

PDABD-831
75920

**AN ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACT OF
CLASP TRAINING ON CLASP TRAINEES
IN GUATEMALA AND A REVIEW AND
ASSESSMENT OF IN-COUNTRY FOLLOW-ON**

VOLUME I

February, 1992

Submitted to:

Latin American and Caribbean Bureau
Office of Development Resources
Education and Human Resources Division
Agency for International Development

Submitted by:

Aguirre International
1735 North Lynn Street
Suite 1000
Rosslyn, VA 22209-2019

This report was prepared under Contract Number LAC-0661-C-00-0046-00 for the Monitoring and Evaluation of the Caribbean and Latin American Scholarship Program II (CLASP II), Project Number 598-0661, between the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and Aguirre International.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	
OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION	1
ASSESSMENT OF THE CLASP-I PROGRAM IN GUATEMALA	1
ASSESSMENT OF IN-COUNTRY FOLLOW-ON EFFORTS	2
CHAPTER TWO: THE IMPACT OF CLASP TRAINING	
ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT ON EMPLOYMENT	3
Trainee Employment	3
Employment by Sector	4
Utility of Training	4
Short-term Trainees	5
Long-term Trainees	5
Obstacles to the Application of Training	6
ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT ON JOB LEVELS AND INCOME	7
Job Levels	7
Income	7
ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT ON EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATIONS	8
COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT, CITIZEN PARTICIPATION AND LEADERSHIP	8
Trainees and Community Activities	8
Levels of Trainee Participation	9
Focus Group Comments	9
Case Study: CLASP Trainee Involvement in PVOs	10
IMPACT ON ATTITUDES	10
Changes in Aspirations	11
Changes in Perspective	11
Broadening of Visions	12
CHAPTER THREE: IMPACT OF CLASP TRAINING SUPPLEMENTED BY IN-COUNTRY FOLLOW-ON PROGRAMS	
COMMUNITY-BASED TRAINING/DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS	13
SMALL COMMUNITY PROJECT FUND	13
CASE STUDY IN CITIZEN PARTICIPATION: REFORESTATION	14

CHAPTER FOUR: IN-COUNTRY FOLLOW-ON EFFORTS IN GUATEMALA

THE EXPERIMENT IN INTERNATIONAL LIVING'S (EIL) IN-COUNTRY FOLLOW-ON PROGRAM	15
The Project's Structure and Functions	15
Trainee Assessments of the Impact of EIL Training	18
Comparison of EIL Participants and Non-participants	18
ASOPAZAC: ASOCIACIÓN DE BECARIOS DEL PROGRAMA DE PAZ EN AMERICA CENTRAL	19
FOLLOW-ON IN THE CASP PROGRAM	21
The CASP Alumni Association	21
The "Everybody Works" Project	22

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

THE CLASP-I TRAINEES – WHO THEY ARE	23
THE IMPACTS OF CLASP TRAINING	24
Employment	24
Community Involvement and Citizen Participation	25
Attitudinal Impact of CLASP Training	26
FOLLOW-ON AND IMPACT	26
ASOPAZAC Project Fund	27
EIL Community-based Development Projects (CBDPs)	27
Reforestation Focus	27
THE CLASP FOLLOW-ON PROGRAMS	27
The EIL Follow-on Project	27
The CAPS Alumni Association – ASOPAZAC	29
CASP Program Follow-on Activities	29
THE CLASP-I PROGRAM AND THE FUTURE	30
CLASP Trainees	30
CLASP-I Follow-on and the Future	31
Benefits of a New ASOPAZAC	32

APPENDICES

- A – Methods: The Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches
- B – Questionnaire
- C – Moderator's Guide
- D – Focus Group Screening Questionnaire

ACRONYMS

AID/LAC/EHR	The Education and Human Resources Office of the Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean, Agency for International Development
ASOPAZAC	Asociación de Becarios del Programa de Paz en América Central
CAPS	Central America Peace Scholarship
CASP	Central American Scholarship Program
CBDP	Community-based Development Project
CLASP	Caribbean and Latin American Scholarships Program
CTP	Country Training Plan
EIL	Experiment in International Living
JYA	Junior Year Abroad
PAZAC	Paz en América Central, the USAID CAPS implementing office
PIET	Partnership in International Education and Training
PYME	Pequeña y Mediana Empresa: Microenterprise
ToT	Training of Trainers
USAID/G	U.S. Agency for International Development Mission in Guatemala

**EXECUTIVE
SUMMARY**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

This evaluation has two major objectives:

- to examine the impact of CLASP training on different groups of Trainees now that the U.S. training phase of CAPS/Guatemala is nearly over. The evaluation presents the broad range of outcomes and impacts that Trainees and others attribute to CLASP training.
- to review and assess post-training Follow-on efforts in Guatemala which have complemented and reinforced the U.S. training. These efforts include the supplemental training provided by the Experiment in International Living (EIL) and the activities of the CAPS Alumni Association, called ASOPAZAC.

The results of the evaluation are presented in two volumes. Volume I reports the evaluation findings, conclusions, and recommendations; the methodology that was used is discussed in Appendix A. Volume II explores the history of the CLASP Program in Guatemala, briefly characterizes the Trainees, and summarizes some of the suggestions by Trainees on how to improve the implementation of the Program.

CLASP/GUATEMALA

USAID/Guatemala began implementing the Central American Peace Scholarship (CAPS) Program in 1985. For each of three consecutive years — 1987 through 1989 — nearly a thousand Guatemalans from all regions of the country and from a vast array of institutions and economic pursuits left for short- and long-term programs in the United States. CAPS/Guatemala retained a high level of new Trainees through 1990 but has now completed its phase of sending new students for training in the United States. Simultaneously, the Central American Scholarship Program (CASP) and its successor the Cooperative Association of States for Scholarships (CASS), both managed by Georgetown University, were sending 339 Guatemalan Trainees, most for long-term technical training. The two programs — CAPS and CASP/CASS — formed part of a larger regional activity named the Caribbean and Latin American Scholarship Program (CLASP-I). A more detailed history of the Guatemalan CLASP-I Program is found in Volume II, Chapter One.

CLASP/Guatemala proved remarkable in its ability to tap into a population which normally would never have had the opportunity to visit the United States, nor have had the chance to receive any targeted technical training of the kind made available to them. A significant proportion of CLASP/Guatemala Trainees were truly socially or economically disadvantaged, including women, those with limited education, those from rural areas, or the indigenous, almost all of whom exhibited leadership characteristics. (The CLASP-I Trainee population is examined in Volume II, Chapter Two.) The Mission successfully recruited, selected, and prepared this diverse population for their CLASP experience, offered them relevant and useful U.S. training and exposure to United States society, and integrated returned Trainees into innovative Follow-on programs. Based on these findings, the Mission is commended for its achievements in CLASP-I implementation.

RECOMMENDATION: The CLASP Population

The CLASP-II Guatemala Peace Scholarship (GPS) Program, the successor to CAPS, is already being implemented. Because it is smaller than CLASP-I, GPS must narrow the selection process to reflect the lower level of funding. It is recommended, however, that GPS continue to focus on groups with socioeconomic characteristics similar to those which have been successfully mobilized under CLASP-I.

THE IMPACT OF CLASP TRAINING

In spite of early criticisms of the briefness of the five-week short-term training program which became the norm for CAPS/Guatemala, short-term Trainees reported that CLASP training had a significant impact on their lives both in terms of the specific training imparted and the related experiences which they had. Long-term Trainees also emphasized the importance of CLASP training. The following activities summarize the areas that were examined to measure this impact.

- Trainees discussed the relation of CLASP training to their work, and specific areas where the training was particularly useful.
- They described their current educational activities.
- Trainees characterized their participation in community activities and their roles as leaders.
- They addressed the impact of the experience on their view of the world and themselves.

The following findings resulted from the analysis of these sources of information.

Employment

CLASP returnees had higher levels of employment than the population at large. They believed that CLASP training has contributed to their job efficiency and satisfaction. Their job-related responsibilities have, for the most part, improved as a result of CLASP training and their incomes have risen. Training programs were generally well suited to supporting the job skills and activities of Trainees.

RECOMMENDATIONS: CLASP Training Impacts on Employment

High percentages of CAPS returnees confirm that their U.S. training was useful on the job, in their careers, and for learning new skills. CAPS Trainees have higher levels of employment than the population at large. The broad base of experience in selection and program design gained in CLASP-I implementation provides a foundation which can be applied to the CLASP-II Guatemala Peace Scholarship (GPS) Program.

Certain short-term training groups showed very high levels of employment. The Mission may wish to examine the bases of these varying rates of employment among short-term Trainees to learn how these variations might shed light on future program emphases.

The achievements related to CLASP impact on employment could be enhanced by minor adjustments in the level of training difficulty for professional Trainees and in preparing Trainees to confront typical obstacles to applying their training in the workplace.

Community Involvement and Citizen Participation

Trainees are heavily involved in a wide range of community activities and organizations. Many attributed their high levels of community participation to CLASP training. Both short- and long-term Trainees reported positive changes in their opinions of the U.S. and in their own values as a result of the scholarship. Most described the experience in enthusiastic terms.

Attitudinal Impact of CLASP Training

A more intangible impact of CLASP training has been on attitudes. Trainees attest to significant changes in their understanding of the world and of their own potential as a result of CLASP training. This impact is often not manifested in the present activities of the Trainees. Nevertheless, these changed attitudes and aspirations remain a latent force in Trainees' self-definition and in the activities they may undertake in the future.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Impacts of CLASP Training on Citizen Participation and Attitudes

Trainees demonstrate high levels of social involvement. It is recommended that the Mission consider drawing on returned Trainees of certain training themes (such as rural health and community development) as potential liaisons with AID-supported activities in rural areas or urban *barrios*. This suggests that appropriate Technical Offices be made aware of the large cadre of Trainees and that some contact be maintained, based on the CLASP Information System (CIS) database and information maintained by EIL.

It is also recommended that the successful short-term training approach used by USAID/Guatemala in mobilizing a diverse and economically disadvantaged population be communicated to other CLASP Missions to assist them in their own future program planning.

FOLLOW-ON AND IMPACT

Chapter III presents findings which reveal that CLASP-I Follow-on programming can greatly enhance the *impact* of Trainee involvement in community activities. Mission investment in EIL's community-based development projects (CBDPs), for example, has proved to be an effective means for strengthening the multiplier effect of economically disadvantaged Trainees in introducing improvements in areas of significant public concern. Likewise, the Small Project Fund for supporting community-level projects provided resources which enabled CAPS Trainees to work concretely to improve their communities.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Follow-on and Impact

It is recommended that CAPS Trainees be given the chance to continue ongoing community educational efforts, even with limited Mission financial support, similar to the EIL CBDPs. This can be done under the present plans to revitalize the national Alumni Association (see below).

Given the importance of continually examining the link between Follow-on and community impact, the Mission may also consider documenting future community activities of CAPS Trainees through subsequent evaluation research.

THE CLASP FOLLOW-ON PROGRAMS

CAPS and CASP in Guatemala have developed a number of innovative Follow-on organizational structures which can serve as models for the CLASP-II GPS Program Follow-on efforts and for other USAID Missions.

The EIL Follow-on Project

The EIL Project, designed to supplement and reinforce what some saw as overly brief U.S. training, has in fact developed into a relevant complement to the U.S. experience at far lower cost than U.S. training. EIL has developed an effective organizational structure to provide services to a dispersed, disadvantaged Trainee population. The evaluation clearly demonstrates that the successes attributed to a short U.S. training period can be enhanced by supplementing U.S. training with intensive in-country Follow-on activities.

RECOMMENDATIONS: EIL Training

It is recommended that other USAID Missions be informed of the beneficial results of the CAPS/Guatemala approach of adding complementary, intensive in-country Follow-on seminars to brief U.S. training as a feasible, cost-effective model for responding to the needs of disadvantaged short-term Trainees. As the CLASP-II Program develops its own Follow-on activities, it could profitably adopt the regionalized organizational structure developed by EIL.

The CAPS Alumni Association – ASOPAZAC

ASOPAZAC, the CAPS alumni association, had periods early on of active participation by hundreds of Trainees. Plenary meetings were widely attended and appreciated by the Trainees. Yet close dependence on PAZAC (the CLASP-I implementing agency), internal dissension over the implementation of the Special Project Fund, and insufficient time-in-office and organizational training for the new leadership weakened efforts to make the Association a sustainable organization.

RECOMMENDATIONS: ASOPAZAC

It is recommended that:

- the Mission go forward with its initiative of offering ASOPAZAC leadership training in a special series of EIL reinforcement seminars focusing on organizational issues;
- the Association be structured as a concomitant of the EIL seminars, into a more decentralized, grassroots organization;
- a small central clearing house for information exchange be maintained in the capital, which provides support for the regional or departmental associations;
- the new ASOPAZAC organizational model be adapted to provide for occupational or field-of-study subgroupings that support Trainee interests in concrete career or community development issues;
- financial support be maintained by USAID/Guatemala at a low level for the Association's centralized activities and for administrative costs for the departmental committees; and
- ASOPAZAC eventually be merged with CLASP-II GPS Program Follow-on Activities.

THE CLASP-I PROGRAM AND THE FUTURE

CLASP-I in Guatemala has been successfully implemented over five years, from selection and predeparture orientation to Follow-on (Trainee views on the U.S. components of their CAPS scholarships are examined in Volume II, Chapter 3). What remains to be discussed are future activities with respect to the **CLASP-I** Program. What relationship will ideally exist between USAID/Guatemala's future training efforts and the body of returned **CLASP-I** Trainees now that the Program is over?

Extension of CLASP-I Follow-on

The evaluators conclude that maintaining some minimal level of Mission support for the **CLASP-I** Trainees will continue to produce the positive, development-related activities that have been reported in this evaluation.

Benefits of a New ASOPAZAC

A reinvigorated **ASOPAZAC** can come about through strong Mission support for the special seminars that **EIL** will offer the Association leadership. It would act as the nexus for ongoing Follow-on activities for **CLASP** Trainees. The Association would serve various purposes that should give it the institutional rationale to survive.

- **ASOPAZAC** would provide a forum for an interchange of information and experiences to the diverse occupational specialties that have received **CLASP** training.
- It would become the coordinating body for local-level volunteer and community activities.
- The Association would retain some of the **EIL** emphasis on ongoing training.
- It would continue to serve, through regional gatherings and via radio programs, as a means of contact for Trainees.
- Finally, it remains a mechanism of contact and communication between the large CAPS population and USAID/Guatemala for purposes that the Mission may designate in the future.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

This evaluation has two major objectives. Its first is to examine the impact of CLASP training on different groups of Trainees now that the U.S. training phase of the Program is nearly over. The evaluation lays out the broad range of outcomes and impacts that Trainees and others attribute to CLASP training. The second objective is to review and assess post-training Follow-on efforts in Guatemala which have complemented and reinforced the U.S. training. These efforts include the supplemental training provided by the Experiment in International Living (EIL) and the activities of the CAPS Alumni Association called ASOPAZAC.

ASSESSMENT OF THE CLASP-I PROGRAM IN GUATEMALA

USAID/Guatemala began its implementation of the Central American Peace Scholarship (CAPS) Program in 1985. This regional Program was to strengthen the human resource base of Central America, thereby providing an adequate foundation for viable democratic societies and for social and economic development. CAPS was later complemented by programs for the A.I.D. countries in the Caribbean and South America as well as some regional components such as the Central American Scholarship Program (CASP) managed by Georgetown University. This expanded Program was named the Caribbean and Latin American Scholarship Program (CLASP).

