

**THE NATURE OF LEADERSHIP TRAINING AND
ITS EFFECTS ON
THE EL SALVADOR MUNICIPAL LEADERS:
RESULTS OF QUALITATIVE EVALUATION
VIA FOCUS GROUPS**

Submitted by: Aguirre International

Author: Enrique Herrera

February 20, 1992

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE NATURE OF LEADERSHIP TRAINING AND ITS EFFECTS ON THE EL SALVADOR MUNICIPAL LEADERS:

RESULTS OF A QUALITATIVE EVALUATION VIA FOCUS GROUPS

	Page
Introduction	1
Summary	1
Objective of the Evaluation	1
Methodology	1
Procedures	2
Characteristics of the Groups	3
Limitations	4
Sub-grouping of the Trainees	4
Salient Results of the Evaluation	5
Acquired Knowledge and Skills Most Mentioned by Trainees	5
Trainees' Overall Assessment of the Program	5
What Worked Well?	5
What Could be Improved?	6
Trainee Anecdotes	6
General Discussion of the Results	7
Predeparture Orientation and Training Objectives	7
Relevancy of the Training	8
The Effects of the Training	8
The Concept of Decentralization	8
From Visions to Development	9
Is the "Conflict" a Barrier?	9
Assessing the Impact and Effect of the Training	9
The Impact/Effect of the Site Visits	10
The Impact/Effect of Visiting with American Families	11
Other Impact/Effect Comments Voiced	11
Conclusions	12
The "Added" Benefits of the Training Program	12
Principal Recommendations	12
Other Recommendations	13

APPENDIX A — Moderator's Guide

APPENDIX B — Screening Questionnaire

THE NATURE OF LEADERSHIP TRAINING AND ITS EFFECTS ON THE EL SALVADOR MUNICIPAL LEADERS:

RESULTS OF A QUALITATIVE EVALUATION VIA FOCUS GROUPS

INTRODUCTION

This is a report resulting from a qualitative evaluation of the El Salvador Mayors Leadership Training Program. Sponsored by USAID/El Salvador, the training program was implemented by Development Associates (DA), and the National Association of Partners of the Americas (NAPA). It took place in the United States and Puerto Rico from September 28 to November 10, 1991. The evaluation was conducted by Enrique Herrera, an evaluation specialist with Aguirre International, the CLASP-II Monitoring and Evaluation contractor.

SUMMARY

The main objective of the evaluation was to assess the effects of the training. The qualitative methodology employed to collect the data included conducting a series of focus groups with Trainees. Trainees were screened prior to their participation in the focus groups using a screening strategy designed to identify Trainees who shared similar demographic characteristics. Each focus group assembled Trainees from three different training groups.

The evaluation concluded that, as a result of the training, Trainees learned the following:

- the importance of citizen participation in the decision-making process;
- the importance of organization and planning;
- the concept of decentralization as applied to municipal public functions and services;
- the concept of the Multiplier Effect, and the responsibilities ascribed to multiplier agents; and
- the scope of some public works in the United States.

OBJECTIVE OF THE EVALUATION

The main objective of the evaluation was to assess the effects of the training, and to examine whether it provided knowledge and skills applicable to the Trainees' social context in El Salvador. Other objectives of the evaluation were to explore the Trainees' satisfaction with the training and the logistics of the program.

METHODOLOGY

The evaluation employed focus groups as a data gathering strategy. In all, four focus groups were conducted. One in Washington, D.C., and three in Miami, Florida. The group in Washington, took place three weeks into the six-week long training. It was

conducted, exclusively, to pilot test the discussion guide. The three groups in Miami, referred to as Focus Group One, Two, and Three, took place within the context of a workshop-seminar developed and implemented by the training contractors after the "formal" training had ended. All focus groups were audio taped, and groups One and Two were video taped as well. An edited version of the two video taped focus groups accompanies this report.

Additional information for the evaluation was gathered by observing the Trainees participation in the seminar during its two-day duration, November 7 and 8, and through a series of informal exchanges with a discrete number of Trainees, trainers, and training administrators. Whereas the focus groups adhered to a discussion guide (Appendix A), the informal exchanges and interactions were of a "free flow" nature; respondents were encouraged to tell their own story with little or no probing. The observation of the seminar was an unstructured activity. The evaluator, however, was present at all of the seminar's sessions, from the opening ceremonies to the closing of the event.

