

**FOLLOWUP AND EVALUATION STUDY
OF
RETURNED INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION
PARTICIPANTS IN EGYPT
WHO HAVE RECEIVED TRAINING IN THE UNITED STATES**

**John B. Stabler
E. Theodore Mogannam
Training Staff, USOM/Egypt**

HC
830
.568
1957

FOLLOWUP AND EVALUATION STUDY
OF
RETURNED INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION
PARTICIPANTS IN EGYPT
WHO HAVE RECEIVED TRAINING IN THE UNITED STATES

Conducted by the United States Operations Mission to Egypt
Training Staff and cooperating USOM/Egypt Technicians
during the period from December 1954 to October 1956.

John B. Stabler
E. Theodore Mogannam
Training Staff, USOM/Egypt

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Pages</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	3 - 4
II. STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON RETURNED PARTICIPANTS AS OF OCTOBER 1956.	5 - 12
III. STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF ORAL INTERVIEWS	13 - 19
IV. STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF WRITTEN QUESTIONNAIRE.	20 - 23
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	24 - 27
VI. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	28 - 32

Schedules

Schedule I: Period and Place of Training.	8
Schedule II: Personal Data	9
Schedule III: Nature of Employment.	10
Schedule IV: Travel Outside Egypt and Over-Stay in the United States.	11
Schedule V: Number of Returned Participants (U. S.) by Fiscal Year and Field of Activity.	12

I. INTRODUCTION

The members of the United States Operations Mission to Egypt Training Staff sincerely hope that the results of this study will be useful to training program specialists both in the field and in the United States.

The study utilized both the oral interview and the written questionnaire as techniques of investigation. It was conducted on an experimental basis in that questions used in both techniques were modified during the course of the study. Those who are specialists in educational tests and measurements and in public opinion surveys will perhaps decry this study as "non-professional." We do not choose to argue the point considering such criticisms as academic. The important consideration is the lack of information regarding the success of the ICA technical assistance participant program. This study is a contribution toward measuring the success of that program. Those who have been closely associated with the program since its inception as a large world-wide program in 1951 will discover that the study verifies many of their beliefs about the program.

This study was made in Cairo, Egypt, during the period from December 1954 to October 1956 and includes data on 261 returned participants who have received training in the United States under the USOM/Egypt training program. The 261 participants represent all returned participants who had received training in the U. S. A. from the inception of the Egyptian program in 1951 and returned to Egypt by October 1956. A total of 132 participants were interviewed by one or both of the writers of this report and in many cases together with the USOM/Egypt specialist in charge of the particular project under which the participant was sent. In addition, some 80 questionnaires were sent to participants and 47 were completed and returned to the Training Office.

If the criteria of the success of the training program are the two generally agreed upon, namely, (1) the extent of the participant's contribution to the economic development of his country, and (2) the development of a better attitude toward the United States on the part of the participant, this study indicates that the second objective of the program has been achieved. The first criteria has met with limited success. However, there are two mitigating factors to be considered. First, the conducting of a world-wide technical assistance training program is an entirely new endeavor in the field of international relations so it should be expected that such a program will have its period of "growing pains." It is still a new program and cannot be expected to have immediate total success. Correct policies and procedures have been introduced, and, in fact, are evolving through experience. Secondly, special note should be taken of the fact that 50.9% of the participants surveyed in this study returned from the United States in 1952, 1953, or 1954, the earliest years of the participant program. The majority of the remaining 49.1% were sent to the United States prior to the effective establishment of "Operation Blueprint" which emphasizes project-centered training, i.e., the sending of participants who are working on ICA projects

1955

and who will return to those projects upon the completion of their training. It is believed that with the effective establishment of this concept, the degree of implementation of returned participants' recommendations and consequently their contribution to the economic development of their countries will be effectively increased.

The very favorable reception this study received on the part of the returned participants and their supervisors who were interviewed was a valuable by-product of the study. Both were impressed with the serious attitude that the USOM took toward the participant program as was evidenced by the followup and evaluation program. This aided in establishing within the various Egyptian ministries the concept of project-centered training.

It will be noted that at the beginning of the interview form and the written questionnaire the participant is asked for his "present position" and "field of training." It might be thought that the correlation of these two factors would give some indication of the effectiveness of the program. Actually, the only information they give is whether the participant is working in the field in which he was trained. This, of course, is useful information but a real test of the effectiveness and success of the technical side of the program is the utilization of his training. A measurement of this can best be made by a study of the accomplishments of returned participants through interviews and questionnaires as has been done by the writers of this report. The results of this inquiry are reported under the heading of "implementation of recommendations" and "training others" in both the oral interviews and questionnaires. Furthermore, the titles of many positions are so general and most fields of training are of a specialized nature that it is difficult to relate the two merely from the titles. However, in almost all cases, participants were working in positions that were related to their fields of training.

II. STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON RETURNED PARTICIPANTS AS OF OCTOBER 1956.

It has been felt that some background information on the participants of the Egyptian training program would be helpful to persons interested in evaluating the success of this program.

