

PD-ARBP-116

94072

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE
INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

MAY 1984

Submitted by:



600 Water Street S.W., NBU 7-7
Washington, D.C. 20024

telephone: (202) 484-7170
telex: 4990821MANSY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
SUMMARY.....	i
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. APPROACH TO TRAINING.....	4
III. MAJOR FINDINGS.....	7
IV. OVER-ALL RATING OF EXPERIENCE.....	8
V. SKILLS TRANSFER.....	10
VI. COMMERCIAL COLLABORATION.....	12
VII. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION	
A. Recruitment.....	13
B. Matching of Participants and Host Firms.....	13
VIII. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	
A. Overall Structure.....	17
B. Analysis of Costs.....	18
IX. CONCLUSIONS.....	20
TABLES:	
I. Number of Participants and Firms Interviewed.....	3
II. Assessments by Participants.....	12
APPENDICES:	
1. Survey Instruments.....	21
2. Comparison of IEDP and NTP.....	30

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

SUMMARY

Keene-Monk Associates developed and operated the USAID-funded International Executive Development Program during 1983 to foster the exchange of technical information and management practices between U.S. private sector firms and their counterparts in Jamaica and Costa Rica. The program consisted of a two-week management instruction component, a four-week executive-level individualized on-the-job placement with U.S. corporations, and a two-week analysis and assessment phase. A total of 67 U.S. firms and 47 executives participated in the program.

The 1983 IEDP program cost \$485,000 in USAID funds (58% of total costs) complemented by contributions in kind from the U.S. firms and participants' companies totalling \$345,000. This latter figure includes \$180,000 contributed by the Costa Rican and Jamaican firms to pay for salaries, international travel, and direct expenses of participants.

Major Findings

On the whole, response to the program was positive. Both participants and host firms ranked the transfer of technical information as most beneficial in the following areas:

- o introduction to information resources or publications pertaining to the industry;
- o obtaining information on technical aspects of production or manufacturing;

- o learning new staffing or management practices.

More generally, participants rated their training as beneficial in those cases where they felt they had learned new skills or gained new information, while firms evaluated the experience positively if, as a result of their participation in the program, they made new contacts or acquired new perspectives or insights on the way they did business. Those firms that qualified their assessment of the program did so by indicating problems, principally with respect to language limitations, inappropriate matches and inadequate time devoted to the effort. The participants that qualified their assessment cited problems associated with inappropriate matches, ill-prepared host firms and non-exposure to innovations.

While most involved with the program have been quite complimentary in their assessment of it, tangible results in terms of future business collaboration have been relatively limited to date. Our investigation indicated no cases of commercial business collaboration to date. Fifteen percent of the U.S. firms and 27 percent of the trainees interviewed indicated that collaborative activities or joint ventures were anticipated as a consequence of the program.

In terms of specific project implementation issues, major suggestions for improvement included program structure, the matching process and logistics management.

The program structure received mixed ratings. The analysis and assessment phase was viewed as good or excellent, as was the host company experience. The management training component was rated positively.

The matching of firm to participant was termed good by most firms and participants. However, suggestions for improvements from almost three fourths of the participants (72%) called for more relevant placements and more adequate planning by host firms. As a corollary, suggestions for improvement from firms called for longer lead-time to allow for better planning of the activity at each firm.

Additional major criticism from the participants centered around the logistics arrangements with insufficient per diem (\$20/day for some participants) being the major complaint. In some cases participants were apparently forced to incur substantial out of pocket expenditure. Overall, only half of the participants thought the logistics were well handled. In general, the firms rated assistance during the program as good.

The costs per participant to AID were approximately \$10,320 (almost \$1,300 per week) not counting in-kind contributions by the U.S. firms, the participants themselves, and their companies. While it is difficult to compare this program to other kinds of on-the-job training being funded by the agency because of its executive target group, the cost per participant does appear to be higher than that of comparable programs. For instance, the AID-funded Nicaraguan Training Program, which was run concurrently with IEDP and which has similar objectives and activities, cost only \$4,836 per person for nine weeks, about half the cost.

Both the participants and the host firms concur on the program's importance in terms of the exchange of technical and business information; however, cost per participant is an area of concern, and the program's impact on the promotion of joint business or mutual trade is only moderately encouraging to date.