For each of three consecutive years — 1987 through 1989 — nearly a thousand Guatemalans from all regions of the country and from a vast array of institutions and economic pursuits were enrolled in short- and long-term programs in the United States. CAPS/Guatemala retained a high level of new Trainees through 1990. At present, however, the Program has completed its phase of sending new Trainees to the U.S. as CLASP-I (CAPS/Guatemala) draws to a close and its successor program, CLASP-II, is put into place. CAPS/Guatemala, with a total of 4,558 short- and long-term Trainees, was the largest single country program in the entire CLASP-I Program. In addition, 339 Guatemalan young people from disadvantaged backgrounds participated in another of the CLASP-I component programs — the Central American Scholarship Program (CASP) managed by Georgetown University.

Table 1.1 Characteristics of CAPS/ Guatemala Trainees (Percentages)

Category	CAPS/ Guatemala	LAC Bureau Target
Women	48	40
Economically Disadvan.	85	70
Ethnically Disadvan.	33	
Rural	90	
Short-term Trainees	86	
Long-term Trainees	14*	30
Leaders	95	
Youth	20	

* Does not include the 339 Georgetown CASP trainees.

CAPS/Guatemala has exceeded all of the specific targets established by the regional CLASP-I Program, as demonstrated in Table 1.1.

The objective of this evaluation is to examine the *impact* of CAPS/Guatemala and CASP training on selected groups of Program returnees now that the U.S. training phase of CLASP-I is nearly over. This evaluation covers a broad range of outcomes and impacts that Trainees and others attribute to CLASP training. These findings will be invaluable both to assess the importance of the CLASP-I Program and, more importantly, to successfully define and implement the newly initiated CLASP-II Guatemala Peace Scholarship (GPS) Program.

The evaluation first examines the following four areas of CLASP training where it is believed that the outcomes and impacts of U.S. training can be identified:

- changes in the workplace and in the income of the Trainees;
- current Trainee educational aspirations;
- changes in Trainees' community activities and citizen participation; and
- changes in Trainees' vision of themselves and the world.

The evaluation then examines an additional area of training outcomes where the impact of U.S. training has been supplemented by post U.S. training "Follow-on" programs in Guatemala, specifically, those impacts directly associated with participation in structured Follow-on activities.

It should be noted that two components are under consideration in the discussion of impact: the U.S. training itself, in which all Trainees participated; and structured Follow-on efforts, especially the EIL Follow-on seminars, in which only a portion of short-term Trainees have taken part. EIL Follow-on seminars offer additional technical training as well as organizational skills training. As the five impact areas are reported upon, in many cases the results apply to all Trainees without distinguishing whether they took part in EIL seminars or not. In other cases, EIL participation is an important analytical factor. These differences are labelled as they become relevant to the discussion.

ASSESSMENT OF IN-COUNTRY FOLLOW-ON EFFORTS

Follow-on is defined as those post-training activities which promote Trainees' successful reintegration into their communities, the application of the technical and leadership skills they acquired during their training, and their participation in community programs. USAID/Guatemala has recognized that by providing opportunities and services to returned Trainees, the effects of U.S. training can be reinforced after Trainees return home. The Mission has also been able to guide how the skills, knowledge and changes in attitudes that accompany CLASP training can be employed in support of development goals. The two major components of the Mission's Follow-on Program are:

- the program of Follow-on reinforcement seminars offered to short-term technical Trainees by the Experiment in International Living (EIL); and
- the alumni association of returned CAPS/Guatemala Trainees, ASOPAZAC.

This evaluation examines the following factors with respect to the above two Mission sponsored Follow-on efforts:

- how the two endeavors have been structured and how they have functioned;
- to what degree CLASP Trainees have participated in them; and
- how their organizational structure facilitated involvement by returned Trainees.

The outcomes and the initial impact that Trainees attribute to the Follow-on training will also be described. In addition to the above mentioned Follow-on activities, the evaluation briefly reviews the post-training Follow-on efforts of the Central American Scholarship Program (CASP) in Guatemala.

CHAPTER TWO

**The Impact of
CLASP Training**

CHAPTER TWO: THE IMPACT OF CLASP TRAINING

In the past, program planners and managers have frequently introduced improvements in training programs based on Trainee recommendations or on Trainees' negative comments about their training experiences. The approach used in this evaluation, however, is to observe the outcomes and *impact* of training as evidenced by Trainees' perceptions of how their training experiences have had particular effects on the way they perform their jobs or participate in the activities of their communities. Experience with such responses, using qualitative evaluation methods such as focus groups as well as survey questionnaires, suggests that they are consistently coherent and reliable (see Appendix A, Methodology).

The following topics summarize the areas that were examined to measure the *impact* of CLASP-I training:

- Trainees discussed where they were employed, changes in job responsibilities, improvements in their economic situation, the usefulness of training to their jobs, obstacles to its application, and specific areas where the training was particularly useful.
- They described their current educational activities.
- Trainees characterized their participation in community activities and their roles as leaders.
- They addressed the impact of the experience on their view of the world and themselves.

ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT ON EMPLOYMENT

Trainee Employment

Nearly all of the returnees interviewed were employed. While 22 percent of the total surveyed population were not working, only one-half that number was seeking work. This means that the unemployment rate of the returnees was approximately 12 percent compared to the current official unemployment/underemployment rate for Guatemala of 28 percent. While these two unemployment rates are not directly comparable, it is clear that the employment conditions of the Trainees interviewed surpass that of the national average. Men are more likely than women to report being employed and it was found that Trainees from the highland indigenous departments show a slightly lower rate of employment than Trainees from the capital and the *ladino* departments. (*Ladino* refers to that segment of the population that shares Hispanic and indigenous cultural characteristics, termed *mestizo* in other Latin American countries.) The Trainees' rate of employment also varies across field of study as indicated in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1 Employment by Field of Study (Percentages)

Field	Working	Not Working
Agriculture/Natural Res.	79.0	21.0
Community Development	73.0	27.0
Computer Science	81.0	19.0
Cooperatives	66.8	33.4
Education	94.8	5.2
Health	65.9	34.1
Machine Repair	100.0	0.0
Private Voluntary Org.	58.3	41.7
Quality Control	100.0	0.0
Small Business	73.1	26.9
Tourism	70.0	30.0
Trainers	95.1	4.9
University Studies	75.0	25.0
Total	76.7	23.3

Source: Returnee Survey n=468

Most Trainees in programs of short-term training were recruited directly from their jobs and presumably have returned to them upon completion of their programs. Those studying in technical fields represent a different situation. These are generally young Trainees who have undertaken long-term training and, upon returning home, are new to their fields. Although the surveyed Trainees in the three fields (computer sciences, quality control, and machine repair) were few, these Trainees' success in finding employment suggests either that the three fields were appropriately selected in terms of skills needed in the Guatemalan labor market or that, as discussed below, the Trainees have been able to take advantage of other training benefits (such as learning English) to secure work.

Employment by Sector

It is interesting to note that over one-third of the Trainees that were interviewed are self-employed while another one-third are employed in the private sector. Less than 30 percent report they work in the public sector. This distribution among economic sectors is consistent with the A.I.D. emphasis on support of the private sector.

The 30 percent of Trainees who reported employment in the public sector contrasts, however, with the 16 percent who said they worked in the public sector before training, as recorded in the CLASP Information System (CIS) biographical database maintained by the Mission. Whether this indicates a real shift in employment patterns or is due to missing responses is unclear. A large number of survey respondents chose not to indicate their sector of employment. This may have partially been due to the limited relevance of the categories for the relatively large proportion of Trainees who are smallhold farmers but who also engage in such other activities as day labor.

Utility of Training

Trainees interviewed — both short- and long-term — overwhelmingly asserted that they utilize their U.S. training in their present job:

- Fifty-six percent of short-term Trainees and 62 percent of long-term Trainees stated they use the training "a great deal" in their work.
- Thirty-six percent of short-term Trainees and 32 percent of long-termers said they used the training "to some degree."
- Only 8 percent of those surveyed said that they used the training "not at all."

These responses did not vary significantly between men and women.

Trainees who were surveyed characterized the utility of their training for different aspects of their work as follows:

- For learning *new skills and techniques*, 80 percent of both short- as well as long-term Trainees said that the training had "a great deal of utility" for them.
- For *professional career training related to their current jobs*, similar proportions of both categories of Trainees found "a great deal of utility" in the training they received.
- For *career development in general*, almost 87 percent of the long- and 84 percent of the short-term Trainees stated that the training had "a great deal of utility."

-
- For application in their present job, 59 percent of the long-term Trainees (most of whom were not employed prior to training) saw the training as being of "a great deal of utility" while an additional 23 percent said that it was of "some utility." For the short-termers, however, the figures were much higher — 70 percent characterized the training as having "a great deal of utility" for their present job, and 19 percent stated that it had "some utility."

Again, there was little difference between the responses of men and women.

Short-term Trainees

Short-term Trainees accounted for 86 percent of the total number of the 4,558 CLASP-I Trainees from Guatemala (approximately 3,900). They participated in programs lasting from five weeks up to six months in duration, although the great majority went for five-week programs (95% of short-term Trainees took part in programs of six weeks or less). For the most part, Trainees were already employed. Many were engaged in rural farm or community activities or in small businesses.

Short-term Trainee responses on the utility of training reported above were confirmed in focus group discussions. For example, among nine small entrepreneurs, one Trainee said that her training course motivated her to open up a beauty academy in her home town. Another woman indicated that she learned how to organize her finances in her small business. Others added that the content of the course — planning, basic accounting, the break-even point, decision-making, setting goals and reaching them — had all improved the way they managed their small enterprises.

Trainers of Trainers (ToT), many in the public sector, also described wide-ranging applications of their training. In a focus group, these Trainees mentioned revising methods used to motivate community members, restructuring their work activities, and undertaking new community-level contacts and campaigns. A public health Trainee, for instance, asserted that his U.S. training, augmented by EIL Follow-on seminars, helped him achieve better coverage in a recent child vaccination campaign. He also reported having greatly improved the administrative side of his work in public health initiatives as a result of procedures he learned in the U.S. This Trainee believed that many of the "200 health promoters" who participated in CAPS programs would report the same thing.

Long-term Trainees

Long-term Trainees, although far fewer in number, also indicated in the focus group sessions that U.S. training has been relevant and applicable to their work. In five focus group discussions with a total of 37 long-term Trainees (20 men and 17 women), they reported that the impact of the scholarship on their careers related directly to the particular long-term program in which they participated. For example, those who had succeeded in finishing a Master's degree in the early years of the Program were largely following professional careers. They work in government agencies, private industry, and international assistance agencies — two of them are employed by USAID/Guatemala. One long-term Trainee, who was interviewed separately, credited the degree that he received in international development studies as providing him with the professional expertise which enabled him to obtain employment in an international assistance agency.

For those long-term Trainees who enrolled in U.S. technical training, the results were less positive. In two groups of the early CASP Trainees, about one-half were working in their fields of study. Several commented that their training was not seen as relevant by potential employers. This led them to shift to other fields upon returning to Guatemala.

The applicability of U.S. training to the workplace is far more difficult to assess at this time for the Junior Year Abroad (JYA) Program, an activity which permitted Guatemalan university students in their Junior year to attend a U.S. university in their field of study for one year. All but one of the 18 JYA participants in two focus groups were still enrolled in university training in Guatemala. The groups could remember only two individuals who had failed to resume their university programs on returning to the country. Too few JYA Trainees have entered the work force to be able to reliably evaluate the work-related benefits of this activity.

For many long-term Trainees, the positive impact of CLASP training on their jobs and career advancement derives not so much from their field of study as from having learned English. Several participants in the JYA focus groups had taken advantage of their English skills to find new jobs or to be promoted in the jobs they have for financing their studies. Two of them, for example, worked in the Bank of Guatemala where they found their English language skills to be frequently required. A third Trainee uses English at the computer firm where he is employed. Both CASP and JYA Trainees are employed as English teachers. CASP, JYA, and CAPS long-term technical returnees all placed the learning of English very high in the list of the applicability of their training to the job market and as one of the principal accomplishments they brought back to Guatemala.

Obstacles to the Application of Training

Surveyed Trainees rank the utility of their training as being very high. In focus groups, some short-term Trainees indicated that the content of the training was not as relevant as it could have been, which caused them some difficulties in applying their training to their job requirements. Others cited obstacles within their work environment which inhibited them from fully utilizing the training which they had received. While these opinions cannot be quantified and may relate to specific groups, their observations merit comment.

Level of Training

Some of the professional-level short-term Trainees mentioned that the training was not designed to meet their needs. One group of eight school teachers from private schools felt that their U.S. training was too elementary and did not take into account their experience as professional teachers. When asked how their training could be transferred to the Guatemalan context, one commented that "what we learned there (in the U.S.) was not much, so there is not a lot that we can take to our community from what we studied." Others seconded her opinion with respect to the weakness of the training program, saying such things as "we knew most of that before" and "in terms of new (teaching) materials, they gave us some good ideas, but in terms of education, they really didn't have anything that we didn't already know about."

Members of a Training of Trainers (TOT) focus group made similar observations about the level of their training. A non-formal education specialist said that those in his training group saw the training as a reinforcement for what they were already doing. He reported that he and his fellow Trainees had played an active role in shaping the content of their program in collaboration with U.S. trainers (who solicited this input). He felt that only 10-20 percent of the training would have been relevant to his work if they had not contributed their ideas, but it became much more applicable once the group was able to participate in revising the course to meet their objectives.

Workplace Obstacles

A second set of reasons limiting Trainee application of their training to the workplace is due to their present work environment. Thirty-seven percent of survey respondents (163 of 440) gave reasons why training had not been applied. Both long- and short-term Trainees alike reported that the training has been of limited usefulness due to the reasons cited in Table 2.2.

Table 2.2 Workplace Obstacles to Application of Training

Reason Given	Percent
Lacked economic resources or tools	40.4
Training not needed in present work	41.1
Employer policies did not favor application	9.8
No authorization from the employer	8.5
Total	100.0
Source: 1991 Guatemala Survey	n=163

Trainees expanded on workplace obstacles to applying their training in the focus groups. A Trainee in cooperative management told how he returned to his job after his CAPS scholarship highly enthusiastic about the prospect of communicating to others what he had learned in the U.S. The first day back, he was warmly greeted and then immediately reincorporated into the daily round of work. He reports that he was never given an opportunity by his supervisors or colleagues to tell them what he had learned. Likewise, a TOT Trainee was told by his supervisor that the Trainee would not need the participatory methods he learned in the U.S. because the policy of the office was to use classroom style teaching.

A Trainee in health education said that due to the disparity of levels in the available technologies in the U.S. and Guatemala, much of what he learned would not be applicable at home. Still, he valued the training experience as a kind of "apprenticeship." Several TOT Trainees in the same focus group said that the very contrast in technologies and in material wealth stimulated them to consider how to apply what they learned on their own.

ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT ON JOB LEVELS AND INCOME

Job Levels

More than 82 percent of the Trainees interviewed who were employed reported that they retain the same job as before their training. Of that number, however, 69 percent report either greater responsibilities in their work or that they have undertaken new activities on the job. This figure is similar for both short- and long-term Trainees. Women were less likely than men to have new responsibilities — 62 percent of the women reported this to be the case while 74 percent of men claimed new responsibilities.

Trainees overwhelmingly feel that the job they now hold, whether it be a new one or within the same institution but with greater responsibilities, is better than the one they occupied before their U.S. training. Only 5 percent of the respondents said their job was "worse" than it was before training, while 90 percent — both short- and long-term Trainees — characterized it as "better." Here again, men were more likely than women to reply that their job had improved; 95 percent of the former stated that this was the case as compared to 90 percent of the women.