The following five schedules (Pages 8 - 12) give such background information on returned participants of the U. S. Operations Mission to Egypt, from the beginning of the training program in 1951 up to October 1956:

(1) Schedule I brings out the fact that 22.6% of all returned participants received training in the United States for three months or under, while Schedule III shows that only 8% of this group held senior positions in the Egyptian Government or private industries. It is recommended that future training programs of three months or under should be restricted to a much smaller percentage, and that such short-term training should only be arranged for participants holding senior positions in their home country. One of the major criticisms of returned participants is that their period of training was too short to allow them to acquire sufficient knowledge in their field of specialization. The main reason for this criticism is that the persons who were holding intermediate or even junior positions were sent on what was termed "leader grants" in the past, specifically on the 1951 and 1952 fiscal years programs.

(2) Schedule I also shows that only 3.5% of participants received training at universities, and that only 3.4% obtained American university degrees under this Mission's program.

The writers of this report consider that in future planning more emphasis should be given to programs which permit participants to receive such degrees. This is especially important in the junior group. Schedule III shows that 18% of returned participants held junior positions, while Schedule I brings out the fact that 19.5% of the returned participants received training for a period from nine to twelve months, and 6.5% of this group received training from twelve to eighteen months. It would appear that in view of these facts, the number of persons who should have been allowed to obtain degrees from American universities would have been higher if better programing had been arranged. It seems a pity to have such a high percentage of participants receive training in the U. S. for over one year and yet be unable to obtain a degree from an American university during that period. Many of the frustrations of such participants are a result of their inability to have secured such a degree. It must be realized that participants holding junior and lower intermediate positions cannot acquire prestige and acceptance of their recommendations unless they can bring back with them something which will help them improve their position in the Government Departments or industrial firms by which they are employed.

As matters stand now, the Egyptian Civil Service Commission is reluctant to promote personnel to more responsible positions unless those persons have

obtained higher degrees; and, in the case of junior participants being sent to the U. S., the only practical means of giving them recognition is to allow them to obtain a degree from an American university.

(3) Schedule II demonstrates that 97.3% of returned participants had already obtained minimum B. A. or B. Sc. degrees prior to receiving training on our program. It is gratifying to note that U. S. training is only being used to supplement training which is not obtainable in Egypt. Most of the training given was in the nature of in-service and practical training, including observation in the U. S. It must be kept in mind that many of the college graduates who were participants on this Mission's training program lacked practical experience.

(4) From Schedule III we find that 94.6% of returned participants were employed by the Government of Egypt. It is sincerely hoped that in future planning more persons employed by private industries will be given the opportunity to become participants on the U. S. Operations Mission to Egypt training program.

(5) Only 8% of the group under study held senior positions as Schedule III shows. It must be emphasized that participants in junior positions are handicapped in implementing their training unless their supervisors or the senior personnel with whom they are working are inclined to accept their new ideas. It will therefore be worthwhile to attempt to increase the number of senior participants on this Mission's training program to achieve better implementation and utilization of returned participants' training in the U. S.

(6) Schedule IV brings out the fact that only 3.5% of the returned participants had either visited or studied in the U. S. It is the opinion of the writers that such a policy should be followed in that training in the U. S. should be given to persons who have never received training in the U. S. before.

It is interesting to note that 56% of participants had never before left Egypt and to them training in the U. S. was altogether a new experience which has helped them not only to improve their academic or technical abilities, but also to widen their outlook in all fields of life.

(7) The Egyptian program has been fortunate in that only 1.5% of participants did not return to Egypt. It is the understanding of the writers that in other areas this figure is much higher. In this connection careful attention should be given to the selection of participants, and the motivations of participants should be carefully examined by training officers so that they are able to eliminate those persons who might not return to their home country and thus defeat the objectives of the program.

(8) Schedule V gives a breakdown of the number of returned participants by fiscal year and field of activity. It is interesting to note that 50.9% of returned participants which are the subject of this study have received training under fiscal years 1951 through 1954 while in fiscal year 1955, 43% of this group received training in the U. S.

One major criticism of the training programs of this Mission during fiscal years 1951 and 1952 is that the majority of participants were trained in community development and in particular in social welfare services. These participants are not now utilizing their training due to the fact that there are no projects with the Government of Egypt in relation to social services or other related fields. However, this has now been rectified and the majority of the participants under the 1955 and 1956 fiscal programs are sent only in projects which are operating in cooperation with the Government of Egypt and for which Project Agreements have been signed with this Mission.

PERIOD AND PLACE OF TRAINING

			PERIOD OF TRAINING				TRAINING ARRANGED AT					
			3 Mos. or Under	3 - 6	6 - 9	9 - 12	12 - 18	18 - 24	Univ.	Combined Univ. & Practical Training	Visitation	Part. recd. US. degree under Program
AGRICULTURE	:Prtcps.:	63	6	14	22	7	13	1	-	36	27	4
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:	"	44	19	8	3	14	-	-	4	22	18	1
EDUCATION	:	16	-	3	2	11	-	-	-	15	1	2
INDUSTRY & MINING	:	31	7	6	12	2	4	-	5	10	16	-
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION:	"	43	20	13	7	2	-	1	-	31	12	-
PUBLIC HEALTH	:	27	2	19	3	3	-	-	-	23	4	2
TRANSPORTATION & COMMUNICATIONS:	"	37	5	8	12	12	-	-	-	26	11	-
GRAND TOTAL	:	261	59	71	61	51	17	2	9	163	89	9
PERCENTAGE	:		22.6%	27.2%	23.4%	19.5%	6.5%	.8%	3.5%	62.5%	34%	3.4%

