

BSSR #513

PN-A 113-094

374.013

141-38638

1952

SOCIAL SCIENCE PERSPECTIVES
ON TRAINING FOR DEVELOPMENT

Report and Recommendations
of a Workshop and Conference
on Non-Technical Aspects
of the AID Participant Training Program

March and October 1965

Final Report Submitted
to the Agency for International Development
on Contract AID/cds - 712

10110
3

Reference Section
Room 1856 NS

BUREAU OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH, INC. 101103
1200 Seventeenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Conference	3
Recurrent Themes	8
Organization of this Report.	10
II. RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION.	12
Standard Procedures and Common Deviations.	12
Conference Recommendations	14
Selection Procedures	14
III. PROGRAM PLANNING	24
Standard Procedures and Common Deviations.	24
Phase 1	24
Phase 2	24
Phase 3	25
Conference Recommendations	25
Procedures	25
Program Content	28
Selection of Training Site	34
IV. ORIENTATION AND COUNSELING	41
1. Pretraining Orientation.	41
Standard Procedures and Common Deviations.	41
Predeparture Briefings	41
Washington Orientation	42
Orientation at Training Site	44
Conference Recommendations	45
General.	45
Predeparture Orientation	47
Washington Orientation	49
Orientation at the Training Site	50
2. Intraining Counseling.	52
Standard Procedures and Common Deviations.	52
Conference Recommendations	54
3. Prereturn Orientation.	59
Standard Procedures and Common Deviations.	59
Conference Recommendations	60

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

Chapter	Page
V. THE TRAINING PERIOD: INTEGRATION VS. INSULATION	61
Conference Recommendations	61
VI. AFTER RETURN	64
Standard Procedures and Common Deviations.	64
Conference Recommendations	66
VII. RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.	72
Conference Recommendations	72
General.	72
A List of Specific Research Suggestions.	75

I. INTRODUCTION

Since its inception, the Participant Training Program has had as its major purpose the provision of "suitable technical training for [foreign nationals] so that when they return home their potentialities will be enhanced to participate in the economic, social, and political development of their respective countries."¹ It still has today.

In recent years, however, policies guiding the program, presently administered by the Office of International Training of the Agency for International Development (AID), have shifted significantly. On the one hand, its administrators have come to recognize that if participant trainees do not adjust well to social, economic, and environmental factors during and after their sojourn abroad their effectiveness in the training situation, as well as their motivation and ability to use the skills and perspectives to which they have been exposed will be reduced. On the other hand, they have been alerted to the fact that mere technical training is not enough--that other important objectives of the program are:

1. the introduction of attitudes and values essential to social and economic development in the countries which AID is assisting; and
2. the acquisition by the leadership groups in emerging nations of attitudes favorable to free democratic institutions and to the broad long-range aims of American foreign policy.²

¹"Non-Technical' Aspects of the AID International Training Program," AID memorandum, May 25, 1964, p. 1.

²"AID Participant Training Procedures and Costs," AID memorandum, March 8, 1965, p. 1.

For the Office of International Training, these changes in approach implied, among other things, that its "staff had to be able to take into account the 'whole man' in his experiences in international training."¹ AID recognized that to do so requires expertise in a wide variety of behavioral science disciplines, e.g., social, clinical and counseling psychology, cultural anthropology, sociology and communications media including linguistics. It also recognized that the Agency does not have the necessary expertise in these fields and cannot easily acquire it through staffing. AID therefore proposed in mid-1964 to contract the services of a private research organization, experienced in working with scientists and other specialists in the behavioral fields, to design and conduct a seminar-workshop on "Non-Technical Aspects of the AID International Training Program." This was viewed as the most feasible method by which AID could avail itself of the information and ideas these disciplines can contribute to improved implementation of the Participant Training Program's new emphases and objectives.

The general plan was to divide the seminar-workshop into two parts: a preliminary two-day seminar, and a later workshop of longer duration, both to be held in Washington, D. C. At the former, a number of behavioral scientists and other specialists representing relevant scholarly fields and academic disciplines would meet with personnel from the Office of International Training and other AID officials to discuss the operations and problems of the training program and to plan the future workshop. At the workshop, conferees would join in an intensive examination of selected problem areas identified at the earlier seminar as meriting further

¹"Conference on Non-Technical Aspects of Training: Notes on First Session, March 13-14, 1965" (Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., Washington, D. C.), p. 2. (Mimeographed.)

consideration. The general purpose of the workshop would be to arrive at some consensus on the scientific techniques, skills and procedures which seem to offer the best means of attacking the current and emerging problems of participant training.

The Conference

First Session: March 13-14, 1965

The first session of the Conference on Non-Technical Aspects of the Participant Training Program was convened by the Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., on March 13, 1965, at the Meridian House, Washington, D. C.

The Conferees included the following behavioral scientists and specialists:

James A. Bayton
Department of Psychology
Howard University

Wayne H. Holtzman
Department of Psychology
University of Texas

Albert D. Biderman
Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc.

Herbert C. Kelman
Department of Psychology
University of Michigan

Frank Bonilla
Center for International Studies
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Walter Laves
Department of Political Science
Indiana University

Robert T. Bower
Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc.

Paul F. Lazarsfeld
Department of Sociology
Columbia University

Ira Cisin
Social Research Project
George Washington University

William Lybrand
Special Operations Research Office
American University

W. Phillips Davison
Council on Foreign Relations
(Conference Chairman)

Margaret Mead
American Museum of Natural History, and
Columbia University

Lloyd A. Free
Institute for International
Social Research

Forrest G. Moore
Office of the Advisor to Foreign
Students
University of Minnesota

Charles Y. Glock
Survey Research Center
University of California, Berkeley

Ithiel de Sola Pool
Center for International Studies
Massachusetts Institute of
Technology

Harley O. Preston
American Psychological Association

Henry Lee Smith, Jr.
Department of Anthropology and
Linguistics
State University of New York at
Buffalo

M. Brewster Smith
Institute for Human Development
University of California, Berkeley

Mottram Torre
Louisiana State Board of Health
Metairie, Louisiana

Sloan R. Wayland
Teachers College
Columbia University

Also present were Robert Kitchen, then the Director of the Office of International Training; Forrest Clements and various other members of the OIT staff, as well as several AID officials from other divisions. In addition, a panel of representatives of government agencies, chaired by Adam Yarmolinsky of the Defense Department, and now on the Law School faculty of Harvard University, participated in the first day's afternoon meeting.

During the two-day session, the manifold facets of the Participant Training Program were described by AID personnel and were discussed in detail by the Conferees. In the course of the discussion, numerous problem areas which might be explored in depth in the subsequent workshop session were identified. It was also proposed that the end product of this later phase of the conference might encompass (1) suggestions based on existing knowledge and the personal experiences of the Conferees relating to immediate modifications in the Participant Training Program, and (2) recommendations for new research, both on unexplored content areas and on methodologies and general research approaches.

At the final meeting it was decided that as an interim step between the first and second phases of the Conference the Conferees would produce

memos on what seemed to be sensible and feasible for the second session and feed them back to the Bureau of Social Science Research. A small committee (Clements, Davison, Lazarsfeld, Mead and Pool) would then meet with Robert T. Bower, the Bureau's Director, to sift the content of the memos, make final decisions about organization of the second session, and commission papers on specific topics or areas of concern which would furnish the main themes for the workshop discussion.

Interim Period: March 15-October 13, 1965

On the basis of the "reaction memos," the following six working papers were commissioned:

Harley O. Preston, "Operations of the AID Participant Program."

Mottram Torre, "A Discussion of Selected Aspects of Selection."

_____, "A Discussion of Selected Aspects of Orientation and Health Maintenance of the Participant Trainee." ✓

Forrest G. Moore, "The Collegiate Environment: The Experience and Reactions of Foreign Students, Government-Sponsored and Self-Sponsored."

Carl F. Hereford, "Attitude Changes Toward the United States of AID Participant Trainees." ✓

Robert Edward Mitchell, "Occupations, Organizations, and National Development: The Participant-Trainees on Their Return Home."

It was explicitly stated that these papers were not expected to be "definitive" of the subject-matter area. Rather, they were to be working papers aimed primarily at stimulating discussion of various "non-technical" aspects and objectives of the Participant Training Program. They were, in other words, to serve as a background against which Conferees might develop operational and research recommendations aimed at the amelioration of problems of participant training.

-6-

The second phase of the Conference was scheduled for October 13-17, 1965, with the following agenda:

Wednesday, October 13

7:30-9:30 P. M. Opening Session

Harley Preston: Remarks on Participant Training Procedure (working paper on the "Operations of the AID Participant Training Program")

Conference-Workshop Objectives and Plans

Thursday, October 14

9:00-10:50 A. M. Working Paper: Mottram Torre
Discussant: Frank Bonilla

11:00-12:50 P. M. Working Paper: Forrest Moore
Discussant: Charles Glock

2:15-5:30 P. M. Workshop 1: Selection (Lloyd Free, Chairman)
Workshop 2: The Foreign Student on the American Campus (Sloan Wayland, Chairman)

Friday, October 15

9:00-10:50 A. M. Working Paper: Carl Hereford
Discussant: M. Brewster Smith

11:00-12:50 P. M. Working Paper: Robert Mitchell
Discussant: Walter Laves

2:15-5:30 P. M. Workshop 3: Attitude Change (Herbert Kelman, Chairman)
Workshop 4: Participants on Return Home (Albert Biderman, Chairman)

Saturday, October 16

9:00-10:50 A. M. Working Paper: Mottram Torre
Discussant: C. Roger Myers

11:00-12:50 P. M. Session on Research and Evaluation
Discussants: William Lybrand and Paul Lazarsfeld

2:15-5:30 P. M. Workshop 5: Orientation and Support (W. Phillips Davison, Chairman)
Workshop 6: Research and Evaluation (William Lybrand, Chairman)

Sunday, October 17

9:30-12:30 P. M. Presentation and Discussion of Recommendations

Second Session: October 13-17, 1965

The second session of the Conference was convened on October 13, 1965 in the Conference Room of the Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., Washington D. C.

In addition to most of the behavioral scientists and specialists who attended the first session,¹ Conferees included:

Carl F. Hereford
Personality Research Center
University of Texas

C. Roger Myers
Department of Psychology
University of Toronto

Robert E. Mitchell
Survey Research Center
University of California, Berkeley

In the opening session it was agreed that for the purposes of the Conference the term "non-technical" would be defined broadly including anything but the curriculum content of technical training programs. It was also agreed that each workshop should strive to produce operation and research recommendations relating to its areas of concern. The workshop chairmen were held responsible for reporting deliberations and recommendations to the Conference as a whole.

The major portion of the opening session was devoted to a wide-ranging discussion of Harley Preston's report on (1) the "set of standard operating procedures for the conduct of [the] Participant Training Program" which AID has developed on the basis of more than fifteen years' experience in the training of foreign nationals,² and (2) common deviations from this procedure occasioned by circumstances both within and beyond the Agency's control.

¹Several earlier consultants were unable to attend the second session.

²Harley Preston, "Operations of the AID Participant Training Program," p. 28.

Subsequent morning sessions and afternoon workshops were devoted to (1) suggestions based on existing knowledge for immediate modification of the Program's operations, and (2) recommendations for research which would yield data essential to improved implementation of the Program's new emphases and objectives.¹ These suggestions and recommendations are detailed below.

Recurrent Themes

Certain recurrent themes of the Conference merit special mention prior to the inventory of specific suggestions and recommendations advanced by Conferees in particular workshops. Four major points were raised in almost every meeting.

First, there was a general call for clarification of Program goals and of the compatibilities among them.

Second, there was a general call for more factual information, continuously collected, on what actually happens to participant trainees in the predeparture, in-training, and aftermath periods.

Third, the need for better staffing, better internal training, and better administration in Washington and in the field (here and abroad) was emphasized repeatedly. It was recognized that "attracting able professionals and creating an environment in which they can function effectively"² is not an easy task. However, it was clear to everyone that no set of new principles or changed procedures can substitute for program administrators of high quality and competence.

¹ In advancing their proposals, Conferees were cognizant that the administration of the Participant Training Program was undergoing dramatic changes and that a number of their operational recommendations might therefore be "out of date" by the time the final conference report was prepared. They were also aware that due to political and other realities, the implementation of some of their operational and research suggestions, although eminently desirable from the social science point of view, might not be feasible at the present time.

² John W. Gardner, AID and the Universities, Report to the Administrator of the Agency for International Development (Washington, D. C.: Agency for International Development, 1964), p. 32.

Fourth, there was a consensus that "the direct creation of favorable attitudes toward the U. S. is not a feasible goal for the AID Participant Training Program."¹ Hereford pointed out that not only is it "extremely difficult to 'teach' attitudes, or to implant a certain set of values in an essentially passive participant" but there is also the likelihood that deliberate persuasive efforts can backfire (i.e., if perceived by the trainee as attempts to manipulate his attitudes they can lead to resentment and devaluation of the whole training experience) and that any attitude changes occasioned by such direct endeavors would be ephemeral. Moreover, in a free society, it "is obviously impossible . . . to gain sufficient control of the trainee's environment to provide him with selected experiences leading to positive attitudes and eliminate negative experiences that might have the opposite effect."