Income

Survey data show that short- and long-term Trainees reported that their economic situation has improved. Sixty-three percent of short- and 60 percent of long-term Trainees say that their

economic status is better than it was before they entered the program. Of the rest, fewer than four percent say their personal economic situation is worse. More male than female Trainees reported improved income, 70 and 56 percent respectively. More than half (56%) of long-term Trainees who responded also feel that their *CLASP training* has a direct influence on their present economic situation. On the other hand, among short-term Trainees, only 38 percent were willing to say that *CLASP training* has influenced their present economic situation.

ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT ON EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATIONS

As indicated in the survey, Trainees recognize that the U.S. training not only created the opportunity to acquire skills to apply in the workplace, but also led them to seek more formal education. Of the total Trainees who responded to the questionnaire, 34 percent said that they are formally enrolled in an educational institution. The majority (56%) of the Trainees specifying said they are pursuing a university degree, either as undergraduates or as Master's degree candidates. Other Trainees mentioned that they are enrolled in such technical courses as nursing, computers or industrial training. The percentage of Trainees pursuing further education is similar for short- and long-term Trainees, and for women and men.

In focus group interactions, many Trainees reported that, beyond pursuing formal education or more technical training, they are sharing with others the skills acquired during their U.S. training. Trainees in two different micro-enterprise focus groups recounted ways that they had tried to be "multipliers." Some shared the knowledge gained about small business by passing on what they learned to fellow business people, members of the family, friends, or clients. A female Trainee reported that the friend to whom she had taught some of the principles she learned in the U.S. now has a small business and is doing well. While it is not possible to quantify the focus group responses, a survey question which probed leadership activities revealed that of the 336 who responded, 184 Trainees (55%) reported they had provided training for others.

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT, CITIZEN PARTICIPATION AND LEADERSHIP

In this section, the *impact* of *CLASP training* on leadership is investigated. It was found that most Trainees report that they are involved in community activities, including regularly attending meetings, undertaking community projects, and assuming leadership in voluntary community organizations.

Trainees and Community Activities

Seventy-one percent of the Trainees surveyed reported that they had participated in a community or church organization, or in some related grouping. Men are more likely than women to report being involved in community activities (78% and 64% respectively). Among short-term Trainees, 74 percent reported that they had participated in an organization since completing U.S. training, while 59 percent of long-term Trainees made this statement.

Seventy-four percent of Trainees reported that their involvement in community organization is greater after their return from the United States. Again, more men than women — 77 percent versus 70 percent — stated that their participation has been greater since their return while 20 and 25 percent report that it has remained unchanged. Only three percent and five percent respectively said that their participation in community activities has declined.

Levels of Trainee Participation

Trainees were asked to characterize their level of participation in the organization which they were most active. Six activities, ranging from the least commitment of effort to the greatest, were presented as options: attending meetings; helping out in a project; leading a meeting or directing a project; acting as a spokesperson within the group; acting as a spokesperson with outside authorities; training others; and taking on formal positions within the organization. Trainees exhibited a high level of participation and leadership:

- Fifty-six percent reported they had trained others.
- An equal number stated they had taken a leadership role as spokesperson for their group;
- Twenty-five percent maintained that they had carried out all six of the options suggested in the questionnaire; 20 percent reported they had taken on at least five of the activities within the organization while another 25 percent had accomplished four of these activities.

Focus Group Comments

In focus groups, Trainees described different ways in which they are involved in the community. Many expressed their involvement in terms of the duty to "serve the community." For example, nine community development Trainees (who are among the most disadvantaged of all Trainees) reminded the evaluators that all of their efforts in applying their U.S. training and in using the EIL reinforcement seminars were voluntary and unpaid. As one put it, "One has this avocation to help the people, to help in learning how we can progress; the fact is that doing this sometimes leads us to neglect our own necessities." Several others in that group recounted how they had endeavored to meet some community need, such as "going the rounds" to secure the construction of more classrooms for the school. A male Trainee added that at times he struggled to do this when he "didn't have enough money to buy a soda." These participants viewed themselves as community leaders, and felt it was their obligation to attend to needs beyond themselves and their families.

A group of nine natural resource Trainees, most of whom were low-paid agricultural extension workers, described the range of activities in which they were involved in the following terms:

- "I represent thirty families; we have a community garden by the hospital, and I meet regularly with the people – sometimes several times a month – to determine how we will manage the garden."
- "All that you are able to learn, you must give to the community. As a volunteer, I find I most often end up giving people advice. Outside of work, I volunteer in the hospital."
- "We volunteer as a family. My wife is illiterate, but ... she learns through me and is interested in improving our lives."
- "In my community, I give talks for the whole family, and the whole family comes, with attendance by ninety percent of the people."

While the comments from these two groups indicate high involvement in community affairs, other focus group results showed that some groups were less active. Among short-term Trainees, micro-enterprise participants were, according to their comments, notably less involved in community

development issues. Long-term Trainees were also less involved in community affairs. Most CAPS long-term academic Trainees have returned to the university and are working as well. In the two focus groups held with them, many academic Trainees related that they are simply too busy with school and work to be involved in community issues. CASP long-term Trainees, however, are more active in community projects, especially in initiatives related to their Alumni Association.

Case Study: CLASP Trainee Involvement In PVOs

Non-governmental small Private Voluntary Organizations (PVOs) have expanded throughout rural Guatemala as a primary means to extend services to the rural poor. Many CAPS Trainees have become involved in these PVO efforts. Trainees throughout the country have worked in local projects, founded their own small voluntary agencies, managed in some cases to secure formal legal status, and applied for outside funding to support their activities. Below are listed a few of the accomplishments of these Trainees:

- One Trainee founded a community association for rural integrated development near Sololá which has received funding from several non-governmental organizations (NGOs) for community projects.
- A Trainee in rural development from Quetzaltenango became the "director of training and projects" for a small PVO at the departure of the Peace Corps volunteers who had founded it.
- In Momostenango, Totonicapán, a Trainee in community development began an organization for carrying out small community projects in rural areas. This group has received support from several outside funding sources.
- A group of women from San Marcos, some of whom worked in reforestation activities described below, founded a women's institution which was recently granted funding from a Spanish institution for community health.

These and other examples are concrete cases in which CLASP Trainees have actively formed their own organizations to improve their communities.

IMPACT ON ATTITUDES

Finally, Trainees reported on their changes in their view of the world and their understanding of themselves resulting from their U.S. training and experience.

These changes are more difficult to assess, since they are less "visible" sociologically. Nonetheless, discussions with Trainees led the evaluators to conclude that the measurement of impact should not stop with directly observable activities or even with Trainee reports of concrete activities in which they have engaged. Many Trainees spoke in broader terms of the impact of the experience on them as individuals. Although in many cases this impact is not fully realized in the present activities of the Trainees, the changed attitudes and aspirations remain a latent force in these Trainees' definitions of themselves and their expectations about the future.

Changes in Aspirations

This "latent" impact or "impact in reserve" was revealed in the answer to one question in the survey, "Do you believe that your hopes and aspirations for the future have changed as a result of your experience in the U.S.?" Eighty-five percent of all Trainees answered in the affirmative, with long-term Trainees indicating a slightly more positive effect than short-termers (88% versus 81%). Trainees provided a wide variety of responses in describing changes in their aspirations:

- efforts to improve their educational level;
- efforts to improve their work or to undertake new work (such as starting a business of their own);
- the desire to improve the living standard of their fellow countrymen based on what they saw in the U.S.;
- the desire to work within their community for social ends, often extending this wish for all Guatemala; and
- the desire to improve themselves by becoming better leaders, better students, by self-motivation as entrepreneurs, etc.

Some Trainees are very concrete in their aspirations, such as the plan to sell more in their shop or to find a particular new job. Others are more studied, such as "I am more conscious of reality," or "My general desire to overcome obstacles and to excel has grown," or "I have a broader vision now," and "I struggle to improve every day."

Changes in Perspective

Many more took the opportunity to mention what are not hopes, but rather what they see as the outcomes or the impact of training on their lives:

- Trainees say they are *animados*, highly motivated to work.
- Many Trainees in the survey claim that they have much greater confidence in themselves, in their ability to carry out tasks and face unknown experiences.
- Several Trainees say they now know how to set goals and work towards them — how to plan.
- One said that "[i]t motivated me to go back to school, even though I am already of advanced age."
- Another stated that "my sales have increased, and the clients are much happier with our shop."
- A third said that she is "more demanding of myself than I used to be."
- Another Trainee said ... "I see the world with greater objectivity."

Broadening of Visions

Other impacts on attitudes, perspectives and aspirations were less concrete, but no less important. One Trainee, for example, talked of how the vision he acquired in the United States changed his understanding of the world and of his own potential. Another said that this trip served to "shake her up," making her realize that she must not remain on the same level, but rather should advance in her business and her goals. A microenterprise Trainee from 1990 said ... "We realized that we had been sleeping; and we went there (to the U.S.) to wake up, and now we come with our eyes open."

Perhaps the words of one of the young Junior Year Abroad Trainees best sums up this kind of reflection:

"Beyond the academic, the thing is that I arrived in a strange country without knowing anything, and I saw there that you can do whatever you most want to do, regardless of where you're from or from where you start. If you have the will and the strength ... you can move ahead, struggling to do that. Because sometimes you don't achieve anything because you're afraid but if you dare to, you can keep moving ahead. Little by little, you keep learning. This experience made me a much more independent person."

The implications of these kinds of statements are difficult to measure. Nevertheless, these Trainee voices indicate that the CLASP scholarship program has had a fundamental impact on the Trainees' understanding of themselves, their role in society, and their place in the world.

CHAPTER THREE

Impact of CLASP Training Supplemented by In-Country Follow-on Programs

CHAPTER THREE: IMPACT OF CLASP TRAINING SUPPLEMENTED BY IN-COUNTRY FOLLOW-ON PROGRAMS

The impact of CLASP training has been influenced not only by training in the U.S. but also by two post-training programs in Guatemala — the supplemental training provided by the Experiment in International Living (EIL) and actions related to the CAPS Alumni Association — ASOPAZAC. These programs are examined in Chapter Four. Here, three particular initiatives which Trainees have undertaken as a result of their participation in Mission-sponsored Follow-on Programs are examined which demonstrate impact at the community level.

COMMUNITY-BASED TRAINING/DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

In the first year of the EIL Follow-on Project, short-term returnees were provided with small amounts of funding to carry out their own training sessions with community groups. This has resulted in a great many "community-based development projects" or CBDPs. Trainees take the initiative in designing a seminar proposal on a training topic which can result in a two day, Trainee-led session in the Trainee's area of expertise. According to EIL counts, over 240 CBDPs had been approved by July 1991, and the rhythm of applications is increasing rapidly. Over 6,600 people attended the 227 CBDPs which had taken place by late June. EIL estimates there are over 165,000 indirect beneficiaries since those who attend pass on the information to others in their communities, social groups, and families. Such important issues as the prevention of cholera and diarrhea, the construction of latrines, basic hygiene and sanitation, child care and breast feeding, kitchen gardens and nutrition, small business management, and the organization of community projects and working groups have been addressed in these CBDPs.

While documentation on the impact of these CBDPs is limited, there were some important activities that have been shown to result from them:

- A report on a health related seminar states that, as a result of training, a local health committee was founded "which is meeting weekly."
- Another talks about the participation of a local Ministry of Health official, who planned to initiate similar seminars in "areas where there are no CAPS *becarios*."
- One Trainee seminar, described as focusing on health "educational techniques," taught about traditional medicinal plants, used puppets in its exposition, and reached some 20 rural health technicians.
- Several reports mention the desire of the participants to take part in future community training seminars.

SMALL COMMUNITY PROJECT FUND

In 1987-89, USAID/Guatemala established a \$200,000 Small Project Fund to support community-level projects for CAPS returnees. The review of this effort shows that the Small Project Fund reached its first goal of providing the means by which CAPS Trainees could work concretely to improve their communities. Thirty-three projects were completed. Trainees and their committees solved a series of problems in executing these projects from preparing the proposal to successfully completing the activity. Whether the results will be limited to the benefits already received — a potable water system or a building which serves the community — is not clear. These projects

which have passed through the life cycle of introducing community improvements may yield ongoing "multiplier effect" resulting in yet more benefits.

The second goal — that of improving the administrative skills of the CAPS Alumni Association (ASOPAZAC) leadership — was not reached. Administrative difficulties were prevalent during the first two years of the Small Project Fund according to documents and interviews. Due to the difficulties of gathering information about these aspects, the evaluators are unable to specify with assurance the source of the conflict. Nevertheless, a lesson learned is that involvement of Trainees in funding decisions may lead to conflicts and misunderstandings unless that involvement is well-planned and accompanied with explicit procedures.

CASE STUDY IN CITIZEN PARTICIPATION: REFORESTATION

CAPS Trainees have successfully participated in or have organized significant development efforts throughout the country. Of greatest consequence has been the area of reforestation.

CAPS Trainees throughout the country have adopted reforestation as a particular area for volunteer participation. They did this through their Alumni Association — ASOPAZAC. During a July 4th celebration in 1989, then U.S. Ambassador Michel authorized a special bank account to be opened to which celebrants were invited to make a small donation to support the reforestation initiative — the equivalent of \$200 was contributed. A reforestation committee was organized within the Association which used the funds to purchase seedlings from state nurseries and pay for transporting the seedlings to reforestation sites. Trainees from 10 or 12 communities received the trees and they were planted in community work festivals. Word spread and more Trainees became involved. A departmental branch of ASOPAZAC — that of San Marcos — decided to adopt reforestation as its main volunteer activity.

With the EIL start-up in 1989, programmers suggested that environmental concerns should be an ongoing focus for training. The San Marcos forestry committee requested that EIL provide a series of workshops and seminars on reforestation. Seedlings were provided by the Guatemalan government. EIL records show that 57 percent of the training participants stated they had actively participated in reforestation or natural resource management. In some cases, this involved planting trees in their communities or nearby watersheds (ranging from 20 to 10,000 trees), while others reported participating in brigades which planted 60,000 and 80,000 trees.

Today, the interest in reforestation continues, led by a group of women short-term Trainees. According to one who recounted their activities to the evaluators, these Trainees formed committees in five communities last year, and each committee took responsibility for planting 5,000 trees in its area.

The interest in reforestation, which CAPS Trainees originally developed as a volunteer project, has now been formalized as the third module in the EIL natural resource training sequence. The evaluators attended briefly the first session of the new module in which forestry issues are given a week's attention. There was a high level of enthusiasm by the 33 men and women working in community-level agricultural extension who attended. All but one of the group said that they had been actively involved in reforestation efforts in the communities where they worked. It is interesting to note that this group was characterized as possessing among the lowest level of formal education, and probably among the lowest incomes, of any CAPS group.

CHAPTER FOUR

In-Country Follow-on Efforts

In Guatemala

CHAPTER FOUR: IN-COUNTRY FOLLOW-ON EFFORTS IN GUATEMALA

The two major components of CLASP related Follow-on activities that are reviewed and assessed in this evaluation include:

- the program of Follow-on reinforcement seminars offered to short-term technical Trainees by the in-country contractor, the Experiment in International Living (EIL); and
- the CAPS Alumni Association – ASOPAZAC – which was sponsored by PAZAC, the CLASP-I in-country implementing agency.

Both of these programs have been oriented to short-term CAPS Trainees who comprised the great majority of the total CLASP Trainee population. EIL seminars are only open to CAPS short-term Trainees. ASOPAZAC incorporated all Trainees into its membership, but Mission personnel stated that the participation of long-term Trainees was limited.

In addition to these two programs, the CASP Follow-on efforts were examined briefly, with an emphasis on future planning for the "Everybody Works" initiative. The CASP program has been designed to meet the needs of the long-term Trainees typical of that activity.

This portion of the evaluation focuses on organization and process to examine:

- how the two endeavors have been structured and how they have functioned;
- to what degree CLASP Trainees have participated in them,; and
- how their organization facilitate involvement by returned Trainees.