PERSONAL DATA

	AGE					SEX		MARITAL STATUS				COLLEGE EDUCATION	
	24 or Under	25-35	36-45	46-55	Over 56	M	F	M	S	W	D	Min. PA or BSc	None
Prtps. AGRICULTURE: 63	1	36	17	9	-	63	-	44 2*	17	-	-	63	-
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT: 44	2	18	19	5	-	41	3	25	18	1	-	40	4
EDUCATION: 16	1	4	10	1	-	15	1	13	3	-	-	15	1
INDUSTRY & MINING: 31	-	18	10	1	2	31	-	21	10	-	-	31	-
PUBLIC ADMIN.: 43	3	26	6	7	1	43	-	22	20	1	-	42	1
PUBLIC HEALTH: 27	1	7	11	7	1	24	3	18	8	-	1	27	-
TRANSPORTATION & COMM.: 37	5	20	10	-	2	37	-	15	22	-	-	36	1
GRAND TOTAL 261	13	129	83	30	6	254	7	158 2*	98	2	1	254	7
PERCENTAGE:	5%	49.4%	31.8%	11.5%	2.3%	97.3%	27	61.3	37.5	.8%	.4%	97.3%	2.7%

Note: Marital Status
M - Married
S - Single
W - Widowed
D - Divorced

NATURE OF EMPLOYMENT

		EMPLOYED BY		POSITION HELD PRIOR TO U.S. TRAINING		
		Government of Egypt	Private Industry	Senior	Intermediate	Junior
AGRICULTURE:	Prtps. 63	63	-	5	47	11
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:	44	40	4	-	28	16
EDUCATION:	16	16	-	-	15	1
INDUSTRY & MINING:	31	22	9	2	28	1
PUBLIC ADMIN.:	43	43	-	9	20	14
PUBLIC HEALTH:	27	26	1	5	22	-
TRANSPORTATION & COMMUNICATIONS:	37	37	-	-	33	4
GRAND TOTAL	261	247	14	21	193	47
PERCENTAGE		94.6%	5.4%	8%	74%	18%

TRAVEL OUTSIDE EGYPT AND OVER-STAY IN THE UNITED STATES

	Whether participant left Egypt before.		Participant was in the US prior to Tng. Pgm.		Participant remained in the U. S. after completion of Training Pgm.		
	Yes	No	Visit	Study	Study own Expense	Study Govn. Expense	Did not Return
AGRICULTURE: ^{Prtps.} 63	29	34	-	1	3	5	2
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT: 44	17	27	-	-	-	-	-
EDUCATION: 16	9	7	-	-	1	-	-
INDUSTRY & MINING: 31	15	16	1	4	2	1	-
PUBLIC ADM.: 43	18	25	-	-	-	-	-
PUBLIC HEALTH: 27	15	12	1	-	1	-	-
TRANSPORTATION & COMM.: 37	12	25	2	1	1	-	2
GRAND TOTAL 261	115	146	4	6	8	6	4
PERCENTAGE	44%	56%	1.5%	2%	3%	2%	1.5%

NUMBER OF RETURNED PARTICIPANTS (U.S.)
BY FISCAL YEAR AND FIELD OF ACTIVITY

As of September 20, 1956

FIELD OF ACTIVITY	Prtps.	FISCAL YEAR					
		1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956
AGRICULTURE	63	5	11	11	17	19	-
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	44	26	13	3	-	1	1
EDUCATION	16	-	3	3	-	10	-
INDUSTRY & MINING	31	2	1	1	2	18	7
PUBLIC HEALTH	27	-	3	7	4	13	-
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION	43	-	-	-	4	31	8
TRANSPORTATION & COMM.	37	-	-	12	5	20	-
GRAND TOTAL	261	33	31	37	32	112	16
PERCENTAGE		12.6%	11.9%	14.1%	12.3%	43%	6.1%

III. STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF ORAL INTERVIEWS

The following is a tabulation and statistical summary of the result of 132 oral interviews conducted with returned participants. At the end of this section is a copy of the questions asked during the interviews. This is a copy of the final form. The original list of questions was changed several times as a result of experience gained through the interviews.

Each participant did not answer every question so the total number of answers for each question does not necessarily correspond with the total number of interviews. Since the questions on the interview form were altered several times, the smaller number of answers in some cases indicates that those questions were not asked in the earlier interviews. Account should also be taken of the element of human error in which the interviewers did not in all cases ask every question or always record each answer.

It will also be noted that the answers recorded in this statistical summary do not directly follow the list of questions on the attached interview form. In tabulating the answers for the purpose of the summary it was determined that to make the summary more meaningful and more readily interpretable, the questions on the interview form should not be followed exactly in the tabular results. This has, however, not altered the true meaning of the answers to the questions. The answers to question #7 on the interview form were not recorded in the summary because they were either too varied or not meaningful enough from which to draw conclusions or tabulate.

Multiple copies of the narrative report of all these interviews have been forwarded to ICA/W. A representative of the USOM/Egypt Training Staff was present at the interview and generally conducted it as is indicated on the followup and evaluation report. As is noted on many narrative reports, the appropriate USOM/Egypt technician was often present and assisted in conducting the interview.

