PN-ABM-581

79690

IMPACT ASSESSMENT

OF THE

USAID SWAZILAND

PARTICIPANT TRAINING PROGRAM

(1971-1989)

KHALIPHA INVESTMENTS (PTY) LTD.

KHALIPHA MANAGEMENT SERVICES DIVISION

UNDER SUB-CONTRACT FROM

THE TRANSCENTURY CORPORATION

AUGUST, 1989

PREFACE

In mid-April Khalipha Investments (Pty) Ltd. was sub-contracted by the TransCentury Corporation to conduct an impact assessment of the (USAID) Participant Training Program from 1971 to 1989. Subsequently, a multi-disciplinary team of local and regional consultants were assembled to conduct the following seven-phase impact assessment: (1) development of impact assessment methodology; (2) tracer, participant and supervisor questionnaire design; (3) questionnaire pilot testing; (4) participant tracer survey; (5) participant survey; (6) supervisor survey; and (7) analysis and report writing.

Throughout this assignment a nine member cross-sectorial "Impact Advisory Committee" was organized and met to discuss the survey findings. This group consisted of former USAID sponsored returned participants and provided invaluable guidance and feedback throughout the assessment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The USAID Participant Training Program
1.2 Terms of Reference
1.3 Sampling Procedures and Research Methodology

2. FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION STUDY

2.1 Returned Participants Interviewed In-depth
2.1.1 Training History
2.1.2 Employment History
2.1.3 Current Employment Status

2.1.3.1 Work Activities and Responsibilities
2.1.3.2 Contributions to Development Work in Swaziland
2.1.3.3 The Perceived Relevance of Training
2.1.3.4 Individuals' Further Training Needs and Career Plans
2.1.3.5 Overall Assessment of the Participant Training Program and Recommendations for Future Programs

2.2 Supervisors' Responses
2.2.1 Main Characteristics of the Supervisors
2.2.2 Assessment of Staff
2.2.3 Mobility and Skills Transfer
2.2.4 The Contribution of Returned Participants to Development Work in Swaziland
2.2.5 Overall Assessment of the Participant Training Program and Recommendations for Future Programs

3. IMPACT ASSESSMENT - CONCLUSIONS

3.1 The Impact of the Participant Training Program to Date
3.2 Likely Long-term Impact of the Program

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

BACHELORS DEGREE	An academic certification given by an accredited college or university to a person who has satisfied that institution's requirements (usually a four-year program or its equivalent).
BONDING	A regulation fixed by a company or institution that "bonds" or contracts an employee to that company or institution for a specified period of time.
CANDIDATE	A prospective participant; an individual who is being considered for USAID-sponsored training.
CERTIFICATE	A document signifying the successful completion of a course of up to three months in length.
COURSE	A unit of instruction in a subject, usually short-term.
DEGREE	Specifically Bachelors, Masters and PhDs.
DIPLOMA	A certificate issued to a student upon the completion of a prescribed course of study.
ESTABLISHMENT REGISTER	The system used by the government to grade employees within the civil service.
FIRST USAID TRAINING PROGRAM	Specifically, the first USAID-sponsored program a participant undertook; occasionally used for the purpose of distinguishing between subsequent USAID sponsored training undertaken by the same participant.
GOS	Government of Swaziland
GRADES	Job grades, levels or rank within the civil service.
HR/GDO	Human Resources/General Development Office
IAC	Impact Advisory Committee
IN-SERVICE	Training undertaken within the context of current employment; short-term courses designed to supplement an employee's skill or knowledge that can be directly applied to the workplace.

INTERVIEWEE	The 130 long-term participants included in the impact assessment study selected by the following criteria: by having completed a USAID sponsored long-term training program and by being employed full-time in Swaziland.
LONG-TERM TRAINING	Any training program having lasted 12 months or more.
MAJOR	A field of study in which a participant has specialized and received his or her degree.
MASTERS	A degree from a college or university received after completing a prescribed program of graduate study in some field; ranking above Bachelors and below PhD.
NON-QUALIFICATION SHORT COURSE(S)	Single "one-time" short-term courses usually targeting one skill area; their value is that the skills gained may be immediately used to benefit the individual and/or workplace.
NON-USAID	Programs not sponsored by USAID, such as those sponsored by other donor agencies, private companies or the Goverment of Swaziland.
PARTICIPANTS	All individuals, both short and long-term, who received training outside Swaziland under USAID sponsorship.
PARTICIPANTS QUESTIONNAIRE	Questionnaire filled out by the 130 participants during their in-depth interviews (See Appendix "B").
PARTICIPANTS TRACER SHEET	Questionnaire used to identify the 425 participants. (See Appendix "A")
PROJECT	A specific development effort being operated by individual ministries or, less often, by private companies.
PTP	Participant training programs(s)
PROGRAM	All levels of training; short to long-term coursework that may lead to degrees, certificates or diplomas, as well as, other training undertaken to improve individual skills - i.e. non-qualification short courses.
PhD	Doctor of Philosophy - A post-graduate degree issued by a university or college.

PARASTATAL	A quasi-governmental organization operated under the auspices of the Government of Swaziland, usually independently managed but funded in part by public monies.
RESPONDENT(S)	Any or all of the 130 individuals who underwent in-depth interviews; may be used separately or in conjunction with participant(s).
SHORT-TERM TRAINING	Any training program shorter than 12 months in length.
SUPERVISORS QUESTIONNAIRE	Questionnaire filled out by 30 supervisors during their in-depth interviews (see Appendix "C").
SPSS-PC+	The Statistical Package for Social Scientists; the computer program used for this impact assessment study.
SADCC	Southern African Development Coordinating Conference which includes the following countries: Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe.
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USG	United States Government
UNISWA	University of Swaziland

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The USAID participant training program has had a significant impact on Swaziland's human resources base. To date, almost 500 Swazi nationals have been trained over the past 15-20 years, the vast majority of whom have returned to Swaziland and are using their skills in a variety of employment situations. This figure does not double count those who have received more than one degree or more than one short-term training program from USAID. Moreover, it does not reflect those USAID-sponsored participants presently in training for their first degree or program. If calculated on a per training basis, the number of USAID sponsored participants would exceed 600.

The following highlights illustrate the impact the USAID participant training program has had on Swaziland:

- A total of 320 participants, 206 male and 114 female, have received long-term training;
- Another 155 participants, 105 male and 50 female, have received short-term training;
- Less than one percent of those participants who received both short and long-term training are presently unemployed;
- Less than four percent of those participants who received both short- and long-term training have emigrated;
- Approximately ten percent of the participants who received long-term training were not traceable. Presumedly, these participants were not traceable within Swaziland during the period of investigation, had emigrated, or are deceased;
- USAID sponsored training accounted for 53% of all training undertaken by the 130 respondents;
- USAID sponsored training was predominant at the Masters, PhD and Bachelor's levels, 95%, 50% and 47%, respectively, of all training undertaken;
- 56% of all USAID sponsored training was undertaken at institutions in the USA;
- 86% of training was long-term (12 months or more);
- Female participants accounted for 29% of all USAID sponsored training;

- Most programs undertaken by female participants were at the Masters and Bachelor's levels, 21% and 64%, respectively, of all training undertaken;

- Only 15 (4%) of all short- and long-term participants did not complete their assigned program;

- USAID-sponsored training most frequently fell into the following categories: Agriculture and Science - 32%, Education - 27%; Business Administration, Maths and Economics - 19%; Health - 11%; Engineering and Architecture - 7%; and Social Science and Humanities - 4%;

- Female participants were most frequently represented in teaching and training positions, although they have increased (58% from pre-training to current positions) their representation in management and administration posts;

- Taking all participants together, the biggest employment transfers have taken place away from job-specific technical posts toward general administration and management posts;

- 51% of the 130 respondents returned to a higher level of employment after completing training;

- 42% of the respondents reported receiving promotions one or more times since completing their first USAID-sponsored training program;

- The mobility of participants across sectors, and specifically, away from public sectors is limited; only 18% of the respondents had made a change across all sectors while 13% had left the civil service to join the private sector;

- 70% of all USAID participants are employed in the public sector;

- At least one third of the participants employed in the civil service are now in senior posts with considerable decision and policy-making responsibilities;

- 33% of the respondents reported to have a job grade of 21+;

- 80% of respondents supervise at least one person, the majority of those supervised being professional workers;

- Female participants generally were less likely to supervise others and, where they did, had fewer people under them;

- 64% of the respondents reported being involved with development projects;

- Of those respondents involved in development projects, 14% were working in the private sector;

- In the civil service, 91% of those working in health, 77% of those working in agriculture, and 72% of those working in agriculture were working on development projects;

- Just over half of the respondents (67) took over posts from non-Swazi nationals (39%) or took up a new post created especially for them (12%), thus furthering the manpower aims of the Government of Swaziland to increase the number of Swazi nationals who are directly participating in development work;

- 92% of the participants listed at least one of the following improvements which had taken place within their ministry or company including. improved manpower/training utilization, improved management/planning functions, departments strengthened or revived, the implementation or improved use of research/information systems, more posts localized, improved access to equipment/resources/funds or increased number of departments/institutes created;

- 95% of the respondents felt that their training was useful to their present position;

- In the absence of comparative data from non-participants in the public and private sectors, it is difficult to establish direct linkages between job mobility and the extent of training undertaken;

- A total of 79 respondents had completed Masters or PhD degrees. Of these, just over half (44) had undertaken their thesis on a subject relating to Swaziland, or had used data from Swaziland;

- The majority of participants reported that their training had a large influence on their future career plans. Among other responses participants mentioned the following: training had increased their interest in their professional field; they were exposed to another culture and other people as a result of training overseas; and

training had made them more ambitious and more confident of their skills, thus preparing them for greater employment challenges;

- Nearly all respondents reported that USAID sponsored training had a positive effect on the participant's personal development (42% said it was as a result of interacting with American culture);

- 90% of the respondents said they required further training to supplement skills acquired from previous training;

- 67% of respondents indicated that further training should be undertaken in the USA; 10% reported that suitable training could be undertaken in the southern Africa region;

- Participant's overall assessment of the training program was extremely positive;

- In respect to development in Swaziland, 77% thought it was positive; 16% mentioned reservations regarding its total impact;

- The most frequently mentioned problem - by both participants and their supervisors - was that academic training in the USA had limited application to day-to-day development work in Swaziland, often due to the inability to obtain and utilize appropriate equipment and resources;

- 34% of participants felt that the placement system was satisfactory; 39% mentioned the need for candidates to be more directly involved in the selection procedure and 15% said that more care should be taken when choosing between possible institutions;

- The two most common recommendations regarding future programs were: (1) involving candidates and employers in the decion-making process; and (2) paying closer attention to the needs of the candidate and the relevance of the program when selecting an institution;

- Respondents felt that a candidates' qualifications were an extremely important selection criterion, but recognized the need for choices that meet the needs of development in Swaziland;

- A sample of participants' supervisors said that USAID trained employees had a markedly better attitude towards their work than non-USAID or locally trained staff;

- Supervisors rated all employees' performance highly, although the work activity of USAID trained staff was consistently ranked slightly above that of their counterparts;

- Non-USAID or locally trained staff performed better than USAID participants in extension work;

- Supervisors felt that all USAID trained employees were qualified for the posts they currently occupied;

- Supervisors reported that a quarter of their USAID trained employees had taken over posts previously held by expatriates;

- Supervisors recommended in-house follow-up training using short courses, seminars and workshops, emphasizing management, administration and job-specific skills;

- One-third of the supervisors interviewed felt that short courses were the type of training most required;

- Inter-Africa training was said to be more suitable for short-term courses, including certificate and diploma programs;

- Supervisors expressed a need for more communication between themselves and USAID;

- Advantages of USAID training mentioned: (1) increased exposure to new technologies and methods; and (2) better quality of training and a general widening of horizons and increased personal development; and

- Training undertaken overseas lead to personal problems caused by such things as marital stress and culture shock.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The USAID Participant Training Program

Manpower needs in Swaziland are extensive and reflect a paucity of skilled labor. In a partial resolution to this problem, the United States Government (USG) has provided the Government of Swaziland (GOS) with both technical and financial assistance since 1971.

Through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the initiative in manpower development has assisted the GOS to substantially increase the health and vitality of the local economy. However, the demographic patterns in Swaziland (3.2 growth in population and 47% under the age of 15 was reported in 1986) will continue to be one of the most important factors influencing the need for manpower development. If this population growth rate continues, pressure will increase to accommodate the new and young work-force into the local economy.

In response to the manpower needs in Swaziland, USAID has sponsored a number of manpower development projects. The most recent project, the Swaziland Manpower Development Project (SWAMDP # 645-0218), is designed to: (1) expand the capacity of selected Swazis and Swazi institutions, both public and private, to independently plan and direct development activities; and (2) encourage an increased level of informed participants by the general Swazi population in a variety of activities. The project is based on the proposition that well-qualified, development-oriented, management and leadership in key institutions will continue to be the major elements contributing to accelerated economic and social development in Swaziland.