I. INTRODUCTION

Keene-Monk Associates developed and operated the USAID-funded International Executive Development Program during 1983 to foster the exchange of technical information and management practices between U.S. private sector firms and their counterparts in Latin America and the Caribbean. The program consisted of a two-week management instruction component, a four-week executive-level individualized on-the-job placement with U.S. corporations, and a two-week analysis and assessment phase. A total of 67 U.S. firms participated in the program and provided on-the-job training and extensive dialogue opportunities for the 20 Costa Rican and 27 Jamaican executives who traveled to the U.S. to participate in the 8 week program.

In an effort to supplement the assessment phase, Management Systems International, an independent consulting firm specializing in program evaluation and not previously associated with the International Executive Development Program, was contracted to undertake an assessment of it. The evaluation done by MSI is based on information obtained from both participants and their host U.S. firms, as well as on comparative information from similar programs. Data on reaction to the program were collected by personal and telephone interviews or by mail questionnaires; 54% of the U.S. firms and 53% of the participants were interviewed.

The timing of this evaluation, almost a year after the IEDP's initial year of operation, was selected to enable assessment of several of the program's "longer term" objectives such as:

- * the strengthening of the private sector role in developing countries;
- * the development of closer ties between U.S. corporations and the decision-makers from both the public and private sectors in less-developed countries; and
- * the encouragement of mutual trading relationships between U.S. and LDC firms.

Careful data collection was used to elicit feedback from both participants and host firms concerning their experience with the International Executive Development Program. A written questionnaire was sent to all host firms, and a specially targetted questionnnaire to all participants (see appendix 1). Of the 67 firms that actually hosted a participant, 24 responded to the written questionnaire; of the 53 participants, 14 responded in writing, 8 from Costa Rica and 6 from Jamaica.

To enhance the response rate, executive interviews were conducted. Eleven additional host firms responded over the phone, while 11 (5 from Costa Rica and 6 from Jamaica) additional participants responded to interviews conducted in person in their home countries. Ultimately, 36 of the 67 host firms participated in this evaluation and 25 of the 49 participants were included.

Table IParticipants

	Costa Rica	Jamaica	Total
In person	5	6	11
Mail	8	6	14
Phone	-	-	

Total No. Interviewed	13	12	25
Total No. Participants	20	27	47

Percentage Interviewed: 53

Firms

Mail	13	11	24
Phone	3	9	12
Total No. Interviewed	16	20	36
Total No. Firms	30	37	67

Percentage Interviewed: 54

II. APPROACH TO TRAINING

The International Executive Development Program is designed to provide three principal services in the short-term: industry-specific management training in a hands-on setting, direct application and discussion of technical skills in a practical setting, and the opportunity to develop solid business and professional relationships. The approach* to these training objectives incorporates several design features worth commenting on, the first and foremost being the IEDP's intention to provide industry-specific on-the-job placements at an executive management level for participants who represent a range of industries. This IEDP design feature requires a rather extensive outreach and networking capacity on behalf of the training organization, so that a range of appropriate level industry placements are available to participants. Keene-Monk has indentified this capacity as one of the elements most crucial to the program's success.

A second feature of the IEDP training approach is that it represents a publically-sponsored effort to facilitate linkages between the private sector of a Less-Developed Country and that of the U.S. More often than not, this type of training is funded and coordinated by a commercial entity with interests in a particular country; for example, Westinghouse and General Electric have sponsored engineering training in the U.S. for Mexican engineers.

* Individually and in combination, these services have been included in many AID training programs. The IEDP, however, is distinctive because it concentrated efforts on two countries and it trained two relatively large groups of participants (20 Costa Ricans and 27 Jamaicans).

A third IEDP feature is its orientation to eliciting on-going in-kind contributions to the program from the private sectors in the Less-Developed Countries and the U.S. The program is designed to encourage U.S. firms to provide supervisory staff time, work facilities, lodging arrangements, and industry-specific technical and management expertise; and to encourage the participants' home firm to provide these salaries during the traditional period, all international travel expenses, and additional direct expenses. The assumed motivation for incurring such expenses is clearly more indirect for the U.S. firms, and is two-fold: to participate in the private sector development and economic well-being of LDC's in a concrete way; and to develop a solid basis for collaborative business with the firms represented. The planned result of this private sector involvement was to be a more cost-effective training program with low AID costs.

A final feature of the IEDP is its tailoring of the management theory curriculum to the particular needs of executives and managers who operate in a lesser-developed economy. The curriculum included segments on management techniques to improve business efficiency when key resources are either scarce or unreliable, the methodology for financial analysis of new opportunities to improve markets and business growth, and improved problem-solving techniques for an executive's daily routine.