* * * *

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. To what degree was the training requested for participant actually received by him?

a. Completely	56
b. Almost completely	35
c. Moderately completed	28
d. Partially completed	13
Total	<u>132</u>

2. Under the following headings participant stated his preference in carrying out the training program:

a. More specialization and fewer visits for longer periods	45
b. Less specialization and visits to more places	1
c. No change	42
Total	<u>88</u>

3. Did you as a participant make recommendations to your government pursuant to your training?

a. Many	32
b. Several	63
c. Very few	17
d. None	8
e. Too early to report	2
Total	<u>122</u>

4. To what extent were the above recommendations implemented by your government?

a. Many	10
b. Several	23
c. Very few	17
d. None	25
e. Too early to know	35
Total	<u>110</u>

5. State the degree of local training courses arranged by you after your return to Egypt.

a. Many	10
b. Several	9
c. Very few	2
d. Through Staff meetings	24
e. Through training associates	23
f. None	19
g. Too early to report	12
Total	<u>99</u>

6. State the degree of increased responsibility you have been given since your return.

a. Greatly	26
b. Moderately	32
c. Slightly	9
d. None	31
Total	<u>98</u>

7. To what degree were you satisfied with the housing accommodations arranged for you in the U. S.?

a. Very satisfactory	45
b. Fairly satisfactory	35
c. Unsatisfactory	8
Total	<u>88</u>

8. To what degree were you satisfied with the travel arrangements made for you while in the U. S.?

a. Very satisfactory	46
b. Fairly satisfactory	34
c. Unsatisfactory	3
Total	<u>83</u>

9. To what degree were you satisfied with the per diem payments made to you while in the U. S.?

a. Very satisfactory	36
b. Fairly satisfactory	43
c. Unsatisfactory	10
Total	<u>89</u>

10. State the degree of social relationships with Americans during your visit to the U. S.

a. Many	60
b. Several	40
c. Few	5
d. None	1
Total	<u>106</u>

11. State the degree to which you have maintained these social relationships.

a. Many	14
b. Several	29
c. Few	28
d. None	5
Total	<u>76</u>

12. State the degree of professional relationships with Americans during your visit to the U. S.

a. Many	46
b. Several	30
c. Few	8
d. None	1
Total	<u>85</u>

13. State the degree to which you have maintained these professional relationships.

a. Many	11
b. Several	28
c. Few	19
d. None	9
Total	<u>67</u>

14. State the degree of your relationship with USOM/Egypt since your return from your training.

a. Working on USOM project full-time	14
b. Working on USOM project half-time	4
c. Working on USOM project part-time	4
d. Very limited association with USOM	24
e. No association with USOM	54
Total	<u>100</u>

15. State your opinion of the orientation program of the Washington International Center.

a. Excellent	58
b. Moderately useful	24
c. No benefit	5
d. Received no orientation	11
Total	<u>98</u>

16. State the manner in which your visit to the U. S. altered your opinion of the U. S.

a. Very favorable alteration	54
b. Moderately favorable alteration	32
c. No alteration	6
d. Unfavorable alteration	0
Total	<u>92</u>

17. Interviewers appraisal of the participant:
The degree of excellence is judged by the following two criteria, both of which must be met for a rating of excellent: (1) An excellent participant is one who has been able to implement some of the recommendations made as a result of his training for the economic and technical development of his country; (2) An excellent participant is also one whose attitude toward the U. S. was favorably increased and who would spread the favorable attitude to other people.

a. Excellent participant	44
b. Moderately favorable participant	63
c. Unfavorable participant	25
Total	<u>132</u>

The following list shows a breakdown of the field of activity in which the above 132 interviewed returned participants received training in the United States:

<u>Field of Activity</u>	<u>Number of Participants</u>
Agriculture	38
Community Development	18
Education	10
Industry and Mining	15
Public Health	18
Public Administration	19
Transportation and Communication	14
Total	<u>132</u>

The following form embodying a list of questions was the final guideline used by the writers of this report during the followup and evaluation interviews with returned participants. This form was used and followed in writing up the evaluation reports so that uniformity could be established.

FOLLOWUP AND EVALUATION INTERVIEW
USOM/EGYPT PARTICIPANTS

PIO/P _____

Interviewers:

Date:

Present Position of Participant:

Present Supervisor of Participant:

Previous Position of Participant:

Field of Training:

Period of Training in U. S.:

Program planned by:

1. Describe the training requested.
2. Was this training actually received? Give details.
3. Based on your training, what suggestions or recommendations did you make to your Government?
4. Describe the acceptance and implementation of these suggestions or recommendations.
5. What training courses have you given or arranged since your return? What was their duration and what kind of response did you receive?
6. Have your responsibilities increased since your return and in what way?
7. Were you aware of any readjustment problem either professionally or socially upon your return to Egypt?
8. Were the mechanics of your program such as housing accommodations, travel, and per diem satisfactory?

9. Did you enjoy social and professional contacts with Americans and have they been maintained since your return to Egypt?
10. What has been your relationship with USOM/Egypt since your return?
11. Was the orientation in USOM/Egypt and the Washington International Center helpful?
12. Did your impressions of the U. S. change as a result of your visits?
13. Interviewers' appraisal of participant.

* * * * *

IV. STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF WRITTEN QUESTIONNAIRE

The following is a copy of the written questionnaire sent to returned participants. Some 80 questionnaires were sent but only 47 were returned to the Training Office. The questionnaire was signed by the participants.

Due to the low percentage of answers received from participants in the early phase of this followup and evaluation program, it was decided to change the procedure. Consequently, instead of mailing a questionnaire to a participant, the questionnaire was given and explained to a returned participant when he called at the Training Office and he was requested to complete it. This latter method proved very satisfactory and the number of completed and returned questionnaires was much higher than when the previous mode of mailing the questionnaire to participants was utilized.