The outcomes and the initial impact that Trainees attribute to the training will also be described, and those short-term Trainees who have participated in EIL seminars are compared to those who have not.

THE EXPERIMENT IN INTERNATIONAL LIVING'S (EIL) IN-COUNTRY FOLLOW-ON PROGRAM

The Project's Structure and Functions

USAID/Guatemala contracted the Experiment in International Living (EIL) in 1989 to provide a series of reinforcement seminars to complement short-term U.S. training (typically, five weeks in duration). The task of the EIL Follow-on Project was to establishment reinforcement seminars for 2,000 of the nearly 4,000 short-term Trainees based on a needs assessments of the different Trainee groups. Two years into the project, the system is well established. Seminars are offered on a biweekly schedule. As a rule, seminars are held in seven sites throughout the country, not including the capital city.

Each Trainee is eligible to attend sequential training "modules" in their field, one every six months, for a total of four reinforcement seminar modules over two years. The topics mirror the areas in which U.S. short-term training was carried out:

-
- Health
 - Small and Medium Enterprise Management
 - Bilingual Education (Spanish and an indigenous language)
 - Monolingual Education (for teachers who are ethnically *ladino*)
 - Cooperative Management
 - Natural Resources

EIL training is characterized by the following features:

- Seminar content balances technical training with leadership and motivational skills. The technical curriculum is based on an assessment of the Trainees' skill levels and is checked against Trainee needs by frequent seminar evaluation.
- The "leadership" or "organizational" component uses and teaches "participatory education" techniques encouraging group interaction, shared creativity, small group discussion, and the use of innovative teaching methods. Trainees participate in and learn to conduct group discussions, mutual brainstorming, and the presentation and interpretation of ideas and problems in a group setting.
- The EIL staff of 30 people is larger than originally planned. Most of the growth reflects an expansion in the range of support offered to Trainees and the labor-intensive production of training materials. The training staff consists of seven "coordinators" who design and teach the training modules and six "facilitators" who assist them as support trainers.
- A network of regional representatives, not a part of the original plan, has expanded program outreach throughout the country. They are located in five of the country's eight regions and are the principal means, apart from the seminars, for supporting Trainee activities.
- Training manuals, designed specifically for the seminars, cover a wide range of topics and employ innovative teaching techniques. Course outlines combined materials from many sources and specified the activities and plans for each week of the seminar emphasizing a range of participatory techniques and methods.
- The EIL staff are knowledgeable and committed professionals who clearly take their work seriously and who evidently identify their interests with those of the Project. By all indications, the staff manage to accomplish a great deal with an economical use of resources. The trainers' job in the Project keeps them in seminars and away from their home essentially every other week, yet morale was high and staff relations amiable.

EIL relies on lists of Trainees which are provided by USAID/Guatemala for issuing invitations to seminars. While all short-term Trainees were said to be eligible to take part in the Follow-on seminars, the evaluators were unable to resolve a difference in Trainee numbers. CIS records indicated that about 3,500 short-term CAPS Trainees were selected between 1985 and 1989. EIL reports, however, that it was supplied a list of about 3,000 Trainee names. Persons conversant with the program asserted that some groups or individuals may have been deleted from the original pool by the Mission, although this could not be confirmed.

The EIL Follow-on Project set out to contact the persons on the lists via telegrams, local meetings, letters and direct contact. EIL Project managers believe that recruitment got off to a slow start. In 1989, for example, only an average of 85 Trainees were attending the seminars

although the Project was aiming for 120. EIL staff identified the following obstacles which prevented Trainees from accepting invitations to participate in seminars:

- difficulty in obtaining permission to leave work for a week;
- the loss of income during the week spent in the seminar;
- a lack funds to pay transportation to seminar sites;
- incorrect addresses impeding the receipt of invitations;
- work loads making a week's absence from the job difficult;
- the fact that U.S. training is more attractive than in-country training; and
- the fact that some CAPS scholars now work in technical areas different from the area of their U.S. training.

The momentum of seminar recruitment increased after late 1989 with the following numbers of Trainees having attended the three sequential modules that have been developed to date (see Table 4.1).

Module I	2,052
Module II	1,873
Module III	1,180

Source: EIL Records

Several more Module III courses will be offered and it is projected that 1,375 Trainees will attend this level of training. Module IV had only begun to be offered in a few fields at the time of the evaluation.

EIL staff continue to use telegrams and letters to invite Trainees to the twice yearly seminar for which they are eligible. EIL invites about twice as many Trainees as it expects to attend. According to EIL reports, acceptance rates have been steady at about 50 percent over the past year. The latest report, through June 30, 1991, notes that the April-June quarter experienced a 33 percent acceptance rate. EIL attributes this lower rate to:

- the inability of wage and salary workers to obtain permission to leave work for a week every six months either because of work load, employer policies, or the jealousies of their supervisors and co-workers;
- the reluctance of small business owners to forego income or leave their businesses in the hands of others;
- the difficulties of women related to family or household duties or the fact that they may have ~~married since completing their U.S. training and have newly acquired household duties or~~ husbands who will not let them attend; and
- the special circumstances of small farmers who face foregoing the loss of income from a week away and a normally very low level of income which limits them paying the bus fare to the training site, even though they are reimbursed for 80 percent of their travel upon arrival.

EIL has made significant efforts to contain in-country costs. The Project negotiated reasonable rates for food and lodging with the owners of the training sites. The average cost per Trainee per

day is about US\$15 while transportation cost reimbursement averages US\$5-7 per participant. EIL has attempted to keep staff salaries comparable to the pay scale of equivalent Guatemalan institutions. While salaries are still attractive enough to maintain a qualified staff, they are not high and have actually lost ground in the past year due to inflation. Within the budgetary constraints that prevail, the Project has been able to offer a range of services beyond those originally included in their contract, such as the regional representatives which have been mentioned above.

Trainee Assessments of the Impact of EIL Training

Of those surveyed, 55 percent of the short-term Trainees had taken part in an EIL seminar. Of that number, 45 percent were women and 55 percent men. Those attending seminars gave it high praise for providing them with a range of benefits (see Table 4.2):

The responses of men and women were very similar, with women expressing a slightly higher level of satisfaction. When asked specifically about the utility of the participatory educational techniques which they have studied as participants, 94 percent said they were "very useful" and only one respondent said they were less than "somewhat useful."

	Some, Little or None	A Great Deal
Learning new skills	3.7	96.3
Professional preparation	6.3	92.7
Present job	10.9	89.1
Self-confidence	6.3	93.7

Source: 1991 Guatemala Survey

The outcomes reported from the survey are reinforced by positive responses within the focus group discussions. A Training of Trainers (TOT) group made up of eight men and one woman reached consensus on their enthusiasm about the work of EIL. Several spoke of the value of learning new participatory educational methods which they can take with them directly to the workplace, and of having more confidence in their own skills. Another focus group of nine Trainees in micro-enterprise management unanimously agreed that they had applied to their businesses such skills as decision-making, accounting, and human relations, which they learned at EIL seminars.

A group of nine teachers attending an EIL seminar were also united in saying that the training had helped them in terms of their professional skills and their careers. They reported that they used the skills in the classroom and in their community activities, such as in neighborhood meetings. They spoke of their impact in their communities in terms of the "multiplier effect," and several asserted that the training raised their visibility as leaders in the community. When asked to "grade" EIL on a 100-point scale, they all, without hesitation, replied ... "100." These complimentary statements are typical of the Trainees' assessment of the EIL Follow-on Project heard across a range of focus groups.

Comparison of EIL Participants and Non-participants

A comparison of EIL reinforcement seminar participants with short-term Trainees who did not take part reveals significant contrasts between the two groups. The figures establish that EIL training reinforces many of the goals that CLASP training is designed to support: advances in the workplace, efforts to gain even greater expertise through further education, and increased community involvement. Those who have taken advantage of EIL training score higher on all these variables; in some cases, the difference is substantial:

- A higher percentage of EIL participants reported they were employed – 81 percent compared to 75 percent for those who had not participated in the seminars.
- A higher percentage of EIL participants reported having new and more challenging responsibilities in their work – 77 percent compared to 59 percent for non-participants.
- A greater percentage of EIL participants with new job related responsibilities characterized their job as better than before U.S. training – 91 percent versus 88 percent for non-participants.
- A greater contrast arises with respect to the impact of CLASP training on their present economic situation – 68 percent of EIL participants stated that training had positively influenced their present economic situation, while only 45 percent of non-participants made the same statement.
- EIL Trainees are also more likely to be enrolled in formal education (40%) than those who have not participated (29%). Interestingly, less than one-half the non-participants enrolled in formal education are in technical training, while 70 percent of EIL Trainees are studying in work-related technical fields.
- EIL Trainees are more likely to participate in community activities and efforts (84%) that are non-participants (71%).

Finally, in concrete terms, a major impact of the EIL Project is visible in the community-based development projects (CBDPs), described in Chapter III. Through these small training seminars, the Trainees have developed training sessions for nearly 5,000 community members.

ASOPAZAC: ASOCIACIÓN DE BECARIOS DEL PROGRAMA DE PAZ EN AMERICA CENTRAL

The USAID Mission in Guatemala emphasized Follow-on activities early in the CAPS Program. Two years into the program, Follow-on in CAPS/Guatemala included:

- membership in the Alumni Association;
- a quarterly newsletter;
- occasional conferences in technical skills and leadership; and
- encouragement to participate in a program of small scale development projects funded by the Mission, with funds administered by a parallel agency.

PAZAC was the agency responsible for these activities.

ASOPAZAC, the CAPS Alumni Association, was founded in late 1986. Membership was open to all returning Trainees in succeeding years. PAZAC secured formal legal status for the Association in 1988 which enabled it to undertake independent activities, such as to apply for funding from different sources and to operate as a corporation. PAZAC continued to play an important role throughout the Association's life. The Executive Director of PAZAC, for example, was a permanent member on ASOPAZAC's National Coordinating Committee.

USAID/Guatemala resources for supporting the Association's activities were also channelled through PAZAC.

The Association had periods of active participation by hundreds of Trainees. Plenary meetings were widely attended and appreciated by the Trainees. However, the Project Fund described in Chapter III became a point of conflict in 1989 between ASOPAZAC leadership and the PAZAC implementing agency, a conflict revolving around the approval process for projects. This led to the replacement of the national leaders. The newly elected national leadership was installed in May 1990 for a two-year term.

The new leadership met several times to establish a national agenda for Association members. Initiatives in the fields of health and training were developed for presentation to the membership. PAZAC supported these 1990 meetings of the national directorate and the departmental leaders. However, when PAZAC closed at the end of September 1990, the resources for further meetings were no longer available, and it proved impossible for the Association to continue to function. The national directorate argues that without funds to carry out Association activities (e.g. mailing out information, sponsorship of meetings), ASOPAZAC can not function. Most members, according to them, are extremely poor and live in rural areas. General meetings are only possible if there is economic support to bring members to the capital or to departmental urban centers. The national president furthermore believes that he should be paid, or at least reimbursed, for the expenses involved in his travel to Guatemala City to participate in Association activities.

The ASOPAZAC name is widely known by the Trainees. Some 78 percent of those surveyed said they were members. Approximately one-half of them report they have taken part in some activity of the Association. The same kind of response was heard from the participants in focus groups. However, some of those in the focus groups who had attended ASOPAZAC events found them not as useful as they would have liked, especially with respect to the large general meetings. One small businesswoman pointed to the diversity and numbers of people attending a conference with her and reported that she felt she shared little in common with others there. Another believed that the themes discussed did not relate to her situation, while others indicated that nothing was accomplished or that communication was nonexistent.

At least five ASOPAZAC departmental committees remain as functioning groups. The group in San Marcos receives the most comment by Trainees and USAID/Guatemala staff. A Trainee from San Marcos who himself works in health training said in June that, "Yes, we continue working within the ASOPAZAC of my department with 150 members." Others from that area said that they believed that the best way for the National Association to improve would be at the level of departmental committees. The strength of these departmental committees lies in previous mobilization around common projects, independent of the central implementing agency.

In focus group discussion, Trainees have offered a number of suggestions which might be taken into account as the future of the organization is considered. While it is not possible to quantify these views, the following opinions were expressed:

- ASOPAZAC membership was too large and the occupational diversity too great, especially in the large-scale meetings that had been held in the past. This was expressed by short-term Trainees who were active in EIL Follow-on activities as well as by Trainees who had not participated. It was suggested that the Association needs to function by field of study, or that it be reorganized into many linked associations which reflect the areas of interest of the Trainee;

-
- Trainees said that it would be more helpful if they were meeting with people who faced the same problems they did. The EIL reinforcement seminars, described below, were cited as evidence of the value of this approach.
 - Groupings at the local level, such as with single departments of the country, have been more effective than overall national groupings. Such departmental arrangements already exist and the EIL training seminars will no doubt strengthen these departmental efforts.

In summary, most Trainees were doubtful about the validity of the organizational approach taken by ASOPAZAC in the past, in which large meetings were held to bring together Trainees of all backgrounds. Local-level associations organized by geographic region and field of study were preferable in their minds. The purposes of such an organization should also be well articulated and related to the Trainees' daily lives, or most would feel little inclination to participate.

FOLLOW-ON IN THE CASP PROGRAM

The CASP Alumni Association

The Central American Scholarship Program (CASP) managed by Georgetown University contrasts with the CAPS efforts in its emphasis on meeting the needs of long- as opposed to short-term Trainees. In Guatemala, the principal form of CASP Follow-on activity has been participation in the CASP Alumni Association until the recent creation of the employment program described below. The Association sponsored various activities such as seminars and occasional training sessions. An association which incorporates all CASP returnees is more appropriate than was the original CAPS Alumni Association — ASOPAZAC — for the following reasons:

- The number of returnees is small — in July 1991, it was just over 130.
- There is greater homogeneity since they are all young, they have completed similar U.S. programs of approximately two years in duration, most still live with their parents, and most of the Trainees are from urban or semi-urban areas.
- The focus of their U.S. training was on vocational, job-related training for new entrants to the labor market bringing them together around common occupational interests.

The CASP Alumni Association provides a base for interaction with CLASP returnees, for networking among themselves and with outsiders, for developing educational opportunities, and for undertaking volunteer projects. It meets regularly and creates linkages among its members, motivating them to participate after U.S. training is completed. For example, Association representatives go to the airport to meet new returnees thereby demonstrating an interest and concern about their welfare even before they arrive at their respective homes. During two focus group encounters with fourteen CASP Trainees, they mentioned the following activities of the Association:

- The Association sponsors training courses for Trainees.
- It facilitates career workshops giving the opportunity to Trainees to learn about specific companies and their personnel requirements.
- The Association assists Trainees to attend trade association courses.

-
- Under Association aegis, Trainees undertake small community projects.
 - CASP returnees, through the Association, are invited to participate in the selection of new Trainees.
 - The Association publishes a newsletter.

The "Everybody Works" Project

A CASP Program-wide evaluation in 1989 highlighted Trainees' concerns that CASP training, offered in a limited number of technical fields, did not adequately prepare them for obtaining jobs on their return home. At that time, the unemployment rates of returnees who had studied agricultural technology and computer sciences was thought to be unacceptably high by the evaluators. At the present time, most Guatemalan CASP returnees are employed but Program personnel report that many are not working in their field of specialization.

Two factors – the strong focus of the Program on vocational training for employment and the resulting concern about job placement for returnees – have led Program staff to reorient their Follow-on activities towards job placement. Called *Trabajo para Todos* (Everybody Works), the Program has endeavored to enlist employers who may then nominate potential trainers as candidates for CASS scholarships – CASS is the successor to the CASP Program. These employers also agree to place returning Trainees in jobs implying, at a minimum, that they replace the candidates they have nominated for long-term training with returnees. The Program is now marketing Trainees scheduled to return by contacting potential employers and supplying them with appropriate resumes and a description of the training they have received.