As in most qualitative evaluation efforts, the intent of this evaluation was not to arrive at "statistically significant" findings. Rather, the intent was to make a reasonable assessment of the effects of the training based on the honest and sincere opinions of the affected parties (e.g., Trainees, trainers, and administrators).

The credibility of this type of qualitative assessment depends heavily on

the respondents' disposition to share truthful and objective information about a phenomenon under question. It also depends on the evaluator's ability to draw and report accurate information by adhering to dependable protocols and data analysis procedures. One of the major challenges faced by the evaluator when utilizing this type of qualitative assessment is facilitating the creation of a trustworthy, relaxed focus group environment, where information is easily requested and spontaneously exchanged.

As presented, the results of this evaluation have been subjected to a *triangulation* test, a qualitative evaluation validation technique by which data gathered from one source are juxtaposed to comparable data gathered from a different source, and then probed within the context of a third source. For example, when examining whether the objectives of a training program have been explicitly explained to a target population and understood by them, an evaluator may examine documentation addressing "training objectives." He or she may then proceed to interview a training provider about the training objectives and, subsequently, probe the theme in a focus group session. For this evaluation, the concept of triangulation, as succinctly explained here, was applied during the data gathering phase, and throughout the display and analysis of the data.

PROCEDURES

The Trainees were screened and selected prior to their participation in a focus group. A Screening Questionnaire (Appendix B), which was

distributed randomly among Trainees, was used for this purpose. Two training administrators, one from NAPA and one from DA, assisted in the recruitment of focus groups participants by distributing the Screening Questionnaires. The final selection of group participants, however, was made by the evaluator.

Unlike sampling procedures used in quantitative endeavors, qualitative "sampling" aims not at constituting a random sample of subjects from a population but, rather, it aims at including a wide spectrum of respondents with some common demographic characteristics and some differences in terms of the "treatment" received. For this effort, focus group participants were selected based on a representative age range, and grouped according to the distinct training sites they had attended (see "SUB-GROUPING OF THE TRAINEES").

Once selected to participate in a focus group, Trainees were invited to a meeting room inside the hotel where the NAPA/DA seminar was taking place. At the beginning of each session, the focus group moderator (the evaluator) explained to participants that Aguirre International was an independent firm not associated with NAPA or DA, and that he was interested in their honest and sincere opinions about the training program. All focus group respondents participated voluntarily and none objected to the audio or video taping.

Focus Group One gathered Trainees from Training Group A, Group Two assembled participants from Training Group B, and Group Three was

composed of a contingent from Training Group C Trainees.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GROUPS

Five mayors participated in Focus Group One. Two were mayors of large cities, San Miguel and Chalatenango, and three headed smaller communities inside the Departments of San Miguel and Usulután. The mayor of Chalatenango, a woman, began her tenure as the city's principal civil officer after a successful teaching career in a school in the community. She was a well known and appreciated professional there. Of the other participants, one was by background an agronomist, and two were small business entrepreneurs. All were elected as mayors of their cities through democratic election. All were part of Training Group A.

Eight mayors participated in Focus Group Two. One was a mayor of a large city. The rest headed smaller communities. Two held university degrees, four had completed *Ciclo Básico*, the first three years of high school, and two had completed primary schooling. Their annual combined family income ranged between 5,000.00 and 110,000.00 Colones a year. The youngest of the group was 32, and the oldest was 54 years old. In addition to holding the post of mayor, one was a coffee grower, and one a small business entrepreneur. The rest dedicated all of their time to the municipality. The recently elected president of the Confederación de Municipios de la República de El Salvador (COMURES) participated in the group

as a respondent. All were married. All were part of Training Group B.

Seven mayors participated in Focus Group Three. All were mayors of small cities in the Departments of Usulután, and La Unión. Three held university degrees, two had attended high school, one was a basic education teacher, and one had completed primary school. In addition to being mayors of their cities, one was an industry business person, and one was an agronomist. Their annual combined family income ranged between 10,200.00 and 80,000.00 Colones. All were married. Their ages were between 32 and 56 years old. All were part of Training Group C.

LIMITATIONS

In conducting the evaluation, the following limitations were detected:

- In the two focus groups that were video taped, some participants appeared affected by the presence of the video equipment and were not as spontaneous.
- During the group sessions, the political status held by some participants permeated the group dynamics and, apparently, constrained open participation by all. The fact that political leaders, mayors in particular, had been targets of violence during the conflict in El Salvador may also have had an influence in their willingness to contribute more openly to the discussion.