Next to each question is a tabulation of replies received by the 47 participants who answered this questionnaire. The reply "too early" to certain questions was not included on the form but was added by some participants in reply to several questions.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR RETURNED USOM/EGYPT PARTICIPANTS

PIO/P: _____

Date: _____

Name: _____

Sex: _____

Age: _____

Home Address: _____

Office Address: _____

Field of Specialization: _____

Employed by: _____

Present Position: _____

Position before Departure to U. S.: _____

Date Departure to U. S.: _____

Date Return from U. S.: _____

1. To what degree was the training in the U. S. requested by you and your Ministry actually received? (Please check one)

a. Completely	17
b. Almost completely	18
c. Partially	11
d. Not at all	1
Total	<u>47</u>

2. As you see it now, when you were in the U. S. should you have (Check one)

A. (1) Carried on about the program as you did?	19
(2) Specialized more and seen fewer places?	24
(3) Seen more places and specialized less?	4
Total	<u>47</u>

B. Explain checked answer briefly.

3. As a result of your training you undoubtedly made a number of recommendations to your Ministry. Check the degree of acceptance and implementation of these recommendations.

a. Completely	6
b. Almost completely	12
c. Partially	18
d. Not at all	1
e. Too early	10
Total	<u>47</u>

4. You probably had a number of social relationships with Americans while in the U. S. Please check the degree.

a. Very few	8
b. Several	22
c. Many	17
Total	<u>47</u>

5. Have you maintained these social contacts in the U. S. since your return to Egypt? Please check.

a. None	-
b. Some	34
c. Many	10
d. Too early	3
Total	<u>47</u>

6. You probably had a number of professional relationships with Americans while in the U. S. Please check the degree.

a. Very few	13
b. Several	22
c. Many	12
Total	<u>47</u>

7. Have you maintained these professional contacts in the U. S. since your return to Egypt? Please check one.

a. None	6
b. Some	34
c. Many	4
d. Too early	3
Total	<u>47</u>

8. What has been your relationship with Point IV in Egypt since your return from the U. S.? Please check one.

a. None	19
b. Occasional	18
c. Extensive	8
d. Too early	2
Total	<u>47</u>

9. Were the mechanics of your program satisfactory? Please check one under each heading.

	<u>Housing</u>	<u>Per Diem</u>	<u>Transportation</u>
a. Very satisfactory	27	16	37
b. Fairly satisfactory	13	23	7
c. Unsatisfactory	3	6	1
Total	<u>43</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>45</u>

Note: A few participants did not answer this question.

10. What is your opinion of the Washington International Center orientation program? Please check one.

a. Excellent	25
b. Fairly useful	18
c. Waste of time	4
Total	<u>47</u>

11. Has your opinion of the U. S. and its people changed as a result of your visit? Please check one.

a. Same	5
b. More favorable	41
c. Less favorable	1
Total	<u>47</u>

12. Have your responsibilities in your job increased since your return to Egypt? Please check one.

a. Not at all	3
b. Slightly	18
c. Greatly	22
d. Too early	4
Total	<u>47</u>

13. To what degree have you arranged training courses in your field of specialty since your return? Please check one.

a. Not at all	6
b. A few times	21
c. On a regular basis	10
d. Too early	10
Total	<u>47</u>

14. Your general comments:

Attach to this sheet any additional comments or remarks of special value.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

From the foregoing statistical summaries the following conclusions and pursuant recommendations are submitted:

1. There is a definite need for the improvement of many of the training programs planned by ICA/W and cooperating agencies.

2. The majority of participants were of the opinion that their programs did not include enough training periods of sufficient length at one place to permit the degree of specialization they felt desirable. They were scheduled to make too many short visits to a large number of places; hence, they were not able to obtain specialized training. This complaint was strongly reiterated by many participants.

A constructive approach towards remedying this problem would be for ICA/W to send to the USOM a detailed training program prior to the departure of the participants. Such a proposed training program could be reviewed by the Mission, the cooperating government, the supervisor of the participant, and finally the participant himself. When such a procedure is followed, most of the complaints of dissatisfied participants will be eliminated. It is gratifying to note that some of ICA/W divisions are following this course of action.

3. The degree of implementation of recommendations made by returned participants to their government is low, probably less than 50%. This indicates greater and continued emphasis on the following:

- a. Training programs of HOW to get results rather than WHAT results are desirable. This could perhaps best be accomplished by emphasis on training conferences in conference leadership, human relations, and job instruction, etc.
- b. Vertical training within host country organizations so that those at the decision-making level who are responsible for implementation of programs will view favorably the recommendations of lower ranking technicians.
- c. Followup with returned participants by USOM training staffs and technicians to encourage returnees to continue their attempts to implement their recommendations and to advise on ways in which their suggestions can be accepted.
- d. Project-centered training under which returned participants have much greater opportunity for achieving implementation.

- e. Supervisors of proposed participants should be interviewed by Mission training and technical staff to insure their understanding of the training program and its objectives and thus pave the way to the implementation of any recommendations made by returned participants.