Other facets of the IEDP training approach are more consistent with either the orientation and structure of domestic on-the-job training programs or with training programs for international participants. The IEDP curriculum is a

combination of both theoretical management instruction and practical, on-the-job experience. The IEDP demonstrates concern for the level of participant it works with, and expends considerable time and effort on outreach and recruitment efforts. As a result of its initial year of operation, it has developed more detailed and specific criteria for who is most likely a "successful trainee." The IEDP provides a segment of the program in Washington to offer exposure to the resources located there. And finally, the program incorporates a self-evaluation component as a source of instructive feedback.

III. MAJOR FINDINGS

On the whole, response to the program was positive, with 82% of the participants characterizing the experience as somewhat or very beneficial, while 78% of the host firms felt they had gained from the experience.

Both participants and host firms ranked the transfer of technical information as most beneficial in the following areas:

- * introduction to information resources or publications pertaining to the industry;
- * obtaining information on technical aspects of production or manufacturing;
- * learning new staffing or management practices.

Most generally, participants rated their training as beneficial in those cases where they felt they had learned new skills or gained new information, while firms evaluated the experience positively if, as a result of their participation in the program, they made new contacts or acquired new perspectives or insights on the way they did business. Those firms that qualified their assessment of the program did so by indicating problems, principally with respect to language limitations, inappropriate matches and inadequate time devoted to the effort. The participants that qualified their assessment cited problems associated with inappropriate matches, ill-prepared host firms and non-exposure to innovations.

IV. OVER-ALL RATING OF THE EXPERIENCE

U.S. host firms and participants both strongly agree that the on-the-job placement experience was beneficial: 78% of the firms felt that they gained somewhat or gained a great deal from the experience and 82% of the participants noted their experience in firms as either somewhat or very beneficial.

In explaining their ratings, 40% of participants explicitly qualified their rating by the mention of some kind of problem (an inappropriate match, ill-prepared host firm, or few business innovations seen). Nevertheless, 47% of participants considered their training very beneficial, citing gains such as enhanced management or technical skills, exposure to a business with similar problems to their own, the opportunity to make contacts, and learning about market advances.

Forty-four percent of host firms rated the participants' experience as only somewhat beneficial, including 32% of host firms that explained their ratings by mentioning a "problem." These problems range from comments on the lack of time devoted to the participant, to comments on the participant's language limitations or an inappropriate match.

In looking at the host firms' rating of their own experience, the percentage of positive ratings (78%) corresponds very closely to the percentage (83%) of indications that the firm gained either a business application or a potential contact. The types of business applications mentioned as gains included comments that the firm had profitted from a different point of view that forced a rethinking or review of decisions, as well as from comparisons with other ways of organizing and doing business. In addition, social benefits were often noted, including making a good friend, making a personal or vacation contact, or an opportunity to learn about another country and

customs. Those firms (21%) that indicated that they had not gained from the experience mentioned such difficulties as the cost of supervising the participant either in terms of money or time lost, the lack of a technology exchange because the participant's production methods were judged to be 10-15 years behind those in the U.S., and difficulty in communicating with the participant.

V. SKILLS TRANSFER

Both host firms and participants were asked to evaluate the on-the-job placement according to the type(s) of functional business skills with which the participant received assistance. Eight skill groupings were proposed for rating, and as might be expected, the host firms felt that they either "assisted somewhat" or "assisted a great deal" more frequently than the participants did. Although there was no one skill grouping which predominated, both host firms and participants ranked the same three groupings in the top four, and both gave the highest rating of assistance to the grouping, "introduction to information resources or publications available pertaining to the industry." The other two groupings, rated by both firms and participants most highly were: "the providing of information on technical aspects of production or product manufacturing," and "the providing of information on staffing or management practices." The response from firms indicated that the fourth area in which they thought they were of most assistance was "the providing of financial, accounting, or budget expertise," whereas the participants felt the fourth area in which they were most assisted was "providing ideas about potential new product or service areas." Participants indicated they had not been provided any financial, accounting or budgeting training; nor did they acquire any new ideas on marketing, advertising or product promotion. (For more elaboration, please see Table II.)