In view of these considerations, Conferees recommended that in attempting to foster the development and persistence of favorable attitudes toward the United States among participant trainees, AID should not engage in deliberate persuasive efforts. Rather, it should focus its energies and resources on providing trainees with (1) high-quality training corresponding to their expectations and relevant to their own and their country's needs; (2) adequate pretraining orientation, in-training counselling, and re-entry preparation; (3) broader opportunities to observe and interact with U. S. culture; (4) more opportunities to participate in planning their programs, to do more while receiving their training, and to help, after return, in planning new programs and in the orientation of prospective trainees; and (5) encouragement and support in their endeavors to use and transmit their new skills and perspectives after they return home.

¹ Carl Hereford, "Attitude Changes Toward the United States of AID Participant Trainees," p. 4.

Organization of this Report

The rest of this report is devoted to a detailed listing of the numerous operational and research recommendations developed in the various meetings and workshops of the second session. The classification schema used in this inventory differs somewhat from that used in the agenda for this session. Recommendations are categorized under six general headings:

1. Recruitment and Selection
2. Program Planning
3. Orientation and Counseling
 - Pretraining Orientation
 - Intraining Counseling
 - Prereturn Orientation
4. The Training Period: Integration vs. Insulation
5. After Return
6. Research and Evaluation

With two exceptions,¹ each section or subsection begins with a brief description of standard operating procedures relating to that phase of the Participant Training Program and common deviations from these procedures.² Against this background the relevant Conference recommendations are presented.

In all, 68 operational and research recommendations are listed in this inventory. The statement of each recommendation is generally followed by a discussion based on (1) notes taken during the various sessions and workshops, (2) workshop reports prepared by designated chairmen,

¹Sections on "The Training Period: Integration vs. Insulation," and "Research and Evaluation."

²These were derived primarily from Harley Preston's paper, and their accuracy with respect to current operations is of course subject to time lags and changes in administration of the program since the Conference.

(3) the working papers, and (4) a research monograph on the evaluation of participant training, which has been completed recently.¹

Although the six working papers prepared for the second session of the Conference are quoted liberally throughout this inventory, they are not incorporated as part of this report. As noted above, they were not expected to be "definitive": they were to serve as a backdrop against which Conferees might develop specific recommendations. These papers and other documents relating to the Conference have been turned over to the Office of Participant Training of AID as provided by the contract.

¹Albert E. Gollin, AID Participant Training Program - An Evaluation Study; Global Analysis (Washington, D. C.: Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., 1966).

II. RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION

Standard Procedures and Common Deviations

According to standard selection procedures set by AID, the selection of trainees begins with members of the USAID, including its Program Officer and the Chiefs of Technical Division, working closely with host government officials to forecast the current and future trained leadership required to carry out agreed-upon programs. Crucial fields of activity are identified in which training would make a significant impact on the economic and social development of the cooperating country. Next an analysis is made of the manpower requirements in each activity field, including consideration of the cooperating country's trained personnel which is and will become available, an identification of remaining personnel gaps which cannot be thus filled, and an assessment of the kinds and levels of skills needed to fill those gaps. Because funds and facilities are limited, a determination must next be made as to the priorities among competing manpower requirements. Then a long range training plan is designed to meet identifiable goals. Built into this analytical process is also an assessment of local training facilities and what the United States can do to help develop them.

The next step is a determination, also in cooperation with the host government, of the qualifications for candidates at various levels and for various kinds of training: mechanical, technical, administrative and policy making. These qualification standards are circulated to the appropriate ministries and other selection entities in the country. Candidates are then recruited. They may apply personally, be selected by the government of the cooperating country or be recommended from the private sector by Chambers of Commerce, labor unions and professional societies. The USAID and the host government jointly screen the candidates, and those approved by the cooperating government are reviewed thoroughly by the technical officers and the training officer of the Mission. Within the limits of the funds available, the Mission gives final approval to those candidates meeting its general and technical criteria.

Ideally each candidate should have the following qualifications:

1. be a citizen of the country and of good moral character and not a member of unlawful organizations;
2. possess sufficient maturity to provide proper representation for his country in his associations abroad, show ability to understand a foreign culture and to benefit from educational and observational experiences abroad;
3. be in good health as indicated by a satisfactory medical examination;

4. display an adequate understanding and utilization of English, unless he is to undergo training in a group large enough to justify an interpreter;

5. show that he has utilized all appropriate and practical training available in his own country in his field of study or training;

6. possess an ability to work with others in order that the multiplying effect of the training can be reasonably assured after his return;

7. be employed at the time of his nomination, in the field of training for which he is proposed or be assured of assignment in such field after his return; the candidate should have had several years of work experience in his own or related fields; and

8. be technically and educationally qualified for the training proposed.¹

However, these procedures, like those relating to other aspects of the Participant Training Program, often must be modified in practice. Preston describes the following situations occasioning deviations from standard selection procedures and criteria in some of the 80 or so countries in which AID operates or has operated.

In some countries where the host governments lack or fail to provide personnel able and willing to cooperate in [the selection procedure] . . . , the Mission must in fact make some of the decisions which in more sophisticated countries is done with full, not merely nominal, cooperation of the other government.

Sometimes the host government may insist on selecting candidates entirely by itself, often without a preliminary screening on the basis of standard criteria. This insistence usually results in some unqualified candidates nominated by a host government for political reasons or through misunderstanding of the objectives of the training program or of a project's objectives. In these cases the Mission is faced with, at the least, protracted argument, and occasionally with the dilemma of either choosing the best of several improperly qualified candidates or having no training program at all--with resulting delay or failure of important projects. The dilemma must be resolved by the AID Mission Director in the light of the circumstances of the time and place

In some countries officers of the host government lack appreciation of the value of technical education . . . Although officially committed to economic development, they are emotionally antipathetic both to acquiring technical skills themselves and to permitting members of other castes or classes in the social structure of the country to acquire such training. The result can be candidates for training who are not

¹Harley O. Preston, pp. 29-31.

seriously desirous of learning new skills but who perhaps have stated a desire for training in order to enjoy the experience of a trip to the United States and such prestige as it confers upon them. Again, the problem must be resolved at the highest level within the overseas Mission in the light of the necessity of achieving the most possible progress within the realities of the situation.

Then there are disorderly governments, changing governments, and changing goals within ministries. In addressing this group of problems Missions often discovered that there may be no real or lasting understanding between them and the host country's officials as to the objectives of the program

Other complications requiring deviations from the standard procedure may stem from acceleration of programs to increase political impact at a crucial period; the development by the Washington staff of special group programs involving participants from several countries, which may accelerate or delay the timing of a training program that has been set up in an individual country; the problem of timing in relation to U. S. Congressional appropriations action, which may have delayed the availability of funds; and the built-in high workload-peak on AID/W and universities just prior to the beginning of the American "school year."¹

Conference Recommendations

Selection Procedures

1. At all steps and in all respects, bi-national cooperation in the selection process must be stressed, in order to ensure the involvement of the host government and hence its concern about the trainee, but with final authority retained by the United States.

As Mottram Torre observes in his paper on selected aspects of selection,

the behavioral science data available demonstrate clearly enunciated negative and hostile feelings by the indigenous officials when they feel that the U. S. has played too active and controlling a role in selection. There are complaints that the U. S. interferes with the countries' sovereignty, and devious motives are attributed to why certain nationals are selected and others rejected. Resistances develop to "using" and reintegrating into the bureaucratic structure a U. S. selected trainee when he returns (sometimes even consciously, to demonstrate to the U. S. selectors their poor selection). Even with excellent selection there will be some failures, such as the trainee's staying in the U. S. (or returning to the U. S. to live after he has completed his indentured service to the foreign country) as well as trainees who did not acquire all the skills felt necessary to do the job by the foreign country. When selection is the prime responsibility of the local government, they cannot blame the U. S. for poor selection, and scapegoat the trainee. They are also less likely to attribute

¹ Ibid., pp. 32-34.

chauvinistic selection criteria to the U. S. although they still might accuse the U. S. of seductive practices with those trainees who remain or return to the U. S. The responsible local selectors, identified with their selection, will do everything possible to see that the trainee successfully uses his training on return, to prove that they are good selectors.¹

2. Although it is realized that there would have to be exceptions in practice, this bi-national cooperation in the selection process should, where feasible, be institutionalized to the extent of setting up bi-national groups, formal or informal, to establish criteria of selection and to review the qualifications of applicants in the light of these criteria. Preferably, members of such bi-national groups should meet together physically around a table.

This arrangement would have the following potential advantages:

1. It would involve the host government in the selection process to a greater degree than is now the case in certain countries and thereby heighten its concern with the trainees, and would also alleviate the sensitivity of some host governments to the fact or appearance of unilateral selection by the United States.

2. At the same time, it would retain U. S. control--at the least a U. S. veto--over the selection of trainees.

3. It would permit the working out of firmer standards on which all concerned could agree, both as to criteria and to the application of these criteria to particular candidates.

4. The group approach would also permit the consideration of factors and criteria other than questions of mere technical skill and would compensate for the narrow outlook on the basis of which technicians make selections from time to time.

5. The joint selection board might well provide an informal means of providing training in selection techniques in countries where officials equipped to assess personality and technical skills are in short supply.

¹ Mottram Torre, "A Discussion of Selected Aspects of Selection," p. 11.

3. The prospective supervisor of the trainee should be encouraged to become involved to the greatest extent possible in every phase of the selection process.

In this regard, the following remarks in Torre's working paper on selection are particularly relevant:

No matter what form the selection procedure takes-- one primarily undertaken by the local country, one primarily undertaken by the USAID mission staff, or a true collaborative effort--all the behavioral science data available indicates the crucial importance of involving in it the prospective work supervisor of the participant trainee Since the supervisor is the person most likely to scapegoat the returning trainee if he was not his personal selection, and extend every effort to see that he succeeds if he is personally identified with the selection, it seems obvious that an attempt should be made to increase the involvement of the supervisor to 100 per cent.

Findings from recent evaluation studies of the Participant Training Program conducted by AID in 23 countries lend striking support to Torre's observations. They indicate that participants working under supervisors who had played an active role in the advance stages of their programming (by recommending or helping to plan the training of participants) were more likely than those working under supervisors who had not been involved in selection and program planning to rank high in the utilization of training.

Judging from the fact that 51 per cent of the participants interviewed in these studies mentioned their work supervisor when asked who had selected them for training, involvement of prospective supervisors in the selection process has by no means been minimal in the past. However, in view of the key role work supervisors are likely to play in the participant's effective use of training on return, added efforts to increase their involvement in the selection process are to be recommended.

4. It is desirable that there be as clear and explicit a description of the future job and role of the trainee as possible before selection is made. Where appropriate, this should go as far as a detailed functional job description, prepared in cooperation with the prospective work supervisor of the trainee.

The circulation of a detailed job description, including "items related to the type of training the trainee would receive and the type of job he would be expected to perform upon completion of the training,"¹ to persons involved in the selection process would have the following advantages:

a) It would allow "the persons requested to nominate candidates to nominate only those who are qualified The nominator, with a good functional job description before him may think of a really good candidate, who would not have occurred to him otherwise."

b) It would permit "persons . . . asked to evaluate the candidate through the reference checking system . . . [to] devote more of their time and be more specific on those dimensions of training and personality which are most relevant to the specific job."

c) "Similarly, the persons interviewing the candidate and making the final selection [could] focus on the relevant dimensions and make assessments of the relative strengths and weaknesses of the candidate in terms of the requirements of the job."

d) Finally, "providing the prospective candidate with a copy of a functional job description allows him to become a more useful partner in the selection process. Most persons, when given full information about the nature of the job and the living conditions, can assist in assessing their capacity to perform the technical duties required . . . and to cope

¹This and all other quotations bearing on recommendation #4 are taken from Mottram Torre, "A Discussion of Selected Aspects of Selection."

with the working and living conditions. Some of the unsuitable persons will eliminate themselves . . . [and] suitable candidates [will be able] to more realistically anticipate the job demands and prepare themselves for it prior to the training period."

5. There is a strong need for systematic personnel selection.

Currently, psychological testing techniques, especially on a cross-cultural basis, are not sufficiently developed nor validated to be of general applicability in the selection process. AID might want to consider contributing toward the development of such techniques through a cross-national test development program.

At present, the study of the life history of prospective trainees for evidence of institution building activities is apparently the best technique available for systematic personnel selection. Even this approach, however, needs to be studied systematically and regularly in the multi-cultural context before we can be sure it will work effectively in the process of trainee selection.

On the other hand, tests on English language facility are quite advanced; more research under the sponsorship of AID is not needed. However, since "lack of English proficiency is a prime cause of academic failure, [and] difficulties in social adjustment among foreign students on American campuses,"¹ AID should be apprised of these developments by other agencies and institutions. Further, persons responsible for selecting participant trainees should be encouraged to take the results of English language proficiency tests seriously in making selections.

¹Forrest G. Moore, "The Collegiate Environment: The Experience and Reactions of Foreign Students, Government-Sponsored and Self-Sponsored," p. 32.