4. There has been a definite lack of dissemination of the technical knowledge of returned participants due to their failure to train others; thus, the very desirable "multiplier" effect has not been utilized. This points to the need for participants not only to receive training in their technical fields but also to be trained in methods of disseminating or multiplying that technical knowledge in their home country after their return. This could be done by including in U. S. programs training in "how to teach others" and "how to conduct training courses." Existing training facilities of this nature in the U. S. could be utilized or a small section could be established in ICA/W to provide this training. It seems reasonable to consider taking up to perhaps 20% of a participant's time in the U. S. for this type of instruction. In addition, aptitude for training others could well be established as one of the criteria for the selection of participants.

5. There has been a fairly good record of returned participants assuming increased responsibility. This could probably be increased by following the recommendations listed in paragraphs three and four above.

6. Almost all returned participants were either "fairly satisfied" or "very satisfied" with their travel and housing arrangements in the United States. The percentage dissatisfied with travel arrangements was about 3.5% while the percentage dissatisfied with housing was about 8%. The most common housing complaint was that not enough flexibility was permitted at places where long periods of training were arranged; and on short training periods, reservations were often made for the participants in expensive hotels thereby not taking into account their per diem allowance. The latter difficulty perhaps can best be solved by increased emphasis in the ICA/W program on establishing "hospitality centers" in large cities and medium-sized cities where a large number of participants regularly receive training.

7. Approximately 11% of the participants interviewed in this study were dissatisfied with their per diem rate while about 50% of those replying to the questionnaire stated they were only "fairly satisfied" with their per diem. The most common complaint was that the per diem was not high enough for those who followed an itinerary taking them through many large cities for brief visits.

8. There is a need to increase the number of professional relationships between participants and their U. S. counterparts. This problem arose particularly at large universities and in overcrowded training offices in the government departments in Washington. At large universities this could be alleviated best by strengthening the Foreign Student Advisory Service which should act as a liaison. Professors could be apprised of the much greater need

for this relationship on the part of the foreign visitor as contrasted to the need of the usual American student. On several occasions participants stated they did not meet their professional counterpart in the cooperating government agency in Washington either at the beginning or end of their program. To their knowledge, their programs were planned by an administrative officer. This short-coming can be remedied by better program planning by ICA/W and the cooperating government agencies. It is strongly urged that the ratio of participants to project managers and program officers be kept at a low enough level to permit adequate individual attention on the part of project managers and program officers to the details of each participant's program, including arranging professional contacts and getting professional advice in planning each participant's program. Above all, participants must be treated as individuals and not automatons. The most important non-technical lesson they should learn in the United States is the dignity of the individual and this can best be learned not from the written word but from daily example.

9. The degree of maintenance by returned participants of their professional relationships with Americans in the U. S. is very low. Increasing and strengthening these relationships as indicated in paragraph eight above will assist in promoting the continuance of these contacts. The excellent plan to assist returned participants to receive professional periodicals from the U. S. should also increase the maintenance of these relationships. Returned participants should be encouraged and assisted to write articles for U. S. professional periodicals regarding developments in their fields in their country. The market for such articles in the U. S. is relatively untapped. Training officers and technicians in the returned participant's country could render this encouragement and assistance and also help place such articles.

10. The majority of participants enjoyed a wide variety of social relationships with Americans and these contacts were frequently the high point of their training in the U. S. They may forget some of their technical training but they cherish the hospitality and warm friendship which they encountered in their social activities. However, the summaries of the oral interviews and questionnaires indicate that there is a definite need for providing more opportunity for these relationships. The recommendation for an increase of "hospitality centers" as noted in paragraph six above would be helpful.

11. The incidence of maintenance of social relationships by returned participants is quite low. Since these relationships must be spontaneous there is little that training officers and technicians can do other than encourage returned participants to maintain their social contacts. In this connection, the use of circular and round-robin letters by participants, the Washington International Center, and training agencies in the U. S. should be encouraged. By promoting the establishment of joint USOM Returned Participants' Organization, the training officer and technicians can build up social and professional relationships for returned participants with Americans in their own country. One returned participant when questioned regarding the maintenance of the many pleasant social activities he described as having had experienced in the U. S., made the interesting reply that he purposely

stopped all of them after his return to Egypt because they reminded him of that wonderful period in his life and made him very unhappy and dissatisfied with his present lot.

12. Over half the participants who expressed their opinion about the Washington International Center termed the program "excellent." Only approximately 5% were critical.

13. Approximately 59% of the participants who were interviewed and answered the question regarding the manner in which their visit to the U. S. altered their opinion of America, stated their opinion was "very favorably" changed. About 35% reported a "moderately favorable" alteration. Furthermore, over 85% of those who replied to the questionnaire stated that they now have a "more favorable" attitude toward the U. S. The conductors of these interviews agreed that the single most outstandingly consistent result of the USOM/Egypt training program has been its success in developing favorable attitudes toward the United States. As any given interview progressed and the barriers between the participant and the interviewer were reduced, it was heart-warming to listen to the participant praise the U. S. Many consider their visit to the States as the high point of their lives. They seemed to thoroughly enjoy discussing the great technical developments of the U. S. and the warmth and friendliness of their reception. They were impressed by the large amount of public interest in civic affairs and the decentralization of authority. One participant expressed his opinion by saying that all the books praising democracy could not be as beneficial as actually "living in" a democracy for six months.

