CANADIAN COOPERANTS IN COUNTERPART TRAINING: PATTERNS AND EFFECTIVENESS

by

Pamela J. Pritchard

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts

Faculty of Education
McGill University
Montreal, Canada

February 1990

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

The study examined the patterns and effectiveness of counterpart training by Canadian cooperants involved in development projects. The traditional one-on-one apprenticeship model of counterpart training was used. Success of the training was analysed by comparing results against the principles of effective training in industry: that a training program should be a results oriented goal system that establishes some observable and sustainable change in the behaviour of those receiving training.

A group of 40 Canadian cooperants returned from postings in Africa participated in the study. All of the cooperants were participants in a major study on cross cultural effectiveness sponsored by the Canadian International Development Agency (Kealey, 1988) and had worked with at least one counterpart. The cooperants were interviewed by telephone to collect the data for the study.

Results of the study indicate that the counterpart training system is not very effective as a means of transferring knowledge and expertise. The problem appeared to lie in the process itself, not in the technical qualifications of the individuals involved nor in their willingness to share their expertise. Training was generally secondary to completion of the project on time and on budget, and tended to evolve as the need arose and as time permitted. Few of the cooperants had any experience in designing training interventions, and so devised their own tools and methods with few identifiable measures of success. There were no formal evaluations of either the cooperant or the counterpart, nor of program success upon completion of the training.

The study concluded that counterpart training does not work well as an isolated intervention, but may be successful as one element in a series of learning activities. It provides benefit by virtue of working individually with an acknowledged expert and acquiring practical experience. Results also indicated that, to be effective, a comprehensive training process must be built into the project from the outset with corresponding accountability for success.

RESUME

Cette étude a examiné les tendances et l'efficacité de la formation des homologues par les coopérants canadiens oeuvrant sur les projets de développement. Le modèle classique de l'apprentissage individuel était utilisé. Le degré d'efficacité de la formation a été analysé en comparant les résultats de l'étude aux principes de la formation efficace utilisé en industrie: qu'un programme de formation devrait être un système avec des objectifs orienté vers un changement tangible et soutenable dans le comportement de l'individu impliqué dans la formation.

Les participants étaient un groupe de 40 canadiens récemment revenus d'une affectation en Afrique. Tous les coopérants faisaient partie d'une étude majeure mandatée par l'Agence Canadienne de Développement International sur l'efficacité des coopérants en affectation à l'étranger (Kealey, 1988) et ils ont travaillé avec au moins un homologue. Chaque coopérant était contacté par téléphone pour discuter de leurs expériences dans la formation des homologues.

Les résultats de l'étude ont indiqué que le sytème de formation d'un homologue n'est pas très efficace pour le transfert de connaissances et de compétences. Il semble que le problème se trouve surtout dans le processus de la formation et non dans ni les qualifications techniques, ni leur désir de transférer leur expertise. En général, la formation était secondaire au mandat de terminer le projet à temps sans dépasser les restrictions budgétaires. Ainsi dit, la formation a eu lieu si le temps la permettait et si un besoin important s'est manifesté. Très peu de coopérants possédaient de l'expérience dans le dessein de la formation, donc ils ont utilisés leurs propres méthodes sans mesures de succès. Il n'y avait pas d'évaluation par la suite, ni de l'homologue, ni du coopérant, ni de l'efficacité du programme de formation.

En conclusion, comme événement isolé, la formation des homologues n'est pas efficace. L'étude indique qu'elle serait plus efficace dans le contexte d'un programme de formation comprenant d'autres activités d'apprentissage. Ainsi, l'homlogue peut acquérir de l'expérience pratique et bénéficier de l'expertise d'un coopérant. Les résultats indiquent aussi que le processus de formation doit être intégré dans le projet dès le début et q'un mesure de succès du projet serait une formation réussie.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There were times, in the writing of this thesis, when it seemed as if I would never overcome the writer's block or the emotional obstacles that prevented me from carrying on. To my family, friends, and colleagues who believed in me and supported me when I despaired of ever finishing, I offer my heartfelt thanks. Their confidence and trust in my capabilities brightened dark moments.