The Guatemala CASP/CASS Coordinator reported that he has visited dozens of employers and gained expressions of support for this strategy. Employer groups have provided some financial assistance to advertise CASS scholarships in their area. For example, FUNDAZUCAR, the sugar producers' association, has contributed to the production of brochures and posters notifying potential candidates of the existence of the Program.

These efforts to make contact with employers will be augmented by ongoing seminars in job-hunting skills and in supporting Trainees in their continuing education, as has already been done through the Association's activities described above.

Since the "Everybody Works" Project is only recently underway, initial results are anecdotal. Concrete outcomes, at least in their first stage, will only be apparent when Trainees arrive and present themselves in person to the offered positions. The pressure to carry out this kind of advance spade work is especially great in 1991, for the group that comes back in the coming months combines both CASP and CASS students, and is the largest contingent in the Program thus far. About 140 will be returning, essentially doubling the number of returned CASP/CASS Trainees in one year.

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusions and Recommendations

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this final chapter, findings and conclusions presented in previous chapters are summarized and recommendations for the future are discussed.

THE CLASP-I TRAINEES – WHO THEY ARE

Drawing on the analysis of CLASP-I Trainees presented in Volume II, it was found that CLASP/Guatemala successfully tapped into a population which normally would never have had the opportunity to visit the United States, nor have had the chance to receive any targeted technical training of the kind made available to them. Specifically, a significant proportion of CLASP/Guatemala Trainees were women, poor, low-educated, from rural areas, or indigenous.

- CAPS/Guatemala sent more Trainees – 4,558 – to the United States in its five years of implementation than did any other USAID Mission participating in the CLASP-I Program.
- Ninety-seven percent of the 3,900 CAPS short-term Trainees were economically disadvantaged. Seventy percent of these short-termers have annual incomes below \$2,000 while over one-half have less than a primary school education.
- Ninety-four percent of short-term Trainees come from rural areas. Locating these Trainees and mobilizing them, given the poor infrastructure of rural Guatemala, required flexibility and creativity on the part of the Program implementers.
- Social structural barriers to reaching the indigenous, Mayan-speaking population exist in Guatemala. Nevertheless, CAPS/Guatemala recruited a substantial percentage (33%) of its short-term Trainees from the “ethnically disadvantaged,” most of whom are indigenous. This group comes from the most disadvantaged stratum of Guatemalan society. This is a singular occurrence in the training of indigenous peoples in Latin America.
- Nearly one-half of the CAPS Trainees and over 40 percent of the CASP Trainees are women, a group which has not been targeted for scholarships in the past, especially rural women.
- Long-term Trainees (both CAPS and CASP) have higher levels of education than the short-term Trainees. This is consistent with the requirements of U.S. universities and advanced technical training. USAID/Guatemala successfully identified largely disadvantaged long-term Trainees who are now striving to apply their training at home.

RECOMMENDATION: The CLASP Population

The CLASP-II Guatemala Peace Scholarship (GPS) Program, the successor to CAPS, is already being implemented. Because it is smaller than CLASP-I, GPS must narrow the selection process to reflect the lower level of funding. It is recommended, however, that GPS continue to focus on groups with socioeconomic characteristics similar to those which have been successfully mobilized under CLASP-I.

THE IMPACTS OF CLASP TRAINING

CLASP returnees have higher levels of employment than the population at large. They generally believe that CLASP training has contributed to their job efficiency and satisfaction. Training programs were generally well suited to supporting the job skills and activities of Trainees. Trainees are active in a range of community activities and organizations, and they attest to significant changes in their understanding of the world and of their own potential as a result of CLASP training.

Employment

- Nearly all CLASP returnees are presently working (77%), while their unemployment rate (12%) is considerably below the national average of 28 percent. Trainees in the field of education and training as well as those in certain technical fields (i.e. machine repair, computer sciences and quality control) have the highest rates of employment. Trainees from the *ladino* departments are more likely to be employed than those from the indigenous departments.
- After completing their training, Trainees generally return to the same job but with greater responsibilities and new activities.
- The majority of Trainees report that their jobs are "better" and that they earn more income than before training.

Trainees participating in focus groups described how they had applied their training in concrete cases. Some of the Trainees in the focus groups also pointed out obstacles to applying their training such as training pitched at inappropriate levels or resistance on the part of employers to permit them to introduce innovations.

RECOMMENDATIONS: CLASP Training Impacts on Employment

High percentages of CAPS returnees confirm that their U.S. training was useful on the job, in their careers, and for learning new skills. CAPS Trainees have higher levels of employment than the population at large. The successes in selection and program design resulting from CLASP-I implementation provide a broad base of experience that can be applied to the CLASP-II Guatemala Peace Scholarship (GPS) Program.

Certain short-term training groups showed very high levels of employment. The Mission may wish to examine the bases of these varying rates of employment among short-term Trainees to learn how these variations might shed light on future program emphases.

The achievements relating to the impact on employment could be enhanced by the minor adjustments which follow.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Professional-level Trainees, in focus groups, reported that training programs were sometimes too elementary or inappropriate for their jobs. These comments were not heard from groups composed of microenterprise, natural resource, and community development Trainees. This suggests that U.S. trainers had more difficulty in designing appropriate programs for Trainees with higher levels of formal education. Two actions are recommended to ensure that training programs are appropriate for all Trainees:

- that training institutions be well informed about the professional and cultural backgrounds of Trainees so that the training can be designed to build on the professional skills already possessed by Trainees. This requires communication between contractors and the Mission and functions best, as shown in other Missions, when training institution representatives visit Trainees in their workplaces in Guatemala prior to training.
- that training institutions be prepared to solicit Trainee input early on in training with respect to curriculum content and difficulty, so as to modify the course to reflect Trainee needs even after the course has begun.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

More than a third of all Trainees cited problems in applying their training in the workplace.

- It is recommended that Trainees be made aware of potential obstacles to implementing their U.S. training in the workplace as part of predeparture orientation. Strategies for minimizing those obstacles can be introduced to U.S. training.
- Consistent with program decisions already undertaken under GPS, the Mission will wish to ensure that intermediary institutions which work with the Program to nominate Trainees are committed to supporting their nominees on their return. Institutions could be encouraged to support or take part in in-country Follow-on efforts provided to their Trainee employees.

Community Involvement and Citizen Participation

In spite of early criticisms of the five-week short-term training program which became the norm for CAPS/Guatemala, short-term Trainees reported that the CLASP training was a significant experience in their lives. Many attribute their high levels of community participation to CLASP training. Both short- and long-term Trainees report positive changes in their opinions of the U.S. and in their own values as a result of the scholarship. Most described the experience in enthusiastic terms.

- A very large proportion (71%) of the Trainees report that they participate actively in community activities, while a slightly larger proportion (74%) say they participate more now than they did before their CLASP training.

- Trainees indicated they are actively involved in multiple levels of volunteer activities, with more than two-thirds (70%) asserting that they had assumed four or more of the six typical activities that were suggested in the survey.
- Almost all short-term Trainees were identified as leaders by the Mission at the time of recruitment. While leadership qualities are difficult to measure, the reported post-training activities of the Trainees today suggest that CLASP scholars are fulfilling their mandate of leadership. This conclusion is reinforced when the large number of Trainees who have participated in the EIL seminars is considered.
- Trainees in focus groups described their involvement in a broad range of concrete activities in their communities and regions and in acting as "multipliers."
- Trainees throughout the country have worked in grassroots projects, have established their own Private Voluntary Organizations (PVOs), have in some cases managed to secure legal status for these organizations, and have succeeded in applying for outside funding to support their activities.

Attitudinal Impact of CLASP Training

Finally, a more intangible impact of CLASP training has been on attitudes. Discussions with Trainees suggest that their view their world and themselves in very different ways as a result of the CLASP training experience. This impact is often not manifested in the present activities of the Trainees. Nevertheless, these changed attitudes and aspirations remain a latent force in Trainees' self-definition and in the activities they may undertake in the future.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Impacts of CLASP Training on Citizen Participation and Attitudes

CAPS Trainees demonstrate high levels of social involvement. It is recommended that the Mission consider drawing on returned Trainees of certain training themes (such as rural health and community development) as potential liaisons with A.I.D.-supported activities in rural areas or urban *barrios*. This suggests that appropriate Technical Offices be made aware of the large cadre of Trainees and that some contact be maintained, based on the CIS database and information maintained by EIL.

It is also recommended that the successful short-term training approach used by USAID/Guatemala in mobilizing a diverse and economically disadvantaged population be communicated to other CLASP Missions to assist them in their own future program planning.

FOLLOW-ON AND IMPACT

Chapter III presented findings on the *impacts on short-term Trainees* attributable to participation in Follow-on activities. It revealed these activities to be effective ways of supporting Trainee community involvement. Mission investment in EIL's community-based development projects (CBDPs), for example, has proved to be a low-cost, effective means for strengthening the multiplier effect of economically disadvantaged Trainees in areas of significant public concern.

ASOPAZAC Project Fund

The Project Fund involved CAPS Trainees directly in improving their communities. Trainees and the committees they established were faced with challenges in designing local activities, mobilizing resources to carry them out, and in working with the Project Fund administrator in completing them. While administrative difficulties were encountered in this effort, 33 small infrastructure projects were completed, and local committees were left in place which may, based on this experience, initiate other community activities.

EIL Community-based Development Projects (CBDPs)

The small training projects carried out by EIL Follow-on Trainees is another concrete example of the impact of CLASP training. They provide Trainees direct experience in the formulation of small-scale training projects. Trainees proposed 227 small projects training over 6,000 people by June 1991, including 800 persons trained in cholera prevention.

Reforestation Focus

Wide participation of CAPS Trainees in reforestation efforts throughout Guatemala drew on activities sponsored by the national Alumni Association. Community involvement continues in EIL training seminars and in separate initiatives taken by regional alumni associations.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Follow-on and Impact

It is recommended that CAPS Trainees be given the chance to continue ongoing community educational efforts, with limited Mission financial support, similar to the EIL CBDPs. This can be realized under present plans to resuscitate the national Alumni Association (see below).

Given the importance of continuing to examine the link between Follow-on and community impact, the Mission may also consider documenting future community activities of CAPS Trainees through subsequent evaluation research.

THE CLASP FOLLOW-ON PROGRAMS

CAPS and CASP in Guatemala have developed a number of innovative Follow-on organizational structures which can serve as models for Follow-on efforts for the CLASP-II GPS Program and for other USAID Missions.

The EIL Follow-on Project

The EIL Project, designed to supplement and reinforce what some saw as overly brief U.S. training, has in fact developed into a relevant, cost-effective complement to the U.S. experience. EIL has developed an effective organizational structure to provide services to a dispersed disadvantaged Trainee population. The evaluation clearly demonstrates that the successes attributed to a short U.S. training period can be enhanced by supplementing U.S. training with intensive in-country Follow-on activities, such as those in the EIL Project.

The Structure of the Project

- The EIL Project has developed an outreach program which has involved over 2,000 Trainees in ongoing activities in spite of the difficulties of communication and transportation.
- EIL has developed training materials in eight fields of study for four week-long seminars for adults. The materials emphasize participatory techniques and practical applications of relevant knowledge. These materials are reported by a great majority of Trainees to be relevant and useful on the job and in their careers.
- EIL has assembled a knowledgeable and committed professional staff which demonstrated high morale and a creative but economical use of resources.
- Program attrition has been about 33 percent from Module I to Module III. Trainees and programmers believe that attrition is due largely to work- and family-related constraints and does not reveal unhappiness with the seminars.
- The network of regional representatives in local offices throughout Guatemala is integral to the EIL Follow-on Project. The representatives provide a network of ongoing support for the small-scale training and development efforts of the short-term returnees in rural areas.
- EIL's efforts in stimulating small training projects, described above, have led Trainees to undertake training efforts with their fellow workers and community members. CAPS Trainees are now providing training in their own communities.

Trainee Assessments of EIL

- Results from the survey and from focus groups show that Trainees are highly enthusiastic about the EIL training seminars. Those who have continued in the program demonstrate high levels of commitment.
- The technical training offered in EIL reinforcement seminars was characterized as having "a great deal" of usefulness for their careers and community participation by over 90 percent of Trainees.
- Trainees affirm that the techniques of participatory education that EIL employs are very useful and appropriate in their work and in the community.
- Even those EIL program participants who were critical of their U.S. training consistently praised the Follow-on seminars as valuable reinforcement, increasing the applicability of the U.S. experience.

RECOMMENDATIONS: EIL Training

It is recommended that other USAID Missions be informed of the beneficial results of the CAPS/Guatemala approach of combining brief U.S. training with intensive in-country Follow-on seminars as a feasible, cost-effective model for responding to the needs of disadvantaged short-term Trainees. As the CLASP-II Program develops its own Follow-on activities, it could profitably adopt the regionalized organizational structure developed by EIL.

The CAPS Alumni Association – ASOPAZAC

ASOPAZAC, the CAPS alumni association, had periods of active participation early on by hundreds of Trainees. Plenary meetings were widely attended and appreciated by the Trainees. Yet close dependence on the PAZAC implementing agency, internal dissension over the implementation of the Special Project Fund, and insufficient time-in-office and leadership training for the new leadership weakened efforts to make the Association a sustainable organization.

ASOPAZAC, founded in 1986, organized a framework of local daughter associations around the country, and achieved formal legal status as a non-profit association. It, therefore, has the potential of serving as a vehicle for continuing CLASP-II GPS Follow-on activities. The Association has been dormant since late 1990 when the CAPS implementing agency, PAZAC, closed. ASOPAZAC's dormancy since that time suggests that it did not develop as an independent entity and cannot presently function on its own without outside assistance.

Despite its present inactivity, the ASOPAZAC name is widely known by Trainees. In the survey, most CAPS Trainees (78% of short-term and 97% of long-term) said they were members. In focus group discussions, most Trainees reported that they had either not participated or had taken part in only one activity. A major (but non-quantifiable) proportion of Trainees attributed their non-participation to ASOPAZAC's all-inclusive structure which they believed did not respond to ongoing training needs in their fields.

Approximately five departmental associations, however, have been active on their own. The factors which permit them to function more independently of PAZAC require further research to assess the possibility of applying their experiences to other departments.

RECOMMENDATIONS: ASOPAZAC

It is recommended that:

- the Mission go forward with its initiative of offering ASOPAZAC leadership training in a special series of EIL reinforcement seminars focusing on organizational issues;
- the Association be structured as a concomitant of the EIL seminars, into a more decentralized, grassroots organization;
- a small central clearing house for information exchange be maintained in the capital, which provides support for the regional or departmental associations;
- the new ASOPAZAC organizational model be adapted to provide for occupational or field-of-study subgroupings that support Trainee interest in concrete career or community development issues;
- financial support be maintained by USAID/Guatemala at a low level for the Association's centralized activities and for administrative costs for the departmental committees; and
- ASOPAZAC eventually be merged with CLASP-II GPS Program Follow-on Activities.

CASP Program Follow-on Activities

CASP has developed a Follow-on program combining a strong focus on job placement with an Alumni Association which provides a notable range of activities and is involved in a broad program of volunteer projects. The new innovations in job placement and job-hunting skills, termed "Everybody Works," are very promising.

RECOMMENDATION: CASP/CASS Follow-on Activities

It is recommended that the new "Everybody Works" program of job recruitment and institutional support be evaluated after a suitable period of implementation. This active assistance in establishing contact with potential employers and in involving employers in Trainee recruitment has broad implications for Follow-on in CLASP-II, especially for long-term training.

THE CLASP-I PROGRAM AND THE FUTURE

What remains to be discussed are future activities with respect to the CLASP-I Program. What relationship can best exist between USAID/Guatemala's future training efforts and the body of CLASP-I Trainees now that the Program is over? The answer to this question can be placed in the context of what already has been accomplished in CAPS/Guatemala.

