survey!

The confidential feedback that you provide through this brief 5-10 minute survey helps Peace Corps leadership to better understand what host country staff around the world think about their jobs, what impact our programs have in the countries where we work, and what progress we have made on important Performance Goals from the Peace Corps’ Strategic Plan for FY 2014-FY2018.

Your responses will be combined with those of other host country staff to create reports that will help Peace Corps leaders make informed decisions on agency policies and procedures that will further strengthen our operations and enhance our contributions in the communities where we serve.

We value your opinions and want to encourage input from all of our staff members, but your participation in the survey is optional. All of your responses to the Host Country Staff Survey are confidential—results will not be provided in ways that make you personally identifiable.

Thank you for sharing your opinions about your Peace Corps workplace!

Please mark the answer that best describes the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

1. I know how my work relates to the agency’s goals and priorities.
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree
   3. Neither agree nor disagree
   4. Disagree
   5. Strongly disagree
   6. Do not know/Not applicable

2. My training needs are assessed.
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree
   3. Neither agree nor disagree
   4. Disagree
   5. Strongly disagree
   6. Do not know/Not applicable
3. **I am given a real opportunity to improve my skills at Peace Corps.**
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree
   3. Neither agree nor disagree
   4. Disagree
   5. Strongly disagree

4. **Supervisors at my post support employee development.**
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree
   3. Neither agree nor disagree
   4. Disagree
   5. Strongly disagree

5. **How satisfied are you with the training you receive for your present job?**
   1. Very satisfied
   2. Satisfied
   3. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
   4. Dissatisfied
   5. Very dissatisfied

6. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:**
   [Scale: Strongly agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree, Don’t know/Not applicable]
   [RANDOMIZE ORDER]
   1. I feel encouraged to come up with new and better ways of doing things at work
   2. I have appropriate input into decisions that affect my work
   3. My supervisor/team leader treats me with respect
   4. I am satisfied with my job
   5. I do high quality work

7. **How does your job with the Peace Corps compare to other jobs that might be available to you in the area where you live?**
   [Scale: My job with Peace Corps is much better, My job with Peace Corps is somewhat better, My job with Peace Corps is about the same as other available jobs, Other available jobs are somewhat better, Other available jobs are much better, Don’t know/Not applicable]
   [RANDOMIZE ORDER]
   1. The respect that others in your community have for the work that you do
   2. How interesting your work is to you personally
   3. Your ability to improve your job skills
   4. Your ability to contribute to your community

8. **Have you gained a new understanding of Americans during your employment at Peace Corps?**
   1. Yes
   2. No
   3. Not sure
9. Have you shared the new understanding of Americans that you gained during your employment at Peace Corps with any of the following types of people?
   [Scale: Yes, No, Not Sure]
   [RANDOMIZE ORDER, ANCHOR OTHER]
   1. Your coworkers
   2. Family members
   3. Friends
   4. People in the media
   5. People on social media such as Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, MXit, or Renren.
   6. Other people in your community

10. What kind of impact do you think Peace Corps has on people in your country?
    1. A strong positive impact
    2. A somewhat positive impact
    3. No impact
    4. A somewhat negative impact
    5. A very negative impact
    6. Not sure

11. To what extent do you agree or disagree that managers/supervisors at your post work well with employees of different backgrounds?
    1. Strongly agree
    2. Agree
    3. Neither agree nor disagree
    4. Disagree
    5. Strongly disagree

12. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the organizational culture of Peace Corps (including staff and Volunteers) is inclusive of diverse people?

    Diversity is a collection of individual attributes that include, but are not limited to, characteristics such as nationality, language, race, color, ethnicity, disability, gender, age, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, socioeconomic status, veteran status, and family structures.
    1. Strongly agree
    2. Agree
    3. Neither agree nor disagree
    4. Disagree
    5. Strongly disagree
    6. Do not know
13. Where, if anywhere, do you see gaps in the culture of inclusion in Peace Corps?