The following impact assessment surveys a portion of the individuals who received USAID training to ascertain the overall effectiveness of the program. Key issues focused on were the level of institutional development in both the public and private sectors and the application of skills as they relate to manpower development in Swaziiland.

1.2 Terms of Reference

The purpose of this consultancy were to assess the overall impact of the USG participant training program on development

in Swaziland, with emphasis on institution building within key public and private sector development institutions. To achieve the above purpose the following activities were undertaken:

A. DATA COLLECTION/GENERAL RESEARCH DUTIES

Develop survey instrument(s) that use proven research methodology and pre-test instruments to determine their ability to provide the required analyses. Data will be quantifiable where possible.

Research Mission archives, all USAID project files and Project Implementation Orders/Participants (PIO/Ps) since 1972 on participants approved for training for one year or more.

Meet with the GOS officials and Ministry staff to cross-check and verify participant data.

Review the existing participant tracking system now in use under the SWAMDP project and develop an expanded information data system on participants both for HR/GDO/USAID as it applies to the Participant Training Management Systems requirements of the Mission and the more comprehensive tracking system currently maintained by the TransCentury Corporation (TCC) including all returned participants funded by AID. The system will encompass all of the contractor's baseline data as well as the new data derived from this impact study.

Compile and codify data on all USAID-funded participants by name, discipline area and degree level of training using above information:

- identify position held prior to training, and update this information giving current positions held and location;

- analyze how participants perform on the job;

- identify the number of participants who are working in the private sector and position held;

- provide statistical data on the number of participants who have migrated;

- identify the number of participants who have since moved into key managerial, administrative and policy-making positions which are directly related to development; and

data on other donor-funded participant training and/or joint training.

Provide gender information (breakdown of men and women) for participants currently in-training and returned participants by area of disciplines, degree levels and post training positions held.

B. INSTITUTIONAL FOCUS

Impact data has been structured using the following as guidelines:

Identify examples of public institutions that were strengthened and/or created as a result of the USAID participant training program;

Assess the effectiveness of this training in terms of institutional development and how former participants are utilizing/applying their skills/training to assist the GOS in strengthening public sector institutions;

Assess the likely long-range impact of the USAID participant training program on GOS institutions in view of positions held by former participants in these institutions;

What impact, if any, has the participant training program had in the private sector;

Are there any specific development gains/benefits in institutional development that could be directly attributed to the participant training program; and

Identify any particular issues or subjects that surfaced during interviews which represent a consensus or trend among participants.

1.3 Sampling Procedures and Research Methodology

The first stage of the sampling procedure involved defining the entire population of participants. Using a "Participant Tracer Sheet", (see Appendix A) two team members traced all known participants who had undertaken USAID-sponsored training between 1971 and early 1989. The task was difficult and time consuming. Participants biodata on the USAID and TCC lists did not match, and a great deal of cross-checking had to be undertaken. After extensive tracing work, however, full details on training, current and past employment, and other data were complied for 425 individuals out of a total population of 475. The break down of the population is illustrated in Table 1 below.

TABLE 1
USAID TRAINED RETURNED PARTICIPANTS
LONG-TERM & SHORT-TERM
(1971-1989)

CATEGORY	LONG-TERM MALE	LONG-TERM FEMALE	SHORT-TERM MALE	SHORT-TERM FEMALE	SUB-TOTAL MALE	SUB-TOTAL FEMALE	TOTAL
GOS/PARASTATAL	161	91	88	45	249	136	385
PRIVATE	20	3	2	4	22	7	29
UNEMPLOYED	0	2	0	0	0	2	2
IN TRAINING (ABROAD)	8	8	0	0	8	8	16
IN TRAINING (SWAZILAND) /1	0	0	2	1	2	1	3
EMIGRATED	7	8	4	0	11	8	19
OFFICIAL DUTY (ABROAD)	6	2	0	0	6	2	8
RETIRED	1	0	4	0	5	0	5
DECEASED	3	0	5	0	8	0	8
TOTAL	206	114	105	50	311	164	475

1/ Those participants currently receiving further training in Swaziland by other sponsors.

More detailed information on characteristics of the entire population of participants is given in Section 2.1 below.

The following criteria were used to select a sample of participants for in-depth interviewing.

a. Interviewees must have undertaken at least one long-term training program (of more than 12 months duration) sponsored by USAID;

b. Interviewees must be in full-time employment within Swaziland; and

c. Interviewees must have been in post since finishing their most recent participant training program for at least nine months.

Using criteria (a) and (b), the possible sample was reduced to 240. It proved difficult to identify the participants' length of service in their current posts during the tracer study - criteria (c) - so a sample of interviewees was picked from the 240 participants who qualified for inclusion under criteria (a) and (b). Due to time constraints and difficulties arranging interviews, particularly for people working in the public sector, the final number of in-depth interviews conducted was 130. This number represents 54% of all those qualifying for inclusion in the survey sample and 41% of all participants (320) who have ever undertaken long-term training.

The sex ratio of the 130 interviewees is proportionate with the sex ratio of the total population, as shown below:

	All USAID Participants		Long-term Training		In-depth Interviews	
Male	311	65%	206	64%	92	70%
Female	164	35%	114	36%	38	30%
TOTAL	475	100%	320	100%	130	100%

We are therefore confident that the impact assessment survey had a representative cross-section of all participants. In order to cross-check information received from the participants, and to obtain more information about their observed job performance, interviewees were asked for permission to interview their immediate supervisor. While a few participants were in senior positions and had no immediate supervisor, the majority

of interviewees granted permission to interview their supervisor. A total of 30 supervisors were interviewed during the impact assessment survey -- see Section 2.3 below for a discussion of their responses. Together, they supervised a total of 66 participants, 35 of whom (53%) were participants interviewed for the survey.

Two separate questionnaires were utilized:

(1) Individual questionnaire for participants (see Appendix B)

This questionnaire was used to obtain information from the individual participants on their assessment of their training as it relates to their current job. Most questions were pre-coded.

(2) Individual questionnaires for the participants' supervisors (see Appendix C)

The focus of this questionnaire was to assess the work performance of participants, and the overall impact of the program on individual ministries, institutions and private companies.

The participant questionnaire was pretested; however, due to time limitations, it was not possible to draw the pretest sample randomly from the final sample population. Participants to be included in the pretest were drawn from those first contacted in the population identification process, using the Tracer Sheets. A total of 23 respondents were interviewed with the pilot questionnaire. Responses indicated that the basic framework of the questionnaire was valid, but some restructuring was required. In addition, a number of previously open-ended questions were precoded.

The supervisors' questionnaire was not pretested because the interview team was unable to identify any supervisors prior to administering the individual questionnaire. However, changes indicated by the pretest of the participant instrument were incorporated. Questionnaires were checked, coded and key punched as the interviewing proceeded, and the results were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS-PC+). Frequency distributions and cross-tabulations were the primary forms of analysis prepared from the data.

Due to the difficulties experienced in bringing together key persons from the various ministries involved in the

participant training program, it proved impossible during the survey period to convene the discussion groups which had originally been anticipated. However, background information pertaining to the USAID participant training program and manpower development in Swaziland was obtained from individual resource persons, as well as, existing documentation and surveys. In addition, an Impact Advisory Committee (IAC) was convened to review the findings of this study. The members of the IAC included:

1.	Sandile Ceko	- Ministry of Natural Resources and Energy Principal Secretary
2.	Ephraim Hlophe	- Ministry of Health Under Secretary
3.	Nomathemba Hlope	- Ministry of Labor & Public Services Senior Management Services Officer
4.	Leon Jacobsz	- SWAKI Accountant
5.	Dickson Khumalo	- Ministry of Agriculture & Cooperatives Senior Agriculture Officer
6.	Stanley Matsebula	- Central Bank of Swaziland Assistant Research Manager
7.	Phindile Mkhonza	- Department of Economic Planning & Statistics Under Secretary
8.	Solomon Simelane	- Ministry of Education Director of Education
9.	Correl Sukati	- UNISWA Registrar

Contextual issues such as those itemized above were discussed at the Impact Advisory Committee meetings.

2. FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION STUDY

2.1 Returned Participants Interviewed In-depth

2.1.1 Training History

Respondents were asked for details of all the training they had undertaken, including that sponsored by USAID, other donors, and undertaken through other institutions at the individual's own initiative. The total number of training programs undertaken by the 130 participants interviewed is shown in Table 2 below:

TABLE 2
TRAINING PROGRAMS UNDERTAKEN
BY 130 USAID PARTICIPANTS INTERVIEWED

	BA/BSc	MA/MSc	PhD	Cert.	Diploma	Other	Total
First USAID PTP	52	62	1	0	12	3	130
Other USAID PTP	5	28	3	13	1	5	55
Total USAID PTP	57	90	4	13	13	8	185
Non-USAID Programs 2/	63	5	4	40	43	11	166
Total	120	95	8	53	56	19	351
USAID PTP as % of total	47%	95%	50%	24%	23%	42%	53%

2/These figures only represent USAID trained participants and do not reflect other donor or personally funded training.

Training sponsored by USAID accounts for just over half of all programs undertaken by the 130 participants and figures most significantly at the Masters, PhD and Bachelors levels. The GOS was another major contributor, sponsoring 74 programs or 21% of the total.

56% of the reported training took place at institutions in the USA. An additional 102 programs (29%) were undertaken at institutions in the southern Africa region, including some non-USAID funded students at UNISWA. Tables 3 and 4 below show the length of training programs, ranging from less than one month to 5 years duration, and the time period in which they were sponsored.

TABLE 3
DURATION OF TRAINING PROGRAMS

	First USAID PTP	All Other Programs 3/	Total	% Of Total
1-6 months	10	41	51	14%
7-12 months	9	15	24	7%
1 year	44	40	84	24%
2 years	39	55	94	27%
3 years	19	17	36	10%
4 years or more	9	53	62	18%
Total	130	221	351	100%

TABLE 4
YEAR OF TRAINING

	First USAID PTP	All Other Programs 3/	Total	% of Total
1960-1969	0	25	25	7%
1970-1979	28	103	131	37%
1980-1989	102	93	195	56%
Total	130	221	351	100%

3/Combined USAID (55) and non-USAID (166) sponsored programs.

Out of the 185 programs sponsored by USAID, 53 (29%) were undertaken by female participants. Table 5 below shows the breakdown by sex of participants undertaking various levels of training. Females were most frequently represented in Masters and certificate-level programs.

TABLE 5
PROGRAM LEVEL BY SEX OF PARTICIPANT
ALL USAID TRAINING COURSES 4/

	BA/BSc	MA/MSc	PhD	Cert.	Diploma	Other	Total
Males	46	56	3	9	10	8	132
Females	11	34	1	4	3	0	53
Total	57	90	4	13	13	8	185
Female % of Total	19%	38%	25%	31%	23%	0	29%

4/ Survey data, 130 participants

The age breakdown of respondents are as follows:

Age of Respondents (130)	Number	%
21-30	16	12
31-40	69	53
41-50	37	29
over 50	8	6

Complete data on all long-term participants was unavailable. However, by calculating date of birth, as listed on 212 of the Tracer Sheets, the findings show that age distribution remained constant.

Age of Participants (212)	Number	%
21-30	28	13
31-40	108	51
41-50	62	29
over 50	14	7

Table 6 below is the breakdown of all degree programs, by subject, undertaken by the 320 long-term participants.