CLASP Trainees

CLASP-I has created a large cadre of Trainees who are generally well disposed to the United States and supportive of USAID/Guatemala. The group is diverse in experience and is distributed throughout Guatemalan society, both geographically and in terms of their socioeconomic status.

The CLASP Trainees are usually *not*, by Program design, at the center of power in Guatemala. They are not the traditional power brokers of Guatemalan society as are the owners of landed estates or industry. They are, nevertheless, situated in particular kinds of key positions that are quite distinct from the arbiters of wealth and industry:

- Trainees are often leaders of rural communities with considerable *poder de convocatoria* — that is, they are able to mobilize a wide constituency to discuss public goals.
- They are people who volunteer many hours of their time in support of community ends, such as health campaigns, training sessions, or the construction of school rooms or community gardens.
- Some are small business owners — "micro-entrepreneurs" — who represent the base level of a growing class of people who are developing private sector skills and who, with the help of CLASP training, are open to small business innovations.
- Others are health workers, trainers, agricultural extension agents and teachers whose positions in the community make them inherent "multipliers."
- Many of the long-term Trainees are young people, typically from modest backgrounds. However, they have already achieved goals that only a very small percentage of their fellow Guatemalans have attained — advanced training at the university level and a command of English. It is, indeed, reasonable to assume that changes presently occurring in Guatemalan society will open avenues of upward mobility for the CAPS/CASP long-term Trainees which will result in their occupying significant positions in the future.

CLASP-I Follow-on and the Future

The evaluators conclude that maintaining some minimal level of Mission support for Follow-on for CLASP-I Trainees will continue to produce the positive activities that have been reported in this evaluation.

RECOMMENDATION: CLASP-I Follow-on

Given the success in mobilizing a large group of Trainees and in creating conditions for a positive assessment of U.S. society and of A.I.D.'s activities in Guatemala, it is recommended that the Mission maintain an ongoing contact with and support for CLASP-I Trainees, in whom a large investment has already been made.

The following suggestions are offered which can serve as a basis for Mission discussions of the dimensions of these future efforts. They are not so much a blueprint for action as a distillation of what many CLASP-I Trainees themselves have said, with an eye to the constraints of future financing.

- The level of effort represented by the current EIL contract is likely to be too costly to continue producing additional modules for CLASP-I returnees as a permanent aspect of Follow-on. Other models of Follow-on activities exist which require less effort. However, it is recommended that several features of EIL training which follow be maintained on a reduced scale.
- ASOPAZAC retains a formal structure and legal status. Taking advantage of upcoming EIL seminars for Association officers, ASOPAZAC could be restructured into a more decentralized, grassroots organization. A central clearing house of information and activities could be maintained in the capital, staffed with a single person overseeing activities and supporting the elected offices. Much greater effort would go to strengthening the departmental ASOPAZACs.
- The organization could be restructured as a cluster of thematic or occupational groupings. Presumably, at least six such occupational subgroupings would form within ASOPAZAC: health, community development, small enterprise, education (which would include trainers), agriculture and natural resources, and cooperatives.
- EIL's present network of regional representatives can serve as a model for channelling support to the departmental associations. A staff of six or seven Guatemalans with training experience would be an effective means to maintain an active presence of the Association at the local level. Association officers would continue to be volunteers.
- It is recommended that a low-level of Mission financial support be maintained for the Association. Such support would be to facilitate communications among departmental and occupational branches and for limited, ongoing training seminars initiated by departmental committees within the Association. These seminars can rely on Guatemalan institutions and/or on volunteer CLASP trainers for the content of the training experience. General meetings at the national level would not be a feature of the reformulated ASOPAZAC. Funds could also be judiciously used to reimburse officers for direct expenses incurred.

-
- **Publishing an Association newsletter or bulletin is a low priority, given the inherent difficulty of communicating by mail with the CLASP population. A more efficient option would be Trainee-produced short radio programs aimed at fellow Trainees. Twice monthly broadcasts about Association activities would reach many more people than a newsletter. This would also give a wider audience to the scholarship program and, if desirable, to USAID/Guatemala. Radio programs could also serve as a ready means of communication for upcoming training seminars and as a means to encourage Trainees to maintain current contact with the national or regional offices.**
 - **As for initial foci of activities, Association leaders might re-examine the projects that had been initiated in mid-1990 but fell victim to the cessation of ASOPAZAC activities.**

Benefits of a New ASOPAZAC

ASOPAZAC can be revitalized through strong Mission support for the special seminars that EIL will offer the Association leadership. It would act as the nexus for ongoing Follow-on activities for CLASP Trainees. The Association would serve various purposes that will give it the institutional rationale to survive.

- **ASOPAZAC would provide a forum for an interchange of information and experiences to the diverse occupational specialties that have received CLASP training.**
- **It would become the coordinating body for local-level volunteer and community activities.**
- **The Association would retain some of the EIL emphasis on ongoing training.**
- **It would continue to serve, through regional gatherings and via radio programs, as a means of contact for Trainees.**
- **Finally, it remains a mechanism of contact and communication between the large CAPS population and USAID/Guatemala for purposes that the Mission may designate in the future.**

A P P E N D I X A

Methods: The Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches

APPENDIX A:

Methods: The

Quantitative and

Qualitative Approaches

METHODS: THE QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE APPROACHES

The CLASP-Guatemala evaluation study involved a research plan which combined traditional survey methods with qualitative techniques. This section provides:

- a description of the survey sample design and administration;
- an account of the focus group method and of the various focus group discussions; and
- an overview of the case study approach adopted.

The chapter concludes with a brief consideration of the benefits derived from the methodological approach taken.

PREPARATORY WORK AND THE SAMPLE SELECTION

Each country Mission participating in the CLASP effort maintains the CLASP Information System (or CIS), a management database which provides ready access to biographical data on program participants. Prior to arrival in-country, the evaluation focused on obtaining and analyzing CIS database information on such population characteristics as the fields of study in which Trainees have been engaged, reported income, the Trainees' schooling previous to CLASP training, occupations prior to selection, household structure, age distribution, and other relevant demographic and socioeconomic data. The results of that analysis are provided in Chapter Two of Volume II.

Tables and frequencies were run to determine the geographic distribution of the population, as well as the frequencies of the above indicated variables. The CASP and CAPS participants were separated by program headings into distinct data files. These files were aggregated into an integrated master file for ease of data manipulation and comparison across particular variables to establish a profile of returned participants.

An additional data source was the lists of Follow-on training participants provided by EIL, used to separate the CAPS short-term Trainee population into those who participated in the EIL supplemental training and those who did not. The EIL data, which contained the most recent addresses of Trainees, were also helpful in locating those EIL participants who were interviewed outside of the training seminars.

Past evaluations of CAPS-Guatemala (Aguirre International 1987, 1988; Chesterfield et al. 1989) as well as other project documents were consulted in preparing for the fieldwork and in tailoring the evaluation questions to the particularities of the Guatemalan situation. Issues highlighted in previous country reports as well as in other earlier evaluations in Guatemala served as reference points for developing the instruments for Guatemala in-country research.

THE RESEARCH IN GUATEMALA

In Guatemala, three primary techniques were used to gather data on Trainee impact and its relation to the Follow-on programs: a survey using a quantitative instrument; a series of focus groups; and case studies. Each of these is discussed in turn.

The Survey of Returned CAPS Trainees

A survey of 525 CLASP Trainees addressed the issues of career advancement, community involvement, and technical skills growth with respect to Follow-on activities. This survey included short-term and long-term CAPS Trainees and Trainees under the CASP programs. This section describes the sample and the development of the survey questionnaire.

The Survey Sample

Proportionate samples were drawn from the principal categories, using the list of the universe of CLASP-Guatemala Trainees provided by the CIS database. A statistically representative, non-random sample was chosen by region. A ten percent sample of the total available pool, about 460 Trainees, was the original goal. However, the relative sizes of each of the pools of participants led to certain sampling considerations. Given the smaller sizes of the CASP and CAPS long-term Trainees groups, these populations were sampled at a somewhat higher rate to ensure representation.

Table 3.1 summarizes the different sub-populations of the CLASP-Guatemala Trainee population which guided the sample design.

Table 3.1 CLASP Sub-populations

Survey Universe	4,744
CASP	186
CAPS Long-term	658
EIL Participants	2,000
Non-EIL Short-term Trainees	1,900

Source: CIS and EIL databases

In addition to the population located at home or in the workplace, the EIL training seminars provided the second major sample. The survey was designed to review to what degree Trainees who take part in EIL's activities are satisfied with the reinforcement

seminars. A comparison of EIL participants with non-participants was one objective of the research.

EIL reinforcement seminars are designed for short-term technical Trainees. Therefore, CAPS long-term Trainees and CASP Trainees are not included in this Follow-on activity. They, too, were included in the survey, both to determine their present activities and to compare them to the short-term population.

Table 3.2 provides an overview of the sample population by training category and participation in the EIL training seminars. How this sample was reached in the field is described below.

Table 3.2 Survey Sample

Long-term	80	
CASP		18
CAPS		62
Short term	445	
EIL		195
Non-EIL		250
Total	525	

Source: 1991 Guatemala Survey

The Survey Questionnaire

The goal was to design a questionnaire which would incorporate the concerns of USAID/Guatemala and provide general information on the returned Trainee population. The questionnaire drew on those questions from the Aguirre International Returnee Questionnaire (used in past country studies) which touched on employment and Follow-on activities. It incorporated new queries to get at such issues underlying the present study as the expanded focus on Follow-on and community activities.

The resulting instrument consists of 54 questions, many of which have several sub-headings. Six questions are open-ended, and

one more has an open-ended component (see Appendix B for the questionnaire).

The questionnaire focuses both on the Trainees' activities since returning to Guatemala, and their particular participation in various Follow-on activities. It asks returned Trainees to describe their present activities educational accomplishments (Questions 12-12), changes in the conditions of employment (Questions 13-25), and community activities (Questions 30-32). Returnees were requested to indicate changes in their income, job responsibilities, or community activities due to their U.S. experience.

In-country Follow-on activities were another focus of the questionnaire. Trainees were asked specific questions about their participation in such in-country Follow-on activities as their awareness of the undertakings of alumni associations as well as other activities in which they may have engaged (Questions 33-42, 48-51, 54). Short-term technical Trainees were asked about their participation in EIL reinforcement seminars (Question 43); those who participated proceeded to evaluate them (Questions 44-47). Two questions asked Trainees to assess the difficulties women might encounter in participating in Follow-on activities (Questions 52-53).

The six open-ended queries (Questions 26, 27, 29, 50, 53, and 54) were not accompanied with a pre-designed coding manual. The intention was to permit the Trainees to express themselves in their own terms which were then categorized. The questionnaire also asked for demographic data (Questions 1-10), posed one question on satisfaction with U.S. training (Question 11), and asked about reactions to U.S. life (Questions 26-27).

The survey instrument was designed in Spanish. The evaluators recognized that the sub-populations to whom it would be administered—like the CLASP Trainee universe itself—would be diverse. Some

Trainees would be literate. However, others might have literacy skills which would affect their answers.

The evaluators were also concerned that the language used in the questionnaire be sensitive to cultural and linguistic realities. Members of highland ethnic groups are bilingual, speaking a Mayan language as well as Spanish. It was impossible to know beforehand to what degree this group would be comfortable in using Spanish. Regional differences also exist in language use. Associated cultural sensitivities needed to be approached with care. For example, asking Trainees for ethnic identification or whether the potential respondent was literate (and thus capable of completing the instrument on their own) was thought to be problematic.

Piloting the Questionnaire

To minimize the effects of such issues as cross-cultural bias, bilingualism, and educational level, several strategies were adopted. On arrival in Guatemala, the team piloted the questionnaire with the local interviewers to detect problem areas. The area of ethnic identification was identified as one of critical concern, and strategies for helping respondents with any discomfort that they might experience with language or literacy issues were designed.

The questionnaire was then piloted with two focus groups, consisting of short-term and long-term Trainees. The views of EIL staff were also solicited with respect to the phrasing of particular questions relating to their activities. As a result, several questions were substantially revised.

Two parallel versions of the questionnaire were developed: a self-administered version and one which was to be used as the basis of an interview. These two versions were tested at an EIL reinforcement seminar in Cobán, where they were administered to twenty-four participants. The previous revisions were incorporated, and this version was implemented.

In spite of the piloting, one particular issue arose with Question 14a, "are you presently employed?" (*empleado* in Spanish). It became apparent that the phrasing of the question may have led some to answer in the negative when they are indeed, by U.S. definitions, gainfully employed. For those speaking Guatemalan Spanish, the term *empleado* carries the connotation of a formal job, in which one either receives a salary or operates a small business for profit. Many peasant farmers, who receive no salary but rather produce their own subsistence crops, may respond "No" to this question in the spirit of "No, I don't have a job for pay; rather, I work my piece of land!" Unfortunately, it is impossible to determine how this may have affected the final percentages.

Conducting the Survey

Seventeen interviewers were contracted in Guatemala. A one-day training was held, in which the interviewers were informed of the nature of the survey, and the survey instrument was presented and discussed. Special concerns in applying the questionnaire were highlighted at this session. Once the final versions of the questionnaire were completed, efforts to locate, contact, and interview the respondents began.

The interviewers proved to be a qualified and active team. Many were faculty or staff of the Rafael Landívar University in the capital. Others were employed in the field of education or in other activities related to training. Most had experience in conducting broad-scale surveys.

A sampling plan, based on the lists produced from the CIS database, was developed, and interviewers were assigned to dispersed sites within the country. The plan called for the respondents to be contacted by telephone, telegraph, and visits to the last-reported work sites or home addresses.

A great deal of mobility on the part of Trainees became apparent. Last known addresses were frequently useless; telephone

numbers were also of limited utility. Most Guatemalans have no access to telephones, and those that do are normally of a higher socioeconomic stratum than the great majority of Trainees. Even if work telephone numbers were available, often this information was out of date. The database provided by the EIL contractor was the most helpful source of information on short-term Trainees, since EIL had been in ongoing contact with participants in their training seminars.

A master computer list of all potential subjects was used to identify representative subject pools. Weights were assigned to each pool, based on predicted difficulty of access. The required proportions of subject groups was maintained to implement the survey design. Interviewers were assigned to certain geographical areas of the country and provided lists of names of Trainees with their last known addresses. The "access weights" were used to assign fee schedules for each of the categories of respondents.

Given the size of the intended sample, the team decided to administer the questionnaires to the EIL respondents when visiting the reinforcement seminars. The questionnaires were thus distributed by the team in Cobán, Panajachel, and at two separate seminars in Quetzaltenango, which were the four sites where seminars were held during the team's stay in Guatemala.

Administering the questionnaires at the EIL seminars required the close cooperation of EIL staff. The resident senior members of EIL at the seminar site introduced the team to the assembled participants and requested the Trainees' cooperation and participation.

As mentioned above, the team had previously identified certain categories of Trainees who might have difficulty responding to the questionnaire. For these, the questionnaire was administered as an interview or in the presence of a mentor to assist respondents. For those able to complete the instrument

on their own, problematic questions were identified by a note on the survey itself.

Survey results were entered into a computerized database for analysis. The survey has provided a core of information which gives an up-to-date broad-based overview of the CAPS population, with information that can confidently be generalized from the sample to the larger universe.

Focus Groups

The focus group permits the comparison of experiences among various returnees in the course of a dialogue, in which common themes are explored and participants are encouraged to express their views in a relaxed atmosphere. Focus groups, lasting about two hours, are conducted by a moderator-observer team, and are an ideal vehicle for the Trainees to recount their experiences and present activities, and to comment on the experience of others.