Table II

There are many different ways a trainee might benefit from spending four weeks in a similar company in the U.S., depending upon the type of business you're in, your needs and interests, and the type of company you were matched with. For each of the potential benefits listed, please tell me whether the company you were placed with assisted you a great deal in that area, assisted you somewhat, didn't assist you at all, or it was not pertinent to your particular business.

	Assisted a Great Deal	Assisted Somewhat	Assisted Not at All
a. Introducing you to information, resources or publications available pertaining to the industry	47%	27%	26%
b. Providing potential contacts with people in the areas of sales, supplies, equipment, etc.	7%	40%	53%
c. Providing ideas on marketing, advertising, or product promotion	7%	20%	73%
d. Providing ideas on supply or inventory acquisition, storage or maintenance	13%	40%	47%
e. Providing information on technical aspects of the production or manufacturing of a product	20%	33%	47%
f. Providing information on staffing or management practices	27%	33%	40%
g. Providing financial/accounting/budgeting expertise	--	27%	73%
h. Providing ideas about potential new product or service area	13%	47%	40%

VI. COMMERCIAL COLLABORATION

Although an inquiry into whether a training program has resulted in any mutual business ventures, when posed only a year after the training seemed to show limited results, responses by U.S. firms and participants do show some positive application. Despite the fact that the results are mainly negative, with similar percentages of firms (85%) and participants (73%) registering no business ventures developed or showing good potential of being developed, it is encouraging to note that 15% of U.S. firms identify the potential for joint business and 27% of participants indicate that some type of collaboration is in process. Participants refer to different types of collaboration: a supplier relationship where the U.S. firm provides materials and expertise to the participant's firm; a joint venture to grow agricultural crops and market them in Georgia; and new business where negotiations are underway but final plans not finalized or publicly announced. Several U.S. firms that identified the potential for joint business offered pointed observations on why it has not developed, including the need for financing and third-party assistance with financing, and the need for more time to pass before a joint effort could come to fruition.

VII. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

A. Recruitment

The IEDP has repeatedly emphasized the identification and recruitment of U.S. host firms as an element critical to program success. When host firms were asked how they were recruited, no one method seems to predominate. The three most frequently mentioned means of recruitment were: directly by Keene-Monk (operator of the IEDP), referral by someone in a similar type of business, or referral by someone who is considered politically influential (state senator, AID or State Department staff, Inter-American Development Bank). In a few instances, the host firm was recruited by its eventual participant or asked in response to the cancellation of another firm's participation.

Although participants were not directly asked about their recruitment, several comments did surface during the executive interviews concerning the broad range of backgrounds and experience represented by those recruited. While the variety was considered stimulating and interesting, it did apparently result in difficulties in presenting theoretical instruction (Phase 1) that would satisfy all of the interests and accommodate the various levels of management represented.

B. Matching of Participants and Host Firms

The majority of host firms (84%) felt that their trainee was either a "good match in some ways" or "a very good match," while 73% of the participants felt that the appropriateness of their match was either good or excellent. In response to a related question, most firms indicated that they felt the match was "appropriate." Comments indicating business "appropriateness" were that: the participant was in the same

type of business and same type of job; the participant was in the same business and from a country that the host had marketing interests in; the trainee was in a variation of the same business; and the participant was bright and experienced in business. Comments indicating business "inappropriateness" were: the participant was not in the same business and did not do business on the same scale, and the participant was in the management or corporate end of the business rather than on the hands-on side of the business.

It is interesting to note that the host firms which considered their matches as inappropriate rarely cited personal attributes of the participants. Firms ranked participants very highly on intelligence and interpersonal skills. Two hosts mentioned that age, socioeconomic status, job status, and stage of family life were important factors to consider when matching hosts and participants, and that these contributed to their successful matches.

Despite their overall satisfaction with the matching, the need to improve the matching process is consistently mentioned by a majority of the participants (72%), particularly in response to inquiries about problems with the IEDP or ways in which it could be improved. Three of the participants interviewed considered their matches to be totally inappropriate. The concerns of the other participants focused on two elements: using information given by participants to arrange a more relevant placement; and obtaining confirmed placements with firms well in advance of the participants' arrival. Most of the participants understood that the amount of time available for the matching process was short, and many were able to endorse the program in concept while remaining somewhat critical of the matching process.

A sampling of participant views on matching follows.

"Good attempt to get exchange."

"It was too good to be true. My placement was a lucky one. My counterpart American had been to Korea in a similar program. We made mutual contributions even though we didn't know what to expect."