Table 6
ALL DEGREE PROGRAMS
UNDERTAKEN BY 320 LONG-TERM PARTICIPANTS

AGRICULTURE & SCIENCE	BA	MA	PHD	TOTAL DEGREES
Agriculture	7	4	-	11
Agriculture Economics	-	6	-	6
Agriculture Education	12	7	2	21
Agriculture Engineering	2	-	-	2
Ag. Extension Education	-	2	-	2
Agriculture Mechanics	1	-	-	1
Ag. Mechanization	-	1	-	1
Agriculture Management	4	-	-	4
Agronomy	-	3	1	4
Animal Production	-	1	-	1
Animal Science	1	2	-	3
Biochemistry	-	1	-	1
Biology	1	-	-	1
Biological Science	1	-	-	1
Botany	1	-	-	1
Chemistry	2	-	-	2
Crop Science	1	-	-	1
Entomology	-	2	-	2
Farm Chemicals	1	-	-	1
Forestry	-	1	-	1
Grain Storage	1	-	-	1
Home Economics	7	2	1	10
Horticulture	1	3	-	4
Husbandry	1	1	-	2
Land Resources	-	1	-	1
Plant Science	2	1	-	3
Range Management	1	-	-	1
Range Science	-	4	-	4
Rural Development	1	-	-	1
Soil Science	4	2	-	6
Soil Survey	1	-	-	1
Vet. Science	1	-	-	1
Water Resources	-	1	-	1
TOTAL SUBJECTS	54	45	4	103
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AND ECONOMICS				
Accounting	1	2	-	3
Biometry	-	1	-	1
Business Administration	1	13	-	14
Computer System	4	1	-	5
Economics	4	11	-	15
Finance/Banking	-	2	-	2
Human Resources	-	2	-	2
International Business	-	1	-	1
Management	-	1	-	1
Management Info Systems	-	1	-	1
Mathematics	-	2	-	2
Public Administration	1	8	-	9
Resource Management	1	-	-	1
Statistics	2	2	-	4
TOTAL SUBJECTS	14	47	-	61

Table 6 (con't)
ALL DEGREE PROGRAMS
UNDERTAKEN BY 320 LONG-TERM PARTICIPANTS

EDUCATION	BA	MA	PHD	TOTAL DEGREES
Curriculum Development	2	3	-	5
Education Administration	-	7	1	8
Education Leadership	-	1	-	1
Education Planning	-	2	-	2
Elementary Education	-	11	-	11
Elementary English	2	-	-	2
English	1	3		4
General Education	33	18	-	51
Primary Curriculum	-	1	-	1
Secondary Education	1			1
School Administration		1		1
TOTAL SUBJECTS	39	47	1	87
ENGINEERING AND ARCHITECTURE				
Architecture	4	-	-	4
Chemical Engineering	2	-	-	2
Civil Engineering	10	1	-	11
Electrical Engineering	1	2	-	3
Industrial Technology	-	1	-	1
Mechanical Engineering	1	-	-	1
Mining Engineering	-	1	-	1
TOTAL SUBJECTS	18	5	-	23
HEALTH				
Dietitian	1	-	-	1
Food Science	1	-	-	1
Health Administration	1	1	-	2
Health Education	5	-	-	5
Health Planning	-	1	-	1
International Health	-	1	-	1
Medical Technology	3	-	-	3
Nursing	6	3	-	9
Public Health	-	5	-	5
Nutrition	3	2	-	5
Occupational Therapy		1	-	1
TOTAL SUBJECTS	20	14	-	34
SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES				
Anthropology	-	1	-	1
Psychology	-	2	-	2
Education Psychology	-	1	-	1
Linguistics	-	2	-	2
Political Science	-	1	-	1
Public and International Affairs	-	1	-	1
Rural Sociology	-	1	-	1
Social Science	1	2	-	3
TOTAL SUBJECTS	1	11	-	12
TOTAL DEGREES	146	169	5	320

USAID training most frequently fell into the following categories: Agriculture and Science-32%; Education-27%; Business Administration, Maths and Economics-19%; Health-11%; Engineering and Architecture-7%; and Social Science and Humanities-4%. Only 15 (4%) of all short and long-term participants did not complete their assigned program.

2.1.2 Employment History

Questions on the participants' employment history sought to identify changes in career patterns and job mobility which had occurred among the participants. In the absence of comparative data from non-participants in the public and private sectors, it is difficult to establish direct linkages between job mobility and the extent of training undertaken.

It is also difficult to distinguish how far USAID-sponsored training has contributed to mobility against other, non-USAID training programs. For example, the 130 participants interviewed had between them undertaken 185 USAID sponsored programs, an average of 1.4 per participant, and 166 non-USAID training programs, 351 in total, for an average of 2.7 per participant.

It appears, however, that the USAID sponsored training has contributed to upward mobility within both public and private sectors, particularly within the GOS civil service. USAID training has nearly always played a significant role in opening up or extending educational opportunities, operating as a type of platform for further personal and professional development (see Section 2.1.3.5 below).

To assess the impact of the USAID participant training program on employment, respondents were asked for details of three employment posts: (1) the job they left when beginning their first USAID sponsored training program; (2) the job they returned to after that training program; and (3) their current job. Information about these thres employment posts has been analyzed in a variety of ways. First, changes in job classification were identified, as shown in Table 7 below.

TABLE 7
CHANGES IN TYPE OF JOB CLASSIFICATION OVER
THREE MAIN EMPLOYMENT POSTS

	Post Before Training		Post After Training		Current Post	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Financial Management	7	3	8	3	7	4
Other Manag. and Admin.	23	4	25	4	38	8
Teacher Training	17	20	18	21	16	20
Research	6	2	8	1	7	0
Job-specific technical work	32	9	33	7	24	6
Other	3	0	0	2	0	0
N/A (students)	4	0	0	0	0	0

There has been little movement between job categories. Females have tended to remain most highly represented in teaching and training positions. Although their absolute number is small (8), they have increased their representation in management and administration posts. Taking all participants together, it is clear that the biggest transfers have taken place away from job-specific technical posts towards general administration and management positions.

Sixty-seven respondents (51%) reported that the position they returned to after their first training was at a higher level than the one they occupied prior to USAID training. A slightly larger proportion of females (52%) than males (48%) returned to a post at the same level after completing training. Overall, 18 participants experienced a delay in taking up a position when they returned from training. In ten of these cases, the respondents reported that the delay was caused by there being no appropriate vacant post for them to move into, or because a new post was being created for them.

Since returning from their first USAID sponsored program, 53 participants (40%) have remained in the same post. While only 38% of male participants have remained in the same post, the corresponding figure for women is 47%. This is perhaps indicative of a situation where promotion opportunities for females are still more limited than for men, despite their training. In four cases, respondents indicated that lack of additional qualifications had caused them to remain in the same post since completing their first USAID program. The reasons most frequently mentioned were: no vacant promotion posts --27; at top of career structure already --13; participant did not wish to move --12; lack of additional qualifications --4; other --7. For those respondents who had changed jobs since returning from training, promotions and transfers within or across their original ministries, departments or companies were quite numerous, as shown in Table 8 below.

TABLE 8
EXTENT OF PROMOTIONS AND TRANSFERS SINCE RECEIVING FIRST USAID SPONSORED TRAINING

	Once	More Than Once	Total
Promoted within same dept/section	33	24	57
Promoted and transferred to another dept/section	15	10	25
Transferred to another dept/ section at same level	6	8	14
Promoted and transferred to another ministry/company	7	8	15
Transferred to another ministry/company at same level	3	6	9

The reasons most frequently reported for promotion or transfer were as follows: possessed required training --55; possessed required skills or experience --54; vacancy/new post had to be filled --34; participant requested transfer --6; other --7. Promotions and transfers within ministries, departments and private companies have led to an 11% change in the physical

location of the participants' workplace. As might be anticipated, it would appear that with higher qualifications gained as a result of training, the trend is towards head offices and "desk jobs", and away from extension posts at the district and regional level. This is demonstrated in Table 9 below. The increase in the number of participants based at training institutions and UNISWA, however, indicates an increase in opportunities to disseminate skills acquired in training through teaching and training activities.

TABLE 9
CHANGE OF LOCATION OF WORKPLACE
BEFORE/AFTER TRAINING

	Location Before Training	Current Location	Loss\ Gain
Head office	61	69	+ 8
Parastatal/dept office	3	4	+ 1
Training institution/UNISWA	13	19	+ 6
Urban school/hospital	8	3	- 5
Rural school/hospital	5	2	- 3
Regional/district office	40	33	- 7

In order to substantiate the information on promotions, respondents were asked to specify the grade of their job. With private sector companies, some parastatal, and semi-autonomous public sector agencies - the Central Bank, for example - it proved difficult to equate the grading system with the Government's Establishment Register. Some trends may be identified, however, from the limited information obtained.

The majority of promotions and transfers took place within the original ministry, department or company within which the participant was situated after training. This trend is further substantiated by the analysis of movement between ministries and companies, as detailed in Table 10 below. The largest losses of participants have been sustained by the Ministries of Finance (predominantly males) and Education (predominantly females). Private companies and financial institutions experienced gains.

TABLE 10
MOVEMENT BETWEEN MINISTRIES AND
PRIVATE SECTOR, BY SEX

	Post Before Training			Current Post			Loss/ Gain
	M	F	ALL	M	F	ALL	
Private Companies	7	1	8	19	2	21	+13
Ministry of Health	3	9	12	3	9	12	0
Ministry of Agriculture	16	4	20	17	5	22	+ 2
Ministry of Finance	7	3	10	3	2	5	- 5
Ministry of Nat. Resources	1	0	1	2	0	2	+ 1
Ministry of Labor	2	1	3	2	1	3	0
Ministry of Works	2	0	2	2	0	2	0
Ministry of Justice	1	0	1	0	0	0	- 1
Ministry of Education	26	17	43	25	12	37	- 6
Ministry of Commerce	2	0	2	1	0	1	- 1
Economic Planning	1	0	1	0	0	0	- 1
Banks/SEDCO etc.	11	1	12	13	2	15	+ 3
Other Public Sector Agency	4	1	5	1	2	3	- 2
NGO/Donor	1	1	2	1	0	1	- 1
Other	8	0	8	3	3	6	- 2

Overall, there has been little movement between sectors. Seventeen respondents (13%) left the civil service to join the private sector; of these 12 were males (71%).

2.1.3 Current Employment Status

2.1.3.1 Work Activities and Responsibilities

The current employment status of the 130 participants interviewed is shown in the tables in the preceding section. The main characteristics may be summarized as follows:

	Male	Female	All
Current Job Classification:			
Financial Management	7	4	11
Other Management and Administration	38	8	46
Teaching/Training	16	20	36
Research	7	0	7
Job-specific Technical Work	24	6	30
Current Grade:			
9-14	2	1	3
15-20	21	14	35
21+	32	11	43
Not Known	37	12	49
Current Employer:			
Ministry of Education	25	12	37
Ministry of Agriculture	17	5	22
Banks and Financial Institutions	13	2	15
Ministry of Health	3	9	12
Other Public Sector	11	5	16
Private Companies	19	2	21
Other, non-public Sector	4	3	7

The majority of participants - 72 (55%) - have been in their current posts for three years or more. Respondents were asked to indicate what proportion of their working time they spent on various activities. As shown in Table 11 below, administrative work was the predominant activity for all participants, although job-specific technical work and teaching/training were other important activities.

Table 11
PROPORTION OF TIME SPENT
ON VARIOUS WORK ACTIVITIES

	None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Financial Management	54	63	8	4	1
Other Administration	22	49	27	18	14
Teaching/Training	43	58	10	8	11
Research/Evaluation	53	65	8	2	2
Extension Work	83	39	6	2	0
Job-specific Technical	59	35	16	8	12
Travelling	55	73	2	0	0
Other	103	27	0	0	0

Respondents were also asked to indicate project-related work they are presently undertaking. "Projects" were defined as specific development activities being carried out by individual ministries or, less often, by private companies. The number of respondents undertaking different kinds of project work were as follows:

Project Identification	51
Project Design/Planning	51
Project Implementation	67
Project Monitoring/Evaluation	65
Other Project Work	13

As an indicator of both seniority and level of responsibility, the participants were also asked to identify the number of people they supervised, and the job classifications of the people supervised. Tables 12 and 13 below show that eighty percent of the respondents supervised at least one person, and the majority of those supervised were professional workers. Female participants were less likely to supervise other employees than males, and where they did act as supervisors, generally had fewer people under their supervision than males.

Table 12
SUPERVISION OF OTHER EMPLOYEES
BY SEX OF RESPONDENT

Sex of Respondent	Numbers Supervised					
	None	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	20+
Male	10	28	16	8	3	27
Female	16	12	4	1	1	4
TOTAL	26	40	20	9	4	31

Table 13
JOB CLASSIFICATION AND NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS
SUPERVISED BY USAID RESPONDENTS

Job Classification of Persons Supervised	Numbers Supervised					
	None	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	20+
Professional	59	41	11	5	3	11
Technical	81	33	10	2	1	3
Administrative	76	33	12	2	3	4
Semi-skilled	104	17	4	1	1	3
Unskilled/Casual	108	7	6	3	4	2
Other	128	1	1	0	0	0

Table 14 below gives some indication of the relationship between level of training and level of employment. Table 15 below shows the current placement of USAID participants (425, as identified by the Tracer Sheets) across the public and private sector. The data shows that the majority of participants have settled into Ministries with a particularly high concentration at UNISWA. This clearly indicates the development of the public sector.

Table 14
CURRENT GRADE BY PROGRAM LEVEL OF
FIRST USAID SPONSORED TRAINING COURSE

Grade	Bachelors	Masters	PhD	Diploma	Other
Grades 9-14	1	1	0	1	0
Grades 15-20	18	13	0	4	0
Grades 21+	12	27	0	2	2
Not Known	21	21	1	5	1

2.1.3.2 Contribution to Development Work In Swaziland

Overall, 83 participants (64%) reported that they were involved in some way or another in specific development projects. These respondents named a total of 139 projects, an average of two (1.67 actual) projects each. The projects mentioned were classified as follows: education/training development --39; agriculture/natural resources/conservation --33; health development --28; construction/infrastructure development --18; industrial/financial development --14; other --7; total --139.

Project activities covered a wide spectrum and included health education for primary health care, staff development projects for ministries and pararstatals, work with small holders in rural areas, dam rehabilitation, school construction, trade promotion and agricultural marketing. As shown in the Table 11 on page 19, participants were involved at all stages of project activity, notably with project identification and design/planning.

Of those respondents involved in development projects, 12 (14%) were working in the private sector. Within the civil service sectors, 15 respondents were working in health, 15 in agriculture, and 17 in education were involved in development projects.