Selection Criteria

6. While the primary purpose of the Participant Training Program remains technical training, trainees' selection in recent years has also emphasized "those who stand to effect in a broad sense, not necessarily directly, the implementation of the U. S. foreign aid program in the home country."¹ In view of this development, characteristics of the applicant other than those described by Preston in his listing of standard criteria for selection merit careful consideration.

In addition to the general and technical criteria currently used by AID, the following characteristics should receive attention:

a) Strong motivation, both in terms of performance in his prospective job and in terms of the development of his country.

b) Ability as a communicator.

c) Ability and dedication as an active agent of economic and social change in desired directions.

d) Potential as a future leader and institution builder. Americans involved in the selection process need to be sensitized to these factors. This will require some comprehension on their part of the kinds of changes that should be sought and of the institutional and human contexts in which such change has to occur. These Americans should, in turn, be relied on to sensitize their foreign counterparts to the greatest possible extent, especially through the mechanism of the bi-national selection groups mentioned earlier.

7. Since attitudes may be subject to change, negative attitudes toward the United States should not per se bar a candidate's selection for training.

Such personality indicators as flexibility and openness to change would be strategic selection criteria, provided (a) one does not give them undue weight, since they are likely to be much less important than other factors (e.g., position in the home country), and (b) one remembers that

¹"Conference on Non-Technical Aspects of Training: Notes on First Session," p. 2.

existing instruments for assessing receptivity to attitude change do not have the demonstrated validity required for their confident use as selection tools.

In his paper on "Attitude Changes Toward the United States of AID Participant Trainees," Carl Hereford makes the following observation:

Within [the] framework of the process by which attitude change occurs, some consideration can be given to modification of the various parts of the Participant Training Program. In the selection of trainees, for example, it would seem reasonable to add to the existing criteria that of capacity for growth and change in the attitudinal area. The personal flexibility of the individual would become an additional factor in his selection. To follow this position through to conclusion, his existing attitudes toward the United States would become of less importance than his capacity to change these attitudes. The relative weight assigned to the various criteria would certainly have to be thought through at a policy level, but the addition of the criteria of susceptibility to attitude modification would certainly alter the selection procedure.¹

8. It should be recognized that the assessment of leadership or influence potential hinges not only on an assessment of personality characteristics of the candidate but also on his position in the social structure of the participating country. In selecting candidates for training, therefore, it is important to determine the organizational structure to which the trainee will return in order to assess the likelihood that it will allow him to make use of the skills and to actualize the values that he acquires during training.

As Robert Mitchell points out in "Occupations, Organizations, and National Development: The Participant Trainees on Their Return Home,"

the developing countries are sometimes called "new nations"; however, their organizational structures and procedures are often so rigid and inflexible that they seem ancient in comparison with the "old nations." And although it is common for many new nations to emphasize egalitarianism and social democracy, their work organizations tend to be rigidly hierarchical and authoritarian. They centralize decision-making authority in a relatively few official positions, and they tend to narrowly limit the freedom of the mass of workers to initiate fruitful changes in work procedures or organization structure. As a consequence . . . unless . . . [returned trainees] occupy one of the decision-making positions, they will very likely have difficulty in fully utilizing their training.²

¹Carl Hereford, p. 8.

²Robert Mitchell, pp. 57-58.

Mitchell goes on to recommend more research on the structure and growth of elites in participating countries--a research recommendation endorsed in almost every workshop held during the conference. He notes:

Much more research on the structure and growth of elites, as well as on the political and influence structures of new nations, is needed in order to provide a clear understanding of the program's political implications. A more dynamic perspective of national development may indicate that the program has been bypassing tomorrow's elite; whereas intensive analysis of present elites may indicate that there are important social cleavages (ethnic, family, and religious) among elites which limit the likelihood that certain people will be eligible for entry into important positions of influence. Furthermore, negative recruitment may operate in certain occupational spheres, so that those with relatively invidious social characteristics are channeled into quite specific occupations.

There may even be invidious distinctions within single occupations which affect the initial selection of trainees and their ultimate impact on their home countries.

9. In view of the key role work supervisors play in facilitating participants' use of training on return, the possibility that supervisors "should be the first ones to be involved in the training program" merits careful consideration.

Findings from evaluation studies of the Participant Training Program indicate that participants working under supervisors who were trained abroad were not only more likely than others to adjudge their supervisors as "very helpful" in utilizing their training but were also more likely to rank high on an index of training utilization.¹

10. In defining criteria for recruitment and selection of trainees, the question of how many persons in a particular work group need be trained to achieve maximum effectiveness of the training program also merits careful consideration.

Mitchell's observations in this regard are pertinent. He comments:

A policy issue with regard to recruitment of trainees also arises for nonsupervisory colleagues. Here the evaluation reports themselves present an apparent contradiction. On the one hand, the Brazilian report [United States Agency for International Development, Report on Evaluation Survey of Participant Training, Training Branch, U. S. AID Mission to Brazil, 1963] suggests that local work groups are very easily

¹Albert E. Gollin, pp. 178 and 223.

and quickly saturated with training. Each returning trainee passes on his newly acquired know-how to his colleagues. . . . This particular evaluation report suggests that there should be a limit to the number of persons trained in one work group, or that training must be made progressively more advanced for each new student if the training is to have an appreciable influence upon the work of the organization.

On the other hand, other studies argue the "community of innovators" theory. That is, the more foreign-trained workers an organization has, the more likely that a progressive culture receptive to Western-style innovations will develop

The saturation theory and the theory of the community of innovators refer to two different components of the development process. The first refers to the "level of know-how" which is being provided and transferred by the training program; the latter refers to the values and structural bases of support and motivation for the utilization of this know-how. It is quite unlikely that either perspective and its associated policy suggestions can be universally applied to all work situations. Furthermore, it would be folly to opt for either until further research has been conducted. Since the results of such research could have profound implications for the concept and organization of the Participant Training Program, it certainly seems worthwhile to give further research attention to this apparent dilemma.¹ [It is possible, however, that there is no real conflict. The "saturation" theory may apply to the purely technical objectives of training whereas the "innovators" conjecture might be concerned primarily with the non-technical goals--Editor's note.]

11. If the training program is to be multipurpose, a scale of priorities with regard to goals and desired characteristics of the trainee should be established and there should be willingness to accept loss in some areas.

Torre notes:

All too often the ends of a foreign education have been viewed as a single package, and this has led to the selection of candidates who, it is hoped, can fulfill a number of objectives simultaneously. In reality, different ends are achievable by the selection of different types of persons. The issue is one of discerning which ends have higher priorities, so that selection policies will lead to picking individuals who have the best chances of realizing the desired objectives.²

Torre then poses the following set of alternatives for those engaged in selection of foreign students and trainees for study in the United States:

¹ Robert Mitchell, pp. 69-70.

² Mottram Torre, "A Discussion of Selected Aspects of Selection," p. 20.

If immediate transfer of U. S. technology and methods is the objective it can best be accomplished by the selection of older persons who already occupy positions that allow them to innovate. In this connection, it is important to assess power positions in terms of norms rather than in terms of projected American norms

If the objective of selection is not the immediate transfer of U. S. technology and skills but the long-range effect on the country, then there is a fair prospect of an ultimate gain by selecting young people. In local institutions a young employee rarely has the influence or the authority to make important innovations. There is always the possibility though, that in the future he may move up into the higher ranks and eventually occupy a position that allows him to introduce what he has learned abroad years before

If the main purpose is thought to be the development of character and a broad outlook on life among potential social leaders then preference should be accorded to the young. The facts gathered show that individuals in late adolescence and early adulthood change most in their basic habits and are still able to make the transition back to the country without suffering personal disorganization

If the future leadership in the social areas of politics, intellectual affairs, and civic life is not predictable and if the purpose of foreign education is to affect the future social leaders, then it is preferable to choose men and women who come from a wide range of classes and regions and who have a variety of interests because of the present uncertainty in determining from what segments of the nation future leadership will be drawn. More especially, any selection should include people that are currently outside the power structures, as well as those who now have power

No rigorous screening is necessary to select a specific type of person if the objective is to increase the number of persons who have better international understanding. Nearly everyone who studies abroad undergoes a change in his perspective. Hence, there is no reason to argue in favor of selection of any special type of person in order to add to international understanding. Should the purpose be to ensure immediate diffusion of opinions by those who study abroad in a way that will have widespread influence, then it will be necessary to select men and women who already have influence On the other hand, should the purpose be the building up of a general fund of goodwill, whether or not it has any consequences in high policy decisions, then any person qualified for a U. S. education is suitable for selection.

III. PROGRAM PLANNING

Standard Procedures and Common Deviations

In principle, development of the prospective trainee's program is initiated immediately after he has been notified of his selection.

Preston delimits three phases in the process of program development:

Phase 1

A document called the "Project Implementation Order-Participant," or "PIO/P," is prepared, giving complete data on the trainee and as complete a description as possible of the training desired. This document, prepared and approved jointly by the Technician and the Training Officer of the Mission, is reviewed with the trainee, with his supervisor, and with other appropriate officials of his government to assure their understanding of its nature and aims.¹

Phase 2

An endeavor is made to send the completed PIO/P and relevant documents, such as the transcript of the participant's academic record, to Washington sufficiently in advance of the desired starting date for the training so that responsible personnel there can develop with a cooperating institution [e.g., Federal, state and local government agencies, private industries or businesses, or other private institutions] a training program of maximum effectiveness. The rules call for the PIO/P to reach Washington at least 90 days in advance of the start of a nonacademic program and 120 days before the start of an academic program.

.....
In the development of training programs the AID Office of International Training in Washington has the continuing responsibility to locate, evaluate, contact, and make arrangements with special training facilities which may meet basic training needs and the obligation to evaluate facilities for the adequate achievement of training objectives. If a proposed training program is considered feasible and placement at an appropriate institution can be made, AID/W prepares a preliminary program in as great detail as possible and returns it with a cost estimate to the requesting Mission at least 30 days before the starting date for the training.

¹ Harley O. Preston, pp. 35-36.

Phase 3

Normally the returned PIO/P is sent for final review to the prospective trainee, to his supervisor, to the appropriate Minister in the host government and to the Technical Officer in the USAID. When approval of the proposed training has been received from the host government, the individual is called into the Training Office of the USAID for predeparture briefing.

Preston indicates, however, that these standards are frequently not realized in practice. With regard to the first phase in the program development process, he notes:

While complete clarification of the requested training is supposed to be reached before the PIO/P is sent to AID/W, some trainees who may be dissatisfied with the proposed training program do not express this dissatisfaction at this time. Later, upon arrival in the United States, they insist on longer training, on training for a degree, or on different training entirely. The recent evaluation survey of 23 countries revealed that some 60 per cent of the participants did not take part in the planning of their training program.

And in reference to the second and third phases, he observes:

Many times a PIO/P reaches Washington at the last moment, necessitating there a scramble to find a suitable placement for the trainee after university deadlines have expired and sometimes resulting in less than optimum placement.

Because of difficulties in placing an unusual individual, the late receipt of a request from the Mission, or the workload on AID/W personnel and on admissions officers at American universities at peak periods, the return of the PIO/P overseas is sometimes delayed until the last minute before departure is required. Such last-minute notification often results in the departure of trainees after their training programs have started . . . [and] an exhausted and confused trainee, who gets more exhausted and confused on his 18 to 24-hour flight to the United States and his late entrance into a training program.

Conference Recommendations

Procedures

1. Whatever else is done, from the point of view of maximizing the trainee's satisfaction with his program and the applicability of skills

and attitudes to the home situation, it is essential to involve the trainee actively in the development of his own training program.

As Hereford observes in his working paper,

The joint planning of the participant's training program . . . [is] an essential element in the program, if we are to enhance the opportunity for attitude change. If the trainee is to become deeply committed and involved, he must participate fully in the planning stage. This participation should represent a great deal more than just an explanation or a "selling job" by the training officer. The training officer would be in a crucial position in this regard. Not only is he the first representative of the United States with whom a meaningful contact is made, he must also have the sensitivity and capability of genuinely accepting the trainee as a full partner in planning the training experience. This is easily said, but very difficult to do. Yet, this point is a highly significant one in the process of involvement of the trainee. As long as he feels that his program has been handed down from above, he has an emotional "out." It is not his program, it is the program of AID. Therefore, his commitment to it and subsequent involvement in it becomes limited.¹

In addition, active involvement of trainees in planning their programs is perhaps the most effective mechanism for giving participants a clear-cut notion of "the kinds of skills they are expected to acquire"² and for reducing or eliminating resentment on the part of the trainees about certain aspects of their training programs. For example, a unilateral decision to avoid high-prestige U. S. institutions which emphasize basic research in favor of training at institutions with more applied programs may be viewed by the participant as an indication that he is not considered good enough for the better institutions and thereby cause resentment on his part. However, such resentment might well be avoided or at least minimized if he is encouraged to take an active part in the decision process.

¹Carl Hereford, p. 9.

²Robert Mitchell, p. 34.

Findings from the aforementioned evaluation studies show a close correlation between trainees' participation in planning their own program and their predeparture satisfaction with it.