"My placements, were extremely satisfactory and relevant to my work. They were well organized although my hosts had little time to plan. I had two placements and visited four cities."

"One got the impression at the outset that we would deal at our own level in the host organizations, however when I got to D.C. I was relegated to a lower level. A little more planning and advance notice might have made it possible for me to gain exposure at my own level."

"Inappropriate placement. Funding cut-off prevented visits to organizations that were extremely relevant to my work."

"My match was bad. I should have been placed in a mining operation and not a sanitary district. I did learn a lot however, and I made the best of it but after 2 weeks I went to Washington, was idle so I went on to New York for a vacation."

"In my case I wound up with my company's parent company in a last minute change. Frankly, they were embarrassed that the Government had to pay to get me there. I was treated royally and the substance of my experience was excellent."

"I had no confirmed placement. The original placement said they didn't have the facilities to accomodate me and I was sent to a conference that was not in my area of interest."

"Develop individualized programs taking into account the position of the participant and his industry and the areas in which he expects to learn."

Several participants also expressed concern about the commitment of the host firms and noted their impression that

the firms were not well prepared for the participants and had no "agenda" for them. A sizeable percentage of host firms (44%), when asked to provide additional information about the on-the-job placement, also expressed a sense of confusion or hesitancy about the on-the-job-training structure. Several firms questioned the program's mission and wondered whether its thrust was to promote trade, exchange information, or convert others to the American way; 17% of firms expressed discomfort with the length of the on-the-job phase; and another 17% of the firms mentioned the amount of time required to supervise an on-the-job placement. Several comments by host firms and participants recommended a more formal structuring to the on-the-job placement during which both host and participant jointly set objectives and map out an agenda.

VIII. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

A. Overall Structure

When asked to evaluate the three phases of the IEDP, the majority of participants rated all three phases as either excellent or good. The lowest rating was given to the two-week segment at the end of the program. There was an overwhelming consensus that the entire program should be shortened, lasting six weeks, including a four week on-the-job placement. Phase I received mixed reviews from the participants: some enjoyed the time allotted for Capitol Hill, others considered it a waste of time; most felt that the executive management instruction component needed improvement and observed that it was either too academic or too long; and the majority felt that there should have been more small discussion group sessions, perhaps according to areas of interest.

About a third of the participants felt that the evaluation, Phase III, should only last a few days. They were uniformly disappointed that the final gathering of all participants did not occur as originally planned. Many expressed the desire for an opportunity to share their experiences with the other participants.

Half of the participants felt the treatment during training and logistical arrangements while in the U.S. was good or excellent, while the other 50% cited these arrangements as fair or poor. A recurring theme heard from both participants and host firms was the inadequacy of the per diem. Participants frequently identified areas in which program improvement could occur: better advance preparation of host firms; "streamlining program implementation so that arrangements made are implemented"; "far more liaison with

participants and hosts before and during the program"; and "the concept of program is good but implementation is inefficient and a great deal of time and energy is wasted because of this."

The host firms rated IEDP administration as generally favorable: 69% of firms felt its efficiency and effectiveness in coordination and recruitment prior to participant arrival was either good or excellent; and 82% of firms felt IEDP's responsiveness and assistance during the program was either good or excellent.

When host firms did express concerns about IEDP administration, these concerns included such things as the need for more information, the need for better participant per diem, the hesitancy of firms to provide on-the-job training and take the responsibility for housing and the participant's social life, and more general dissatisfaction with the planning and support provided by IEDP. Fourteen percent of the improvements or recommendations offered by host firms focused on logistical arrangements and program administration.

B. Analysis of Costs

The 1983 IEDP Program cost \$485,000 in USAID funds, complemented by contributions-in-kind from the private sector which have been reported by the contractor to total \$345,000. The private sector's contributions included \$180,000 from the Costa Rican and Jamaican firms that enabled their executives to participate by payment of salaries during training, all international travel expenses and additional direct expenses. The remainder (\$165,000) was contributed by U.S. firms in the form of training and associated goods and services provided gratis.

The total costs of the program for 1983 are \$830,000.00. The

USAID portion is 58% of the total.