Fourteen focus groups were conducted with CAPS and CASP returned Trainees to obtain perceptions and opinions with respect to the CLASP training experience in the United States and to the subsequent Follow-on components. One was conducted with survey interviewers at the conclusion of their work.

Focus group sampling requires a purposive methodology, matching Trainee profiles established statistically from the databases in terms of relevant selection criteria with focus group participants. Sampling criteria for the focus groups were gender, short-term/long-term training, age, participation/non-participation in Follow-on activities, and the recency of CLASP participation (i.e., how long it has been since the Trainees returned to Guatemala after training). The training seminars offered by EIL also provided one source of focus group participants. In addition, a screening questionnaire was developed for application to each potential focus group participant.

The accompanying sampling frame (Table 3.3) illustrates the arrangement of focus group participants by Trainee category:

Focus Group Session	CAPS			CASP L/T	Special Issues
	L/T	S/T EIL	S/T NON-EIL		
1			X		
2			X		
3		X			
4		X			
5		X			
6		X			
7			X		
8				X	
9				X	
10	X				
11	X				
12	X				
13			X		
14		X			
15					X

- Nine focus groups were carried out in Guatemala City. Two were mixed Trainee groups for piloting the questionnaire; three CAPS long-term groups (two of Junior Year Abroad Trainees and one with participants of several long-term programs); two CASP long-term groups; a "non-EIL" group, and a final group with survey interviewers.
- Six focus groups were composed of CAPS short-term Trainees participating in the EIL reinforcement seminars. One of these was held in Cobán, two in Panajachel, and three in two different seminars in Quetzaltenango.

52

Of the Guatemala City groups, Groups 1, 2 (piloting groups), 7 and 15 were held at Rafael Landívar University. Group 7 was a non-EIL group comprised of short-term technical trainees. Group 15 was a focus group conducted with a number of the interviewers hired for the survey.

Group 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 were conducted at another site in Guatemala City. Groups 8 and 9 were comprised of CASP participants. Group 10 had long-term academic participants. Group 11 was made up of long-term academic Trainees in the JYA program administered by PIET. Group 12 was also comprised of JYA participants; however, their U.S. training program was administered by META.

Of the various EIL short-term groups, Group 3 was convened from Module III school teachers attending the EIL training seminar in Cobán. Group 4 was made up of community development volunteers who took part in a Module III EIL training seminar in Panajachel. Group 5 was comprised of micro-enterprise (PYME) participants attending the Panajachel training. Group 6 was conducted in Quetzaltenango with participants who had been in Training of Trainers groups in the U.S. Group 13 was a short-term micro-enterprise or PYME group; these Trainees were from the FY 1990 CAPS program and were just beginning their first EIL module in Quetzaltenango. The members of Group 14 were short-term natural resource Trainees also attending the same EIL seminar (for the focus group Screening Questionnaire, see Appendix D).

Whenever possible, the focus groups in which EIL participants took part were situated outside the main EIL activity area. EIL staff was not present in any of the focus groups.

Focus group discussions usually lasted between ninety minutes and two hours. All were conducted in Spanish by a moderator-observer team. Focus group respondents

were given a small honorarium to cover transportation costs.

A general focus group guide was developed, which was modified somewhat for each group of participants. The guide contained the key questions underlying the research. The guide differed from the survey questionnaire in that it contains discussion points rather than strictly structured questions. The topical areas serve as a stimulus to elicit group discussion. (See Appendix C for the moderator's guide.)

Focus groups were audio recorded with the permission of the group. The resulting audio tapes were treated as raw data and used as primary information for the accompanying topline reports. Two of the focus groups were video recorded, again, with the group's permission. The video tape has been edited to a brief, fifteen-minute version for Mission use.

Case Studies

The case study method, the third form of data collection in the Guatemala evaluation, adapted a form of ethnographic inquiry to the needs of the evaluation to examine several specific initiatives within the CLASP program. The case study allowed the evaluators to highlight particular examples of Trainee actions which were a useful and relevant base for expanding the "lessons learned" with respect to CLASP training and its individualized impact on the careers and community activities of returned Trainees. Case studies were an appropriate vehicle for getting at the richness of attitudes, ideas and actions which underlie the returnee experience.

The approach was used to examine two areas of interest:

1. initiatives taken by Trainees in relation to volunteer activities related to CLASP Follow-on, such as have taken place in the past in the CAPS alumni association or at present in relation to the

supplemental training program of EIL;
and

2. inquiries into particular examples of the application of CLASP training and/or EIL Follow-on work to the workplace, looking at the way in which CLASP Trainees have produced innovations on the job.

Concretely, these were incorporated into the report in the following areas:

- An examination of the reforestation endeavor that a committee within ASOPAZAC implemented, using a donation from the Embassy. This has become the focus of interest for recent EIL training. (See Chapter Three for the history of this initiative.)
- An exploration of the practical results of the ASOPAZAC small project fund, in terms of its history, the kinds of projects it supported, the leadership roles it engendered, the success of the projects in the community, and ongoing impacts (see Chapter Three).
- A review of the community-based development projects initiated by EIL (see Chapter Three).
- A focus on the JYA Trainees (see Volume II, Chapter Three on the U.S. training experience).

THE INTEGRATION OF THE APPROACHES

The three complementary approaches—the quantitative survey, focus groups, and case studies—were used to integrate a broad range of information for analysis.

- The formal survey method is the most circumscribed, requiring a narrowing of questions and answers to allow for quantitative and statistical analysis.

- The focus group is less constrained in probing issues around a central set of concerns.
- The case study, the most open and unstructured, allows themes to evolve depending on the nature of the responses offered by informants.

Quantitative analysis uses “standard measures so that the varying perspectives and experiences of people can be fit into a limited number of predetermined response categories to which numbers are assigned” (Patton 1990:14). Using a pre-designed questionnaire, the reactions of large numbers of people can be obtained to a limited list of questions. Numbers are compared, aggregated, and analyzed statistically. The results can be presented parsimoniously. If certain protocols are followed, especially in relation to the selection of a sample in relation to the overall population and in the way the data are collected, results can be generalized to a wider population.

The principal shortcoming of the quantitative approach is related to its strength. Because of the necessity to create response categories beforehand, the quantitative approach thus assumes that the correct categories of queries are known beforehand. If specific questions are not asked, information can not be obtained. The requirement to delimit questions excludes the ability to capture the full range of answers that may exist in a population, and which may be relevant for policy planning². “[I]t is presumptuous of evaluators to maintain they always know in advance the most useful research questions . . .” (Shadish, Cook, and Leviton 1991:465).

Qualitative approaches were used to complement the survey approach. The open-ended interviewing characteristic of focus groups and of case study research avoids the imposition of a predetermined range of answers (or of simple “yes/no” alternatives). A wide variety of substantive responses are recorded for subsequent analysis.

Unanticipated categories of responses may appear which can shed new light on an evaluation topic. What is often the superficiality of questionnaire responses can be expanded upon as the interviewer probes answers and enlarges the area of discourse.

The interchange that occurs within focus groups joins to the open-ended approach the dynamics of an open dialogue. People who are brought together can express their viewpoints spontaneously. The viewpoints expressed by other participants serve as points of discussion and debate. CAPS Trainees frequently challenged each other, confirmed or disputed the remarks of other group members, and responded to an ongoing flow of discussion.

Case studies are opportunistic in their data-gathering techniques, combining interviews (both individual and group) with Trainees, their employers and employees, AID and contract program administrators, and other key informants. Case studies also include document analysis (such as program applications, memos, documents produced by Trainees, and others); observations; and other sources of information.

These different qualitative tools provide the analysis with a broader range of attitudes and ideas, expressed in everyday language and behavior, than quantitative approaches. Qualitative approaches are also appropriate for exploring areas as opposed to confirming predictable responses. The open-ended, conversational approach allows the Trainees to tell what is on their minds, rather than only relying on issues identified by the evaluators.

Qualitative methods are particularly helpful in getting at CLASP training issues which are hard to quantify: questions about leadership, about the understanding of democratic processes, about changes in understanding about the U.S.

Nevertheless, there are limitations to the qualitative approach.

- In comparison with the large samples possible under quantitative approaches, the results are necessarily more limited in the number of people or cases with which they deal.
- Qualitative data are descriptive data. While quantitative data can be reported concisely, ways in which qualitative data can be most usefully presented are still under review.
- A third limitation is not inherent in the methods themselves, but rather is part of the external context: policy makers have had less experience with qualitative data, and they may feel much less confident about the conclusions drawn.

Determining "Impact": Methodological Considerations

Assessing the outcomes and impacts of a training program is not straightforward. In this report, the term "impact" indicates a broad range of changes in behavior and attitude identified by CLASP Trainees and others as concomitant of CLASP training.

Sources of Information on Impact

- Impact assessment must rely in many cases on statements Trainees make about their activities and attitudes, and the relation of these to the training experience. There are a number of reasons for this. Time in the field is limited; and the "impact" that respondents suggest can often only be self reported and not confirmed. Extended field work in the job site or home of Trainees is not possible due to the constraints of time and funding.
- Even if an "impact" were observed, there is no simple test to ensure that activities or attitudes expressed occur in the absence of the outside observer. In addition, information gained from a single, or a small number, of returnees about their understanding of the relationship between

their U.S. training experience and their subsequent activities does not ensure that these observations of actions were representative of the whole group.

- A representative sample could of course be drawn. But to use statistical tests for the impact of training would require one to assume that the dimensions of that impact are known beforehand. Thus, a large number of persons would have to be surveyed for "impact"-related activities or attitudes, and the nature of that impact would have to be known before the inquiry was undertaken to examine systematically each case.

The Problem of Causality

The real obstacle to assessing the impact of events on behavior is that the very concept "impact" implies causality. Causality of any kind is difficult to establish in applied social research. Indeed, there are many schools of thought that would argue that establishing causality is not a desirable, or even a feasible, goal for the social sciences. While statistical tests can establish the strength of certain associations of behavior, it may be literally impossible to establish the kind of causality that many presume to exist in the physical sciences. A principal difficulty in formulating a rigorous model of causality in human behavior is that such behavior is by definition diverse and imbued with competing modes of significance. To hope to encounter an "if X, then Y" kind of causality is most likely to condemn oneself not to talk about "impact" at all. It is usually impossible in real life to rule out definitively the role of external factors.

Trainee Perceptions

To ask Trainees to assess the impact of a past experience on their present actions is to ask them to weigh its importance with respect to all the various sets of activities which constitute their lives. Even without taking into account formative social, cultural, psychological factors, this will be no easy

task. On the other hand, Trainees can and do tell us their stories and relate to us what they are doing; and many offer concrete ways in which their training experience relates to these. These views can serve as a base for analyzing impact.

In the past, program planners have often accepted Trainee recommendations for improvements in training programs or considered negative comments about some experience related to their U.S. experience. This approach to impact argues for equal credence to the Trainees' statements about their perception that the training experience has had particular effects in the way they perform their jobs or work in the community. Experience with such responses suggests that they are consistently coherent and reliable.

Approaching Impact Analysis

A mixed set of tools was therefore adopted to discuss the impact of CLASP training. Questions relating to the impact of training in the work place and in the community were included in the survey and asked of all who were interviewed. These are reported in terms of percentages, with cross-tabulations drawn to highlight significant relationships or contrasts among differing populations. Issues of impact were discussed in the focus groups and in the context of one-on-one interviews as well, and are reported here in terms of the kinds of responses offered by the Trainees. Other sources of information include case studies of particular activities undertaken by Trainees. Interviews with Mission personnel and with others involved in the program complement the analysis.

The goal in this evaluation has been to establish relatedness, whether this be through logical connections, empirical observations, or statistical associations, and these argue for establishing a case for the strength of certain linkages without conclusively "proving" that one set of circumstances or conditions derives from the other. The process parallels not a scientific experiment so much as it does a legal

proceeding, in which "proof" is established by a judicious weighing of a range of evidence from various sources.

**COMMENTS ON RESEARCH
ARRANGEMENTS IN GUATEMALA**

The evaluation team could not have conducted its extensive tasks without the combined cooperation and collaboration of a host of people in Guatemala. The team is most appreciative of the great deal of in-country support provided.

USAID/Guatemala Training Office representatives provided a mandate for the team to do whatever was required to accomplish the task and to speak with whomever was appropriate. No limits were placed upon the team as the evaluation was conducted. This freedom to proceed with the research design was helpful.

Mr. German Chew of the Rafael Landívar University was selected from a pool of candidates as in-country coordinator. He took charge of all such logistical issues as the recruitment of Trainee respondents for the survey and the focus groups, supervising the effort to contact participants as well as selecting sites. A computer specialist was identified who provided advice on data analysis and who prepared the raw data for electronic storage and analysis.

On the Mission's advice, EIL was contacted for information and support for the Follow-on portion of the evaluation. EIL generously provided the electronic files of their participants and a schedule of forthcoming dates of activities. Logistics issues were helpfully resolved for the evaluation team by the EIL staff.

ENDNOTES

1. The piloting of the instrument with Trainees available for group interviews in Guatemala City in the first days of the research did not reveal this possibility to the evaluators; this only became clear in subsequent interviews carried out by the team with rural indigenous folk.
2. Open-ended, qualitative information can, of course, be collected in a questionnaire which is otherwise collecting quantitative data.

A P P E N D I X B

Questionnaire

APPENDIX B:

Questionnaire

**AGUIRRE INTERNATIONAL
PROGRAMA DE BECAS PARA LA PAZ EN AMERICA CENTRAL
(PAZAC)
CUESTIONARIO DE EVALUACION**

JUNIO, 1991

ENTREVISTADOR:

A continuación se encuentra una serie de preguntas relacionadas a la experiencia que algunos ex-becarios guatemaltecos tuvieron en los Estados Unidos y las actividades en que ahora están involucrados en Guatemala. Haga cada pregunta tal y como está escrita. Pida que el/la entrevistado(a) conteste sincera y honestamente. Explique que es posible que el/la entrevistado(a) recuerde haber contestado un cuestionario similar al regresar a Guatemala. En contraste con aquel, diga que el presente capturará opiniones actuales. Asegure al entrevistado(a) que, a pesar de que su nombre va registrado en la página siguiente, las respuestas que dé serán confidenciales.

Explique que esta encuesta está financiado por la AID para conocer mejor el aprovechamiento de su capacitación y experiencia obtenidas a través de la beca. La investigación está a cargo de Aguirre Internacional, una compañía con oficinas en los Estados Unidos y México.

Fecha de la entrevista _____

Entrevistador _____

**AGUIRRE INTERNATIONAL
EL PROGRAMA CLASP EN GUATEMALA:
CUESTIONARIO DE EVALUACION**

JUNIO, 1991

PAZAC _____
CASP _____
Corto plazo _____
Largo plazo _____

I. DATOS PERSONALES

(Pregunte y anote los datos siguientes:)

1. Nombre completo: _____
2. Fecha de nacimiento: _____
3. Dirección Actual: _____

4. ¿Reside Ud. en una zona rural, semiurbana, urbana o marginal? (circule una):

RURAL SEMIURBANA URBANA MARGINAL

5. Estado civil: _____
6. ¿Cuántas personas viven en su hogar? (Incluya al entrevistado) _____
(Nota: El hogar incluye a todas las personas que residen juntos, aunque sean parientes o no)
7. ¿Cuántos hijos viven con Ud.? _____
8. ¿A qué grupo étnico o social pertenece Ud.? (Si no contesta, después de una pausa podría decir, "Por ejemplo, natural, Cakchikel, Ladino, hispano--criollo, blanco, etc.")

-
9. ¿Vive Ud. ahora en la misma comunidad en que vivía cuando recibió la beca a los Estados Unidos?