14. It will be noted that 78% of the participants interviewed who replied to the question regarding their relationship with USOM projects since their return stated there was no association or "occasional or very limited" association. On the other hand, 92% of participants completing the questionnaire had no contact or just occasional contact with the Mission in Egypt. This has been one of the reasons for the poor results in implementation of recommendations and lack of dissemination of technical knowledge as noted in paragraphs three and four above. However, in fairness to USOM/Egypt, it should be noted that no large project agreements were signed until the summer of 1954, due principally to the instability within the various Egyptian ministries. Also the principle of project-centered training and the regulations of "Operation Blueprint" regarding this matter were not thoroughly promulgated within the Mission and to the Egyptian Government until discussions were undertaken concerning the FY 1956 participant program early in that year. All of the participants dealt with in this study were participants in the FY 1955 or earlier programs. Hence, for the above reasons, the results of the statistical summaries on this question are not surprising. It is the belief of the USOM/Egypt Training Staff that of the FY 1956 participants chosen, at least 80% were project-centered; hence, the results on this question, if a similar study is made later, should be much more favorable.

VI. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following general observations and recommendations pertaining to the overall USOM/Egypt training program are based on:

- a. Discussions among the writers and participants during oral interviews but not recorded in the tabular summary. These matters are generally mentioned in the narrative reports.
- b. The effectiveness of training discussed with returned participants and USOM technicians by USOM/Egypt Training Staff on many other occasions besides the oral interviews.
- c. The experience of the USOM/Egypt Training Staff over a period of 23 months in the planning, operational, and followup and evaluation activities with more than 350 participants.

1. It is necessary that strong emphasis should be placed on the requirement that participant training be project-centered. A rule should be established that participant training will be arranged only where there are U. S. technicians in the Mission to aid in the selection of participants and where U. S. technicians will be available to assist and encourage returned participants. In exceptional cases it might be possible to substitute host government technicians trained in the U. S.

2. One of the most common complaints among participants was that their programs were not prepared when they reached Washington and consequently valuable time was lost. A second grievance was that while receiving training in the U. S., their itinerary program sometimes was only one jump ahead of them thus creating anxieties and embarrassments. It has been noted that sometimes ICA/W states they will wait for a participant's arrival before firming up his program. This practice should be prohibited. The PIO/P is the "bible", so to speak, as far as the participant's program is concerned. Missions should be required to give careful consideration to block 17 of the PIO/P. The Manual Order instructions for filling out this block should be followed in detail and complete information supplied on the kind of training requested. This does not mean that the USOM is more qualified to recommend a detailed training program for a particular participant, but only a recognition of the fact that Washington simply does not have detailed information about conditions in every field in each host country which the participant's training is designed to remedy. The PIO/P should be carefully studied by Washington in both ICA/W and the cooperating agencies and any questions relative to it should be raised with the Mission. In short, there should be a full and frank exchange of information to bring good program planning.

Though program planning for participants is a cooperative endeavor, ICA/W and cooperating agencies should realize that ultimate authority in the matter rests with the Mission. Any changes of a substantial nature in the training program must be cleared with the Mission.

3. It is recognized that there are advantages to group training such as the cross-fertilization of ideas and that better programs can be sometimes planned on a group basis. However, it must be candidly admitted that in some cases group training is arranged as a subterfuge way to "handle more participants." Undoubtedly group programs can be handled with less administrative work than if programmed individually. Therefore, group training should be carefully planned so that all members of the group actually require the same training. It is not sufficient justification to put a participant in a group program when one of his interests fits into a group, unless the other interests of the participant are dealt with by an individual program. Even where group training is arranged, provision should be made for individual attention within the group and no participant should experience only group training. Group training should be carefully explained to the Mission and by it to the host government and the participants.

4. ICA policy regarding allowing participants to obtain degrees from American universities as a part of their training program has given ICA/W, USOMs, participants, and host country officials, many problems and has produced a number of dissatisfied participants. However, it is hoped that the new Manual Order, ICA Participant Policy No. 1300.1, dated January 3, 1957, will help solve this important and major problem. The great majority of participants who spend nine months or more in a training institution in the U. S. were anxious and insistent that they work toward a degree. This is perfectly understandable since the degree means increased prestige and promotion to them when they return home. A satisfactory answer has not yet been found to the participant's claim that without the degree he will not have an influential enough position to implement his training when he returns home. Faced with the insistent participant and the ICA policy on working towards degrees, many training institutions will make very effort to assist the participant to work on a degree. One university went to the extent of lending a few participants money to pay for extra courses not on their program. In these cases, with a few exceptions, it has meant that the practical training part of their program had to be minimized in favor of the degree emphasis.

On the other hand, it has been noted during the interviews made in connection with this study that returned participants who received degrees from American universities showed considerable more confidence in themselves and in the possibility of implementing their recommendations in their field of specialty. The interviewers received the impression that such participants who have obtained American university degrees would persist longer and more successfully in the face of adversity than those participants without degrees.

It is felt that Mission technicians while preparing PIO/Ps for periods of nine months or over at one training institution, should consider seriously the question of whether or not such participants should be considered for training towards an American university degree. This question will invariably arise after the participant starts on his training program and it would be wise for USOMs to make a definite recommendation in all such cases prior to the departure of the participant for the U. S.

If such a procedure is followed, it will enable participants and the host country to be informed from the beginning whether or not the participant will be allowed to work towards a degree. This would considerably reduce the number of dissatisfied participants and lighten the burden put on ICA/W, cooperating agencies, and training institutions.