I would like to thank Dr. Gary Anderson, of McGill University, for his professional advice and support throughout my studies, especially in his role as my thesis advisor. Specifically, I would like to thank him for his astute attention to research methods in developing plans for the data collection. His knowledge of the subject frequently challenged me, gave me much food for thought, and helped point me in the best direction to review previous studies and research. His specific and pertinent feedback, as well as his endless patience with delays and revisions as the paper evolved, kept me focussed and on track.

I wish also to thank the individuals of the Canadian International Development Agency Briefing Center who helped me realize this study, as well as those who so generously agreed to participate and share their experiences. I owe a special debt of gratitude to Daniel J. Kealey. Quite apart from providing me with the resources to undertake this research as a smaller component of his study on cross-cultural effectiveness, he also included me as a member of his research team and launched me on one of the most amazing experiences of my life. More important, he became my mentor and my friend. He gave me wise counsel, unflagging encouragement, and believed in the importance of the study. During the many long and animated discussions we enjoyed, his insights and expertise proved invaluable to me both professionally and personally. My association with him has enriched my life.

Finally, I would like to dedicate this paper to the memory of my mother, Iris. She fully supported my decision to return to graduate school full-time and would have been proud to know that I completed my studies.

LIST OF TABLES

Introduction

As international borders all but disappear and are replaced by a more global ideology in terms of economics, technology and industry, it is imperative that developing countries rapidly reduce their dependency on aid from First World nations and work toward autonomy. Consequently, many development projects in labour-rich but technology-poor countries are concentrating on transferring skills and technologies to build a base for future advancement. The idea is to create technological self-sufficiency in developing countries. The transfer of skills is not limited to aid projects. A growing number of countries are introducing nationalistic labour laws requiring multinationals to hire, train and develop local people to run all aspects of their business operations (McCaffrey & Hafner, 1985).

The introduction of training and development programs in developing countries can be difficult and frustrating. Time is needed for people to learn to work together in any new operation and the process is further complicated when taught by people of another culture. Many development projects, implemented by foreign governments, use counterpart training as a means to transfer required skills and knowledge. Counterparts are local personnel of a country receiving aid who have the same role as and complement the work of technical assistance experts (Viet, 1985).

Counterpart training stems from the apprenticeship learning model where an individual is put under the care and tutelage of a master or expert for the purpose of learning a trade, skill or profession. The principal objective is to ensure that the counterpart is able to take over the position of the project member at the end of the training period.

The purpose of this study is to examine the role of the cooperant or expert in counterpart training in terms of the various patterns of training and their effectiveness.

Specifically, the study examines Canadian counterpart training programs in development projects and attempts to establish what the patterns are and how they work. If the transfer of skills and technology to developing countries is of such importance, it is equally important that methods such as counterpart training be closely examined to ensure their objectives are being met.

2.0 Review of the Literature

2.1 Background of Project-related Technical Assistance and Training

For nearly thirty years, the developing countries of the world have been receiving assistance in many forms from more developed, industrialized nations. There are approximately 24 donor countries, 10 multilateral development banks and funds, 19 United Nations agencies and hundreds of non-government organizations (NGO's) providing development assistance (excluding export credit agencies and commercial banks that may also provide financing). Of 50 countries receiving significant amounts of aid, Canada donates large amounts to about 15-20 countries (Poats, 1985). Most of that assistance has been given with the aim of helping developing nations achieve the expertise to respond effectively to their needs and their own development plans and timetables. A problem inherent in the donation of aid has been the lack of qualified people from the recipient nation. While such a shortage of qualified individuals has long been lamented by both donor and recipient, the problem remains a serious one. Most aid to developing nations is "tied", meaning that a large portion of the aid money must be used to purchase technology and equipment from the donor country. Naturally, if the recipient country does not have suitably qualified personnel, technical assistance expertise is required from the donor in order to implement the project. Exporting technology and the accompanying expertise can be beneficial for the donor in the short term, but unfortunately, without adequately trained replacements, the long-term benefits to both donor and recipient are often questionable.