[RANDOMIZE ORDER 1-13, ANCHOR 14 AND 15]
1. National origin / nationality
2. Language
3. Race / color
4. Ethnicity / ethnic group / tribal identity
5. Disability (such as blindness, deafness, not being able to walk, etc.)
6. Gender or sex (male or female)
7. Age
8. Religion
9. Sexual orientation
10. Gender identity (personal sense of being a man or woman)
11. Socioeconomic status (such as being rich or poor)
12. Veteran status (experience in the military)
13. Family structures (such as being single or married and having or not having children)
14. Other (specify): __________________________________________
15. I do not see gaps in the Peace Corps’ culture of inclusion

14. How has your overall opinion about Americans changed since you became a Peace Corps employee? Is your overall opinion about Americans...
   1. More positive
   2. About the same
   3. Less positive
   4. Not sure

Thank you for your participation!

___________________

If you have any other thoughts or concerns to share with us on interactions among Volunteers or staff and building an inclusive culture in Peace Corps, you can email the Office of Civil Rights and Diversity privately at OCRD@peacecorps.gov.
Nous avons le plaisir de vous inviter à participer à l’enquête de 2015 auprès du personnel des pays d’accueil du Corps de la Paix!

Les commentaires confidentiels que vous nous soumettez dans ce bref questionnaire de 5 à 10 minutes permettent aux dirigeants du Corps de la Paix de mieux comprendre ce que le personnel des pays d’accueil partout dans le monde pense de son travail, quel est l’impact de nos programmes sur les pays dans lesquels nous sommes implantés et quels sont les progrès que vous avez accomplis par rapport aux importants objectifs de performance du plan stratégique du Corps de la Paix pour les années fiscal 2014-2018.

Vos réponses seront regroupées avec celles du personnel d’autres pays d’accueil, dans le but de créer des rapports qui aideront les dirigeants du Corps de la Paix à prendre des décisions informées quant aux politiques et procédures de l’agence. L’objectif est de renforcer nos opérations et d’améliorer nos contributions auprès des communautés que nous servons.

Votre opinion est pour nous de la plus haute importance ; c’est pourquoi nous encourageons tous les membres de notre personnel à s’exprimer, même si la participation à l’enquête est optionnelle. Toutes vos réponses à l’enquête auprès du personnel des pays d’accueil sont confidentielles ; la communication des résultats ne permettra pas de vous identifier.

Nous vous remercions de bien vouloir faire part de votre opinion sur l’environnement de travail de votre Corps de la Paix!

Merci de bien vouloir cocher la réponse la plus adaptée pour indiquer dans quelle mesure vous êtes en accord ou en désaccord avec les énoncés suivants:

1. Je comprends le lien entre mon travail et les objectifs et priorités de l’agence.
   1. Tout à fait d’accord
   2. D’accord
   3. Ni d’accord, ni pas d’accord
   4. Pas d’accord
   5. Pas du tout d’accord
   6. Je ne sais pas/pas applicable

2. Mes besoins en formation sont évalués.
   1. Tout à fait d’accord
   2. D’accord
   3. Ni d’accord, ni pas d’accord
   4. Pas d’accord
   5. Pas du tout d’accord
   6. Je ne sais pas/pas applicable
3. Je bénéficie d’une réelle opportunité d’améliorer mes compétences au Corps de la Paix.
   1. Tout à fait d’accord
   2. D’accord
   3. Ni d’accord, ni pas d’accord
   4. Pas d’accord
   5. Pas du tout d’accord

4. Les responsables de ma mission favorisent le perfectionnement du personnel.
   1. Tout à fait d’accord
   2. D’accord
   3. Ni d’accord, ni pas d’accord
   4. Pas d’accord
   5. Pas du tout d’accord

5. Êtes-vous satisfait de la formation dont vous bénéficiez à votre poste actuel ?
   1. Très satisfait
   2. Satisfait
   3. Ni satisfait, ni mécontent
   4. Mécontent
   5. Très mécontent

6. Indiquez dans quelle mesure vous êtes en accord ou en désaccord avec les énoncés suivants:
   [échelle : tout à fait d’accord ; d’accord ; ni d’accord, ni pas d’accord ; pas d’accord ; pas du tout d’accord ; je ne sais pas/pas applicable]
   [À ORGANISER DE MANIÈRE ALÉATOIRE]
   1. J’ai le sentiment d’être encouragé(e) à identifier des méthodes de travail nouvelles et innovantes.
   2. Je peux contribuer aux décisions qui affectent mon travail.
   3. Mon responsable/chef d’équipe me traite avec respect.
   4. Je suis satisfait(e) de mon travail.
   5. Mon travail est d’une grande qualité.