The GOS has pursued a policy of localization as an important component of manpower development in both the civil service and the private sector. The aim is to increase the number of Swazi nationals directly participating in development work. Respondents in the survey were thus asked to indicate from whom

they had taken over their current post. Responses were as follows:

Previous Post Holder	Number	%
Swazi national	53	41%
Expatriate/technical assistant	51	39%
Post was created for respondent	16	12%
Not known	10	8%

Just over half the respondents took over posts from non-Swazis or took up a new post created especially for them. Table 15 shows USAID-sponsored participants by ministry and institution as a percent of professional staff. Experience of training programs in other developing countries has demonstrated the importance for returned trainees to disseminate the skills they acquired while in training. Where the skills gained remain only with the returned trainee, and are not passed on to others, the future benefits of training are minimized, especially in situations where there is high staff mobility. Respondents were also asked which mechanisms, if any, they used to transfer their skills to others. All respondents claimed to use at least one of the following mechanisms: one-to-one guidance of staff --97; writing reports/publications --86; in-service workshops --81; supervising interns/staff-in-training --78; research work --61; part-time teaching, outside workplace --51; and other --6.

Respondents were also asked to indicate the ways in which they themselves had contributed to the strengthening of the ministry or company for which they worked. Thirty-seven (28%) participants were unable to respond to this question. A further 59 (45%) gave unspecified answers; they felt they were more effective in their jobs but could not indicate particular contributions. Among those giving detailed answers, however, the following contributions were mentioned: through training/supervising others --53; in advisory capacity/committee membership --49; improving general planning functions --45; improving general administration and management --41; improving co-ordination\networking --36; through research activities --24; improving financial management --17; through procuring resources/funds/equipment --14; and other --13.

Again, the responses demonstrate the extent to which participants are, at least as they perceive it, involved in key activities in their workplaces, and making significant contributions to their ministries or companies. Responses from the participants to this question are compared with those from the supervisors in Section 2.2.3 below. Both respondents and supervisors were asked to specify what improvements they had seen in their ministries or companies as a whole, and to

Table 15
USAID-SPONSORED PARTICIPANTS BY MINISTRY AND INSTITUTION
AS A PERCENT OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Ministry	Total Professional staff	USAID Sponsored L-T	USAID Sponsored S-T	% Of L-T Trained By USAID	% OF S-T Trained By USAID	% OF L-T Plus S-T USAID Trd
MOE	7513	90	32	1.20	0.42	1.62
MOAC	1047	62	22	5.92	2.10	8.02
MOH	982	34	26	3.46	2.65	6.11
MOW&C	553	9	0	1.63	0	1.63
MOI	359	2	3	0.56	0.84	1.40
MOF	262	6	19	2.29	7.25	9.54
MONR&E	154	4	0	2.50	0	2.50
MOL&PS	154	2	3	1.30	1.95	3.25
MOCIM&T	57	2	0	3.50	0	3.50
UNISWA	120	55	0	45.83	0	45.83
S/Bank	150	3	6	2.00	4.00	6.00
C/Bank	216	11	1	5.09	0.46	5.55
P/Sector	N/A	27	6	N/A	N/A	N/A

MOH-Ministry Of Health; MOE-Ministry of Education; MOAC-Ministry of Agriculture & Co-operatives; MOL&PS-Ministry of Labour & Public Service; MOW&C-Ministry of Works & Communications; MOI-Ministry of Interior; MONR&E-Ministry of Natural Resources & Energy; MOF-Ministry of Finance; MOCI&T-Ministry of Commerce, Industry & Tourism; UNISWA-University of Swaziland; S/Bank-Swaziland Development & Savings Bank; C/Bank-Central Bank; P/Sector-Private Sector.

determine how important staff training had been in respect of the achievement of such improvements. Only 10 returned participants (8%) could not identify any improvements which had taken place in their ministry or company. The other 120 respondents mentioned at least one of the following improvements: improved manpower development/training/ utilization --82; improved management/planning functions --52; departments/institutes strengthened or revived --48; improved implementation/use of research or information systems --43; more posts localized --41; improved access to equipment/resources/ funds --28; departments/institutes created --21 and other --20.

Despite the number of improvements mentioned by participants, there were a large number of constraints identified, as shown below: lack of finance/funds n=63; lack of skilled/ trained manpower --62; lack of co-ordination/networking --41; lack of transport --39; shortage/loss of staff --34; lack of planning base/skills --33; lack of other equipment --31; other --28; and unproductive/unprogressive staff --14.

2.1.3.3 The Perceived Relevance of Training

Respondents were asked in a number of questions about the perceived relevance of their training. Questions focused on the relevance of training programs to specific work activities, and to the role or work of their ministry or company.

Seventy-seven (59%) thought that their training was very useful in respect of their current jobs, while 46 (35%) thought it was useful. The remaining seven respondents felt it was not useful at all. The estimated importance of training in assisting participants to make contributions to their employing agencies, as discussed in the previous section, was somewhat higher:

Importance of Training in Making Contributions:

Extremely important	82	63%
Very important	27	21%
Important	15	12%
Hardly important	6	4%

A total of 79 respondents who had undertaken Masters or PhD programs had prepared a research thesis. Of these, just over half (44) had researched a subject relating to Swaziland or had used data from Swaziland.

2.1.3.4 Individuals' Further Training Needs And Career Plans

Only four participants reported no future career plans at the present time. Among the other respondents, career plans were described as follows: to stay in current job --38; to go into own business/consultancy --29; undertake further training --24; move to another ministry/company (but remain in same sector)--16; join international agency or private company --11; and undertake more research work --8.

For the majority of participants, their training had a large influence on their career plans. Fifty-three respondents (41%) said that training had developed their skills and expertise and motivated them to continue in their respective areas of specialization. Another 11 (9%) respondents rated exposure to other cultures and other people as most influential. Twenty-one participants felt that training had made them more ambitious and more self-confident so that they were prepared to actively seek out greater employment challenges in the future.

The USAID sponsored training significantly influenced the respondents' personal development. The single negative comment came from a respondent who felt that the long period of training in the USA had destroyed his family life; eight respondents reported that training had no impact on their personal development.

For 54 (42%) respondents the personal impact was most closely related to a broadening of outlook and understanding through interaction with American culture. A further 48 (37%) said their most significant gains had been in increased self-confidence, a better attitude towards problem solving and and better interpersonal skills. Four (3%) participants reported that the rise in their income levels had the greatest impact on their personal development.

Despite the number of training programs already undertaken by the participants interviewed, only 13 (10%) said that they did not require any further training. Asked what training they required, and at what level, the remaining participants responded as follows:

Level of Training Required	Number
Bachelors	5
Masters	37
PhD	41
Short courses	21
In-service training	6
Other	7

Area of Training Required	Number
In same technical field	74
In different technical field	12
Management skills, to supplement existing technical skills	26
Technical skills, to supplement existing management skills	5

For the majority, therefore, higher level training was desired to extend or supplement skills acquired from previous training programs. There was little call for training to assist a move away from current areas of expertise or specialization. Given the number of higher level degrees specified, it is not surprising that 72% of those desiring further training thought that programs of at least one year duration were necessary. And given the linkages between the survey and the USAID programs, it is not surprising that 67% indicated that the training they required could be undertaken in the USA. Notably, 14 (10%) respondents mentioned the southern Africa region as providing suitable training programs.

2.1.3.5 Overall Assessment of the Participant Training Program and Recommendations for Future Programs

The participants' overall assessment of the training program was extremely positive. In respect of its impact on development in Swaziland as a whole, 100 (77%) considered it was positive, mentioning factors such as increased localization, benefits to manpower development, extending the number of trained personnel available, etc. 21 respondents gave a negative assessment, and the most frequently mentioned reservation was that training in the USA has limited relevance to the situation in Swaziland. Lack of equipment, resources, and a defined promotion structure in the civil service were mentioned by these respondents as reducing the effectiveness of training on Swaziland's development.

Respondents had a number of recommendations to make in respect of the future operation of the program, as shown below:

Recommendations for Future Programs	Number
Change procedures for choosing training institution	28
Increase the scale of the program/send more participants	21
Program requires no changes	18
Increase support and assistance with accommodation, orientation, etc.	17
Change entrance exam requirements	9
Make allowances for spouses to visit during long courses	9
Sponsor more courses in African countries	6
Increase allowances	5
Eliminate role of broker (contractor)	3
No response	21

There were two major concerns relating to the current systems used to choose a training institution for a particular candidate. The most frequently mentioned was the perception that candidates had very little say in making the choice, which they found to be unacceptable. Candidates felt that they were handed a fait accompli, and had no role in deciding from a number of options which would be the better training program.

The second concern related to the perception that institutions were selected on criteria other than the relevance or excellance of their programs. Respondents felt that the same programs at the same institutions were chosen time and again, without real efforts being made to look further afield for others that might prove to be more appropriate and ultimately more beneficial.

The need for change in the placement system, as it currently operates, was brought out in responses. Fifty-one (39%) respondents said the candidates needed to be more directly involved in the selection process. Twenty-one (15%) said that more care should be taken in choosing between possible institutions and 34 (26%) participants felt the system was satisfactory.

In respect to the participants' assessment of the various selection criteria, the following responses were obtained:

Most Important Selection Criteria:	Number
Candidate's academic qualifications	84
Candidate's work experience/performance	81
Area of training a priority for Swaziland	78
Candidate's personal interests	49
Area of training a priority for employer	47
Scores for TOEFL, GRE or entrance exams	21
Recommendation from employer	17
Other	7
No response/not known	6

Clearly, respondents feel that candidates' qualifications, both professional and personal, are extremely important, but they also recognize the need to relate training to Swaziland's development efforts.

2.2 Supervisors' Response

2.2.1 Main Characteristics of the Supervisors

A total of 30 supervisors were interviewed in the course of the impact assessment survey. Among them, they supervised a total of 66 USAID trained participants, 35 of whom (53%) were interviewed in the survey. The supervisors themselves had undertaken a total of 57 training programs, ranging from PhDs to non-qualification short courses. Two supervisors - both skilled workers in manufacturing industries in the private sector - claimed to have undertaken no specialized training. The 57 programs included the following: bachelors --26; masters --12; PhD --1; certificate --5; diploma --11; and non-qualification short - courses --2. The highest qualifications gained by individual supervisors were: no qalifications --2; bachelors --10; master --12; PhD --1; certificate/diploma --3; and not known --2.

Only 20 of the 57 training programs had been undertaken in the southern Africa region or other African countries, 23 were taken in the USA. USAID sponsored programs accounted for one third of this total. Five supervisors (17%) were working in private sector companies. Those working in the public sector were based in the following ministries: Ministry of Health--3; Ministry of Agriculture --5; Ministry of Finance --1; Ministry of Natural Resources --2; Ministry of Labor --2; Ministry of Works --1; Ministry of Education --5; Ministry of Commerce --1; Prime Minister's Office --1; and financial institutions --4.

Job grades were unobtainable from nine supervisors. Of the remaining 21, 20 were in jobs classified at grade 21 or over, and one was in a post classified as grade 19. The majority (24) were working at head office level, while four were based in training institutions, three at UNISWA and one at the Nazarene Nursing College. Supervisors occupied the following job categories: financial management --3; other managerial and administration --18; teaching/training --3; research --2; and job-specific technical work --4.

The majority supervised professional, administrative or technical staff; only 10 had semi-skilled or unskilled employees under their supervision. Among the USAID returned participants they supervised, 52 (79%) were professional, 11 technical and three, in administrative posts.

2.2.2 Assessment of Staff

It proved very difficult to encourage supervisors to provide a rating of their staff. They were particularly uncomfortable comparing locally trained or non-USAID sponsored staff with USAID participants. Many were unwilling to give even an absolute rating to other groupings.

In part, this was because supervisors felt that the two categories of trainees had not received comparable training, and were, in addition, not usually in comparable job situations; it was, therefore, unfair to try and rate them on a comparative basis. Another frequent response, however, was that the distinguishing factor between USAID participants and staff trained locally was their attitude towards work. The impression was that USAID trained employees had a markedly better attitude towards their work, although this was not clarified by the supervisors.

Thus, data obtained from the rating exercise is very limited, but does give some indication of supervisors' perception of job performance. Supervisors were asked to rate employees on a 5-point scale, ranging from very capable (1) to not capable (5), on a variety of work activities. In Table 16 below, percentages are given for the number of employees in each category who were rated as very capable (1), quite capable (2) or capable (3).

Table 16
RATING OF STAFF CAPABILITY, BY TYPE OF SPONSORSHIP FOR TRAINING AND TYPE OF WORK ACTIVITY

	USAID Participants	Locally Trained or non-USAID Trained
Financial management/ budgeting (rated 1-3)	90%	60%
Other admin/managerial work (rated 1-3)	100%	71%
Teaching/training (rated 1-3)	100%	83%
Research/evaluation (rated 1-3)	100%	67%
Job-specific technical work (rated 1-3)	100%	63%
Extension work (rated 1-3)	80%	100%
Project identification (rated 1-3)	100%	33%
Project design/planning (rated 1-3)	100%	33%
Project implementation (rated 1-3)	100%	80%
Project monitoring/ evaluation (rated 1-3)	100%	67%
Managing people (rated 1-3)	80%	78%
Organizing work tasks for others (rated 1-3)	88%	90%

While the figures must be treated with some caution, given the high non-response rate to this section of the questionnaire (on average, approximately 50% per work activity), they do show an interesting pattern. Throughout, the USAID participants have consistently high scores, and are rated above other employees for each work activity, with the exception of extension work, where they are at par. The locally or non-USAID trained staff, received high scores on extension work and work scheduling.