Data from these studies also point up the need for a more concerted effort on the part of AID Mission personnel to involve the trainee actively in the development of his own training program. Only 30 per cent of the participants surveyed "were fully satisfied with their role in planning their training program" and a decided majority (63 per cent) reported they "had no opportunity whatever to shape the content of their program." Further, "three-quarters [of the latter] said that their training would have been better had they done so." Clearly, there is much room for improvement in this aspect of the Participant Training Program's operations.

2. It is equally essential to involve the prospective work supervisor of the trainee actively in the development of the training Program.

The evaluation studies have demonstrated that a key element in the outcome of [a participant's] training is the attitude and actions of his supervisor. Further, as noted above, participants who were working under supervisors who had played an active role in the advance stages of their programming were more likely than those who were working under supervisors who had not been involved in selection and program planning to be high utilizers.

3. Although it is clearly often difficult to conform to the requirement that the PIO/P reach Washington at least 90 days in advance of the start of nonacademic programs and 120 days before the start of an academic program, concerted efforts on the part of all personnel involved in processing the PIO/P to conform to these regulations are strongly recommended.

John Gardner stresses this point in his report on AID and the Universities, noting:

A considerable amount of preparatory effort must go into a good Participant Training Program. To handle groups of participants, it is important that the United States university be given more adequate lead time than it often receives today. It needs time to familiarize itself with the total planned AID effort in the host country, thereby placing its own efforts in the perspective of the total development plan. It needs time to design special training courses, to plan field experiences where necessary, and to assign certain trainees to other more suitable institutions when appropriate.¹

Program content²

4. There is a need to be sure that the training is relevant to the position occupied by the trainee on his return.

The primary consideration in designing the training program must remain the applicability of the skills and occupationally-related attitudes acquired during training to the participant's home environment.

Overtraining.--The possibility of overtraining, especially in the professions, is apparent. For example, if a participant sent to receive medical training in the United States develops the attitude that the only way to be a good physician is by the use of elaborate facilities and devices, in addition to developing a dependence on these devices, he may be incapacitated for practicing medicine at home. If he comes to value only basic research in his specialty, he may find himself both frustrated when he returns and unprepared to contribute to meeting the needs of his society.

The need for special programs in universities.--Since it seems safe to assume that "the major emphasis [in U. S. institutions] will continue to be academic training oriented to job possibilities in the United States despite the fact that foreign students are expected to

¹ John W. Gardner, pp. 15-16.

² Recommendations in this section focus primarily on Participant Training Programs involving extended training at academic institutions in the United States.

return home, selected institutions should be urged, and subsidized to enable them to take action on the urge, to establish special curricula for those whose careers will be spent in attempting to bridge the differences between cultures."¹ At the very least, universities should be encouraged to pay more attention to the special needs of foreign students and to prepare them for life in their own countries rather than in American professional society.

In this regard, John Gardner's remarks on participant training in his report on AID and the Universities are most pertinent. He observes:

Perhaps the most frequently noted deficiency of present university Participant Training Programs is that trainees too often receive training that is only partly relevant to their needs on returning home The fact that the university should tailor special programs and render a multitude of services to AID participants ought to be frankly recognized.²

It should also be recognized, however, that providing special courses for students from developing countries which would have the required emphasis on applying their skills at home may involve the trainee in experiences that create resentment because of status deprivation, insult, paternalism, or involvement in an unequal relationship and thereby foster unfavorable attitudes toward the training program, in specific, and the United States, in general. This possibility would be minimized if (1) the courses were defined not as courses for special people but as courses on special topics (e.g., medicine in a setting removed from hospital facilities); (2) Americans and students from other industrialized countries interested in the particular topic (because they are planning to work in developing countries or in underdeveloped pockets in their own countries)

¹Forrest G. Moore, pp. 69-71.

²John W. Gardner, p. 17. Recent special programs of AID, involving summer training of foreign students and communications seminars, are steps taken in recognition of this need.

participated in the course; and (3) if these courses were presented as high-prestige courses because of the special challenge involved.

Out-of class education activities.--Moore suggests that it may be "in the cocurricular that there is enough flexibility to make what one is exposed to immediately relevant to the problems of his own society." This possibility merits consideration in the program planning phase of the Participant Training Program.

It may prove fruitful to incorporate "quality out-of-class activities" into programs of particular participants. For example, Moore observes:

Economists and comparative education experts have pointed out that there appears to be in newly developing countries a relationship between improvement in educational level and economic development. They hastento add that entrepreneurship appears also to play a part in this process. Does the business community have the interest and the skill to translate the tactics of private enterprise into effective tools for use in countries where industries are subject to national controls? If so, this would seem to be an area in which a creative relating of both American and foreign students, near completion of academic programs, to American businessmen with expertise might begin to put academic learning into practical perspective. How about an Institute in which American businessmen could demonstrate the tools and techniques of effective use of capital, labor, and production . . . under varying types of government control?

The need for more research on occupations.--To formulate training programs applicable to the trainee's home environment, we need to know more about occupations in developing countries. As Mitchell points out:

Little is known about the relative importance of various skills and activities contributing to the overall success of a person in his work roles, but the information that is available suggests that the mixture of skills and tasks differs by country and by occupation. Therefore, skills central to successful occupational performance in one country may only be of peripheral significance in other countries.

Research on . . . these issues is needed in order to properly formulate training programs for particular occupations, development projects, and individual nations.¹

¹Robert Mitchell, pp. 36-37.

5. Insofar as the Participant Training Program is aimed at the introduction of attitudes and values essential to social and economic development in the countries which AID is assisting, there is a need to make participant trainees knowledgeable about the process and problems of economic development.

The lack of this kind of information can decrease the effectiveness of the returned trainee. For example, instruction should be given in the social and political context within which U. S. development has taken place and training should emphasize the fact that this development involved more than specific techniques and equipment.

6. Training programs should probably include an orientation to general managerial skills for all participants in anticipation of upward mobility across functional lines beyond the extension of training.

As Mitchell points out:

If the trainee successfully applies his new skills, he will very likely be rewarded by a promotion Therefore, the narrower the range of training skills provided, and the more technical rather than managerial these skills are, . . . the more likely the training experience will have only a temporary impact on the trainee's work capabilities.

In brief, a training program which focuses on acquisition of a narrow range of technical skills may, in the long run, be self-defeating.

7. In formulating training programs, every effort should be made to build in opportunities for the participant (a) to give more while he is receiving his training and (b) to observe and interact with U. S. culture.

Judging from available information, both kinds of opportunities are crucial to the development of favorable attitudes toward the United States. As Hereford says:

Attitudes are not changed in the abstract, they cannot be taught and are probably only fleetingly influenced by even the most skillful propaganda. Attitudes develop out of personal experience and involvement.¹

One possible way to help the participant balance the "giving-receiving equation" would be to build into his training program some

¹Carl Hereford, p. 11

opportunities to make use of his existing skills or knowledge. For example, trainees sent to academic institutions might be encouraged to serve as resource persons in relevant courses. Another possibility is to include as part of training special courses, institutes, seminars, or meetings focused on topics of interest to both trainees and Americans concerned with problems in developing countries or in underdeveloped areas of their own country. Such gatherings would not only provide trainees with an opportunity to contribute from their own experiences but would also involve them in a setting where the possibility of establishing reciprocal, give-and-take relationships with Americans is enhanced.

Variety in the training program is also an important consideration. "The combination programs of academic training, on-the-job work experience, and observational visits offer the trainee a much broader opportunity to observe and interact with U. S. culture"¹ than, say, a program confined to academic training on one or even several campuses

In this regard, continuing experimentation with summer seminars for trainees involved in long-term academic programs is to be recommended. It might also be desirable to provide such trainees with opportunities to study American history and institutions during the academic year, provided that courses offered in this area involve free-ranging discussions and are neither dull nor aimed at conversion or persuasion. It is further recommended that training programs of academic participants be arranged so that summer seminars and/or study of American history and institutions occur in the middle of their sojourn rather than at the beginning or the end since the potential values of such activities go beyond initial orientation and final debriefing.

¹Carl Hereford, p. 11.

8. It should be recognized that short-term observation tours are likely to be the least productive in terms of the technical goals of the Participant Training Program.

As Mitchell observes:

Relative low level of success [in utilization and transmission of training on return] . . . for lower-level occupational groups who have been exposed to short observation tours . . . is to be expected. There is a limit or ceiling to effectiveness Relative ineffectiveness among trainees on short observation tours to acquire high-level or wide ranges of skills also is to be expected, since such tours are not appropriate means to provide such skills.¹

Findings from the recent evaluation studies point to the same conclusion. They show that the least effective types [of program] in terms of later use of training were the observation tour or special group program, when it was the sole form of training that was experienced. Further, they show a strong correlation between duration of training and subsequent utilization: the longer the period of training, the higher the utilization.

9. It should also be recognized that observational tours and short-term training programs of whatever type are least likely to encourage the development of favorable attitudes toward the United States.

Hereford notes:

Observational visits . . . appear to offer little opportunity for attitude change. The individual is not highly involved. He comes to observe, not to participate. He is also insulated from the environment by the group he is with and by the AID person who makes all the arrangements and takes care of the details. In addition, much of his information comes through the selective filter of an interpreter.

He also observes:

The length of the training period is of great importance in terms of attitude change. The period of culture shock is highly variable from individual to individual, lasting from perhaps a few weeks to several months, but it always takes some time to adjust to a new environment. This period is frequently accompanied by a negative reaction, sometimes quite strong, toward the environment A certain amount of paranoia creeps into the thinking of the person

¹Robert Mitchell, p. 34.

undergoing culture shock. Things are not just difficult, obstacles are deliberately being placed in his way. People are not just strangers, but become enemies. As understanding and acceptance take place and adjustment occurs, these feelings disappear, but if the trainee is returned home during this period, his overall reaction is likely to be quite negative. In terms of time, a training program of less than six months duration should be carefully evaluated in the light of the individual trainee's background and experience.

Findings from the evaluation studies are of limited relevance here since for various reasons participants' attitudes toward the United States were not explored. It is worth noting, however, that these findings indicate that on almost every measure of satisfaction with training used in the study--with its technical and non-technical aspects, its career impact, its general value, etc.--the longer the program's duration the higher the proportion of satisfied trainees.

Selection of Training Site

10. Those who place trainees in colleges in the United States must continue to give careful consideration to the ways in which various institutions' curricular programming meshes with individual training needs and agency responsibilities.

In this regard, the following factors merit attention:

a) the quality of the courses offered in the trainee's specialty, their applicability to the participant's home country, and their level, relative to the trainee's learning potential,

b) the availability of courses of general interest to students from developing countries, e. g., courses on the economic development process, and

c) the availability of area programs relating to the trainee's region or other special programs offering participants opportunities to give more while receiving training.

To facilitate better placement of participants sent on academic programs, systematic compilation of information on curricular programming of U. S. colleges and universities is recommended.

11. Equally important to the effectiveness of the trainee in his training situation and his use of the acquired knowledge and skill when he returns to his home country as well as to his attitudes toward the United States, "is placing students in educational institutions where investigation has shown that attention will be given to the personal needs of the participants."¹

As Moore notes, both the number and the quality of "advisers, counselors, and administrators who have, as a share of their work load, foreign students in general and AID participants in particular" vary from campus to campus. On some campuses, "the foreign student finds a variety of these specialists engrossed in adding intellectual depth to his education, . . . [reducing] tensions and frustrations of study abroad, including minimizing of the time spent satisfying federal, local, and university regulations, . . . [and providing] assistance in locating housing, borrowing money, learning sufficient English, and adapting to the system." On others, "a single individual performs most of these functions [and] often his perceived qualifications for the assignment relate more to experience than to training."

The extent to which faculty members are oriented toward doing a good job with foreign students also varies from campus to campus and from one department to another on a particular campus.

At present, Moore asserts, we do not know enough about colleges and universities in the United States "so that we can advise that students from certain countries and certain fields of study should be directed to and away from certain institutions." More research on the campus

¹Forrest G. Moore, p. 85.

environments in which foreign students are trained is needed. One product of this research might be a handbook of American universities from the foreign student's point of view. Such a handbook would be helpful to AID personnel in the field and in Washington who are responsible for recommending and deciding upon training sites.

Moore's observation on campuses including concentrations of AID participants, based on information about the 3,184 participants in the United States during 1964-65 attending colleges and universities is worth mentioning here. He notes:

Most institutions with groupings of AID participants are not known to have programs of strength in either an office manned by an adviser to foreign students nor in student personnel services generally.

Judging from this remark, there is a clear need for more systematic information on the adequacy of orientation and counseling services available to foreign students on various American campuses and on variations in the faculty's capacity for and interest in helping participant trainees to become effective agents of economic and social change in their home countries.

12. The "strength and flexibility of the communication net linking AID supervisors to college counterparts" as well as the proximity of "several types of AID designated institutional centers . . . for research, for counseling and psychotherapy, if needed, and for special courses in English and educational procedures" should also be considered in placement of trainees on various U. S. campuses.¹

13. Insofar as the Participant Training Program is aimed not only at the transfer of technical know-how but also at the development of favorable attitudes toward the United States, the extent to which training sites within this country offer opportunities for participants to become involved in meaningful and satisfying relations with Americans must also be considered by those responsible for deciding where participants will receive training.