Sí _____ (Continúe con la pregunta 11) No _____

10. Si se ha mudado, ¿cuál fue la razón?

- por el trabajo, me hicieron mudar
 - para buscar nuevo trabajo
 - para estudiar o seguir estudiando
 - porque creció la familia
 - para acompañar a un familiar / pariente
 - por falta de disponibilidad de vivienda
 - otra (Especifique) _____
-

II. EDUCACION Y TRABAJO

11. ¿Hasta qué punto está Ud. satisfecho(a) con su programa de entrenamiento en los Estados Unidos? Permítame leerle las siguientes opciones:

- Muy insatisfecho
- Insatisfecho
- Ni insatisfecho ni satisfecho
- Satisfecho
- Muy satisfecho

12. ¿Está Ud. matriculado(a) ahora en algún curso educativo?

Sí No (continúe con la 14)

13. En caso afirmativo, ¿qué tipo de curso?

- Técnico:---> ¿En qué área técnica? _____
- Primaria
- Secundaria
- Bachillerato
- Universitario
- Maestría
- Doctorado

14. a. ¿Está Ud. empleado(a) en la actualidad?

Sí (continúe con la pregunta 15) No

b. (Si la respuesta es "No") ¿Está buscando trabajo?

Sí ____ (continúe con la pregunta 22)

No ____ (continúe con la pregunta 22)

15. ¿Con quién trabaja Ud.? (Si tiene más de un empleo, marque las clasificaciones necesarias y anote cualquier comentario al lado de la clasificación.)

____ Por cuenta propia (autoempleo/no-asalariado)

____ Miembro de cooperativa

____ Empresa privada (ej: finca, fábrica, empresa)

____ Organización privada voluntaria

____ Estatal (del gobierno)

____ Mixta

____ Empresa autónoma

____ Otra (explique) _____

16. ¿Trabaja Ud. en el mismo empleo que tenía antes de su programa de estudio o entrenamiento en los Estados Unidos?

____ Sí

____ No (continúe con la 18)

____ No estaba empleado al entrar al programa (continúe con la 19)

17. ¿Tiene Ud. nuevas responsabilidades o realiza nuevas actividades en el trabajo desde que regresó del entrenamiento?

____ Sí

____ No (continúe con la 19)

18. Si tiene un trabajo distinto o nuevas responsabilidades que en el antiguo trabajo, ¿cómo compara Ud. el trabajo que tiene ahora con el que tenía antes de sus estudios o entrenamiento en los Estados Unidos? (Permítame leerle las siguientes opciones:)

____ Mejor que antes

____ Igual que antes

____ Peor que antes

19. ¿Cómo compara Ud. el contenido de su programa de estudios o entrenamiento en los EE.UU. con las tareas que desempeña Ud. en su trabajo actual? (Permítame leerle las siguientes opciones:)

____ Muy relacionado

____ Algo relacionado

____ Ninguna relación

20. ¿Ha utilizado el entrenamiento en su trabajo actual mucho, poco, o no lo ha utilizado?

- Mucho (Continúe con la pregunta 22)
- Poco
- No lo ha utilizado

21. (Si es poco o no lo ha utilizado,) ¿Porqué no ha utilizado su entrenamiento (más) en su trabajo actual? (No lea las categorías. Marque las categorías adecuadas y detalle la respuesta abajo.)

- Por falta de autorización del jefe.
- Las políticas y los reglamentos no me lo permiten
- No tengo ni los implementos, ni el equipo u otros recursos necesarios
- Mi trabajo actual no requiere de las técnicas que adquirí durante el entrenamiento
- Otros: (Respuesta Detallada:) _____
- _____
- _____
- _____

22. ¿Qué utilidad ha tenido el entrenamiento en relación a lo siguiente:

	<u>No útil</u>	<u>Poco útil</u>	<u>Algo útil</u>	<u>Muy útil</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Para su preparación profesional	()	()	()	()
<input type="checkbox"/> En el aprendizaje de técnicas/habilidades nuevas	()	()	()	()
<input type="checkbox"/> Para su trabajo actual	()	()	()	()
<input type="checkbox"/> Para su carrera en general en general	()	()	()	()

23. Si al regresar de los Estados Unidos Ud. no estaba empleado, ¿cuánto tiempo demoró en conseguir trabajo?

- _____ días
- _____ semanas
- _____ meses
- _____ Estaba empleado al regresar

124

24. ¿Ha cambiado su situación económica desde su regreso de los Estados Unidos, en comparación de lo que era antes de viajar a los EE.UU.? (Permítame leerle las siguientes opciones:)

- Es igual
- Ha mejorado
- Ha empeorado

25. ¿Sus estudios o entrenamiento en los Estados Unidos han afectado o influenciado su situación económica actual?

Sí No

III. REACCION GENERAL A SU EXPERIENCIA EN LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS

26. ¿Qué aspecto(s) de la vida en los Estados Unidos le gustaría ver adoptado(s) en su comunidad?

27. ¿Qué aspecto(s) de la vida en los Estados Unidos no le gustaría ver adoptado(s) en su comunidad?

28. ¿Cree Ud. que sus aspiraciones para el futuro han cambiado debido a su experiencia en los Estados Unidos?

Sí No (Continúe con la 30)

29. ¿Cómo es que sus aspiraciones han cambiado? _____

IV. PARTICIPACION EN ACTIVIDADES DE LA COMUNIDAD

30. Desde su regreso, ¿ha participado usted como voluntario en alguna organización de la comunidad, iglesia, o en otro tipo de grupo organizado?

Sí No (Continúe con la pregunta 33)

31. ¿En la organización o grupo en el cual ha sido Ud. más activo, en qué capacidad ha participado? (Marque todas las opciones que le sean pertinentes.)

- He asistido a reuniones
- He colaborado en actividades/esfuerzos/proyectos
- He dirigido actividades/esfuerzos/proyectos
- He servido de portavoz dentro del grupo
- He capacitado a otras personas
- He servido de portavoz o representante con autoridades externas
- He asumido puestos formales dentro del grupo

32. Desde su regreso de los Estados Unidos, ¿se encuentra participando en más, en igual número, o en menos organizaciones o actividades, comparado con su participación antes de su viaje?

- Más
- Igual
- Menos

V. ACTIVIDADES DE SEGUIMIENTO EN GUATEMALA

33. ¿Sabe Ud., desde que regresó de los Estados Unidos, de actividades programadas para los ex-becarios?

Sí No (Continúe con la pregunta 49)

34. ¿Se reúne Ud. con otros ex-becarios? (Por favor, conteste con: "A menudo," "algunas veces," o "Nunca.")

A menudo ____ Algunas veces ____ Nunca ____ (continúe con la 38)

35. ¿Con qué fines se reúne Ud. con otros becarios? (Marque todas las opciones que le sean pertinentes.)

- Para fines sociales
 - Para trabajar juntos en proyectos comunales
 - Para participar en actividades del programa PAZAC o CASP
 - Para intercambiar informaciones y conocimientos
 - Porque trabajamos en la misma institución o el mismo lugar
 - Porque somos miembros de la misma organización (p.ej., una parroquia, sindicato, etc.)
 - Por casualidad
 - Otra razón (Especifique) _____
-

36. ¿Ha organizado Ud. actividades con/para compañeros ex-becarios? (Por favor, conteste las siguientes preguntas con: "A menudo," "algunas veces," o "Nunca.")

A menudo ____ Algunas veces ____ Nunca ____

37. ¿Ha participado Ud. en la estructuración/formulación de los programas de seguimiento?

A menudo ____ Algunas veces ____ Nunca ____ (Continúe a la 39)

38. ¿Sigue participando en la estructuración/formulación de los programas de seguimiento?

A menudo ____ Algunas veces ____ Nunca ____

39. ¿Patrocina la AID las actividades en las que Ud. participa?

A menudo ____ Algunas veces ____ Nunca ____

40. ¿Es Ud. miembro de alguna asociación de ex-becarios?

Sí No (Continúe con la pregunta 42)

41. (Para los ex-becarios PAZAC únicamente) ¿Es Ud. miembro de ASOPAZAC, la asociación PAZAC de ex-becarios?

Sí No

42. (Para los ex-becarios PAZAC únicamente) ¿Ha tomado parte en alguna actividad de ASOPAZAC?

Sí No

(Preguntas 43 a 47 se dirigen sólo a los ex-becarios CAPS/PAZAC a corto plazo.)

43. ¿Ha participado Ud. en los módulos o seminarios proporcionados por EIL (Experiment in International Living)?

Sí No (Continúe con la pregunta 48)

44. ¿Cuál fue el área técnica del seminario de seguimiento? _____

45. ¿En cuántos módulos (o seminarios de capacitación de una semana) ha participado Ud.?

1 2 3 4

*46. ¿Qué utilidad ha tenido la capacitación de seguimiento de EIL en relación a lo siguiente?

	<u>No útil</u>	<u>Poco útil</u>	<u>Algo útil</u>	<u>Muy útil</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Para su preparación profesional	()	()	()	()
<input type="checkbox"/> En el aprendizaje de técnicas/habilidades nuevas	()	()	()	()
<input type="checkbox"/> Para su trabajo actual	()	()	()	()
<input type="checkbox"/> Para su seguridad en si mismo	()	()	()	()

*47. ¿Qué utilidad han tenido las técnicas de la educación participativa empleadas por EIL en los seminarios de seguimiento?

<u>No útil</u>	<u>Poco útil</u>	<u>Algo útil</u>	<u>Muy útil</u>
()	()	()	()

48. ¿En qué otras actividades relacionadas con los EE.UU. ha participado Ud. como resultado del programa? (Lea las opciones, y marque todo lo que sea pertinente.)

- Lectura de revistas profesionales
- Participación en grupos profesionales o reuniones relacionadas con los EE.UU.
- Aspectos de negocios de los EE.UU.
- Otra participación relacionada con los EE.UU.
- Ninguna participación

49. ¿Le gustaría participar en actividades adicionales si fueran organizadas?

- Sí No (Continúe con la pregunta 50)

50. En qué actividades adicionales le interesarían participar?

51. ¿Con qué frecuencia le gustaría participar en actividades que involucran a otros ex-becarios? (Entrevistador: No lea las categorías siguientes, sino categorizar la respuesta dada.)

- Quincenalmente
- Mensualmente
- Cada tres meses
- Cada seis meses
- Anualmente
- Nunca

52. ¿Le parece que las mujeres ex-becarias tienen limitaciones para participar en actividades de seguimiento?

- Sí No (Continúe con la pregunta 54)

53. ¿Qué tipo de problemas tienen las mujeres ex-becarias para participar en las actividades de seguimiento?

54. ¿Qué sugerencias o recomendaciones tiene Ud. para mejorar el programa de seguimiento de los ex-becarios en Guatemala? _____

APPENDIX C

Moderator's Guide

APPENDIX C:

Moderator's

Guide

**CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES: AN IMPACT ASSESSMENT
OF CLASP TRAINING AMONG RETURNED GUATEMALAN TRAINEES****FOCUS GROUPS MODERATOR'S
GUIDE****I. Introduction**

Brief explanation of Aguirre International's rationale for an impact assessment, and the utilization of focus group methodology. (Moderator: Establish that Aguirre International is an USAID contractor not linked to or associated with any training institution).

1. Respondents' Introductions: Name, marital status, field of study, date of return to Guatemala, and current work-related activities.

II. Characterization of the U.S. Training

1. How would you characterize the training you received in the United States? (Convey the importance of the participation of all).
2. After a few respondents characterize their U.S. training, ask the group: How would you complete this sentence "My training in the U.S. was . . ."

III. Expanding the Characterization of the U.S. Training

1. What were the most important aspects of your training? (Probe: Content, significance, relevance, and any other important aspect brought up by the group)

2. During your training in the United States, how many of you had the opportunity to put into practice that which you were learning? (Probe: Hands-on, field, and open-entry/open-exit training)
3. Who would like to share, briefly, the content of his/her training? (Probe satisfaction with training content)
4. What aspects of your training have been more beneficial to you? (Probe: beneficial on a personal, professional, community level)
5. Discussion of the groups' common experiences regarding training. (Probe: training duration, language of training, training institution, logistics, and non-formal experiences associated with the training).

TRANSITION: Indicate change of subject saying, "Now, let's talk about training you received in the U.S. as it relates to your current activities in Guatemala."

IV. Focus on Relevance, Transferability, and Applicability of the U.S. Training to Local Guatemalan Situations

1. Was the training that you received in the U.S. relevant? In what way(s)? or Why not?
2. How transferable was your training to the Guatemalan context? (Probe any and all responses)

3. How applicable is the new knowledge you acquired in your field to Guatemala?
4. How useful have been all other training-related experiences to your personal, professional, and community-life situations? (Ask for examples).
5. Was the training you received what you expected? In what way(s)? How about the rest of you, what do you think?
6. What part (portion/segment) of the U.S. training did you like most? Why?
7. What part (portion/segment) of the U.S. training did you like least? Why?
8. Would you recommend the training program to your friends? Why? Why not?
9. If you were asked to grade your U.S. training on a zero to ten scale, with ten being highest score, what grade would you give it? Why?

V. Role Playing

Suppose you (the group) are the planners of a new training program who would recruit and select people—just like yourselves—for training in the U.S., Please plan a successful, upcoming training. Take into consideration your experiences and suggest a training plan that includes: curriculum content, length of training, and any other aspect of the training that you consider important. (Probe: relevancy, transferability, and applicability of training).

1. What sort of themes would you like to see included/excluded in the pre-departure orientation? Why?
2. What other type of training—if any—would you like to include in the program? Why?

3. What other type of trainees—if any—would you like to include in the program? Why?
4. Are there any other aspects of the training program that you would consider or reconsider in next year's program? What are they?

VI. EIL'S Follow-on Training Program

1. Has EIL's follow-on training program reinforced the training you received in the U.S.? If so, how?
2. Has EIL's training helped you in establishing a continuing relationship with the USAID Mission and/or U.S. institutions or individuals? If so, how?
3. Open discussion of the relevancy of CAPS training to the needs of Guatemala. Probe: effect on salary, advancement, multiplier effect, satisfaction level, status in the community, prospects for the future, etc.
4. Has the CAPS training helped you to develop your full potential as an individual?
5. What have you done or been able to accomplish that you would not have been able to do without this training experience?
6. Are you currently participating in the development of your country's democratic processes and institutions? If so, how?

VII. Follow-on Activities: Rights and Responsibilities

1. Who should take the lead in organizing follow-on activities? (Probe: AID, Alumni, ASOPAZAC, AID-related organizations such as EIL, other)

2. In relation to follow-on activities, how do you see the role of AID?

3. "In fact, what is follow on?" (Have the group develop a definition)

VIII. Closing Remarks and a Word of Thanks

A P P E N D I X D

Focus Group

Screening Questionnaire

APPENDIX D:

Screening

Questionnaire

**CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES:
AN IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF
CLASP TRAINING AMONG GUATEMALAN RETURNEES**

Focus Group Screening Questionnaire

Dear participant: Aguirre International is conducting an impact assessment of the CLASP (CAPS/CASS) program in Guatemala. One of the assessment's event is a series of focus groups. Would you please answer the following questions to determine your eligibility to participate in one of the groups?

1. Name _____
2. Address _____
3. Current place of residency _____
4. Age _____
5. Sex: M___ F___
6. Marital Status: Single ___ Married ___ Divorced ___ Other ___
7. Household size: _____
8. Annual combined family income—approximate _____
9. Occupation _____
10. Length of stay in the U.S. _____
11. Have you participated in a focus group before? Yes ___ No ___
12. Ex-scholar of: CLASP ___ CAPS ___ CASS ___ Other ___
13. Affiliation: ASOPAZAC ___ EIL ___ Other ___
14. Preferred language of communication:
English ___ Spanish ___ Other (specify) _____