These results serve to reinforce the comment made by many supervisors, discussed in Section 2.2.5 below, that a major disadvantage of the USAID sponsored training was that it was not always relevant to the situation in Swaziland. Lack of relevance would obviously be particularly acute at extension and project level, where an understanding of context and "socio-cultural characteristics" is particularly important.

The supervisors were also asked to rate USAID participants and locally or non-USAID sponsored employees on a variety of factors which they themselves considered important in evaluating staff performance. While the supervisors were generally forthcoming with lists of evaluation factors, they were again reluctant to rate their employees. The results, therefore must be treated with caution.

The factors used to evaluate staff performance were as follows:

Interpersonal relationships	17
Initiative/creativity	14
Job skills - not specified	12
Reliability/punctuality	12
Knowledge of job	11
Communication skills	11
Performance on the job - not specified	11
Personality	7
Ability to motivate others	7
Drive/determination	6
Compilation of reports	6
Decision-making	5
Diligence/conscientiousness	5
Potential for advancement	3
Knowledge of English	2
Understanding - not specified	2

Given this wide range of factors, and the small number of supervisors who responded to this exercise, it was not possible to identify a rating for the two categories of USAID and non-USAID trained employees, against each individual factor.

Overall, all employees were rated consistently high on the evaluation factors, although the USAID participants were as a rule marginally higher, or equal to, those of other employees.

By and large, supervisors felt that the USAID participants were suitably qualified for the posts they were holding. None thought that any USAID participants were in posts for which they were unqualified, although six supervisors reported that some or all of USAID trained employees they supervised were in posts for which they were only partly qualified. Four felt that some or all of their USAID trained employees were holding posts for which they were over-qualified.

2.2.3 Mobility and Skills Transfer

Overall, the supervisors reported limited mobility of USAID participants between sectors, within the past year. Four said that up to three of their employees in this category had emigrated, and another four said that two of their USAID trained staff had changed sector; in all cases this was a move from the public sector to private companies. In common with the participants themselves, supervisors most frequently mentioned the attraction of better salaries, conditions of service, and greater job satisfaction, as reasons for movement between sectors.

Asked to indicate what percentage of USAID participants had been promoted and/or transferred within the past five years, the supervisors provided the following figures:

Table 17
PROPORTION OF USAID PARTICIPANTS PROMOTED, TRANSFERRED OR REMAINING IN POST OVER PAST FIVE YEARS

	No Change	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Promoted internally, or promoted and transferred	11	4	4	0	11
Transferred internally, or to another ministry/ company at same level	20	0	0	1	0
Remained in same post	18	1	2	3	6

In respect of skills transfer, supervisors were asked to indicate what proportion of the USAID participants used the various mechanisms, shown below:

Table 18
PROPORTION OF USAID PARTICIPANTS USING SKILLS TRANSFER MECHANISMS

	None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
In-service workshops	12	3	0	0	15
Part-time teaching, outside workplace	23	0	0	1	6
Supervising staff in-training	15	0	0	1	14
One-to-one guidance of staff	9	1	0	1	19
Through research work	20	1	0	0	9
Through writing reports	15	1	0	1	13
Other	26	0	0	0	4

The above figures correspond closely with those obtained from the participants' questionnaires, and indicate that the most frequently utilized mechanisms were one-to-one guidance of staff, supervising staff in training, conducting in-service workshops or seminars and writing reports.

Only 10 (33%) of the supervisors said that their ministry or company had any fixed bonding regulations. Two did not know what the regulations were in their employing agencies, while the remaining 18 said there were no such regulations (one supervisor said procedures existed in theory, but were not followed in practice). Bonding regulations which did exist, normally bonded the employees for a period at least equal to the length of time spent in training, although in four cases, all of which were government institutions, a post-training contract of five years was said to be mandatory, regardless of the length of long-term training.

2.2.4 The Contribution of Returned Participants to Development Work in Swaziland

In a manner similar to that addressed to the participants themselves, supervisors were asked to assess what contributions USAID trained staff were making towards development in Swaziland. Estimating the proportion of USAID trained employees involved in various aspects of development projects, the supervisors provided the following figures:

Table 19
PROPORTION OF USAID PARTICIPANTS
INVOLVED IN PROJECT WORK

	None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Project Identification	17	0	0	1	12
Project Design/Planning	19	0	0	1	10
Project Implementation	14	0	2	0	14
Project Monitoring Evaluation	15	0	2	0	13

In respect of each of the various activities, at least 60% of supervisors indicated that one or more, and most frequently, all of their employees with USAID sponsored training were involved in project work.

In only two cases supervisors reported that participants had taken over their current posts from technical assistance personnel, 15 indicated that the posts of at least a quarter of the USAID trained staff had previously been held by expatriates. Another three reported that the posts had been created for the USAID participants and the remainder were in posts previously filled by Swazi nationals. Comparison is made below of the responses of supervisors and participants, in respect of the latters' contribution to development within their employing agencies.

Table 20
RESPONSES FROM SUPERVISORS TO PARTICIPANTS
CONTRIBUTION TO DEVELOPMENT
WITHIN THEIR EMPLOYING AGENCIES

	Supervisors	USAID Participants
Being More Effective in the Job Not Specified	80%	15%
Through Training/Supervising Others	70%	14%
Improving Administration and Management	47%	11%
Improving General Planning Functions	30%	12%

Due to the high level of non-response on the part of the participants, it is rather difficult to make comparisons between their responses and those of the supervisors. However, the pattern of the supervisors' responses corresponds quite closely with that of the participants themselves, although the latter placed emphasis on their contribution in an advisory capacity and through committee membership, which was only mentioned by four supervisors.

Despite the generally high levels of satisfaction with participants' job performance, which were evident from the supervisors' comments, supervisors made a number of recommendations about ways in which the participants' contributions to development work could be improved. By far the greatest number of these related to the need for follow-up training, principally to be done in-house, through the media of short courses, seminars and workshops, with a particular emphasis on improving management, administrative and job-specific skills. It appears that the requirement was for academic skills to be supplemented by on-going training in more practically orientated subjects with direct relevance to day-to-day work activities.

In addition, supervisors indicated that their employing agencies, in both the public and private sector, still had high levels of training requirements for all their staff. Lack of qualified and appropriately skilled personnel was the single most frequent constraint the employing agencies mentioned. While approximately one third of the supervisors felt that short courses were the type of training most required, 10 specified a total of 63 staff in need of training to degree level, and for an additional 54 staff, higher degree training to masters or PhD level was recommended.

In the majority of cases, overseas training was favored for academic training, at degree level and above (eight supervisors indicated that the programs required could be undertaken in the USA), while local training (within Africa) was regarded as suitable in respect of short-term courses, including certificate and diploma courses.

Despite the very detailed nature of the responses on training requirements from a number of the supervisors, the majority were able to offer only very vague ideas about what training plans their employing agencies had developed. Sixteen (53%) said that the question would have to be referred to the training officer, or that there were no plans of which they were aware. Eleven indicated that their agencies' existing plans centered mostly on providing in-service training for personnel; five identified specific plans for sending staff for academic training at the degree level and above.

Ideas about the manner in which USAID training opportunities were incorporated into ministry or company training plans were equally undefined. Six supervisors said it was impossible to incorporate programs offered in the USA into their training programs when individual staff members could only apply after responding to public announcements made each year. Others felt that direct representation by each ministry, including the use of quota systems, would make it easier to use the USAID opportunities more effectively as a part of their overall planning for training. The majority of supervisors indicated that the process was essentially pragmatic, if USAID was offering programs of interest to the employing agencies, they would try and capitalize on them.

Asked what other factors, apart from training, would help to accelerate or strengthen development work within their ministry or company, a number of supervisors raised needs which were in fact training-related. Ten supervisors, for example, mentioned the need for educational tours, secondment to overseas or local institutes involved in similar work activities or attendance at professional meetings. Others mentioned the need for equipment and facilities which would both encourage highly trained staff to use their skills more fully, and act as an incentive to remaining on the job. The need for improved salary and promotion structures was also mentioned in this respect.

2.2.5 Overall Assessment of the Participant Training Program and Recommendations for Future Programs

In respect of an overall assessment of the participant training program, supervisors had somewhat more serious reservations

than the participants themselves. While they enumerated a number of advantages of USAID training - most frequently: increased exposure to new technologies and methods (24), better quality of training (17), and a general widening of horizons and increased personal development or enlightenment (13) - many disadvantages were also identified.

Most commonly, as noted earlier, these related to the questionable relevance of the American training to Swaziland's context, particularly where frustrations arose when participants did not have access to the type of equipment and facilities they had used during training. Marital stress, culture shock and other personal problems were mentioned, particularly in respect of the number of young and immature candidates who were accepted into the programs.

In respect of the placement system, supervisors made very similar comments to those of the participants, discussed in earlier sections of this report. The lack of participation by the candidate and his or her employer was mentioned by 12 (40%) supervisors as a problem area. Overall, only six (20%) supervisors thought the placement system was satisfactory as it currently operates, which compares with a similar response from 26% of the participants.

The most important criteria to be used in selecting candidates were again similar for both participants and supervisors, although not surprisingly, the importance of employers' recommendations and priorities figured more strongly for the latter, as shown below:

	Supervisors	USAID Participants
Candidate's academic qualifications	73%	17%
Candidate's work experience/ performance	73%	16%
Area of training priority for employer	57%	9%
Recommendation from employer	43%	3%

Recommendation for the participant training program centered around the placement system, specifically, the need for more participation by the candidate and employers in the selection process and the establishment of more direct communication between USAID and the employers early on in the process. There were also a number of comments relating to ways in which training could be made more relevant within the context of

development needs in Swaziland. Suggestions included a more careful assessment of the host institutions, so that relevant programs were chosen, and an increase in the number of training places in non-American institutions, with a particular emphasis on more practically-orientated training programs.

Thus, the overall assessment of the program for development in Swaziland, and for individual ministries and companies, while generally positive, was tempered by reservations about the relevance of the training received. The benefits of a qualified and well-orientated staff was appreciated and seen to be important in the long-term, not to mention the high level of confidence shown by USAID trained staff. Yet this was overshadowed by feelings that the academic nature of training was impractical for the day-to-day requirements of development work in Swaziland.

It should be noted that many of these concerns were echoed by the members of the IAC committee during their discussion meetings, particularly with respect to the need to incorporate USAID training opportunities into a national manpower development program.

3. IMPACT ASSESSMENT - CONCLUSIONS

3.1 The Impact of the Participant Training Program to Date

In preparing an impact assessment of the USAID participant training program in Swaziland, we have used both quantitative and qualitative indicators. Both are important, for by themselves, the figures on number of trainees, number of different programs undertaken and so forth, do not give the whole picture. The manner in which participants use, disseminate and further develop their skills is an equally significant measure of the impact of their training, as assessed both subjectively and objectively by themselves, their supervisors and the consultants. In addition, whether participants work in the private or public sector, the employment, socio-economic and cultural environment of Swaziland has a bearing on the impact of the training program as a whole.

In quantitative terms alone, the impact of the program is certainly significant. Almost 500 Swazi nationals have been trained over the past 15-20 years, the vast majority of whom have returned to Swaziland and are using their skills in a variety of employment situations. The training programs undertaken have covered a wide range of disciplines in the crucial public service sectors, particularly in agriculture, education and health. While the majority of participants have been trained to bachelors and masters level, many have undertaken short-term training with an emphasis on improving job-specific skills.

The need has been expressed for more of the latter type of training programs, indicating a feeling that too much emphasis has been placed on the academic, as opposed to the more practically orientated programs. Both types of training are clearly required. At the start of the USAID program in the early 1970's, skill levels in the public sector were extremely low and the initial decision to begin with basic academic training for the majority of participants was understandable, and indeed, practical at that time. We have not observed any particular change in training trends over the period of the USAID program; as discussed below, changes in the level of programs and the range of subjects offered are now necessary, but may be difficult to achieve effectively in the absence of a national manpower development plan.

In quantitative terms, we have assessed the mobility of participants across sectors and specifically, away from the public sector. Such movement appears to be limited: only 23 (18%) of the participants interviewed have made a major change across sectors, while 17 (13%) had left civil service employment for private companies. Although this might be regarded as 'wastage', it may also be argued that the importance of the private sector to Swaziland's economy means that skills are equally beneficial in that sector.