¹Forrest G. Moore, pp. 2, 85.

Communities--campus and noncampus--differ in the number and quality of organizations interested in providing foreign visitors with opportunities to establish personal relations with Americans.¹ They also differ with respect to the number of businessmen and residents in general who are likely to subject "foreigners" to negative experiences, for example, overt or covert racial discrimination.

Here again, systematic information is lacking. The National Directory of Community Organizations Serving Short-Term Visitors and "the NAFSA Directory, published by the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, which lists the foreign student advisers on the different campuses as well as other college and community leaders with responsibilities for foreign students,"² represent a first step toward filling this gap.

14. It might be advisable for AID to explore the implications for realization of Agency goals of variations in the political environment of United States campuses.

Can the goals of training programs be attained at certain universities with a tradition of political activity by its foreign students? On the one hand, AID clearly does not want to foster ferment against the host country. On the other hand, it does want to foster the views of democratic freedom.

15. Participants who are either physically unfit or who manifest an abnormal amount of anxiety require special handling and placement while in the United States.

As Torre points out:

The maintenance of the physical health of the participant trainee who is healthy is quite adequately accomplished through the normal medical support available in almost all training sites. The physically unfit who is selected in spite of his infirmity requires special handling. This includes early recognition of the infirmity, and communication of

¹For a general discussion of this point, see Forrest G. Moore, pp. 53-55 and 57.

²Harley O. Preston, P. 22.

this to the person responsible for planning the placement in the U. S., so that he can be placed in a training experience which is not beyond his physical capacities, and where specialized medical support (or monitoring) is available.¹

Similarly, trainees with an abnormal amount of anxiety should be identified and given additional help before departure, as well as special placement and handling when in the United States. Whenever possible, they should be assigned to a training site at which transcultural counselors who understand the problems of the foreign student are available.

16. The development of techniques and systematic information which would permit the typing of participants destined for academic training in the United States by their personality needs and of educational institutions by the amount and type of stress in their environment merits careful consideration.

Such techniques and information "would allow us to more intelligently match student and college environment"² and would thereby help to minimize "the development of emotional difficulty with consequent loss of satisfaction and productivity"³ during the training period.

Intensive case studies of participant trainees who fail to complete their programs or who experience more than the average amount of difficulty during their training period might provide a fruitful starting point for research on these factors. Such studies would also have relevance for those responsible for pretraining orientation and in-training counseling of participants.

¹Mottram Torre, "A Discussion of Selected Aspects of Orientation and Health Maintenance of the Participant Trainee," p. 3.

²Forrest G. Moore, p. 3.

³Mottram Torre, ". . . Orientation and Health Maintenance," p. 4.

17. We need to know more about the relative advantages of scattering foreign students on many campuses versus concentrating them in a few selected universities with special facilities and experience.

The alternatives include one large university for foreign students like the USSR's Patrice Lumumba University; a group of twenty to thirty institutions considered to be "chosen instruments," and a wide scattering of students among various institutions. Each of these alternatives doubtless has significant implications for the various goals of the Participant Training Program.

Judging from information on the location of the nearly 4,000 participants attending colleges and universities in the United States during 1964-65, the current AID practice is to assign trainees to a wide variety of locales. In that academic year, participants were scattered across 50 states, registered in 298 institutions.

To facilitate research on the relative advantages of dispersal versus concentration of AID-sponsored students and other topics as well, Moore recommends that attention be given to placement of students "in such a manner as to have available in selected institutions experimental and control groups of students from the same country or area of the world." As he points out:

Strategic placement of AID-sponsored students will allow educational institutions to undertake some of the basic research studies needed, make available service facilities which can be used by all the institutions in a given area, and stimulate interinstitutional cooperation in the planning and management of programs that will benefit all foreign students and strengthen programs of the cooperating universities.¹

¹Forrest G. Moore, pp. 85-86.

18. It should be recognized that third country training offers limited opportunities for participants to observe and interact with United States culture and, in turn, for modification of attitudes toward the United States.

In terms of applicability of training received, ease of adjustment to the training environment, and the broadening of "the training base of the Free World and [the development of] bilateral and multilateral technical and cultural ties that create or reinforce a community of interest among countries participating in these programs,"¹ third country training might well be desirable. In terms of developing an understanding of and favorable attitudes toward the United States, it is not.

As at other points in the execution of the Participant Training Program, a scale of priorities with regard to goals of particular training programs should be established and there should be a willingness to accept loss in some areas.

In this regard, findings from the evaluation studies are of interest. They show that participants trained in third countries (with the exception of those trained at Far Eastern sites) were more likely to express satisfaction with several non-technical aspects (i.e., funds allotted to them, the amount of free time they had, and arranged social activities) of their training programs than those who went to the United States. Conversely, third country trainees were less likely to express satisfaction with the technical aspects of their programs (i.e., length, level, and variety) and were also less likely to rank high on the index of training utilization.

¹"AID Participant Training Procedures and Costs," AID memo, March 8, 1965, p. 14.

- 41 -

IV. ORIENTATION AND COUNSELING

1. Pretraining Orientation

Standard Procedures and Common Deviations

Pretraining orientation of participants destined for training in the United States is divided into three major stages: (1) predeparture briefings in their home country, (2) orientation in Washington D. C., and, (3) orientation at training site, for those who will receive the bulk of their training at one institution (e.g., on programs devoted entirely, or primarily, to academic training).

Predeparture Briefings

Each participant is supposed to confer with the Training Office in the United States Mission on at least three separate occasions prior to departure for training. Preston describes the ideal procedure as follows:

At the first conference [which takes place soon after the participant's selection for training], the objectives of the training program are discussed with the prospective trainee, . . . biographical data are checked, and preliminary briefing is given on such subjects as health arrangements, use of automobile, insurance, stop-overs, passport and visa information, cash, travelers' checks, pay, etc. The trainee is given an opportunity to raise any questions. To the greatest degree possible, published materials are made available to the trainee that deal with aspects of his training as well as general books about the United States and the technical field in which he will be studying.

It is at [the] second conference [called after the PIO/P is returned from Washington and the host government has approved the proposed training] that the prospective trainee is given a workbook to fill out. This book is designed to develop in his mind the training program objectives which have been agreed upon. He and the Technician or Training Officer work out specific written statements which clarify content, priorities and emphasis in the proposed training.

When a "call forward" is received by the Mission from a Program Development Officer in AID/W, . . . the [trainee] is called into the Mission for a third conference at least ten days before his scheduled departure. This third conference often lasts a full day and is divided into two parts. In part one, his travel documents are given a final check. He is given travel instruction, his ticket, and usually an advance of funds. The second and more important part of the conference is a briefing to help him in his initial encounter with the United States.

This orientation does not duplicate the orientation which will take place at the Washington International Center after his arrival in the United States, but deals rather with those special difficulties which the Training Officer believes may occur because of the particular cultural and occupational background of the particular individual. . . .

The purpose of this third conference is to reassure the trainee and his family, to ease his first days of adjustment, and to lay a foundation for a relationship with the USAID Mission which should continue after his return.¹

Data from the evaluation studies indicate that deviations from this model have been frequent in the past. As noted above, only 30 per cent of the participants surveyed were fully satisfied with their role in planning their training program and 63 per cent reported they had no opportunity whatever to shape the content of their program. Hence, it would appear, as Preston concludes in his review of AID operations, that "the values of using the predeparture orientation contacts for establishing rapport, for giving the individual a sense of control over his life, and for forming a basis of cooperative work upon return" are not being realized as fully as they might be were standard predeparture briefing procedures followed more closely in the field.

Washington Orientation

Generally, participants sent to the United States for training receive their initial stateside orientation in Washington, D. C. This orientation, usually six days in duration, is described by Preston as including (1) an introduction to the culture of the United States via a program of "lectures,

¹Harley O. Preston, pp. 35, 39-41.

seminars, library readings, and short visits to local historical places" conducted by the Washington International Center, (2) attendance at a required orientation meeting at AID/W, and (3) a conference with a Program Development Officer.

The Washington International Center, operated by the Meridian House Foundation since 1961, arranges to meet the participant trainees upon arrival in Washington, assists them in getting hotel rooms during their orientation period, and schedules a program of lectures and discussions about life in the United States. The latter deal with such subjects as customs in daily living, government and politics, the family, education, race relations, and the U. S. economy. Speakers and leaders of discussion groups are drawn usually from the local community and its universities. The center also plans evening and community activities to encourage the trainees to engage in social functions as soon as possible.

At the AID/W orientation meeting, usually a group session, each trainee receives very specific instructions on what shall be required of him while in the United States and is told of the mutual obligations between him and AID.

Immediately after his group orientation at AID/W, the trainee generally meets with his Program Development Officer for the first time.

Preston notes:

For those on short-term observational tours, this meeting may be brief and relatively impersonal since the trainee will be under the continuous guidance of a trained leader or manager. For those in academic programs, the meeting is highly important and personal since it will establish an official relationship that will exist until the trainee is back in his homeland. It is the responsibility of the Program Development Officer to monitor all aspects of the training of those individuals assigned to him; it is the trainee's responsibility and obligation to keep his PDO informed of his training activities and any academic or social problems that may occur.

Apparently most major deviations in the Washington orientation of trainees are occasioned by time limitations. According to Preston, 'while six days is the usual period [for the Washington International Center's program], many [participant trainees] spend less than three before they must proceed to third formal training elsewhere.' He also notes that variations in the initial meeting with the Program Development Officer may be traced back not only to differences in style and experience of the 40 to 50 PDO's (who are expected to be 'equally proficient in two generally uncorrelated skills . . . attention to small details of programming and effective interpersonal relations with persons of different cultural backgrounds') but also to 'different peak work loads the PDO's encounter.'

For college-bound trainees, August is a peak month. The work of this month is further complicated by trainees from the French-speaking countries who generally do not complete their school year until July, and there is insufficient time for biographical data to be sent to the PDO for his consideration in either programming or in orienting the trainee.

Orientation at Training Site

Because training institutions differ, standard procedures relating to initial orientation of participants at their training sites are minimal. AID is expected to provide appropriate officers at the training institution with advance information about the trainee; in turn, the training institution is expected to communicate directly with the participant's Program Development Officer about any adjustment problems, academic difficulties, and illnesses.

Apparently even these minimal regulations are occasionally not observed. Sometimes training institutions cannot be informed until the last moment on whom to expect. Conversely, sometime the standard procedure

of notifying the Program Development Officer when serious problems arise is ignored or postponed with resulting personal and legal complications.

Conference Recommendations

General

1. If pretraining orientation is to be done properly and in different places at different times, it should be planned in concert and show a progression in its content.

In order to be able to make more informed decisions about what to deal with in orientation when and where (e.g., in the home country, in Washington, at the training site on arrival or at some point thereafter), better bookkeeping on what types of problems come up, for what kinds of participants, and at what stage, is needed. Evaluation studies of orientation programs now in use, especially that of the Washington International Center, would also be valuable. These and other studies of various approaches to orientation and problems of foreign students would help to define aims of orientation and criteria for judging them. Studies of foreign student problems might well include American students within their purview so as to see which problems are characteristic mainly of foreign students, and which are shared by both groups.

2. The phenomenon of "culture shock" should be treated more extensively in pretraining orientation sessions.

As Hereford points out:

The orientation periods, both predeparture and in Washington, should serve to reduce the time required for adjustment to the training situation or, in other words, to cushion the culture shock It seems obvious that the more smoothly the transition from home country to training situation can be made, the more positive the effect on the trainee will be.

¹ Carl Hereford, p. 9.

For participants whose training involves living and working (or studying) in a foreign environment for several months or more, it is almost inevitable that they will, at some point in their sojourn, suffer from "anomie, alienation and communication failure."¹ Such experiences cannot be eliminated, and from the point of view of attitude change and the eventual favorable impact of the training program on participants, it is questionable that they should be. Those participants who experience culture shock may be the most likely in the long run to show the changes desired.

On the other hand, if awareness or anticipation of the phenomenon is built into pretraining orientation sessions, it is possible to cushion the culture shock to some extent. "Anticipatory guidance" at this stage would assist the trainee "in maintaining his mental health by helping him anticipate the kinds of stresses and strains he will meet and develop the coping mechanisms necessary to successfully deal with the stresses of . . . living in the United States" or in the case of third-country trainees, in other foreign countries.²

In determining how much anticipatory guidance is desirable, and at what stage or stages in the pretraining orientation process it might most profitably be introduced, the Peace Corps experience might prove valuable.³ However, it seems clear that careful study is needed to find out how much anticipatory guidance is desirable--how much makes a difference to participants' adjustment to their training situation.

¹Forrest G. Moore, p. 40

²Mottram Torre, ". . . Selected Aspects of Orientation and Health Maintenance . . .," p. 17.

³Torre cites two papers on Peace Corps: "Mental Health Implications of the Peace Corps Program," presented by Harold H. Morris, Jr. and Harold Dillon at a meeting held by the Peace Corps in March 1963 on use of behavioral scientists, and Thomas Marezki's article on "Transitional Training," presented at the 23rd Annual Meeting of the Society for Applied Anthropology in San Juan, March 1964.