The task of training competent personnel in developing countries is daunting. Many nations now have high calibre educational institutions capable of producing well-trained manpower to assume most of the tasks remaining for full development,

although they may lack the financial resources for equipment (Caustin, 1974). Also, there are numerous fellowships and university programs throughout the world sponsored by donor countries expressly for training recipient country personnel. Nonetheless, the majority of developing nations, especially the less developed countries (LDC's), are far from maintaining their own educational base. The LDC's remain beholden to developed economies to supply the necessary technology and expertise in aid projects. While there is growing support and the possibility of exchange of expertise between developing and less developed nations instead of the industrialized West, the traditional donors of aid and expertise remain the post-industrial economies of the world.

In an analysis of project-related technical assistance (PRTA) for the World Bank, Lethem and Cooper (1983) defined it as:

> Services provided by firms or individuals, working alone, or in association with beneficiary agency personnel, to help achieve the primary objectives of the project. The purpose of the assistance provided may range from execution of tasks for which skills are not available within the beneficiary agency to the transfer of knowledge and development of the beneficiary's technical and managerial capabilities (p.75).

In 1982 the Bank prepared its first major study of project-related training (PRT) components in the projects it financed. Technical assistance services amounted to nine percent or $1.2 billion of the financing provided by the World Bank in fiscal year 1982 (Lethem & Cooper, 1983). The amount has remained steady over the years 1983 - 1987 but declined as a total proportion of Bank lending (World Bank Technical Assistance Report, 1987). An analysis completed in fiscal year 1984 showed that training lending as a percentage of total Bank lending had stabilized at approximately

1.7% with 87% of projects containing a training component, or approximately $1.5m for each of 168 projects in 1984 (Barker & Sterling, 1985).

In 1964, technical assistance comprised 12.5% of the total net bilateral overseas development assistance (ODA) budget for Development Assistance Committee (DAC) members. In 1985, it accounted for almost one-third of the budget (Poats, 1985).

According to Lethem and Cooper (1983), PRTA falls into two main categories: engineering technical assistance and institutional technical assistance:

1) Engineering TA is the hardware component of PRTA and deals with the feasibility and design of professional architectural or engineering services. Typically, engineering TA receives the bulk of the financial support and is the more successful of the two. Because the state of the art of engineering TA is generally well known and accepted, it is fairly easy to estimate costs. It is, in effect, "ready-made" technology and little behaviour change is required of the recipient regardless of the development stage of the country.

2) Institutional TA, on the other hand, is the software component of PRTA. It consists of diagnostic and prescriptive assistance as well as managerial, technical, operational, or training assistance. It is difficult to define the problems or needs of these services. The state of the art is unclear, problem resolution frequently does not enjoy the precision of engineering TA, and it is not easy to measure results in a tangible manner. Also, a behavioural change is often required in the recipient (p.15-16).

An engineer in the Lethem and Cooper (1983) study noted:

> An engineering design, for instance, often can be taken 'off the shelf' and installed anywhere- it is sterile and inanimate. But once you get to its running and maintenance, you get into human factors. Science can be applied worldwide; its management depends on the environment (p. 24).

In recent years, there has been a growing awareness that TA has not always been successful. Certain factors affected utilization, absorption, and sustainability by the recipient - key elements in measuring the success of TA. The factors included the perception that TA was imposed instead of answering local needs; that some projects were not reflective of borrowers' needs; there were coordination difficulties among donors; the cost of TA was high in relation to local salaries but did not provide tangible results (except in engineering TA); and finally, the shift from engineering to institutional TA caused additional problems in implementation and monitoring (World Bank Technical Assistance Report, 1987).