5. Requests for extensions are too often not critically examined by the training institutions, cooperating government agencies, and ICA/W. In fact, USOMs sometimes feel that extensions are encouraged by training institutions. The PIO/P is supposed to be a carefully considered document and if ICA/W feels the duration of training is not long enough to accomplish the objectives, it should advise the USOM prior to issuance so that the adjustment can be made. Thereafter, extensions should be strongly discouraged but if deemed necessary they should be requested as early as possible and the various organizations concerned in the U. S. should be asked to make a definite recommendation in the matter rather than to merely state they "have no objection."

6. It is almost imperative that USOMs be notified in some detail of the participant's program prior to his departure so that they can make appropriate comments. This will result in much better programing and in lessening the misunderstandings between USOMs and ICA/W in this matter. Program planning is a joint responsibility but it should be recognized that in case of disagreement the USOM view should be decisive. Any change other than a minor change in a participant's program should be cleared with the USOM.

7. There appears to be a tendency on the part of some returned participants to be reluctant to train others. This is believed to be a result of both inertia and the fact that officials in underdeveloped countries, where there is usually a surplus of labor, like to hug their knowledge to their bosom as a safeguard for their positions. The fact that only they possess a certain body of knowledge gives them security. As noted earlier, this can perhaps be partly remedied by making aptitude for training others one of the criteria for the selection of participants.

8. The usefulness of a followup and evaluation program was clearly shown during the course of this study. The returned participants who were interviewed were pleased, enthused, and flattered that the USOM was interested in resurrecting the details of their program and what they had been doing since their return. They admitted they needed assistance and for the most part eagerly sought it. They also appreciated the encouragement that was given to them. Many of them returned to the Training Staff Office several times on an unsolicited basis. They indicated an eagerness for professional and social contacts with the USOM and endorsed the suggestions for meetings of returned participants. Several of these meetings were held with moderate success.

9. Toward the end of this study the Training Staff of USOM/Egypt commenced to interview supervisors of returned participants. Since less than ten of these interviews were held the results were not incorporated in this study. Generally these interviews proved very valuable. The supervisors were reminded of the training the returned participants under them had received and, in some cases, the failure to utilize certain abilities of returned participants was brought up by the Training Staff and discussed. The supervisors had useful comments to make about the training programs. One of the most common ones was that too many short visits were made to a large number of places. The supervisors were impressed with the serious attitude of the Training Staff toward the utilization of returned participants and this should help in educating host governments away from the idea that the participant program is a fellowship or scholarship program. The Training Staff took great care not to give the impression that they were meddling in the supervisors' departments or trying to promote the cause of the returned participants.

10. It is interesting to note that the replies recorded for the oral interviews were generally very similar to those recorded on the written questionnaire. It is believed useful to utilize both methods as a check against the other and also because some participants cannot be reached for oral interviews. However, it should be clearly stated that oral interviews are much more desirable because more information is obtained. The returned participant is gratified at being brought into close touch with the USOM, and in many cases it gives technicians a chance to establish a connection with a returned participant not previously contacted who may be useful on a project. It is believed that unsigned questionnaires would be a useful check on the oral interviews and signed questionnaires.

11. A number of participants when interviewed about their training in Puerto Rico were unenthusiastic and stated they did not spend enough time there to gain anything useful. Others said it was so similar to the training already received in the U. S. that it was not beneficial. It is recommended that ICA/W seriously reconsider the present criteria for determining whether participants should receive training in Puerto Rico.

12. An interesting side development from this study was that returned participants are a useful source of information regarding USOM projects and particularly regarding the training needs of these projects.

13. At least three or four participants indicated some dissatisfaction with the Washington International Center. Two indicated that they heard lectures in which political propaganda for Israel was disseminated and in another case propaganda for Britain. Evidently in these cases the Center invited lecturers without carefully screening their comments.

14. A number of participants when questioned regarding the utilization of their training complained that they lacked the required modern equipment. This indicates a need for the training requests to specifically state what type of equipment will probably be available to returned participants so that they can be trained on that equipment and not on equipment they will not have when they return. There has always been an understandable tendency on the part of U. S. training institutions to show foreign participants our very best equipment and train them on it. It is good to show them such equipment but not always good to train them on it because it may cause great frustration to the participant when he returns home and such equipment is not available to him. It may be a difficult suggestion for program officers in Washington to seek out training institutions with equipment similar to that which the participant has available in his home country, but it should result in more meaningful programs. In addition, this particular problem of returned participants indicates the need to encourage them to make the best of what they have and to "adapt not adopt." This means giving moral encouragement to returned participants on the part of technicians and training officers in the U. S. and the host country.

15. The writers would like to emphasize the need for ICA/W to transmit to the USOM a regular monthly contact letter from each participant and a final evaluation report from the project manager and training institution. These reports should include comments of the participants and the U. S. government department planning his program. Such monthly reports are invaluable to the Training Staff in keeping contact with the participant's supervisor and impressing upon the latter the Mission's interest in seeing that each participant receives support in attempting to utilize his training. The final reports will greatly help the Training Staff in its followup and evaluation of the training program of the participant.

* * * * *

In conclusion the writers of this report feel that a followup and evaluation study of the training operations of a USOM is most helpful in improving the programing and operation of the participant training program in both ICA/W and the USOM. Further, the results of such a study could help the Mission improve its procedures and criteria for selection of participants.

John B. Stabler
E. Theodore Mogannam
Training Staff, USOM/Egypt

Washington, D. C.
January 1957