- Many times, it was difficult to obtain concise answers from focus group participants. Some of them would talk at length before making a concrete point.
- Each focus group session was an added activity to a saturated seminar schedule, and some participants were understandably tired. This had an effect on their enthusiasm to participate.

SUB-GROUPING OF THE TRAINEES

As the original group of seventy-three Trainees arrived in the U.S., it was divided into three different subgroups. These subgroups were sent to separate training sites: Training Group A initiated its training in Washington, D.C., and, after four weeks of training, moved on to Lubbock, Texas. Training Group B received its first four weeks of training in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, and later moved on to Puerto Rico. Training Group C remained in Tucson, Arizona, for the duration of their six-week training program. Whereas Training Groups A and C were managed by NAPA, Training Group B was managed by Development Associates.

To conduct the training, NAPA and Development Associates subcontracted with the Academy for State and Local Governments (ASLG), the Consortium for Services to Latin America (CSLA), and the University of Arizona (U. of A.) In turn, the University of Arizona contracted the Arizona-Sonora Field School to conduct part of the training. These training providers serviced

Trainees in groups A, B, and C, as follows:

<u>Group</u>	<u>Provider</u>	<u>Site(s)</u>
A	ASLG	Washington/Lubbock
B	CSLA	Baton Rouge/Puerto Rico
C	U. of A.	Tucson

SALIENT RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION

Acquired Knowledge and Skills Most Mentioned by Trainees

- **Community Participation:** Trainees learned that the participation of the citizenry at large is critical to community development.
- **Organization and Planning:** Trainees learned that good organization and planning are important factors contributing to a public administration that functions well.
- **The Concept of Decentralization:** Trainees, in general, learned the concept of decentralization as applied to the procurement of revenues and the rendering of public services.
- **The Multiplier Effect:** Trainees, in general, learned the concept and practice of the Multiplier Effect, and the responsibilities ascribed to multiplier agents.
- **Public Works:** Trainees were impressed by examples of public works in the United States. The

processing (cleaning) of sewage, and the recycling of goods inspired some of them to want to initiate similar projects in El Salvador.

Trainees' Overall Assessment of the Program

When Trainees were asked to complete the sentence "My training in the United States was. . .", most respondents, in all three groups, replied "Excellent." Upon probing, some reasoned, "because we have acquired the necessary knowledge to develop ourselves and our communities," and "because we learned how to guide our people to achieve a full development in terms of economy and culture." Trainees rated the training with "ten" (one group), and with "eight" (average for the other two groups.)

What Worked Well?

- NAPA and DA's organization and scheduling of activities. A Trainee summarized saying, "*todo trabajó al centavo*," (everything worked to perfection.)
- Instructors—in general. An instructor from the Tucson site, however, was criticized by some Trainees who complained of "heavy loads of work," and of working on assignments beyond reasonable hours.
- Lead trainers at the Academy for State and Local Governments. Training Group A, spoke highly of the ASLG's two lead trainers.
- Training content and site visits.

- Logistics.
- Accommodations and meals—in general.
- The interaction between Trainees and the staffs of NAPA and DA. All of the Trainees who spoke about the staffs of NAPA and DA stated that all treated them with “respect and understanding.”
- Per-Diem amount—in general. Trainees received a \$28.00 Per-Diem allowance. Most felt that it covered everything. However, some of them experienced certain “limitations;” particularly, when on occasions, and unexpectedly, they had to pay up to “\$12.00 or \$15.00 for a meal” when, according to them, they had been told that the average price of a meal would be \$5.

What Could be Improved?

Based on the Trainees comments, the following aspects of the training could be improved:

- **Predeparture Orientation:** Trainees would benefit by a more in-depth “culture shock” predeparture orientation. Such orientation would specifically address eating habits, the need for Trainees to occasionally prepare their own meals, the intensity of the training program, and the cost of eating out.
- **English Language Training:** While most Trainees voiced concern with receiving too little English, too late, it should be noted that this is a concern expressed by the majority of

short-term Trainees participating in CLASP. It remains unclear as to whether or not additional English Language Training (ELT) would, in fact, significantly change Trainees opinion as to whether it was enough. Consequently, additional ELT is not necessarily a recommended remedy to the Trainees concern.