3. In pretraining orientation, a more adult treatment would be beneficial in many cases.

For example, in preparing participant trainees for their sojourn in the United States, differences in the mores of the United States and the country of origin, and the effects of adhering to social norms of their own country in the United States should be pointed out. However, trainees should be treated as adults; AID should not insist that they try to adopt American standards.

Predeparture Orientation

4. Predeparture orientation should start to acquaint participant trainees with symptoms of culture shock.

If this is done well, some potential trainees may decide (quite correctly) that they would prefer not to come, thus eliminating some of those who are most likely to experience severe maladjustment.

In his paper on orientation and health maintenance, Torre makes the following suggestions in this regard:

The behavioral science information available strongly indicates the need to arrange for the P. T. to receive some orientation into the human relations aspects of adjustment to the United States [prior to departure]. This might be accomplished by having the host government take the prime responsibility for predeparture orientation in this area, or by expanding USAID predeparture orientation to include this element

Properly used, returned P.T.'s, and other nationals who have been abroad can be of great help by sharing their own experiences with the prospective trainee. They can give . . . [him] an opportunity to hear of the kinds of human relations that are encountered (including racial discrimination) and . . . to measure his own human relations skills against the reality of the proposed trip. Some kind of written material (prepared by the foreign country perhaps in consultation with USAID personnel) might also prove useful.

.
Most of the United States Overseas agencies have developed . . . a pamphlet [detailing stresses and strains one might expect to encounter in a foreign country] to give to American personnel going overseas, as have some of the U. N. agencies and international non-governmental agencies It might be useful to provide to each U. S. AID mission a collection of several [such pamphlets], so

that the local personnel responsible for developing the local orientation material can pick and choose from them that material which seems most applicable

A pamphlet of this kind is useful only if there is available someone with whom the P. T. can express his own doubts about his abilities to cope with the various kinds of stresses and strains indicated. It can provide a guide to the areas of discussion which should be thoroughly gone into in predeparture orientation sessions¹

5. In preparing the trainee for his period abroad, it would be useful to equip him to contribute more while he is receiving his training.

Although research on the "giving-receiving" ratio is definitely needed, what little data are available indicate that opportunities for the trainee to make contributions of his own will enhance not only his involvement but also his self-esteem.

Torre suggests some ways in which participants may be prepared in the predeparture period to give more while they are receiving training. This may be done, for example, through "backstopping by the cultural attache of the country or by having the local university professors develop special content materials on the history of the country of origin, its culture, politics, economics, and so forth."

6. As one mechanism for working out guidelines for orientation overseas, training officers from the countries in each region might hold periodic seminars to exchange experiences.

Such sessions might also lead to the development of an orientation handbook based on the experiences of many AID Missions.

7. To improve the quality of predeparture orientation, personnel trained in orientation should be stationed at as many overseas missions as feasible. In addition, orientation specialists from Washington should visit other missions frequently, taking orientation materials with them and instructing local personnel in their use.

¹Mottram Torre, ". . . Selected Aspects of Orientation and Health Maintenance . . .," pp. 8 and 11.

8. Successful former participant trainees should be used in group sessions to help orient those who are about to leave for the United States.

On the one hand, Torre points out, this practice would provide the prospective trainee with an opportunity "to hear how others fared and how they eventually mastered their own situation overseas" and might thereby help to reduce his anxiety or insecurity in the new situation. On the other, it might prove to be an excellent follow-up mechanism for maintaining the returned participant's interest in and commitment to the Participant Training Program and its goals.

Washington Orientation

9. Washington orientation should continue the process started overseas of anticipating problems and explaining to participants how they may be able to deal with them on their own or where they can find assistance. It should also summarize and consolidate the experience of the trainee up to that time.

There are many more anthropologists, psychiatrists, and other specialists, working in Washington, D. C. than in either the home countries of the participants or most United States training centers. Hence, opportunities to provide trainees destined to receive their training in the United States with anticipatory guidance are more abundant at this juncture of their pretraining orientation than at any other stage. In view of this consideration, the possibility of expanding the Washington orientation to include a major portion of the anticipatory guidance deemed necessary to facilitate participants' early adjustment to their particular training situations merits careful consideration. In designing and executing this aspect of the Washington orientation program, full use should be made of the abundant resource personnel in the area.

10. In Washington orientation sessions, use might be made of Americans who have had similar experiences abroad (e.g., Peace Corps Volunteers) and of foreign personnel who have already been in the United States.

11. Those responsible for orientation of participant trainees in Washington, and at their training sites as well, should be alerted to the possibility that decisions regarding who shall welcome participants on arrival have implications for the subsequent adjustment of the visitor.

It is sometimes assumed that the foreigner wants to be welcomed on his first arrival by an American. On the contrary, he might want his first welcome from somebody from the same area and with similar experience. He may need to talk with somebody who can say, and really mean it, "Why, I know exactly what you mean."

Since first impressions may well be lasting ones, more information is needed on whom participants want to meet on arrival, both in Washington and at their training site. However, participants' desires in this regard are not the only factor meriting consideration. It is possible, for example, that being met by a person from one's own country or region facilitates insulation from the new environment and impedes the process of building relationships with Americans. Hence, we also need to know the effect of the way in which the participant is first greeted on his subsequent adjustment.

Orientation at the Training Site

12. Universities and other training institutions should be aware of what has already been done by way of orientation overseas and in Washington.

There is little doubt that some academic trainees (e.g., those who arrive in the United States after classes are underway) receive little or no systematic orientation either to the culture of the United States or to the situation in their assigned training institutions while others are

oriented excessively. The frequency with which both extremes occur may be reduced (a) by concerted efforts on the part of Mission personnel and AID/W to adhere to the required lead times stipulated in regulations governing program stages and (b) by strengthening the communication net linking AID personnel to college counterparts.

13. In order to facilitate the participant's entry into his training settings, every effort should be made to provide him with a continuing, stable, and readily available source of information and advice during his settling-in period.

As Moore observes, "the importance of continuity and stability of relationship during these early days has been pointed out by a number of those who have studied the reaction of foreign students and visitors to the American experience."¹

One possible way of filling this need on American campuses would be to assign to each participant trainee, during the first week or two of his stay, a carefully selected and trained American student to act as his guide and informal adviser. Moore reports that this plan is "advocated by a number of educators."²

14. Persons responsible for orienting participants at their training sites should be alerted to the possibility that too much orientation immediately after arrival may be as detrimental to the participant's adjustment to his new surroundings as too little orientation.

In discussing orientation of foreign students on American campuses, Moore calls attention to the fact that "the content, the manner in which ideas are expressed, and the timing of information given have been much

¹Forrest G. Moore, p. 17

²This plan is described in John Bennett, Herbert Passin and Robert K. McKnight, In Search of Identity (Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1958), p. 311.

criticized." As a case in point, he cites the following passage from Bennett, Passin, and McKnight's In Search of Identity:

The American university guidance staff, or its officials, often conceive of the foreign student as "lost"; that is, "away from home" as the freshman is away from home, and seek to induct him into the university community in a manner similar to that used for the freshman. But the "lost-ness" of many overseas students is a different thing and requires different treatment. It demands recognition of the basic strangeness of American life styles to the overseas visitor; therefore, by bringing him into close rapport with the American student community, or presenting the university to him in the guise of a substitute parent, it may force upon him the very strangeness that he rejects. He may be better off if he is permitted to remain uninvolved for a while, and, with some expert counseling, is permitted to observe the culture of the university for himself. Orientation and counseling should perhaps be designed not to bring the mature foreign student into the total student community, but rather to help him interpret American culture patterns.

Clearly, more research is needed on various approaches to orientation and on the optimal times at which certain types of orientation should be given if AID is to improve the effectiveness of its pretraining orientation programs.

2. Intraining Counseling

Standard Procedures and Common Deviations

Since November 1964, the Office of International Training has included an Orientation and Counseling Division "whose specialized staff works closely with . . . community hospitality groups and foreign student advisers, and, upon reference from Program Development Officers, may deal directly with individual trainees who are experiencing personal or social difficulties."¹

¹Harley O. Preston, p. 21 All other quotations in this section come from his working paper.

Special problems of participants on observation tours are generally handled by the program manager who accompanies teams on such tours.

Problems of academic trainees are usually handled by the foreign student adviser on the campus.

In addition,

each trainee is covered by health and accident insurance, including hospitalization. In case of illness, treatment is administered and the cognizant Program Development Officer is notified. Most colleges and universities provide medical care for their students and the participant trainees are thus included. When long-term treatment is required, AID usually arranges with the participating country for its trainee to return home.

The quality of the assistance participants receive in meeting the unfamiliar situations they encounter during their sojourn in a foreign country and in solving their personal problems varies. As Preston observes:

Training institutions . . . vary in their facilities to provide trainees with needed counseling and guidance. All are not equal in the quality of their foreign student advisers Not all are able to take appropriate action in cases of physical or mental illness, social discrimination, or financial difficulty.

At present, Program Development Officers are being requested to advise the Counseling Division immediately "of each serious and potentially serious problem that comes to their attention and to initiate a 'Participant Case Record' which will keep all interested persons advised on developments and the remedial actions taken." In addition, "the existence and capabilities" of the Counseling Division "are being systematically called to the attention of all foreign students and academic advisers by AID/W as a professional service now available to them."

Conference Recommendations

1. No matter how effective pretraining orientation is, it can only cushion the culture shock for participants whose training programs require them to live and work in a foreign culture for several months or more. Hence, every effort should be made to ensure that all such participants have ready access to counseling and support services either at their training site or from a central source near this site.¹ Such services should be aimed not only at helping participants handle crises but also at making them self-supporting as quickly as possible.

As Hereford points out:

Orientation by necessity occurs before the individual has really come to grips with his new environment [It] is essentially an intellectual process. The real emotional coming-to-grips with the environment occurs when the trainee goes to work.²

Moore's comments on the persistent problems of foreign students on American campuses are also relevant. He notes:

Every study of foreign students mentions at least four problems that tend to linger throughout the student's stay in the United States and that cause nonadjustive behavior ranging from anxiety to psychotic reaction and require treatment ranging from adviser to counselor reassurance in an office setting to psychotherapy in a hospital ward.

These problems and a brief description of their effect on the academic experience are:

1. Problems of communication--range from severe to mild and cause students to waste their own time and money and stretch institutional resources and patience. Lack of English proficiency is a prime cause of academic failure, difficulties in social adjustment, and usually causes financial problems.
2. Problems of academic performance--few students are able initially to perform at the level their previous work would predict or at a level satisfactory to their internal demands.

¹John Gardner stresses this same point in his short discussion of "Participant Training" in AID and the Universities, noting (on pp. 16-17):

Despite the fact that they average 29 years of age, participants normally require much the same services that are desirable for all our foreign students We would urge [therefore] that somehow all participants receive some measure of attention. They have much to gain, for example, by frequent individual and collective consultation on substantive matters as well as opportunities for counseling, hospitality, and extracurricular activities. There is ample evidence that extracurricular activities and adjustment may greatly enhance or detract from the training experience.

²Carl Hereford, p. 19.

??
Y

3. Problems of inadequate or marginal resources--most foreign students are using resources needed by another member of their family and are in constant competition for limited university scholarship funds.

4. Problems of social adjustment--if the foreign student fails to adjust socially he suffers from a feeling of loneliness; if he does adjust he has feelings of guilt about his views of his own society and is pulled along toward even greater integration among his contemporaries with loss of identity and lowered motivation to return home.

Around these four problem areas most of the foreign students in difficulty flounder with different levels of involvement, comprehension, and hope of solution. Each of the four problems can, if severe enough in effect, cause the student to fail in the achievement of his goals and to deteriorate psychologically. The discovery, description and solution of these difficulties is the preoccupation of those individuals directly concerned with foreign student welfare: the adviser to foreign students, counselors, psychologists, academic advisers and Health Service psychiatrists.

To maximize the number of participants who have ready access to quality counseling services at their training site, Moore suggests that more attention should be devoted, at the program planning stage, to placement of trainees in institutions "where investigation has shown that attention will be given to the personal needs of the participants."

In addition, expansion of the capabilities of the Office of International Training's Orientation and Counseling Division might be considered. For example, Torre suggests that it might be valuable to hire, when needed, a number of professionals with experience in rendering aid to foreign students "who could be called upon for consultation in areas near where they work." He further notes:

If [such professionals] would accomplish their consultation on the student crisis, by working as a teacher-consultant to the less skilled counseling person, who is available to the trainee at many sites, rather than dealing directly with the trainee, some of the local counselors would gradually develop this kind of cross-cultural counseling expertise. As a result, the local counselor would be able

¹ However, as Moore notes, "students supported by AID scholarships do not face the same kinds of financial worries as do the privately supported students."

to render more help to all foreign students for whom he has responsibility without further need of outside consultation.¹

2. Counseling and orientation personnel should be alerted to the tendency of foreign students with problems to attribute their difficulties to (a) the system or the bureaucracy, (b) the fact that they are foreigners, or (c) their present situation in the training country. Although in many instances, their analysis of the source of their problems may be correct, it is important to explore with them the possibility that their difficulties may stem, in part or entirely, from other sources.