7. Quelle comparaison peut-on faire entre votre travail avec le Corps de la Paix et d’autres emplois auxquels vous pourriez avoir accès là où vous vivez ?
   [échelle : mon travail avec le Corps de la Paix est bien mieux ; mon travail avec le Corps de la Paix est un peu mieux ; mon travail avec le Corps de la Paix est relativement similaire aux autres emplois possibles ; les autres emplois possibles sont un peu mieux ; les autres emplois possibles sont beaucoup mieux ; je ne sais pas/pas applicable]
   [À ORGANISER DE MANIÈRE ALÉATOIRE]
   1. Le respect qu’ont les autres membres de votre communauté pour votre travail
   2. À quel point votre travail vous intéresse vous, personnellement
   3. Votre capacité à améliorer vos compétences de travail
   4. Votre capacité à apporter une contribution à votre communauté
8. Votre emploi avec le Corps de la Paix vous a-t-il permis de mieux comprendre les Américains ?
   1. Oui
   2. Non
   3. Je ne suis pas sûr(e)

[POSER Q9 SI LA RÉPONSE Q8 EST POSITIVE]
9. Avez-vous communiqué cette meilleure compréhension des Américains obtenue au cours de votre emploi au Corps de la Paix aux personnes suivantes ?
   [échelle : oui ; non ; je ne suis pas sûr(e)]
   [À ORGANISER DE MANIÈRE ALÉATOIRE, FIXER LE RESTE]
   1. Vos collègues
   2. Des membres de votre famille
   3. Des amis
   4. Personnel des médias
   5. Contacts dans les médias sociaux : Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, MXit, ou Renren.
   6. Autres personnes de votre communauté

10. À votre avis, quel est l’impact du Corps de la Paix sur la population de votre pays?
   1. Impact positif fort
   2. Impact assez positif
   3. Aucun impact
   4. Impact assez négatif
   5. Impact très négatif
   6. Je ne suis pas sûr(e)

11. Indiquez dans quelle mesure vous êtes en accord ou en désaccord : les responsables/coordonnateurs de votre mission savent bien travailler avec des employés de différents milieux
   1. Tout à fait d’accord
   2. D’accord
   3. Ni d’accord, ni pas d’accord
   4. Pas d’accord
   5. Pas du tout d’accord

12. Indiquez dans quelle mesure vous êtes en accord ou en désaccord : la structure traditionnelle du Corps de la Paix (personnel et bénévoles inclus) est propice à l’inclusion des personnes dans leur diversité.

La diversité est un ensemble d’attributs de l’individu parmi lesquels on compte, entre autres, les caractéristiques telles que la nationalité, la langue, la race, la couleur de peau, l’ethnicié, le handicap, le sexe, l’âge, la religion, l’orientation sexuelle, l’identité de genre, le statut socioéconomique, le statut d’ancien combattant et la composition de la famille.
   1. Tout à fait d’accord
   2. D’accord
   3. Ni d’accord, ni pas d’accord
   4. Pas d’accord
   5. Pas du tout d’accord
   6. Je ne sais pas
13. **Dans quel domaine, le cas échéant, considérez-vous qu’il existe des lacunes dans la culture d’inclusion au Corps de la Paix ?**

[1 À 13 : À ORGANISER DE MANIÈRE ALÉATOIRE, 14 ET 15 DOIVENT RESTER FIXES]

1. Origine nationale/nationalité
2. Langue
3. Race/couleur de peau
4. Ethnicité/groupe ethnique/identité tribale
5. Handicap (cécité, surdité, incapacité à marcher, etc.)
6. Sexe (homme ou femme)
7. Âge
8. Religion
9. Orientation sexuelle
10. Identité de genre (sentiment d’être un homme ou une femme)
11. Statut socioéconomique (p. ex. : être riche ou pauvre)
12. Statut d’ancien combattant (expérience dans les forces armées)
13. Composition familiale (p. ex. : être célibataire ou marié et avoir ou non des enfants)
14. Autres (préciser) : __________________________________________
15. Je ne pense pas qu’il y ait de lacunes dans la culture d’inclusion du Corps de la Paix

14. **En quoi votre opinion globale sur les Américains a-t-elle changé depuis que vous êtes devenu employé du Corps de la Paix ? Votre opinion globale sur les Américains est…….**