- **“Extended” Days of Instruction:** Training Group C complained that instruction, at times, was unnecessarily extended “beyond a reasonable time.” According to them, an instructor would keep them on assignments for up to six hours when the assignment “could well be completed in four hours or less.”
- **Communication of Training Objectives:** The communication between training contractors and subcontractors could be better. Specifically, the explicit articulation of training objectives to the training providers—as opposed to mere training activities.
- **Length of Training Program:** While not the majority feeling, many mayors expressed that the time they spent outside El Salvador was “too long.” This is not an uncommon response for short-term Trainees, who are older, have families, and are actively involved in work or community life in their country.

Trainee Anecdotes

- Trainees in Training Group A enjoyed the experience in Lubbock, Texas, more than that in Washington, D.C. According to

them, people in Lubbock were more accessible and friendly than in D.C.

- Trainees in Training Group B were puzzled at what they perceived an indiscriminate provision of free state services to “people who drove nice cars” in Puerto Rico.
- Trainees in Training Group C enjoyed very much their visit to the Nogales (Arizona/Sonora) sewage processing binational effort. The visit, and what they saw, inspired them to want to pursue similar projects for the benefit of their communities.

GENERAL DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

This discussion addresses different training components, and a variety of themes which emerged from the data during data display and analysis. The discussion, to a large extent, is the recounting of the training experience as told by Trainees who participated in the focus groups.

Predeparture Orientation and Training Objectives

Antecedent: The predeparture orientation (PDO) consisted of a two-week Trainee gathering in San Salvador. During PDO, Trainees were introduced to some aspects of American culture. They were told where in the United States—or Puerto Rico—they were going to go for training, and were told that the training intended to provide administrative and leadership skills.

In probing the information related to “training objectives” offered at PDO, most Trainees stated that the objectives of the training were to instill in them administrative and leadership skills, and to convey to them the importance of public works, community participation, organization, and planning. They also thought that additional objectives of the training were to learn about the “multiplier effect” concept, and to get acquainted with some of the responsibilities ascribed to “multiplier agents.”

Overall, most Trainees felt that the training objectives were achieved. Moreover, many felt that the training had been better than expected. All commented, or else agreed, that the training objectives had been adequately explained to them during a “ten-day long orientation program” which they attended prior to their departure from El Salvador.

A Related Observation: According to a few Trainees, the training objectives were not as well communicated to those who actually carried out the training. The training providers, according to Trainees, did not appear to be as knowledgeable or focused on the training objectives as they were, and appeared they were more concerned with conducting training activities than with meeting the program’s objectives. This, however, was not a generalized assessment. It pertained more to the activities in the Tucson, Arizona, site (Training Group C).

Relevancy of the Training

Most Trainees deemed the training relevant. They felt that the acquisition of public administration skills, and the leadership capabilities that they learned were related to their work as El Salvador's local government functionaries. Additionally, their observation of several community public works motivated them to want to initiate similar projects in their country. As one put it, "The training has awakened our interest in wanting to work in a better and more organized fashion." From a different group, a woman commented, "We were working under an old paradigm; now we will be working under a new different one, a futuristic paradigm."

For a number of Trainees, the training was "a mixture of theory and practice." According to them, the training was "very complete." Some added, "It will help us at the personal level, and in helping our communities." Most regarded the emphasis of the training on leadership and administrative organization as key for development.

The Effects of the Training

From the Trainees' perspective, the training "provided a vision toward development," and the necessary tools to develop their communities. They said that it was important to learn that the participation of the citizenry in the decision-making process was one of the foundations upon which development may occur. Through the training they realized that in El Salvador they have some resources already but, perhaps more importantly, they realized that

they were lacking the necessary knowledge to exploit such resources for the benefit of their communities. "Now we will struggle with our people to develop," said one in Group Two, while his peers nodded in agreement. "Now we have the raw materials and the tools to reach out, to plan what we are going to do in our communities, and to eliminate dependency," said someone else in a different group. Others in the group agreed.

The Concept of Decentralization

The concept of decentralization drew much attention from most Trainees who see it as a potential administrative re-organization alternative for El Salvador. However, some of them were leery as to the applicability of the concept in small jurisdictions. Many forewarned that small communities may not be administratively equipped to handle the required demands of a decentralized organization.

As a national priority, however, the decentralization of public services has begun in El Salvador—they said. Next year, for instance, the Government will begin the decentralization of the education system. As it takes place, teachers and teaching matters will be administered and controlled by the municipalities.