For example, Moore reports that "research studies . . . show that most foreign students overrate their ability to manage the American educational system" and that many are shocked "when the first quarter marks are issued and they find themselves, often for the first time, not at the top of the class but often in the middle of the grade range or even at or near the bottom." He also remarks that "this is usually a temporary situation for the foreign student unless he continues to hold the system rather than himself responsible for his low grades."² In such situations, it is the responsibility of counseling personnel to encourage the student to direct his energies away from finding fault with the system and toward positive efforts to improve his academic performance.

Moore also reports that studies of American student adaptation to the campus show that American students encounter many of the same problems in their settling-in period as foreign students. The introduction of such information into discussions with foreign students who tend to attribute their difficulties to the fact that they are foreign might prove beneficial. It is for this reason that future studies of problems of foreign students should include Americans within their purview. This would permit an assessment of the extent to which problems of foreign students on United States campuses are or are not unique.

¹Mottram Torre, ". . . Selected Aspects of Orientation and Health Maintenance. . .," p. 25.

²Forrest G. Moore, p. 38-39.

The possibility most likely to be overlooked by both the foreign student and his counselor is that the difficulties the student is experiencing may not spring from his present situation at all. For instance, Dr. Dallas Pratt, a pioneer in the field of transcultural psychiatry, reports that many of the emotional conflicts of foreign students who consulted him in his capacity as a New York psychotherapist "had little or nothing to do with educational travel, or with the impact of an alien culture."¹ He comments further:

This is not to say that students have no problems springing from their residence in a foreign country The reader is referred to the vast American literature on this subject. Necessary as it is to aid students in solving these problems, much of this literature is written from the point of view of Americans who are "concerned" that students from abroad should adjust themselves to American ways and institutions. This emphasis tends to obscure the fact that troubled students themselves are far more preoccupied with problems such as conflicts with their families, sexual difficulties often beginning long before they came away from home, long-standing psychosomatic disorders, vocational confusion (which both they and their families may have hoped would be resolved by their experience abroad), and old religious or philosophical perplexities.

3. It is recommended that AID, rather than returning participants who break down during training to their home country, try instead to rehabilitate them in the United States.

Premature return of participants because of mental illness or severe emotional difficulties of adjustment may well engender negative attitudes towards the United States not only on the part of the trainee himself but also on the part of other people in the home community who may conclude that "the United States is a place that makes people mentally ill." In addition, it is likely to result in the unnecessary loss from the program of a number of trainees who could complete their training were they provided with care and treatment in the United States.

¹Dallas Pratt, "Relation of Culture - Goals to the Mental Health of Students Abroad," International Social Science Bulletin, vol. VIII, No. 4 (1957).

It is therefore recommended that AID make more extensive use of advanced psychiatric treatment centers equipped to treat foreign patients, and also insist that before any trainee is returned home on psychiatric grounds he is seen by a transcultural psychiatrist. Torre suggests:

In many cases, such a psychiatrist could be sent as a consultant to the training site, and with some consultation to the local psychiatrist in the student mental health clinic or hospital or in private practice arrange for adequate treatment locally. If this is not possible and hospitalization is not required, he could arrange for the trainee to complete his training at a site where such help is available.

If the trainee requires hospitalization, he could be hospitalized in one of the advanced psychiatric centers. If, after extensive treatment, the staff feels that he should be returned home for further treatment, rather than having a United States psychiatrist accompany him, it would be better for AID to pay for the local psychiatrist from the patient's country to come to the United States, spend a few days in the hospital working out the best therapeutic plan (at the same time being exposed to the best in United States psychiatry) and accompany the patient home.

Some additional support might be given to institutions handling participant trainees requiring special treatment by building in research contracts along with the specialized cases they treat.

4. To provide guidelines for future orientation and counseling programs, further investigation of the "U-curve" phenomenon is needed to find out why it differs with different trainees.

As Hereford points out, "the period of culture shock is highly variable from individual to individual, lasting from perhaps a few weeks to several months, but it always takes some time to adjust to a new environment."² Research aimed at exploring such questions as (a) why some trainees experience stronger negative reactions toward their environment than others, (b) why some recover more quickly than others, and (c) what aspects of the training institution affect the curve of sentiments (initially high, then low, and finally high as departure time nears) would enable AID to make better decisions about the kinds of orientation and counseling services needed for various categories of trainees.

¹Mottram Torre, p. 35.

²Carl Hereford, p. 10.

One possibility is to ask a carefully selected sample of trainees to keep diaries of their own reactions throughout their training experience. This would not only provide data on the U-curve phenomenon but might also yield information on the therapeutic effects of self-scrutiny.

3. Prereturn Orientation

Standard Procedures and Common Deviations

Standard procedures for prereturn orientation of participants trained in the United States are described by Preston as follows:

All participant trainees are expected to return to their homelands by way of Washington, D. C. Some come directly to Washington from the training institutions, but increasing numbers are being routed first to a location where they can be enrolled for one week in a Communications Seminar, conducted for AID by the Department of Communications of Michigan State University. The aims of the seminar are to instruct trainees in effective ways of communicating their newly acquired knowledges and skills to others and to become more effective agents of change in their home countries

Only a very short period is spent in Washington. Here, trainees receive their tickets for home, turn in a final written report on their training experience, and, in the case of those who have received professional training, are urged to enroll in an American professional society for at least three years. Those on observational tours may be given a group "exit" interview. Academic trainees usually have a brief interview with their Program Development Officer who congratulates them on their achievements, queries them on their reactions to their programs, and establishes a basis for subsequent follow-up and evaluation.¹

Judging from Preston's report, deviations from standard procedures in the final processing in Washington are infrequent. However, some trainees refuse, for financial or other reasons, to attend to Communications Seminar, and occasionally trainees take unofficial delays in route on their way home "to the inconvenience and consternation of the USAID and others in the home country."

¹Harley O. Preston, pp. 54-55. In the fall of 1966, AID inaugurated a systematic exit interview procedure which is expected to include all, or nearly all, participants before they return to their home countries.

Conference Recommendations

1. Further evaluation of reentry programs now in use, such as the Communications Seminar, would be worthwhile.

Participants surveyed in the recent evaluation studies who had attended a communications seminar at the end of their training generally praised it as an experience and well over half said they had made some subsequent use of the principles of ideas to which they had been exposed.

Research on reentry programs now in use might well consider Hereford's suggestions about expanding their scope. He points out:

The use made of posttraining seminars or retreats should be carefully considered in the light of attitude change. Utilizing small group techniques, these sessions could offer an excellent opportunity for the trainee to think through his experiences in the United States, to gain a still broader perspective by discussion with other trainees and to consolidate his attitudes and feelings about the United States. These sessions should also give an opportunity for the trainee to consider his situation when he returns to his home country. If the training experience has been meaningful, there will be readjustments for him to make when he returns. Culture shock in reverse is not an uncommon phenomenon. Neither should the communication aspects, now emphasized in most training seminars, be slighted. If we grant importance to the multiplier effect and the diffusion of technical knowledge, we should give equal emphasis to the returning trainee as an influence in cross-cultural attitudes.¹

¹Carl Hereford, p. 12.

V. THE TRAINING PERIOD: INTEGRATION VS. INSULATION

Conference Recommendations

1. Further investigation of how different degrees of integration of participants into the residential and community setting within which training takes place influence the various goals of the Participant Training Program is needed. However, available information suggests that attitude change at more than a superficial level requires the participation and personal involvement of the individual. Hence, from the point of view of attitude change, a high degree of integration of participants into the residential and community setting is recommended.

Trainees sent to the United States on programs aimed at least in part at the creation of favorable attitudes towards the United States should be

integrated into the normal pattern of everyday life . . . group living situations composed entirely of foreign students should be broken up, and close relationships with U. S. citizens encouraged Rather than change the environment to accommodate the foreign trainee, he should be helped [through orientation and counseling] to adjust to the environment as it is.¹

Such trainees should be provided with opportunities to travel in the United States, to visit Americans in their homes, and, in general, to become involved with Americans as equals in work settings and social and cultural activities. In this latter regard, Moore's observations about organizations and programs aimed at stimulating personal contact between Americans and foreigners in United States college communities are relevant. He notes:

The number of organized groups interested in facilitating inter-personal relationships is increasing . . . [but] only a few have the skill to do the job and far too many of the individuals involved have

¹Carl Hereford, pp. 11-12.

personal goals that are not consonant with the purposes of educational institutions. Objective information based on careful research is still lacking on many of the ideas which might serve as the basis for useful programs.¹

Participants' evaluations of the number of social activities arranged for them during training and of their home visits, explored in recent surveys of returned trainees, are also of interest here. With respect to the former, 71 per cent of the participants felt that they had done enough, and most of the rest (all but 3 per cent) wished for still more of these kinds of activities on their schedules. With respect to home visits, almost all who went on such visits enjoyed them.

2. In establishing rules of conduct relating to the participant's intraining period, every effort should be made to avoid excessive restriction and overprotectiveness.

Excessive restrictions on participants not only limit their opportunities for exposure to wide-ranging experiences of America and Americans but may also create resentment and thereby foster unfavorable attitudes toward the program and its sponsors.

A case in point are regulations prohibiting participants from owning cars or marrying an American while in training. These prohibitions may well be experienced by trainees as deprivations and as signs of an unequal relationship. Hence, the feasibility of eliminating these rules merits careful consideration.

3. While the participant's exposure to the living situations of American counterparts is desirable from the point of view of increased understanding and attitude change, it should also be kept in mind that close association with conationals and other foreign visitors may have great value.

For example, maintenance of contact with conationals may provide needed support and comfort to the trainee and may thereby facilitate his adjustment to the training situation. As Moore observes, "it is natural

¹Forrest G. Moore, p. 57.

for the foreign student to feel lonely. This feeling has been described as loneliness of the spirit and is a need rarely ministered to by other than a full-fledged member of one's own culture." Further, he notes that association with conationals may also serve to keep participants, all of whom are expected to return home after training, in touch with their home country and help them in "balancing . . . loyalties to the 'back home' culture and to the realities of the 'here and now'."¹

Contact with persons from other developing countries may also prove valuable, for example, in terms of the trainee's attitudes towards his own country. Such exposure provides him with opportunities for comparison and may thereby foster a broader perspective on the development needs, problems, and potential of his home country.

¹Forrest G. Moore, p. 31.

VI. AFTER RETURN

Standard Procedures and Common Deviations

Recognizing that "systematic follow-up, adjusted to local circumstances, is an essential and integral part of participant training,"¹ AID has charged Mission personnel in participating countries with the responsibility to undertake follow-up activities to:

1. Assist the returned participant in developing and transmitting new ideas and introducing them into his work situation;
2. Assure that the participant's training is fully utilized;
3. Extend the returned participant's knowledge and skills in his field of specialization;
4. Enhance the returned participant's interest in his country's economic and social development; and
5. Broaden the participant's understanding of the United States, its people, institutions, and culture, thus engendering durable affirmative attitudes toward the United States and its policies and interests abroad.

AID has also affirmed that

Follow-up responsibilities do not necessarily terminate when AID no longer has a program in a particular country. It may prove desirable for AID to discharge these duties directly or to transfer them to another United States agency.

In pursuance of AID's policy of "continuing concern for and assistance to returned participant trainees," the Training Officer and the appropriate American Technical Officer are expected to interview each participant within a few days after his return.

The main purposes of this interview . . . are to congratulate the trainee, to determine the favorable or unfavorable attitudes he may have toward the United States, and to describe and to plan with him appropriate follow-up activities.

.....

¹From Manual Order 1389.2; cited by Preston, p. 55-56. (All other quotes in this section are from Preston.)

At [its] conclusion . . . , the returned trainee is encouraged to come to the Mission or to contact American personnel whenever he has a problem of adapting his skills and techniques to novel situations he may encounter back on his job. He is assured of continuing AID interest in his future career.

Further,

within three to six months after a trainee has returned, a United States Technical Officer is required to contact both the former trainee and his supervisor to find out if problems are being encountered in adapting to particular situations and in utilizing the technology acquired from the training. Thereafter, at six-month intervals, or less, the Technical Officers of the Mission are responsible for taking the initiative in continuing assistance to returned trainees.

In principle, various kinds of continuing assistance are available to returned participants. Depending upon the country and the program of training received, they may include (1) technical literature, (2) membership in American professional societies, (3) American correspondence courses that either relate to the training received or supplement it, (4) workshops, seminars, and conferences extending the previous training and exposing former trainees to advanced technical and managerial knowledge, (5) encouraging formation of professional or "alumni" associations, (6) Certificates of Achievement, (7) English language training, and (8) encouraging and assisting returned participants to present lectures, lead workshops, and give courses to others in their field who have not had the opportunity of going abroad.

Apparently, prescribed follow-up procedures are seldom observed in the field. For example, 43 per cent of the participants questioned in the recent evaluation studies said they had had no contact whatsoever with the United States Mission since return, and 62 per cent said there was no United States technician available to them. Only 18 per cent reported frequent contact with a technician, and no more than 22 per cent had ever requested any forms of assistance (equipment, advice, money, publications, etc.) from the Mission in their country.