The costs per participant to AID were approximately \$10,320 (almost \$1,300 per week), not counting in-kind contributions by the U.S. firms, the participants themselves, and their companies. While it is difficult to compare this program to other kinds of on-the-job training being funded by the agency because of its executive target group, the cost per participant does appear to be higher than that of comparable programs. For instance, the AID-funded Nicaraguan Training Program (NTP), which was run concurrently with the IEDP and which has similar objectives and activities, cost only \$4,836 per person for nine weeks, about half the cost. (See Appendix 2 for comparative description of the two programs.)

IX. CONCLUSIONS

1. Response to the program by participants and firms was positive.
2. Both participants and firms felt that there was a transfer of technical information. A majority of participants gained new information and learned new skills.
3. Both participants and firms gained from on-the-job placement and experience. Participants were particularly positive about the practical application of skills offered by this approach to training.
4. The benefit to host firms seems to be more subjective, e.g., a social experience and feeling of helping.
5. Where dissatisfaction was cited by participants it was usually associated with the administration rather than the substance of the program.
6. Tangible results of business collaboration are limited to date and potential for commercial collaboration appears minimal.
7. The cost per participant month of training was \$5160, against the AID standard of \$3100 per participant month and \$2150 for a comparable program. The total cost per participant (AID and private contributions) was \$8830 per participant month.

Appendix 1

THE INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
EVALUATION

Trainees:

Please circle the appropriate answer to each question or write your answer in the space provided.

1. Now that it has been several months since you attended the Keene-Monk training program in the United States, we are interested in your opinions of various aspects of the program. For each item that I mention, please tell me if you feel it was excellent, good, fair, or poor.

	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>
a. your preparation for coming to the U.S. including the logistical arrangements for getting you here (travel arrangements, etc.)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
b. your treatment during the training program, including the logistical arrangements (hotels, transportation, etc.)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
c. the two weeks of coursework prior to being placed in a company for four weeks	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
d. your experience during the four weeks you spent with your host company	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
e. the appropriateness of your match for the four-week in-company experience	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
f. the two weeks spent in Washington, D.C. at the end of the session before going home	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)

2. There are many different ways a trainee might benefit from spending four weeks in a similar company in the U.S. depending upon the type of business you're in, your needs and interests, and the type of company you were matched with. For each of the potential benefits listed, please tell me whether the company you were placed with assisted you a great deal in that area, assisted you somewhat, didn't assist you at all although it would have been useful, or it was not pertinent to your particular business.

	<u>Assisted a Great Deal</u>	<u>Assisted Somewhat</u>	<u>Assisted Not at All</u>	<u>Not Per- tinent</u>
a. introducing you to information resources or publications available pertaining to your industry	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)

	<u>Assisted a Great Deal</u>	<u>Assisted Somewhat</u>	<u>Assisted Not at All</u>	<u>Not per- tinent</u>
--	--------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------------------

(IF ASSISTED) How did they assist you?

b. providing potential contacts with people in the areas of sales, supplies, equipment, etc.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----

(IF ASSISTED) How did they assist you?

c. providing ideas on marketing, advertising or product promotion	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
-------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----

(IF ASSISTED) How did they assist you?

d. providing ideas on supply or inventory acquisition, storage, or maintenance	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----

(IF ASSISTED) How did they assist you?

e. providing information on technical aspects of the production or manufacturing of a product	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----

(IF ASSISTED) How did they assist you?

	Assisted a Great Deal	Assisted Somewhat	Assisted Not at All	Not per- tinent
f. providing information on staffing or management practices	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)

(IF ASSISTED) How did they assist you?

g. providing financial/accounting/ budgeting expertise	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
-----------------------------------------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----

(IF ASSISTED) How did they assist you?

h. providing ideas about potential new product or service areas	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
--------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----

(IF ASSISTED) How did they assist you?

i. anything else? BE SPECIFIC

3. Overall, would you say your experience during the four weeks at your host company was:

- (1) Very beneficial
- (2) Somewhat beneficial
- (3) Not very beneficial

3A. Why do you feel that way?

4. Have any business ventures been developed or show good potential of being developed as a result of this training program?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

4A. (IF YES) Please describe the resulting or potential venture.

5. What other benefits or assistance were you provided by any aspect of this training program that we haven't covered already?

6. What problems, if any, did you encounter during the training program, the company you were placed with, or any other aspect of the program?

7. In what ways do you feel the training program could be improved?

Thank you very much for your time and help.

Please return this to us immediately in the envelope provided.

THE INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Please circle the appropriate answer to each question or write your answer in the space provided.