According to some participants, however, not all municipalities are ready for the decentralization of the school system. As one said, "I am not prepared to have control over schools and teachers. The [current levels of] revenues emerging from local taxation would not allow me to invest in teacher

contracting. Should I do it, it will be ultimately detrimental to the children.”

From Visions to Development

In one of the groups, a Trainee revealed, “Prior to the training, I was content with what I was doing as the mayor of my city but, through the training, I discovered that I didn’t know much about public administration. Fortunately, I am also discovering that I now have the necessary tools to infuse development, the main tool being to involve people in all of the work. Upon my return to El Salvador, I am going to procure the means to organize people in the rural areas. I plan to call upon the *fuerzas vivas*, the awakened social forces of my community, including ranchers, active women of the market place, and the owners of the buses. They will help me to plan some well intended community projects.”

In general, Trainees stated their honest desire to put into practice the newly acquired knowledge and skills. Specifically, they were interested in promoting community participation, in holding open Town Hall meetings on a regular basis, and in organizing street cleaning campaigns. Many said they were ready to implement learned management strategies to provide better services in their municipalities. Others stated that, as multiplier agents, they will share with other mayors the fruits of their experience.

Is the “Conflict” a Barrier?

“One can work [within it]. I’ve been a mayor for three years, and I’ve worked within the conflict. I have succeeded.

Surely, the war is a barrier; 12 mayors have been killed. In my own case, I’ve been affected by the war in the sense that I could have done better work in certain communities, but entering some areas is dangerous.”

“The war plays an important role; in the sense that it impedes development. But the war in El Salvador has to end. It has no place in our history, nor in the history of Latin America. There has to be a raising of people’s consciousness so that everything and everyone may work in harmony, especially, those of low and high [socioeconomic] status. There has to be harmony in order to achieve peace.”

When the war was discussed in a different group, one Trainee said, “In my sincere desire to implement community projects, I am going to work with the people to make them aware and to make them act on such awareness. However, it is going to be difficult because of the war. The war has instilled, among other things, a sense of dependency, and some people are not used to getting involved. If now we ask them to get involved, it is going to be difficult.”

Assessing the Impact and Effect of the Training

Most Trainees maintained that impact is “something that provokes an instant reaction from an affected party.” Tied to their definition of impact, Trainees stated that the training had a significant impact on them. But, as pointed out in two of the groups, the mayors now need some lead time for action (e.g., time to implement certain community

projects). They formulated projects during their U.S. training with the intent of helping their communities. These projects, as drafted in the Trainees' "action plans," focus on health, education, public works, transportation, administrative procedures and, in general, social action projects.

Some of the specific community projects identified in their action plans include the construction of a community school, the provision of a better garbage collection system, and the construction of a *Casa de la Cultura*, or cultural center. One ambitious mayor of a large city wanted to establish a municipal Management Information System to better handle every administrative transaction, from keeping vital statistics records, to maintaining a tighter control over all incoming revenue from local taxation.

For some Trainees, the major training impact was simply to observe how "things are done in the United States." Other Trainees went as far as saying that, as a result of the training, they are going to change their behavior. One offered an example of how she was going to change, "I used to call for and conduct *Cabildos Abiertos*, or Town Hall Meetings, just to comply with an eligibility requirement to secure funds from the Comisión Nacional de Reforma Administrativa (CONARA). That was my mentality." She was now committed to change, and to call for such meetings with the firm desire to truly incorporate people in the decision-making process.

For other Trainees, the impact of the training was verbalized as "it was interesting to get acquainted with new things." Other Trainees, perhaps the more analytical, explained, "We didn't realize how critical it was to involve the community in the development process. But, now we know how important it is."

The Impact/Effect of the Site Visits

The experience of taking a trip on a plane was exciting for most Trainees who had never travelled far from home or ever flown in an airplane. But, it was more exciting for Trainees in Training Group A. As reported by them, they visited the site of an U.S. Air Force Base in Lubbock, TX, and some had the opportunity to navigate on an AFB aircraft. Of the experience, one said, "I have never experienced a similar phenomenon before, in my whole life." As he spoke, his excitement was evident.