Overall, the numerical impact of the training program has been greater in the public sector, (only 10 participants in our sample were in private sector employment when they undertook their first USAID sponsored training program). Given the relative size of the sectors - employment in the public sector has, over the period of the USAID training program, accounted for approximately 70% of total formal employment - it would appear then, that more emphasis could be given to training employees from the private sector. However, it is very likely that the sector's internal resources and access to finance for training, whether in-service, locally or overseas based, is far greater than that available to the Government of Swaziland. The public sector is more heavily dependent on donor assistance for training awards, and the opportunities made available by USAID and other agencies should be targeted primarily by the civil service, although not to the total exclusion of private sector personnel.

It is clear from the findings of the impact assessment survey that the majority of participants have been upwardly mobile in terms of grading and salary levels, and at least one-third are now in senior posts within the civil service, with significant decision and policy making functions. The range of work activities undertaken by the majority of USAID trained employees in their current posts is broad, and includes responsibilities at fairly high technical and professional (managerial/administrative) levels.

Supervisors indicated high levels of satisfaction with the participants' performance in these areas, but a somewhat lower assessment of their work at extension level and in respect of project implementation. The number of participants contributing to development projects is significant. Eighty-three (64%) participants were involved in development projects, primarily in identification and planning. All respondents (130) claimed to actively transfer their skills in one way or another. Combined with the numbers of participants in key institutions and the posts occupied, the impact can be assumed to be considerable. Although more difficult to assess, the transfer of knowlege and skills should clearly work to strengthen the respective ministries or companies.

In respect of the impact of the program on women, the results indicate that females represent just under a third of participants interviewed in the course of the study and their mobility, seniority and general employment status is somewhat lower than that of males. Family commitments and domestic pressures, together with somewhat unprogressive attitudes towards the abilities of female employees are characteristic of most employment environments in both developing and developed countries.

There is no reason to expect that the situation in Swaziland should be significantly different, but the fact that USAID has trained female personnel - and approximately 60% of these, to the masters level - seems not to have had a particular influence on the attitude of those responsible for promotion and the delegation of work activities. A further in-depth study would be required of the employment situation of women in Swaziland to ascertain more clearly the reasons for the prevailing trend, and methods which might be developed to improve it.

Assessment of the impact of the program in qualitative terms is more difficult to assess. Our findings suggest, however, that both subjective and objective assessment of the impact, by those involved, is relatively high. Three major limitations were identified fairly consistently, however. First, both participants and supervisors frequently noted that participants were often unable to obtain and utilize appropriate equipment and resources to translate their training into practical work on a day-to-day basis. While there was some concern that the limited relevance of the training itself was the cause of the problem, the more commonly raised issue related to the inability of the Government to provide adequate resources for transport, equipment, etc., as well as, a lack of systematic promotion structures and salary gradings, which further frustrated participants. While structural and resource problems within the

Government machinery may not be areas which USAID feels it is within its scope of work to influence, these problems must be recognized as ones which may ultimately limit the impact of the training program.

The respondents' second concern related to the feeling that the program to date had emphasized too heavily the availability of training places for academic subjects as opposed to ones more practically-orientated, especially a lack of short-term training in management and administration. Our results confirm that academic training has been the major type undertaken by the USAID participants to date, but concludes that it has provided a much needed skills base across the public sector.

The third major concern related to the selection process used to determine which candidate would ultimately be offered a training place, and to which institutions he or she would be sent. In respect of both parts of the process, participants and supervisors felt equally strongly that much more direct contact was necessary between all the parties involved, from an early stage, and that candidates and employers should have a greater role in reviewing the relevant programs and institutes available, and be involved in the final decision on the best choice for the individual. For many respondents the current lack of participation on the part of the candidates and employers limited the impact of the training received. It was felt that where they did not have an opportunity to discuss their needs and priorities fully with TransCentury or USAID, it was not always the most relevant training program or institution which was chosen.

3.2 Likely Long-term Impact of the Program

While the current situation indicates that the USAID training program has contributed significantly to providing a cadre of generally well-trained personnel in the senior and middle levels of the Swaziland civil service, the long-term effect of the program will be determined by two primary factors:

- the future mobility and employment situation of the participants; and
- the ability of those who take up their current posts as they are vacated through retirement and movement across jobs and to carry on with work activities already in place.

In respect of the first factor, the majority of participants interviewed indicated a general satisfaction with their current employment situation and prospects. Most were willing to stay and work in the civil service, and were, indeed, often

determined to use their skills acquired through training to contribute to development work and improvements in the functioning of their current employing agency. Given this loyalty to the civil service, a significant movement away from the public sector to the private sector in the short to medium term is unlikely.

Over time, however, the expansion of the private sector, which is progressing fairly rapidly at present, may offer incentives to the participants which they may find hard to resist. If, at the same time, the GOS fails to establish more attractive promotion and salary scales, and conditions of services generally, the losses may increase. Moreover, training for the majority of participants, and subsequent work experience, has created an ability and willingness to make and see through important decisions regarding policy and program development. The dual system of national decision-making, where the traditional leaders and civil servants both have a large role to play, may ultimately frustrate these personnel in carrying out activities and development work, where the slow impetus for change among many of the leaders delays the process at a number of levels.

A number of the respondents mentioned that their career aspirations involved the setting up of their own businesses or small consultancy practices. The infrastructure and incentives to establish small businesses in Swaziland are relatively well developed. For the SADCC region as a whole, as well for the country itself, consultancy services for development work may be increasingly in demand. Other countries in the region have already experienced a situation where donor agencies themselves "cream off" the most able civil servants for local project management posts. It is extremely difficult to estimate how extensive these trends may be in the long-term and how many participants may make good their aspirations of self-employment. The skills of the participants may be equally useful, wherever they are utilized for significant development work in Swaziland or the region.

There are long-term benefits in training people in subordinate positions who are likely to take over the posts of the older participants as they move on. Some of these subordinates may already have academic training, sponsored by USAID or other donors, and require only short in-service training to develop and/or supplement their skills.

Such planning will not be appropriately formulated unless the GOS is able to produce a long-term assessment of manpower development for the civil service. Shortfalls are easily identified, but projections of future needs require fairly

sophisticated planning and statistical techniques. While technical assistance personnel have been helping in this area up until now, there has been limited progress in actually producing forecasts in significant detail. With the relatively well-trained cadre currently in post, however, the long-term effects of the program will be reduced if such forecasts are not available for the medium to long-term.

There is thus clearly a need for USAID to determine how far it wishes to become involved in such a planning exercise, to ensure the maximum impact of the program in the future. Without development in the planning base, the program will not be completely effective. If the program does not recognize the need for review and respond to the trends highlighted in the assessment exercise, its impact will be reduced. There is currently a peaking at the higher levels of the civil service, with respect to the availability of suitably trained participants. Attention should continue to be paid to academic training for middle management, as well as, broadening the range of training opportunities in respect of managerial, administrative and practical skills.

Wherever possible, this training should be conducted within the SADCC region. Within the country, there is need to strengthen existing training institutions, possibly through the deployment of technical assistance to help in the development of course planning and curriculum design. UNISWA will continue to require overseas training to PhD level within all its faculties, to further increase the standard of academic training which the university itself can provide.

In the medium to long-term, the USAID participant training program will need to extend the range of training opportunities it can offer, while maintaining the present number of academic placements. Current speculation about priority needs and actual numbers of trainees requiring places for the various types of training are insufficient, however, to form a meaningful planning base for any extension of the program. Every effort should be made to develop comprehensive national manpower policies and plans, and for the USAID program to respond to the needs identified within it. The program has to date made a significant contribution to the development of Swaziland in general, and to the development of the manpower base in the public sector in particular. It is important that this contribution is maintained in the long-term.

IMPACT ASSESSMENT

OF THE

USAID SWAZILAND

PARTICIPANT TRAINING PROGRAM

(1971-1989)

APPENDIXES

AUGUST, 1989

KHALIPHA INVESTMENTS (PTY) LTD

KHALIPHA MANAGEMENT SERVICES DIVISION

UNDER SUB-CONTRACT FROM THE

TRANSCENTURY CORPORATION

44

APPENDIX "A"

PARTICIPANT TRACER SHEET

PARTICIPANT TRACER SHEET

PIO NUMBER: ..... KI NUMBER:.....

Participant's Surname ..... Foreman .....

Sex ..... Marital Status ..... DOB .....

Current Employment:

Min/Ins/Co..... Address .....

Job Title/Position .....

Time in current job ..... years ..... months Phone number.....

Supervisor's Name ..... S NUMBER: .....

Supervisor's Job title/Position .....

Supervisor's contact phone number: .....

If not employed in Swaziland, current status: .....

Training History:

BACHELOR DEGREE: Subject ..... Score/GPA .....

University ..... Country .....

Start date ..... Finish date ..... USAID PTP? Yes No

If YES, which programme: .....

If NO, sponsored by whom:
.....

MASTERS DEGREE: Subject .....

University ..... Country .....

Start date ..... Finish date ..... USAID PTP? Yes No

If YES, which programme: .....

If NO, sponsored by whom:.....

PHD: Subject .....

University ..... Country .....

Start Date ..... Finish date ..... USAID PTP? Yes No

If YES, which programme: .....

If NO, sponsored by whom:.....

CERTIFICATE: Subject .....

Institute ..... Country .....

Start date ..... Finish date ..... USAID PTP? Yes No

If YES, Which programme: .....

If NO, sponsored by whom:.....

DIPLOMA/AA: Subject .....

Institute .....

Start date ..... Finish date ..... USAID PTP? Yes No

If YES, which programme: .....

If NO, sponsored by whom:.....

When first went for USAID PTP, in what position:

Min/Ins/Co .....

Job title/position .....

CHECK: private sector ..... public sector .....

Member of USAID Alumni Association: Yes No

Available for interview:

	Mon	Tues	Wedn	Thurs	Fri
Wk 1 April 24 - 28	.....	H	.....	.....	.....
Wk 2 May 1 - 5	.....	.....	.....	H	.....
Wk 3 May 8 - 12	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Wk 4 May 15 - 19	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

Interview Checklist

	Participant	Supervisor
Interview booked	Date/Time.....	Date/Time.....
To be interview by:.....		.....
Call back:	Date/Time	Date/Time .....
Q/naire coded:	.....	.....
Q/naire punched:	.....	.....

-41

APPENDIX "B"

PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE

USAID/Swaziland PARTICIPANT TRAINING PROGRAM EVALUATION

PARTICIPANTS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Participant's KI Number: _____ 1-4 ☐☐☐☐

First USAID Course PIO/P Number: _____ 5-9 ☐☐☐☐☐

Card Number 10 ☐1

Name of Interviewer: _____ Date: _____

Participant's Surname: _____

Forenames: _____

Sex: Male 1 Female 2 11 ☐

Marital Status:

Never Married	1	
Married	2	12 ☐
Separated/Divorced	3	
Widowed	4	
No Response	5	

13 ☐

In which age group do you belong:

1. Under 21
2. 21-30
3. 31-40
4. 41-50
5. Over 50
0. No Resp.

Number of Children: _____ 14 ☐

1. When you first went for USAID participant training, what job were you in?

   Job Title/Position: _____ Grade: _____ 15-16 ☐☐

   Name of Ministry/Company: _____ 17-18 ☐☐

   Location of workplace: _____ 19 ☐

2. What type of training did you first undertake as a USAID Participant?

   Program/Level: _____ 20 ☐

   Subject/Major: _____ 21-22 ☐☐

   University/Institute: _____

   Country of Training: _____ 23 ☐

   Did you complete the course? Yes 1 No 2 24 ☐

   Start date (year): _____ 25-26 ☐☐

   Length of course: _____ months _____ years 27 ☐

INTERVIEWER CHECK: PROGRAM NUMBER _____ 28-34 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

3. What job did you take up when you returned to Swaziland?

a) No job taken up 1 (Go on to Q.5) — Took up job 2 (Continue to Q3b)

35 ☐

b) Job Title/Position: _____ Grade: _____

36-37 ☐☐

Name of Ministry/Company: _____

38-39 ☐☐

Location of workplace: _____

40 ☐

c) Was this job at the same or a higher level as the one you left when you went for training?

41 ☐

same level 1 higher level 2

4. Did you take up this job as soon as you returned to Swaziland or was there a delay?

42 ☐

Yes 1 No 2

If Delayed, Why?

1. No appropriate vacant post. 1
2. Post abolished in absence. 2
3. Process involved in creation of appropriate post 3
4. Other. 4

43 ☐

5. Apart from the course described in Q2, what other training have you undertaken, including that sponsored by USAID, any other donors, the GOS, or through your own initiative?

	First	Second	Third	
Program/Level:	_____	_____	_____	44 ☐ 45 ☐ 46 ☐
Subject/Major:	_____	_____	_____	47 48 ☐☐ 49 50 ☐☐ 51 52 ☐☐
University/Institute:	_____	_____	_____	
Country:	_____	_____	_____	53 ☐ 54 ☐ 55 ☐
Course Completed:	Yes=1 No=2	Yes=1 No=2	Yes=1 No=2	56 ☐ 57 ☐ 58 ☐
Start Date (year):	_____	_____	_____	59 60 ☐☐ 61 62 ☐☐ 63 64 ☐☐
Length of Course:	___m ___y	___m ___y	___m ___y	65 ☐ 66 ☐ 67 ☐
Sponsored by:	_____	_____	_____	68 ☐ 69 ☐ 70 ☐

Participant's KI Number: _____ 1-4 ☐☐☐☐

Card Number 5 [2]

INTERVIEWER: CHECK PROGRAM NUMBER IF SPONSORED BY USAID:

First _____ Second _____

Third _____

6-12 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

13-19 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

20-26 ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

6. Are you in the same job/position as the one you returned to when you returned to Swaziland after USAID participant training (as specified in Q3)?