When designing services, Lethem and Cooper (1983) propose that Terms of Reference (TOR) be prepared for both local and expatriate personnel and subscribe to one of four basic TA models:

1) The performer or substitute model engages an expert to perform a specific task prescribed by the recipient.

2) The prescriptive model, where the expert diagnoses a problem and suggests a solution.

3) The counterpart-advisor model, which presumes a national will work as an apprentice to the external specialist.

4) The collaborative model expects both national and expatriate to perform substantive tasks, share responsibility for results, work together as a team, and learn from each other

Once a model is chosen, the TA delivery mode is specified and reinforcement of the desired relationship is more easily sustained (page 8).

Unfortunately, despite the obvious importance accorded to TA and PRT, "experts still tend to be technically competent but poor trainers, whereas their training function should in most cases be of major importance" (Poats, 1985, p. 189).

Thus, the system of counterpart training has long been an accepted model for the exchange of expertise between donor and recipient countries. It is surprising then, when reviewing the literature on the subject, to find so many authors espousing radical improvement in the transfer of technology through PRT and yet so little published specifically on counterpart training. Few authors have dealt directly with the topic though some mention it in passing. Little has been written since the late 70's that provides an in-depth analysis of the success or failure of the current counterpart system, nor how it should be evolving as a training method in today's "high tech" world. It remains a traditional and familiar training format and as such should receive periodic examination to ensure its viability.

Counterpart training, then, can be divided into three main components:

1) It may evolve as a long term training process of more than one year and could include schooling and training outside of the project parameters.

2) It can be seen as a more short term endeavour of less than one year, yet still involve outside learning and interaction.

3) Counterpart training can take place in the traditional apprentice-cooperant dyad during the project.

This study proposes to examine the third important component, that of the expert and counterpart engaged in exchange of expertise on a one-on-one basis. The literature review examines various training philosophies from bilateral, multilateral, non-governmental, and business projects overseas in order to determine the role of counterpart training.

2.2 Colonial Influences on the Counterpart System

Between industrialized and developing countries, the exchange of expertise has

traditionally been considered a one-way flow of information and technology to the Third World. The basic assumption has been, of course. that the developing nations needed the knowledge held by post-industrial societies. Such a view traces its roots to colonial days and, although the political reality has changed, maintaining dependence on Western technology is an effective method of guaranteeing ongoing economic control of former colonies (Spitzberg, 1978). Ten years later, a 1988 study of Nordic technical assistance personnel in Africa found similar attitudes:

> Commercial interests and employment considerations interfere with development objectives. Aid money is often tied to purchases in the donor country, to support investments from the donor country, to employ personnel from the donor country, and to provide business for consultants. Aid money brings students for training programmes in the donor country; at universities, in industry and on professional courses. Education is also business (p.5).

The following overview of the circumstances leading to independence provides a context for the beginning of the counterpart training system. A result of colonial tradition, counterpart training began in earnest after the Second World War when Britain and France saw the inevitable independence of their remaining colonies (Spencer, 1978). Although both countries viewed the government of the colonies in very different ways, the end result at independence in the late 50's and early 60's was the same: there was no structure prepared for the new countries to take over their own administration and government.

Following the elimination of concessionary companies that ran the colonies until the end of the nineteenth century, but prior to 1945, the British governed their colonies through indirect rule and a policy of trusteeship. The aim was gradually to prepare the colonies for self-government and independence in the far distant future. Spencer (1978) describes the policy thus:

> British policy can be viewed as a scaffolding around a slowly rising structure of African self-government. The lower floors, the clerks and messengers, were already filled with Africans in West Africa and with non-Europeans like Goans in the east and central African white-settler territories. The skeleton of this building was the training, slow and sure, of Africans who would one day govern themselves (p. 44).