Other Trainees participated in several observational field trips. For example, some observed a community sewage processing system at work, a waste recycling project in operation, people actively participating in the decision-making process of their community, and the every-day administrative and office work inside a city hall. Some of the effects that these visits had on Trainees, as subjective as they may be, include an acquired motivation to initiate similar projects in El Salvador, and the desire to imitate, as much as possible, the mechanisms behind the rendering of social services to a community.

One striking impact emerging from a site visit to a city council meeting was

the Trainees' witnessing of a local political entity working together for the common good without partisan considerations or constraints. One Trainee in Group Two observed, "It was good to see how a city council works together and seeks people's participation regardless of party affiliation." As a result of the same site visit, another Trainee observed, "As far as we were able to determine, city officials are elected, mainly, because of their honesty."

In their reactions to other site visits, some Trainees felt that the public work projects that impressed them the most were not applicable to the situation of their communities in El Salvador. Nevertheless, these examples inspired them to want to develop projects appropriate to the country's local conditions. Other Trainees were more optimistic. As one Trainee articulated, "We know that, with the participation of our communities, similar projects can be staged in El Salvador."

By saying, "We have learned that all citizens have to be responsible for identifying needs and for taking action to fulfill them," Trainees recalled a visit to Fredericksburg, Virginia, where they observed a group of people at a meeting discussing problems affecting their community.

The Impact/Effect of Visiting with American Families

Some Trainees had the opportunity to visit with American families. Many thought that the visits were "a great experience." One commented, "[The visits with American families] were a

great 'school' for us, because we learned how all members of a family help with the chores." Other Trainees were impressed by the perceived "love that Americans give to strangers."

One Trainee summarized his new awareness of culture in the United States by saying, "I had a different dimension of how the American culture was. Now I understand [American's] organization, the value they give to time, and the citizen's commitment to comply with the law."

Other Impact/Effect Comments Voiced

The following comments were also heard when the various groups addressed the program's impact/effect:

"The training impacted on me. I learned how the United States developed."

"The training has alerted me how to work with and organize people, so they can have a better life."

"I was impressed by the training. I didn't have much to offer in my community, but now I have a better vision as to how to serve my people better."

"A major impact was to learn about the autonomy of the municipalities in the United States where cities and towns are independent. They do not depend on the central government. They reach decisions on their own. We, in contrast, depend on the central government for any course of action we take."

CONCLUSIONS

The "Added" Benefits of the Training Program

Aside from the more tangible benefits of the training, this program brought together a large group of important civil municipal leaders from El Salvador. This, in itself, should be viewed as a major accomplishment, and as an "added" benefit of the effort for at least two reasons. First, these mayors, together, constitute approximately a third of one of the most influential human resource cores of the nation. Second, these U.S. trained persons are individually well known in their communities, and some of them occupy important posts in the nation's political structure. As a human core of El Salvador's political pool, they are able and ready to share with others what they have learned and experienced. As members of the country's political structure, and with a "new vision for development," they, more than others, will likely participate in the democratic rebuilding of their nation.

These added training benefits point to several, diverse and challenging implications. For instance, as the Mission has targeted this group for training, and as the training has been successfully accomplished, a consequent challenge is to strategically structure an in-country Follow-on component. It was evident that the Trainees left the United States highly motivated. They now need a well defined, functional Follow-on program to support their individualized "action plans".

Throughout the training, these leaders met in large and small groupings, discussed diverse leadership patterns and other organizational issues, experienced different decision-making processes than the ones they knew, agreed on certain points and disagreed on others, listened to presenters and had the opportunity to be heard, and argued their point of view and compromised. Above all, and despite the fact that they belong to different political parties, they were able to work together in the U.S. This is something they don't usually do as members of the *Partido Demócrata Cristiano* or *ARENA*, currently the party in power. Many of them acknowledged, with pleasure, that they were able to communicate in the U.S., and hoped that their party affiliation will not be an impediment to promoting development in El Salvador.

PRINCIPAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The Training Program Merits

Replication: Training programs of the nature and magnitude of the El Salvador Municipal Leaders Training Program merit recognition and replication. As more mayors from El Salvador are brought into the United States for training, and as they are touched with or affected by a "new vision" of development, they will surely augment the increasing number of individuals and groups that may provide the necessary foundation for a more democratically administered society, and, therefore, promote a more healthy developing country.

Identifying the "Human Core": The success of this training effort indicates that the Mission should continue to

aggressively identify and recruit others of El Salvador's "human cores" for training. The activity will ultimately facilitate the transferability of knowledge and skills to broader contingents of people inside the country; especially, when those who have been in the United States for training continue to be involved in a systematic, in-country Follow-on program.