In same job	1	(Continue)	27 ☐
In different job	2	(Go to Q7)	

What factors have contributed to your remaining in this post?

	Yes	No	N/A	
At top of career structure already	1	2	8	28 ☐
No promotion posts to move into	1	2	8	29 ☐
Lack of qualifications	1	2	8	30 ☐
Like the present job	1	2	8	31 ☐
Other (specify) _____	1	2	8	32 ☐
	(Go to Q9)			

7. In respect of the other jobs you have had, have you been:

	Once	More than Once	Never	N/A	
Promoted within same department/ section	1	2	3	8	33 ☐
Promoted and transferred to another department/section	1	2	3	8	34 ☐
Transferred to another department/ section at same level	1	2	3	8	35 ☐
Promoted and transferred to another Ministry/company	1	2	3	8	36 ☐
Transferred to another Ministry/ company at same level	1	2	3	8	37 ☐
Demoted	1	2	3	8	38 ☐

What factors do you think contributed to your being transferred or promoted?

	Yes	No	N/A	
Possessed required skills/experience	1	2	8	39 ☐
Possessed required training	1	2	8	40 ☐
Vacancy/new post had to be filled	1	2	8	41 ☐
Participant requested transfer	1	2	8	42 ☐
Other (specify) _____	1	2	8	43 ☐

51

8. Since undertaking any USAID participant training, have you:

	Yes	No	N/A	
Left government for private sector	1	2	8	44 ☐
Left government for self-employment	1	2	8	45 ☐
Left private sector for government	1	2	8	46 ☐
Left private sector for self-employment	1	2	8	47 ☐
Left self-employment for public sector	1	2	8	48 ☐
Left self-employment for private sector	1	2	8	49 ☐

What factors contributed to your leaving government service/ the private sector, or going into self-employment? (Code up to THREE factors)

01 -Better conditions of service
02 -Better salary
03 -Better fringe benefits
04 - Lack of promotion prospects
05 - Lack of training opportunities
06 - Greater job satisfaction/challenge in work
07 - Under-utilization of training/skills acquired
08 - Problems associated with working relations
09 - Family reasons
10 - Other (specify) _____
88 - N/A
00 - No Response

First _____ 50-51 ☐☐
Second _____ 52-53 ☐☐
Third _____ 54-55 ☐☐

9. What is your current job?

Job Title/Position: _____ Grade: _____ 56-57 ☐☐

Name of Ministry/Company: _____ 58-59 ☐☐

Location of workplace: _____ 60 ☐

How long have you been in this post: _____months _____years 61 ☐

10. How many people do you supervise directly: _____ 62 ☐

1. None
2. 1-5
3. 6-10
4. 11-15
5. 16-20
6. Over 20
0. No Resp.

How many are in each of the following categories?

1 - Professional _____ 63-64 ☐☐

2 - Technical _____ 65-66 ☐☐

3 - Admin/Clerical _____ 67-68 ☐☐

52

4 - Semi-skilled _____ 69-70 [ ][ ]

5 - Unskilled/casual workers _____ 71-72 [ ][ ]

6 - Other 73 [ ] [ ] 74

Participant's KI Number: _____ 1-4 [ ][ ][ ][ ]

Card Number 5 [3]

11. What proportion of your time is spent on the following:

Financial Management/Budgeting	_____%	6-8 [ ][ ][ ]
Other Administrative/Managerial Work	_____%	9-11 [ ][ ][ ]
Teaching/Training	_____%	12-14 [ ][ ][ ]
Research/Evaluation	_____%	15-17 [ ][ ][ ]
Extension Work	_____%	18-20 [ ][ ][ ]
Job-specific Technical Work	_____%	21-23 [ ][ ][ ]
Travelling	_____%	24-26 [ ][ ][ ]
Other (specify) _____	_____%	27-29 [ ][ ][ ]

12. Does you job involve any work on specific development projects or programs?

Yes 1 (Continue)
No 2 (Go to Q13) 30 [ ]

Please give names of specific projects/programs you have been involved with since the beginning of 1988:

1. _____ *31-32 [ ][ ]

2. _____ *33-34 [ ][ ]

3. _____ *35-36 [ ][ ]

In what ways have you been involved?

	Yes	No	N/A	
Project/program identification	1	2	8	37 [ ]
Project/program design/planning	1	2	8	38 [ ]
Project/program implementation	1	2	8	39 [ ]
Project/program monitoring/evaluation	1	2	8	40 [ ]
Other	1	2	8	41 [ ]

53

13. Was your job previously:

Held by a Swazi National	1	
Held by an expatriate	2	
Held by technical assistant	3	
Created for respondent	4	
Not known	9	

42 ☐

14. How far has the training you received under the USAID participant training program assisted you to undertake work in the following categories in your current job:
(Rate on scale 1-5)

	Bach	Mast	PhD	Dip	Cert					
Financial management/budgeting	___	___	___	___	___	43 ☐	44 ☐	45 ☐	46 ☐	47 ☐
Other admin/managerial work	___	___	___	___	___	48 ☐	49 ☐	50 ☐	51 ☐	52 ☐
Teaching/training	___	___	___	___	___	53 ☐	54 ☐	55 ☐	56 ☐	57 ☐
Research/evaluation	___	___	___	___	___	58 ☐	59 ☐	60 ☐	61 ☐	62 ☐
Job-specific technical work	___	___	___	___	___	63 ☐	64 ☐	65 ☐	66 ☐	67 ☐
Extension work	___	___	___	___	___	68 ☐	69 ☐	70 ☐	71 ☐	72 ☐
Project identification	___	___	___	___	___	73 ☐	74 ☐	75 ☐	76 ☐	77 ☐

Participant's KI Number: _____ 1-4 ☐☐☐☐

Card Number 5 [4]

Project design/planning	___	___	___	___	___	6 ☐	7 ☐	8 ☐	9 ☐	10 ☐
Project implementation	___	___	___	___	___	11 ☐	12 ☐	13 ☐	14 ☐	15 ☐
Project monitoring/evaluation	___	___	___	___	___	16 ☐	17 ☐	18 ☐	19 ☐	20 ☐
Managing people	___	___	___	___	___	21 ☐	22 ☐	23 ☐	24 ☐	25 ☐
Organizing and scheduling work tasks for others	___	___	___	___	___	26 ☐	27 ☐	28 ☐	29 ☐	30 ☐
Other (specify) _____	___	___	___	___	___	31 ☐	32 ☐	33 ☐	34 ☐	35 ☐

Scale: 1 = very helpful 2 = quite helpful 3 = helpful
4 = hardly helpful 5 = not helpful 8 = N/A

15. How far has the training you received under other training program(s) assisted you to undertake work in the following categories in your current job:
(Rate on scale 1-5)

54

	Bach	Mast	PhD	Dip	Cert					
Financial management/budgeting	___	___	___	___	___	36 [ ]	37 [ ]	38 [ ]	39 [ ]	40 [ ]
Other admin/managerial work	___	___	___	___	___	41 [ ]	42 [ ]	43 [ ]	44 [ ]	45 [ ]
Teaching/training	___	___	___	___	___	46 [ ]	47 [ ]	48 [ ]	49 [ ]	50 [ ]
Research/evaluation	___	___	___	___	___	51 [ ]	52 [ ]	53 [ ]	54 [ ]	55 [ ]
Job-specific technical work	___	___	___	___	___	56 [ ]	57 [ ]	58 [ ]	59 [ ]	60 [ ]
Extension work	___	___	___	___	___	61 [ ]	62 [ ]	63 [ ]	64 [ ]	65 [ ]
Project identification	___	___	___	___	___	66 [ ]	67 [ ]	68 [ ]	69 [ ]	70 [ ]
Project design/planning	___	___	___	___	___	71 [ ]	72 [ ]	73 [ ]	74 [ ]	75 [ ]
Project implementation	___	___	___	___	___	76 [ ]	77 [ ]	78 [ ]	79 [ ]	80 [ ]

Participant's KI Number: _____ 1-4 [ ][ ][ ][ ]

Card Number 5 [5]

						6	7	8	9	10
Project monitoring/evaluation	___	___	___	___	___	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Managing people	___	___	___	___	___	11 [ ]	12 [ ]	13 [ ]	14 [ ]	15 [ ]
Organizing and scheduling work tasks for others	___	___	___	___	___	16 [ ]	17 [ ]	18 [ ]	19 [ ]	20 [ ]
Other (Specify) _____	___	___	___	___	___	21 [ ]	22 [ ]	23 [ ]	24 [ ]	25 [ ]

Scale: 1 = very helpful 2 = quite helpful 3 = helpful
4 = hardly helpful 5 = not helpful 8 = N/A

16. How useful do you think your training is, in respect of your current job?

Very Useful	1	Hardly Useful	4
Quite Useful	2	Not Useful	5
Useful	3	Don't Know	9

26 [ ]

17. FOR MASTERS AND PhD PARTICIPANTS ONLY - Did you do your thesis on a subject relating to Swaziland, or using data from Swaziland?

Yes 1 No 2 N/A 8

27 [ ]

18. What type of further training do you require?

Program/level: _____

28 [ ]

55

Subject/major: _____ 29 [ ]

Where available: _____ 30 [ ]

Length of training: _____ months _____ years 31 [ ]

19. What are your future career plans?

_____ *32-33 [ ][ ]

_____

How has your training influenced these career plans?

_____ *34-35 [ ][ ]

_____

20. What impact has the USAID participant training you received had on your personal development? (PROBE)

_____ *36-37 [ ][ ]

_____

21. What opportunities or forums do you use to pass on the skills you acquired through training to colleagues or other staff with whom you work?

	Yes	No	
Conducting in-service workshops/seminars	1	2	38 [ ]
Part-time teaching, outside own Min./Ins./Co.	1	2	39 [ ]
Supervising interns/staff-in-training	1	2	40 [ ]
One-to-one guidance of staff	1	2	41 [ ]
Through research work	1	2	42 [ ]
Through writing reports/publications	1	2	43 [ ]
Other (specify) _____	1	2	44 [ ]

22. What is the role of this Ministry/Institute/Company in the national development of Swaziland? Give details of specific programs and activities:

_____

_____

_____

23. What constraints are faced by the Ministry/Institute/Company in carrying out its role in development? (Code THREE most important)

No constraints	00		
Lack of finance/funds	01		
Lack of transport	02	First _____	45-46 [ ][ ]
Lack of other equipment	03		
Lack of skilled/trained manpower	04	Second _____	47-48 [ ][ ]
Unproductive/unprogressive staff	05		
Shortage/loss of staff	06	Third _____	49-50 [ ][ ]
Lack of coordination/networking	07		
Lack of planning base/skills	08		
Other (specify) _____	09		
Not known	99		

24. In what ways have you most contributed to the strengthening of your Ministry/Institute/Company? (Code THREE most important)

No contributions	00		
In advisory capacity/committee member	01		
Improving planning functions - general	02	First _____	51-52 [ ][ ]
Improving coordination/networking	03		
Improving financial management	04	Second _____	53-54 [ ][ ]
Improving general admin and management	05		
Through training/supervising others	06		
Through research activities	07	Third _____	55-56 [ ][ ]
Through procuring resources, funds or equipment	08		
Being more effective in job - n/s	09		
Other (specify) _____	10		
N/A	88		
Not known	99		

25. How important has your training been in enabling/assisting you to make these kinds of contributions?

Very important	1	Not important	5	57 [ ]
Quite important	2	N/A	8	
Important	3	Not known	9	
Hardly important	4			

26. What improvements can you identify which have taken place within this Ministry/Institute/Company as a whole? (Code THREE most important)

No improvements	0		
Depts/institutes strengthened or revived	1		
Depts/institutes created	2	First _____	58 [ ]
Improved manpower development/training/utilization	3	Second _____	59 [ ]
Improved access to equipment, resources or funds	4		
Improved management/planning functions	5	Third _____	60 [ ]
Improved implementation/use of research or information systems	6		
More posts localized	7		
Other (specify) _____	8		
Not known	9		

27. How important has the training of Ministry/Institute/Company staff veing in making these improvements?

'51'

Very important	1	First _____	61 ☐
Quite important	2		
Important	3	Second _____	62 ☐
Hardly important	4		
Not important	5	Third _____	63 ☐
N/A	8		
Not known	9		

28. Amongst the following, which do you think are the three most important criteria which should be used in selecting candidates for USAID-sponsored training?
(Code THREE most important)

Candidate's work experience/performance	1		
Candidate's academic qualifications	2	First _____	64 ☐
Candidate's personal interests	3		
Scores for TOEFL, GRE or entrance exams	4		
Recommendation from employer	5	Second _____	65 ☐
Area of training is a priority for employer	6		
Area of training is a priority for Swaziland	7	Third _____	66 ☐
Other (Specify)	8		
Not known	9		

29. What are your comments on the university placement system for prospective participant trainees?

_____ *67-68 ☐☐

_____

_____

30. What recommendations do you have for the operation of any future USAID participant training programs?

_____ *69-70 ☐☐

_____ *71-72 ☐☐

_____

31. What comments do you have on the overall impact of the USAID participant training program in Swaziland?
(PROBE for detailed answer)

_____ *73-74 ☐☐

_____ *75-76 ☐☐

_____

_____

58

32. Any other Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

INTERVIEWER EXPLAIN:

As part of the impact assessment, we are also talking to a number of officers in Government and in private companies who supervise returned participants. This is in order to obtain general information from the supervisors about the impact of the program as they see it from their position.