Preston suggests that the gross deviations from standard procedures reflected in these findings may be attributed in part to "local cultural circumstances," noting:

In most countries some degree of chauvinism, archaism, graft, favoritism, family pressures, religious barriers to change, a latent or overt anti-American atmosphere, in any combination, affect the realities of what the returned trainee and the USAID can in fact do in the circumstances. They affect the degree to which 'standard procedures' can be applied.

However, as he also points out, "there seem to be difficulties within certain Missions that prevent them from doing all they might to assist returned trainees to utilize their potential." For example:

There are reports of a lack of sufficient Training Officers in overseas posts and of their insufficient status within the Mission hierarchy. In many Missions, one American Training Officer at a fairly junior level is assigned total responsibility for all predeparture and post-return activities. Where returned trainees number several thousands, the workload prescribed by the standard procedures is impossible for one man to carry out.

Conference Recommendations

1. The number of highly qualified United States technical advisers sent overseas should be increased.

Recent evaluation studies have pointed up the crucial role American technical advisers perform in facilitating participants' use and transmission of training after return. Participants in frequent contact with United States technicians were considerably more likely than others to rank high on the use of training, yet, less than one-fifth of all trainees surveyed in these studies said they saw a United States technician frequently. This suggests that there are too few advisers and that those assigned locally feel that they have more important things to do than act as general technical assistants to native staffs.

Added efforts to recruit competent professional personnel for overseas assignments are clearly needed. In recruiting such personnel their professional standing is of utmost importance because of the need to encourage greater professionalism among the local staffs. Further, as Mitchell points out, "Since the local people with whom the advisors work are somewhat older men already established in middle and higher-level occupational careers, the American advisors will have more authority if they also are older men."

The problem of technician turnover should also be considered. Under the present two-year contract system, the technician may spend as long as six months getting to know the country and his job, no more than a year on the job, and another six months planning for his return. It may prove desirable to extend the stay of technicians--perhaps up to five-year contracts--if competent professionals willing to spend such a long period overseas can be found.

2. To help in formulating guidelines for allocating and training American technical advisers, a research program aimed at determining factors influencing United States technicians' effectiveness in facilitating participants' utilization of training should be instituted.

Mitchell notes:

The research program should locate which advisors are most successful in facilitating trainees to use their skills; the organizational, occupational, and personality factors which influence the advisors' effectiveness; and the techniques used in achieving success. For example, do idiosyncratic factors seem to determine effectiveness, or can effectiveness only be achieved in certain kinds of organizational contexts? Do effective advisors act primarily as resource people, or do they tend to act in a line capacity? Do they urge others to use their skills, or do they limit themselves to providing advice and encouragement only when asked for these? And, to what degree is the advisor's effectiveness dependent on his independence from normal authority and communication channels within the native work organizations?

3. Research is also needed on factors influencing the extent to which work supervisors and colleagues of returned participants encourage and facilitate use and transmission of skills and perspectives acquired during training.

The evaluation studies indicate that the work supervisors' role in facilitating participants' utilization of training on return is no less crucial than that of United States technicians. "Participants who characterized their supervisors as 'very helpful' in their efforts to apply the skills and ideas acquired in training [were] far higher utilizers than (successively) those who rated their supervisors as less helpful, indifferent, or even hostile." They further indicate that "participants who work in a milieu where their supervisor (or others) have also been trained abroad are higher utilizers."¹

Clearly, the work setting of returned participants has a profound impact on their success in making use of training. We need to know more about what constitutes "helpfulness" on the part of work supervisors and colleagues, what factors influence variations in such helpfulness, and what can be done to maximize the number of returned participants who are placed in settings in which both their supervisors and colleagues are receptive to their innovative efforts.

4. There is a clear need for basic research on factors affecting receptivity to change in developing countries and on the nature of the occupational and organizational systems into which the returned participant is expected to fit.

It would seem that by almost any criteria used, the Agency for International Development should be allocating more of its funds for research. Furthermore, . . . these funds should be given to basic research, not just to . . . administrative book-keeping. . . .

Many American scholars feel that the AID and, more generally the State Department are woefully . . . shortsighted in their inability to distinguish basic from applied research. Of course, basic research

¹ Albert E. Gollin, p. 222-223.

can have important policy implications, as it would have for the kinds of research which the AID would be advised to support. In specific, . . . [there is a] paucity of information, concepts, and ideas which might contribute to a better understanding of factors affecting the success of the Participant Training Program.¹

For example:

a) The large, long-range issue of the receptivity to change in the power structure and the society as a whole of participating countries and how this receptivity might be fostered, is basic to all that AID is doing and goes beyond the Participant Training Program as such. It is an issue on which research is needed.

b) Before doing systematic research on the returned participant it is necessary to understand the nature of the occupational and organizational systems into which he fits. One approach to this might be to conduct international comparative studies of occupations on a pilot basis. The selection of occupations for examination could be based on our present knowledge of successes and failures in training for the same occupation in various national settings. As Mitchell notes, "Systematic studies of differentially successful development programs within individual countries also would be extremely useful, not only to social scientists interested in the dynamics of development but also to government officials charged with directing these programs."¹

c) Another significant area for research is the understanding of the attributes of work organizations and institutional structures which render innovative patterns self-sustaining. It is important to know the points at which technical aid can be discontinued and leave behind a viable organization. An associated question is how long it takes to establish an organization as self-sustaining and under what circumstances.

¹ Robert Mitchell, p. 94. Also see John W. Gardner, pp. 18-19.

5. To foster the development of conditions under which participants are rewarded for high performance in their work specialties and to prepare and encourage the successful segments of the occupational community to further modernize the way occupational tasks and national development are accomplished, the establishment of executive staff colleges in participating countries is recommended.

Executive staff colleges could contribute to greater emphasis on professional aspects of management and thereby encourage greater rationality in performing occupational duties. By enrolling both participants and their nonparticipant work colleagues, these colleges might also contribute toward a more pervasive application of the perspectives toward work that training has sought to encourage in participants. Alternative patterns of operating such colleges (e.g., by the host government, through bilateral government arrangements, international organizational sponsorship, bilateral university and foundation sponsorship) may serve different functions. These would include the facilitation of regional self-help, and the cultivation of a diffuse professional, rather than narrowly bureaucratic, identification on the part of those who attend the college.

Further study is needed to determine how such programs should be established in the developing countries. Mitchell suggests the following general outline:

Executive staff colleges . . . would hold three- or four-week sessions; the "campus" would be located away from urban environments; the program and accommodations would be arranged so that the students and faculty would be dependent almost entirely on each other for their social and educational life; the curriculum would include group projects, individual projects, workshops, and formal lectures; and certificates would be awarded upon completion of the session.

In addition, the college would provide its students with a perspective on their country's developmental problems; the interest of the American government, together with the assistance it offers, would be made known; near the end of the session, workshops would recommend key issues for further intensive analysis; and possible solutions to outstanding development problems would be suggested.

That is, the college would help produce critical self-analysis, a continuing concern for self-improvement, an awareness of national needs, a receptivity for future innovations, an increase in professional competence, and a better understanding of the international development interests of the American government.

6. A critical factor in the achievement of training objectives in the postreturn phase is the development of research activities within the home country. The strengthening of local research capabilities should be encouraged.

Among other things, the development of "research-mindedness" contributes to a rational approach to the world of work and to problem-solving in general. The presence of research activity per se stimulates the process. The catalytic role of institutionalized research in fostering a professional and rational atmosphere in work and management should be recognized by AID in development planning. Research activities, involving participant trainees, should be incorporated more frequently as part of country and regional programs.

The strengthening of the few existing local research capabilities for the empirical study of human and organizational problems of national development in AID-recipient countries and the creation of such capabilities where none now exist is also a prerequisite for meeting the many needs for knowledge that have been identified by this Conference.

7. More extensive use of returned participants in planning programs for prospective trainees and in predeparture orientation is also recommended.

This, along with other mechanisms detailed above, would help to maintain former participants' interest in and commitment to the Participant Training Program and its goals.

72

VII. RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Conference Recommendations

General

1. There is a clear need for research of various kinds on almost every phase of the Participant Training Program. However, research should not be used to avoid administrative solutions of obvious problems, however difficult these may be.

For example, the recent evaluation studies revealed that over three-fifths of returned participants surveyed had no United States technician available to them. More research will not correct this situation. The immediate needs in this instance are better staffing, better staff training, and better administration. Research on factors influencing the success of United States technicians overseas might well provide a basis for formulating better guidelines for recruitment and training of such personnel in the future, but what is needed right now is not research but immediate corrective action on the administrative level.

2. Basic to the consideration of specific research ideas is an understanding of (a) AID goals and (b) what really goes on in the field.

Clarification of broad agency goals and of the relationship of specific subgoals to these major aims constitutes a prime research problem and merits most careful consideration.

The need for more information about "what really goes on" in various phases of the training program was a recurrent theme throughout the Conference. Both Preston's review of "Operations of the AID Participant Training Program," and recently-completed country, regional, and world-wide reports based on data gathered in the evaluation studies represent a significant step in this direction.

3. In formulating and evaluating research proposals, it is necessary to keep in mind the utilization by AID of the results of the research. Hence, the facts which the agency or the program can and cannot affect should be taken into account.

Major attention should be focused on the trainee and the leverage the Participant Training Program has available to it to influence the system.

4. The aftermath period, although lower in opportunities for manipulation than certain other phases (e.g., pretraining orientation in Washington), has a high research priority.

This is so not only because little is known about the postreturn phase, but also because events occurring in that phase are central to the ultimate objectives of AID. Moreover, the evaluation studies have clearly demonstrated that characteristics of the aftermath period have an overriding influence on how participants use and transmit new skills and perspectives acquired during training.¹

5. Another factor meriting consideration in delimiting areas for future investigation is the existence of certain sensitivities surrounding the conduct of research both here and abroad.

Overseas research among nationals on topics closely tied to issues of sovereignty and independence should probably be conducted cooperatively between local and United States research agencies. Support by AID of local research institutions would facilitate such cooperative research endeavors.

There are also problems involved in conducting research on participant trainees in this country. Many universities, for example, are jealous of their research prerogatives, and it may be that research on programmatic aspects of participant training would best be accomplished through grants to the universities.

¹ See Albert E. Gollin, pp. 185-226.

6. Any schema for a research program should take into account the following four dimensions:

- a) The phasing of the training program, from selection to aftermath.
- b) The types of research focus to be used, including research on criteria, on problems, on implementation, and on social or cultural systems.
- c) The relative emphasis on individuals or on systems as points of reference and analysis.
- d) The differences between the United States and the host country, in goals, characteristics, systems and modes of instruction etc.

7. The establishment of an independent in-house research capability in AID is recommended.

In his report on AID and the Universities, Gardner also calls attention to this need, noting:

The Agency should have a small but strong in-house research and analysis unit staffed with first-class people. This unit would (a) conduct analyses and systems research related to specific development problems, and (b) undertake surveys and evaluations at the request of the administrator.¹

The existence of such a research capability might help to check what seems to be a tendency developing in AID to have most program evaluation conducted at the mission level rather than centrally. Clearly, research on several points along the time line (orientation, sojourn, and reentry) cannot be undertaken at the mission level. Rather, it must be performed either by the agency or the training institution.

8. AID should encourage the Office of Education and other agencies to extend their activities to include foreign students as a category of attention.

For example, by expanding the funds available for studies of foreign students without specification of the content of the research to

¹John W. Gardner, p. 19.

be conducted, the Office of Education might foster research in this general area by the universities. Special funds for Ph. D. research might also be considered.

9. Establishment of local research institutes in participating countries should also be encouraged.

Such institutes might be assistance projects in their own right or adjuncts to existing facilities. The former alternative is perhaps the more desirable of the two.

In either case, these institutes would perform a dual function. On the one hand, they could carry out or cooperate in research on the predeparture and aftermath periods of the Participant Training Program. On the other, and perhaps even more important, they would contribute to the creation and maintenance of a rational approach to the organization of work and to problem-solving in general.

A List of Specific Research Suggestions

Specific research suggestions proposed by Conferees are noted under the appropriate sections above. Hence, this final note is confined to a brief review of the topics we have touched on.

1. Personnel selection techniques.
2. Structure and growth of elites in participating countries.
3. Number of trainees selected from one work group.
4. Occupations in developing countries.
5. Training sites.
6. Typing of academic participants by their personality needs and educational institutions by the amount and type of stress in the environment.
7. Dispersal vs. concentration of participants in United States training sites.

8. Better bookkeeping about who has problems, their nature and when they are experienced.

9. Evaluation of pretraining orientation programs.

10. Approaches to orientation.

11. Problems of foreign students.

12. Anticipatory guidance.

13. Giving and receiving ratio.

14. Who should welcome participants on arrival.

15. The U-curve phenomenon and culture shock.

16. Evaluation of reentry programs.

17. Integration of trainees into the residential and community setting.

18. Programs aimed at facilitating personal contact between Americans and foreigners.

19. United States technicians' effectiveness.

20. Helpfulness of work supervisors and colleagues.

21. Receptivity to change in developing countries.

22. Nature of occupational and organizational systems in participating countries.

23. Differentially successful development programs.

24. Self-sustaining organizations and institutional structures.

25. Clarification of agency goals and the relationship of subgoals to major aims.