(English Translation)
The 34th Professional Statistical Analysis Workshop" hosted by IDCJ Evaluation Department
(2022/7/28,29 & 7/27 Pre-training) (Zoom)
Results of post-questionnaire survey

1. You learned about "histogram, mean, median, and standard deviation. At what level did you learn about histograms, mean, median, and standard deviation?

- I am very satisfied. I was a bit fuzzy of even the basic vocabulary was, so it was good to reconfirm it in the pre-training and at the beginning of the first day.
- Very satisfied. As it was the first time to learn this content, I could not fully understand it in one session, so I wanted to learn it while reviewing and using it in my work.
- It was an opportunity to organize the basic items and understand the meaning and necessity of each. Depending on the level of the participants, I felt that if the repetition of the same tasks (e.g., calculating averages each time) were reduced, the more difficult items could have been explained in more detail.
- Satisfied.
- Satisfied.

2. You learned about "t-tests (before-after t-test, two-group t-test)". At what level of satisfaction did you learn about t-tests?

- I am satisfied. In particular, he carefully explained "why it is n-1" many times, which helped me to understand it little by little.
- Very satisfied. The orderly explanation was very easy to understand.
- Satisfied.
- Satisfied.

3. You learned about the "proportionality test (chi-square test). At the end of the course, I was able to learn about the "test of proportionality (chi-square test).

- Satisfactied. This was my first time trying the chi-square test and I was able to understand it easily. Also, the Sputnik paper that was discussed as an actual example was timely and very interesting.
- Due to the time crunch on the first day, I felt that it was a bit rushed. However, if the lecture covered everything about the chi-square test, that is not the case.
- Very satisfied. I was listening to the doctor's explanation, wishing I could understand it better.
- Satisfied.
- Satisfied.

4. You learned about regression analysis. At what level of satisfaction did you learn about "regression analysis"?

- Very satisfied. It was easy to understand, taking into account the explanation of the history of statistics.
- Satisfactied. This was my first regression analysis since I was a student. As an undergraduate student, I learned only single regression analysis, but I was glad to learn multiple regression analysis as well this time. However, I didn't fully understand "what these formulas mean" when it came to manual calculations, so I had to work on it half mechanically.
- I would have liked to learn more about multiple regression analysis in more detail and how it works. I would have liked to know more about how to analyze and interpret variables and variables' influences and confounding factors, in addition to understanding the calculations.
- Satisfied.
- Satisfied.

5. Please give us your comments on how much you were able to get out of the "Pre-training: Basic Design and Examples of Impact Evaluation" and what improvements you would like to see in the future.

- I am very satisfied. The five models you explained at the beginning made it easy for me to understand the lecture from the first day onward.
- I have no experience working as a specialist or consultant, so there were many things I did not understand, but I learned a lot because I would like to be involved in international cooperation in the field of basic education in the future. I apologize for my attendance at the recording.
- I learned a lot from hearing about various cases by design, and my interest in RCTs has increased.
- Satisfied.
- Satisfied.

6. **Please give us your comments on the mode of this workshop, using Zoom?**

- I appreciated it very much.
- No problem. I think the convenience is good.
- Although it was appreciated due to the overseas business trip, I think that face-to-face training opportunities would have stimulated more active discussions among the participants.
- I have no complaints. I think it would be great to have a recording to review.
- There was no problem.

7. **Please feel free to add any other comments or requests.**

- Thank you for the three days of lectures! Even though I am a beginner in statistics, he taught us in an easy-to-understand way, sometimes using his body in expression. I am not currently engaged in any work related to statistics, but I would like to experience working with statistics in the future.
- Thank you very much for explaining the terms and contents in detail so that even beginners can easily understand. On the other hand, I thought it would be useful for beginners to understand the level of the content of the lecture, as well as to meet the needs of participants of various levels, if you could explain the content in a slightly more in-depth manner with the preface that it is not necessary to understand the content.
- Overall, the training was very easy to understand and provided a very good learning opportunity. On the other hand, there are probably very few people who use statistical analysis in their daily work, and I personally feel that the issue is how to learn over the medium to long term (opportunities to solve problems and face issues anyway). It would be very helpful if you could enhance the collection of problems, including actual examples, and if you have any, share them (specific methods of medium- to long-term learning) with us. Thank you in advance.
- It was very useful for reviewing basic statistics or understanding how it works. I would like to attend the next level of training if the opportunity arises. I would also like to be introduced to tools and recommended reference books. Thank you very much.
- Japanese aid, is dominated by project-level (micro) evaluations, but it would be good to cover even just program-level evaluations such as those conducted by international organizations. Evaluation of the combined impact of multiple projects. For example, the evaluation framework for the SDGs is the UNDP-led Localization process, in which indicators remain the same but targets are changed by country, sub-national, etc. The framework then analyzes the contributions of all actors, including countries (macro). While we do not believe this is correct (the World Bank and the United Nations have acknowledged its limitations), we think it is a good way to understand the current mainstream of evaluation.