We should like to interview your supervisor, if you agree to it. Please be assured we will not be asking for a specific evaluation of your own, personal job performance or capabilities -- we are merely seeking general information. All information from the study will be treated in the strictest confidence.

Permission to interview supervisor:

Granted	1
Not Granted	2
N/A	8

77 ☐

54

APPENDIX "C"

SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE

USAID/Swaziland PARTICIPANT TRAINING PROGRAM EVALUATION

SUPERVISORS' QUESTIONNAIRE

TO BE COMPLETED PRIOR TO INTERVIEW:

S Number: 9____ (1-4: 9 [ ][ ][ ])

Supervisor's Surname: _____

Forenames: _____

Returned Participants supervised by this Supervisor:

	Part's Surname	KI Number		Part's Surname	KI Number
1.	_____	_____	6.	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____	7.	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____	8.	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____	9.	_____	_____
5.	_____	_____	10.	_____	_____

Name of Interviewer: _____ Date: _____

Card Number (5: [1])

1. What training have you yourself undertaken, including that sponsored by USAID, any other donors, the GOS or through your own initiative?

	First	Second	Third	First	Second	Third
Level/Program:	_____	_____	_____	6 [ ]	7 [ ]	8 [ ]
Subject/Major:	_____	_____	_____	9-10 [ ][ ]	11-12 [ ][ ]	13-14 [ ][ ]
University/Institute:	_____	_____	_____			
Country:	_____	_____	_____	15 [ ]	16 [ ]	17 [ ]
Length of Course:	___m ___y	___m ___y	___m ___y	18 [ ]	19 [ ]	20 [ ]
Sponsored by:	_____	_____	_____	21 [ ]	22 [ ]	23 [ ]

INTERVIEWER CHECK:
Respondent's highest academic qualification is: _____ (24: [ ])

2. What is your current job:

Job Title/Position: _____ Grade: _____ (25-26: [ ][ ])

Name of Ministry/Company: _____ 27-28 ☐☐

Location of workplace: _____ 29 ☐

3. How many people are under your direct supervision? _____ 30-31 ☐☐

How many are in each of the following categories?

1 - Professional _____ 32-33 ☐☐

2 - Technical _____ 34-35 ☐☐

3 - Admin/Clerical _____ 36-37 ☐☐

4 - Semi-skilled _____ 38-39 ☐☐

5 - Unskilled/Casual Workers _____ 40-41 ☐☐

How many of these people are USAID returned participants, in which categories?

1 - Professional _____ 42-43 ☐☐

2 - Technical _____ 44-45 ☐☐

3 - Admin/Clerical _____ 46-47 ☐☐

4 - Semi-skilled _____ 48-49 ☐☐

5 - Unskilled/Casual Workers _____ 50-51 ☐☐

INTERVIEWER CHECK: Total number of returned participants supervised: 52-53 ☐☐

4. Thinking generally about the USAID returned participants whom you supervise:

- Firstly, how would you rate their performance in respect of the following work activities (fill in under col. A);
- Secondly, how would you rate the performance of locally-trained staff in similar positions, in respect of the same work activities (fill in under Col. B):

	Col A (USAID)	Col B (local)		
Financial management/budgeting	_____	_____	54 ☐	55 ☐
Other admin/managerial work	_____	_____	56 ☐	57 ☐
Teaching/training	_____	_____	58 ☐	59 ☐

-62'

Research/evaluation	____	____	60 ☐	61 ☐
Job-specific technical work	____	____	62 ☐	63 ☐
Extension work	____	____	64 ☐	65 ☐
Project identification	____	____	66 ☐	67 ☐
Project design/planning	____	____	68 ☐	69 ☐
Project implementation	____	____	70 ☐	71 ☐
Project monitoring/evaluation	____	____	72 ☐	73 ☐
Managing people	____	____	74 ☐	75 ☐
Organizing and scheduling work tasks for others	____	____	76 ☐	77 ☐
Other (specify) _____	____	____	78 ☐	79 ☐

Scale: 1 = very capable 2 = quite capable 3 = capable
4 = hardly capable 5 = not capable 8 = N/A

S Number: 9____ 1-4 [9][ ][ ][ ]

Card Number 5 [2]

5. IF ANY DIFFERENCES IN RATING SCALES BETWEEN OVERSEAS AND LOCALLY TRAINED STAFF, what do you think accounts for the differences in performances between the staff trained overseas and the staff trained locally?

_____ *6-7 [ ][ ]

_____ *8-9 [ ][ ]

_____

6. What factors do you take into consideration when evaluating your staff's job performance (fill in under Col. A):

Col A (factors for evaluation)	Col B (USAID)	Col C (local)			
1. _____	____	____	10-11 ☐☐	12 ☐	13 ☐
2. _____	____	____	14-15 ☐☐	16 ☐	17 ☐
3. _____	____	____	18-19 ☐☐	20 ☐	21 ☐
4. _____	____	____	22-23 ☐☐	24 ☐	25 ☐

63

5. _____ _____ _____ 26-27 28 29

6. _____ _____ _____ 30-31 32 33

7. _____ _____ _____ 34-35 36 37

8. _____ _____ _____ 38-39 40 41

How would you rate the USAID returned participants in respect of these factors? (fill in under Col.B)

How would you rate locally trained staff in respect of these factors? (fill in under Col. C)

Scale: 1 = very capable 2 = quite capable 3 = capable
4 = hardly capable 5 = not capable 8 = N/A

7. Approximately what proportion of USAID returned participants would you classify as follows:

In posts for which they are over-qualified _____% 42-44

In posts for which they are fully qualified _____% 45-47

In posts for which they are only partially qualified _____% 48-50

In posts for which they are unqualified _____% 51-53

8. Approximately what proportion of USAID returned participants are currently in posts which were previously:

Held by Swazi nationals _____% 54-56

Held by expatriates _____% 57-59

Held by techincal assistants _____% 60-62

Created for returned participants _____% 63-65

9. Within the last five years, approximately what proportion of USAID returned participants have:

Been promoted within this Ministry/Institute/Company OR promoted and transferred to another Ministry/Institute/Company _____% 66-68

Been transferred at the same level to another Ministry/Institute/Company OR within this Ministry/Institute/Company _____% 69-71

Remained in the same post (no transfer/promotion) _____% 72-74

S Number: 9_____ 1-4 [9][ ][ ][ ]

Card Number 5 [3]

10. Within the last five years, approximately what proportion of USAID returned participants have:

Left this Ministry/Institute/Company for employment in another sector _____% 6-8 [ ][ ][ ]

Left this Ministry/Institute/Company for self employment _____% 9-11 [ ][ ][ ]

Left this Ministry/Institute/Company to emigrate _____% 12-14 [ ][ ][ ]

11. IF ANY USAID RETURNED PARTICIPANTS HAVE LEFT THE SECTOR, what are the THREE major factors which you think contributed to the returned participants leaving their post for another sector or for self-employment or to emigrate?

01 - Dissatisfied with conditions of service
02 - Dissatisfied with salary
03 - Dissatisfied with fringe benefits 15-16 [ ][ ]
04 - Lack of promotion prospects
05 - Lack of training opportunities
06 - Lack of job satisfaction/challenge in work 17-18 [ ][ ]
07 - Under-utilization of training/skills acquired
08 - Problems associated with working conditions
09 - Family reasons 19-20 [ ][ ]
10 - Other (specify) _____

Enter code numbers: First _____ Second _____ Third _____

12. What proportion of the USAID returned participants whom you supervise are involved in the following activities, relating to specific development projects and programs?

Project identification _____% 21-23 [ ][ ][ ]

Project design/planning _____% 24-26 [ ][ ][ ]

Project implementation _____% 27-29 [ ][ ][ ]

Project monitoring/evaluation _____% 30-32 [ ][ ][ ]

13. What opportunities or forums do returned participants use to pass on their skills acquired in training, to colleagues or other staff with whom they work?

Conducting in-service workshops/seminars _____% 33-35 [ ][ ][ ]

Part-time teaching, outside own Min/Ins/Co _____% 36-38 [ ][ ][ ]

65

Supervising interns/staff-in-training _____% 39-41 ☐☐☐

One-to-one guidance of staff _____% 42-44 ☐☐☐

Through research work _____% 45-47 ☐☐☐

Through writing reports/publications _____% 48-50 ☐☐☐

Other (specify) _____ _____% 51-53 ☐☐☐

14. What bonding arrangements do you have for staff who have been on training programs?

_____

_____ *54-55 ☐☐

_____

15. What kind of manpower development and training plans do you have for your Ministry/Institute/Company?

_____

_____ *56-57 ☐☐

_____

16. How do you incorporate the USAID training program opportunities in your own plans or programs?

_____

_____ *58-59 ☐☐

_____

17. What is the role of this Ministry/Institute/Company in the national development of Swaziland? Give details of specific programs and activities:

_____

_____

_____

18. What constraints are faced by the Ministry/Institute/Company in carrying out its role in development? (Code THREE most important)

No constraints	00
Lack of finance/funds	01
Lack of transport	02
Lack of other equipment	03

Lack of skilled/trained manpower	04		60-61
Unproductive/unprogressive staff	05	First _____	☐☐
Shortage/loss of staff	06		62-63
Lack of coordination/networking	07	Second _____	☐☐
Lack of planning base/skills	08		64-65
Other (specify) _____	09	Third _____	☐☐
Not known	99		

19. In what ways have the USAID returned participants contributed to strengthening or improving this Ministry/Institute/Company?
(Code THREE most important)

No contributions	00		66-67
In advisory capacity/Committee members	01	First _____	☐☐
Improving planning functions - general	02		68-69
Improving coordination/networking	03	Second _____	☐☐
Improving financial management	04		70-71
Improving general admin and management	05	Third _____	☐☐
Through training/supervising others	06		
Through research activities	07		
Through procuring resources, funds or equipment	08		
Being more effective in jobs - n/s	09		
Other (specify) _____	10		
N/A	88		
Not known	99		

20. What long-term effects will USAID returned participants have on the development of your Ministry/Institute/Company?

_____

_____ *72-73 ☐☐

_____

21. How could the contribution of returned participants be improved?

_____

_____ *74-75 ☐☐

_____

22. What additional training (state numbers and level) is required for staff of your Ministry/Institute/Company (including returned participants?

_____

_____ *76-77 ☐☐

_____

23. Where should they obtain this training?

_____ *78-79 [ ][ ]

_____

_____

S Number: 9____ 1-4 [9][ ][ ][ ]

Card Number 5 [4]

24. What do you consider are the main advantages/disadvantages of sending staff for overseas training under the USAID program?

Advantages:

1. _____ *6-7 [ ][ ]

2. _____ *8-9 [ ][ ]

3. _____ *10-11 [ ][ ]

Disadvantages:

1. _____ *12-13 [ ][ ]

2. _____ *14-15 [ ][ ]

3. _____ *16-17 [ ][ ]

25. Apart from training, what other factors would help to strengthen or accelerate the development of your Ministry/Institute/Company?

_____ *18-19 [ ][ ]

_____ *20-21 [ ][ ]

_____ *22-23 [ ][ ]

_____

26. Among the following, which do you think are the three most important criteria which should be used in selecting candidates for USAID sponsored training?
(Code THREE most important)

Candidate's work experience/performance	1		
Candidate's academic qualifications	2	First _____	24 [ ]
Candidate's personal interests	3		
Scores for TOEFL, GRE or entrance exams	4		
Recommendation from employer	5	Second _____	25 [ ]

68

Area of training is a priority for employer	6		26 ☐
Area of training is a priority for Swaziland	7	Third _____	
Other (specify) _____	8		
Not known	9		

27. What are your comments on the University placement system for prospective participant trainees?

_____

_____ *27-28 ☐☐

_____

28. What recommendations do you have for the operation of any future USAID participant training programs?

_____ *29-30 ☐☐

_____ *31-32 ☐☐

_____

29. What comments do you have on the overall impact of the USAID participant training program in Swaziland? (PROBE for detailed answer)

_____ *33-34 ☐☐

_____ *35-36 ☐☐

_____

_____

30. Any other comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

68