Opportunities to Profit from the Trainees Knowledge and Expertise:

Most of the seventy-three mayors who were trained under this program, are experienced individuals who know their communities and the people who live within them. Some also hold academic degrees. Based on this facts, the Mission and training providers may want to promote, even more, their active participation as subjects in the training, as opposed to objects of it.

Share the Successes: The issues raised in the section "What could be better" were, to a certain extent, known by the training providers who expressed to correct problems, where possible. However, it may prove more beneficial to share with the training providers some of the success stories of the training.

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

As the Follow-on phase of the Municipal Leadership Training Program is critical to facilitating the trainees application of the knowledge and skills they learned while training in the U.S., the Mission is encouraged to consider the following:

- the nomination of COMURES as a "broker" organization for the purpose of offering a variety of Follow-on products and services to the U.S. trained mayors. These products/services may include printed, reference materials with information that reinforces the Trainees' newly acquired knowledge and skills.
- the development and implementation of a Follow-on training program, or at least a training program module, dedicated exclusively to **teaching** the mayors some application strategies for the gainful utilization of the skills they obtained as a result of the U.S. training. Apply to these efforts, the concepts and practices of **social marketing**.

Other meaningful training modules to consider for development and implementation include:

- Organization and management in a decentralized national public service structure.
- The essence of debate, compromise, and consensus in a democratic society.
- Participation and dissent in a democratic society.
- Private commitment for public administration.

A P P E N D I X A



AGUIRRE INTERNATIONAL

1735 North Lynn Street, Suite 1000 • Rosslyn, VA 22209-2019 • 703/525-7100 • FAX 703/525-7112

411 Borel Avenue, Suite 402 • San Mateo, CA 94402 • 415/349-1842 • FAX 415/513-6299 • Telex 237400486 Main Office

The Nature of Leadership Training and Its Nurturing Effects on the El Salvador's Municipal Leaders

FOCUS GROUP MODERATOR'S GUIDE

I. INTRODUCTION

1. A brief introduction to Aguirre International.

(Moderator: Establish that Aguirre International is an independent firm not associated with NAPA or DA.)

II. OBJECTIVE OF THE FOCUS GROUP

1. To assess the impact of CAPS (CLASP) Leadership Training on municipal leaders.

III. RESPONDENTS INTRODUCTIONS

1. Name, marital status, nature of civil service work, and current work-related activities.

IV. CHARACTERIZATION OF THE U.S. TRAINING

1. How would you characterize the training you received in the United States?
(Moderator: Convey the importance of group participation.)
2. After a few respondents characterize their U.S. training, ask the group: How would you complete this sentence "The training that I am receiving in the U.S. is"
3. What have been the most important aspects of your training? (Probe: Training content and other important aspect brought up by the group)
4. Who would like to share, briefly, the content of his/her training? (Probe satisfaction with training content)
5. What aspects of your training have been more beneficial to you? (Probe: At the personal and professional level.)
6. Discussion of the groups' common experiences regarding training. (Probe: Language of training, training institution(s), logistics, and non-formal experiences associated with the training.)

TRANSITION

(Moderator: Indicate change of subject saying, "Now, let's talk about the training you are receiving as it relates to your activities in El Salvador.")

IV. FOCUS ON RELEVANCE, TRANSFERABILITY, AND APPLICABILITY OF THE TRAINING TO THE EL SALVADOR SITUATION

1. Is the training that you are receiving relevant? In what way(s)? or Why not?
2. How transferable would the content of your training be to the socio-economic and political context in El Salvador? (Probe any and all responses)
3. How applicable would the new knowledge be to your work in El Salvador?
4. How useful would all other training-related experiences be to your personal, professional, and community life environment? (Moderator: Ask for examples.)
5. Is the training you are receiving what you expected? In what way(s)?
6. What part (portion/segment) of the training are you enjoying the most? Why?
7. If you were asked to grade your U.S. training on a zero to ten scale, with ten being highest score, what grade would you give it? Why?
8. Has the training helped you to develop new administrative skills? If so, which?
9. As a result of your training, what would you be able to accomplish upon your return to El Salvador?
10. Are you currently participating in the development of your country's democratic processes and institutions? If so, how?

V. ADJOURNMENT

A P P E N D I X B