1. Plus positive
2. À peu près la même
3. Moins positive
4. Je ne suis pas sûr(e)

**Merci de votre participation!**

Si vous avez des réflexions ou préoccupations supplémentaires à nous soumettre concernant votre interaction au sein des bénévoles ou du personnel et la mise en place d’une culture d’inclusion au sein du Corps de la Paix, vous pouvez envoyer un e-mail privé au Bureau des droits civils et de la diversité (Office of Civil Rights and Diversity) à [OCRD@peacecorps.gov](mailto:OCRD@peacecorps.gov).
HCSS Questionnaire as Distributed in Spanish

Cuestionario parte de la encuesta de 2015 para el personal de los países anfitriones

Nos complace brindarle la oportunidad de participar en la encuesta de 2015 para el personal del Cuerpo de Paz de los países anfitriones.

Las respuestas confidenciales que proporcione en esta breve encuesta de 5 a 10 minutos de duración permiten a la dirección del Cuerpo de Paz entender mejor la opinión que el personal de los países anfitriones de todo el mundo tiene sobre su empleo, los efectos que nuestros programas tienen en los países donde trabajamos y los avances que hemos logrado en las importantes metas de desempeño del Plan estratégico del Cuerpo de Paz para el Plan Estratégico 2014 a 2018.

Sus respuestas se combinarán con las del personal de otros países anfitriones para generar informes que los directivos del Cuerpo de Paz podrán usar para tomar decisiones informadas sobre las políticas y los procedimientos de la organización con el fin de fortalecer nuestras operaciones y de ampliar nuestras contribuciones en las comunidades donde prestamos servicio.

Valoramos sus opiniones y deseamos alentar a todos los miembros de nuestro personal a que expresen su punto de vista; sin embargo, su participación en la encuesta es opcional. Todas las respuestas a la encuesta del personal de los países anfitriones son confidenciales, y los resultados no se darán a conocer de ninguna manera que puedan identificarle personalmente.

Le agradecemos por compartir sus opiniones acerca de su lugar de trabajo en el Cuerpo de Paz.

Marque la respuesta que describa mejor su acuerdo o desacuerdo con las siguientes declaraciones:

1. Conozco la relación que existe entre mi trabajo y las metas y prioridades de la organización.
   1. Totalmente de acuerdo
   2. De acuerdo
   3. Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo
   4. En desacuerdo
   5. Totalmente en desacuerdo
   6. No lo sé / No corresponde

2. Se evalúan mis necesidades de capacitación.
   1. Totalmente de acuerdo
   2. De acuerdo
   3. Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo
   4. En desacuerdo
   5. Totalmente en desacuerdo
   6. No lo sé / No corresponde
3. **En el Cuerpo de Paz, se me da una oportunidad real de mejorar mis habilidades.**
   1. Totalmente de acuerdo
   2. De acuerdo
   3. Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo
   4. En desacuerdo
   5. Totalmente en desacuerdo

4. **Los supervisores en el país apoyan el desarrollo de los empleados.**
   1. Totalmente de acuerdo
   2. De acuerdo
   3. Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo
   4. En desacuerdo
   5. Totalmente en desacuerdo

5. **¿Qué tan satisfecho está con la capacitación que recibe en su trabajo actual?**
   1. Muy satisfecho
   2. Satisfecho
   3. Ni satisfecho ni insatisfecho
   4. Insatisfecho
   5. Muy insatisfecho

6. **Califique su acuerdo o desacuerdo con las siguientes declaraciones:**
   [Escala: Totalmente de acuerdo; De acuerdo; Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo; En desacuerdo; Totalmente en desacuerdo; No lo sé / No corresponde]
   [ORDEN ALEATORIAMENTE LAS DECLARACIONES.]
   1. Se me anima a buscar nuevas y mejores formas de hacer las cosas en el trabajo.
   2. Contribuyo de forma pertinente a las decisiones que afectan mi trabajo.
   3. Mi supervisor o cabeza de equipo me trata con respeto.
   4. Estoy satisfecho con mi trabajo.
   5. Realizo un trabajo de alta calidad.