1. Please describe how you were recruited to participate in this training program.

2. One consideration in determining how beneficial the training program was, is how well matched the trainee was to the business he spent the four weeks with. In retrospect, would you say that putting your particular trainee in your company was a:

- (1) Very good match
- (2) Good match in some ways
- (3) Not a very good match.

- 2A. Why do you feel this way? (Please note specific reasons that it was a good match or that it was not a very good match.)

3. There are many different ways a trainee could benefit from this kind of an experience, depending upon the type of business he is in and the kinds of needs he had when he arrived. For each category listed below, please tell me whether you feel this four week stay with your company assisted him a great deal, assisted him somewhat, assisted him not at all, or that the area was not applicable to your trainee's interests.

	<u>Assisted a Great Deal</u>	<u>Assisted Somewhat</u>	<u>Assisted Not at All</u>	<u>Not Applic- able</u>
a. introducing him to information resources or publications available pertaining to the industry	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
b. providing potential contacts with people in the areas of sales, supplies, equipment, etc.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
c. providing ideas on marketing, advertising, or product promotion	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
d. providing ideas on supply or inventory acquisition, storage, or maintenance	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
e. providing information on technical aspects of the production or manufacturing of a product	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
f. providing information on staffing or management practices	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
g. providing financial/accounting/budgeting expertise	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
h. providing ideas about potential new product or service areas	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
i. anything else? PLEASE BE SPECIFIC				

4. Overall, would you say the experience your trainee had in your company was:
- (1) Very beneficial
 - (2) Somewhat beneficial
 - (3) Not very beneficial

4A. Please give specific reasons or examples of why you feel that way.

5. One usually thinks of a training program such as this as providing benefits mostly to the trainee; however, in some cases the company also benefits from its participation. Would you say that your company:

- (1) Gained a lot from the experience
- (2) Gained somewhat from the experience
- (3) Didn't gain anything from the experience
- (4) Found the experience a waste of time and effort

5A. Why do you feel this way? Please give specific examples of how you benefited or why you found the experience a waste of time and effort.

6. Have any business ventures been developed or show good potential of being developed as a result of this training program?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

6A. (IF YES) Please describe the results or potential ventures.

28

Appendix 2Comparison of IEDP and NTP

The MSI evaluators were asked to compare the IEDP program with other comparable programs. Although we were able to find no fully comparable program, we believe that comparison to the Nicaraguan Training Program (NTP) may be instructive.

The Nicaraguan Training Program goal was to facilitate Nicaraguan national development, and its purpose was to increase the supply of U.S.-trained Nicaraguans. While the IEDP also intended to enhance the managerial and technical skills of its participants in an effort to enhance the participating countries' national development, it had "second tier" goals that included the promotion of mutual trade or business ventures and the encouragement of U.S. private sector interest in the development of participating countries.

The Nicaraguan Training Program coordinated both long-term masters-level academic training and short-term technical training for private sector employees. Many of its participants were technicians as opposed to management-level personnel, and did not have the equivalent of a high-school education or travel experience outside Nicaragua. The NTP conducted its recruitment efforts in conjunction with in-country recruiters and screeners, and there was reference to the difficulty in communication and coordination for such a collaborative agreement. The IEDP, on the other hand, did not offer academic training options, but did offer managerial and technical on-the-job training for those who were executives or managers. The IEDP also made use of in-country recruiters and seemed somewhat surprised at the length of time and degree of effort this phase required, commenting particularly on communications difficulties in Jamaica. The IEDP recruitment in Costa Rica lasted for three months and included a public

relations campaign through newspapers, televised public service announcements, telexes and cables sent to companies meeting the criteria for participation, and formal candidate interviews.

The Nicaraguan short-term training program constituted of a three-week long summer session in English language instruction followed by nine weeks of practical training at either private companies or technical training facilities. The training was intended to balance hands-on experience with theory and was usually conducted in Spanish. In most cases, a large number of contacts had to be made before either an appropriate English-language placement or training placement could be made, and the program commented on the administrative difficulties inherent in the phase. The NTP provided 112 person months of short-term training to 40 persons in 25 professional fields.

The housing arrangements were of similar intent for both programs: the NTP coordinators were responsible for housing logistics and tried to arrange host families if possible; the IEDP delegated responsibility for housing to host firms, hoping to solicit host families. As perhaps indicative of the differing job levels represented in each program, the NTP authorized the purchase of special clothing or tools needed for training, whereas the IEDP provided a per diem for incidental expenses.