7. **¿Cómo califica su trabajo en el Cuerpo de Paz cuando lo compara con otros trabajos que podría tener en el lugar donde vive?**
   [Escala: Mi trabajo en el Cuerpo de Paz es mucho mejor; Mi trabajo en el Cuerpo de Paz es algo mejor; Mi trabajo en el Cuerpo de Paz es igual que otros trabajos disponibles; Otros trabajos disponibles son algo mejor; Otros trabajos disponibles son mucho mejores; No lo sé / No corresponde]
   [ORDENE ALEATORIAMENTE LAS DECLARACIONES.]
   1. El respeto que otras personas en su comunidad tienen hacia el trabajo que usted desempeña.
   2. Lo interesante que su trabajo es para usted personalmente.
   3. Su capacidad para mejorar sus habilidades en el trabajo.
   4. Su capacidad para contribuir a su comunidad.
8. ¿Ha llegado a conocer mejor a los estadounidenses durante su trabajo en el Cuerpo de Paz?
   1. Sí
   2. No
   3. No estoy seguro

   [SI LA RESPUESTA A LA PREGUNTA 8 ES AFIRMATIVA, HAGA LA PREGUNTA 9.]

9. ¿Ha comunicado a algunas de las siguientes personas lo que ha aprendido sobre los estadounidenses durante su trabajo en el Cuerpo de Paz?
   [Escala: Sí, No, No estoy seguro]
   [ORDENE ALEATORIAMENTE LA LISTA; PONGA AL FINAL "OTRAS PERSONAS...".]
   1. Sus compañeros de trabajo
   2. Parientes
   3. Amigos
   4. Personas en los medios de comunicación
   5. Personas en los medios sociales, como Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, MXit o Renren
   6. Otras personas en su comunidad

10. ¿Qué tipo de efecto considera que el Cuerpo de Paz tiene en la gente de su país?
    1. Un gran efecto positivo
    2. Un efecto algo positivo
    3. Ningún efecto
    4. Un efecto algo negativo
    5. Un efecto muy negativo
    6. No estoy seguro

11. Califique su acuerdo o desacuerdo en cuanto a si los coordinadores o supervisores en su país trabajan bien con empleados de orígenes diversos.
    1.Totalmente de acuerdo
    2. De acuerdo
    3. Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo
    4. En desacuerdo
    5. Totalmente en desacuerdo

12. Califique su acuerdo o desacuerdo en cuanto a si la cultura organizacional del Cuerpo de Paz (incluido el personal y los voluntarios) está abierta a la diversidad de las personas.

   La diversidad se refiere a un conjunto de atributos individuales, entre otros, las características como la nacionalidad, el idioma, la raza, el color, el grupo étnico, la discapacidad, el sexo, la edad, la religión, la orientación sexual, la identidad de género, la condición socioeconómica, la condición de veterano y las estructuras familiares.
   1. Totalmente de acuerdo
   2. De acuerdo
   3. Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo
   4. En desacuerdo
   5. Totalmente en desacuerdo
   6. No lo sé
13. Si las hay, ¿cuáles considera que son los vacíos en la cultura de inclusión del Cuerpo de Paz?

[ORDENÉ ALEATORIAMENTE LAS OPCIONES 1 A 13, DEJE AL FINAL LAS OPCIONES 14 Y 15.]

1. País de procedencia o nacionalidad
2. Idioma
3. Raza o color
4. Etnicidad, grupo étnico o identidad tribal
5. Discapacidad (p. ej., ceguera, sordera, incapacidad para caminar, etc.)
6. Sexo (hombre o mujer)
7. Edad
8. Religión
9. Orientación sexual
10. Identidad de género (percepción personal de ser hombre o mujer)
11. Condición socioeconómica (como ser rico o pobre)
12. Condición de veterano (experiencia en las fuerzas armadas)
13. Estructuras familiares (como ser soltero, casado, con o sin hijos)
14. Otra (especificar): _____________________________________________________
15. No considero que haya lagunas en la cultura de inclusión del Cuerpo de Paz

14. ¿Ha cambiado su opinión en general acerca de los estadounidenses desde que empezó a trabajar como empleado del Cuerpo de Paz? ¿Cuál es su opinión en general acerca de los estadounidenses?

1. Más positiva
2. Casi igual
3. Menos positiva
4. No estoy seguro

Muchas gracias por participar.

Si tiene otros comentarios o inquietudes que desee comunicarnos sobre las interacciones entre los voluntarios o el personal y el logro de una cultura de inclusión en el Cuerpo de Paz, puede enviar un correo electrónico privado a la Oficina de Derechos Civiles y Diversidad (Office of Civil Rights and Diversity) a OCRD@peacecorps.gov.
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