The problem inherent in the system was expatriate dominance in top-level jobs which would leave unfillable vacancies upon their departure at independence.

In early colonial years France, too, tried to govern its colonies by granting concessions to companies to run them and make money. It was not a pleasant period of colonial history. As Jules Meline, France's Minister of Agriculture stated in 1809:

> We should discourage in advance any signs of industrial development in our colonies (and) oblige our overseas possessions to look exclusively to the mother country for manufactured products, and to fulfill, by force if necessary, their natural function, that of a market reserved by right to the mother country's industry (Spencer, 1978, p.46).

The pre-1945 period was one of centralization, with Paris maintaining tight control over colonial affairs while espousing the opposite.

After World War II Britain began to speed up Africanization programs and the counterpart method of transferring skills became commonplace. However, by the 1960's, when independence took place, most of the top government posts were still held by Europeans.

France lagged even further behind the British in their Africanization. Their system of assimilation tended to favour only upper levels of African society with the end result

that the new countries had to call upon France for technical assistance, thus cementing the counterpart system (Spencer, 1978).

The final outcome of colonialization, whether British or French, was that newly independent states did not have enough trained people to replace departing expatriates. This in turn paved the way for massive technical assistance programs requiring skills transfer and training. Ingrained paternalistic attitudes toward the developing nations ensured that counterpart training was a natural choice of the former "parent country" and a familiar manner of interacting with Europeans for many former subjects.

Counterpart training, then, with its colonial legacy, is much more than a simple one-to-one relationship between advisor and apprentice. It is a complex scenario influenced by international economics, modern technology based in the industrialized world, as well as racial and cultural differences. The flow of expertise has traditionally been one-way and does not favour the Third World (Altbach, 1978). There have been changes. Scott-Stevens (1987) notes that "one of the more significant policy changes in the transfer of technology *per se* has been an increasing insistence by recipient countries that "technical" knowledge (software) be transferred along with the technical hardware" (p.2).

As Europe, North America (and now Japan) has long dominated the world politically and economically, these countries also dominate in educational, intellectual and technological resources, with the Third World in a dependent position. The current world situation, however, is less one of dependency than of neocolonialism. According to Altbach (1978), "neocolonialism results from the conscious policies of industrialized nations to maintain their power and influence over the Third World, and to protect what are seen as vital interests" (p. 68). Scott-Stevens (1987) also states that in the past "the donor country (or company) retained exclusive control over pertinent technical knowledge, thereby creating a knowledge gap and a technologically dependent

relationship" (p.2). She argues however, that the growing "insistence on the transfer of knowledge by recipients or an awareness that "ideas" and "things" go hand-in-hand does little good if there is not an equal awareness of the facilitating or constraining factors which inhibit the transfer of the *entire* technological package" (p.2). The Nordic study (1988) concluded that "many aid projects have a negative impact on institutional development, for example by creating oversized organizations that are not sustainable without assistance" (p.ii).

A counterpart relationship, therefore, is a microcosm of the prevailing political and economic influences and occurs in a situation of inequality. The exchange of knowledge cannot be isolated from its societal context and can as easily contribute to further dependency as minimize it. Most nations' foreign policies attempt to further their own interests. Although aid may be given for mutual benefit, little is given for purely altruistic reasons and the expatriate necessarily reflects the predominant view of the donor toward the recipient. As Altbach (1978) mentions:

> The combination of national interest and the natural propensity of the counterparts themselves to reflect the orientations of their societies means that both the activities undertaken by counterpart personnel and the individuals themselves reflect the systems which they represent (p. 74).

There is little likelihood that the balance of power will change rapidly. Despite vast improvements in manpower development since the end of colonialism and increasing emphasis on the empowerment and participation of recipient countries (World Bank Technical Assistance Report, 1987), developing nations will remain far behind the industrialized world in terms of socio-economic advancement. The increasingly rapid pace of technological development will necessarily keep many less developed countries in an inferior and dependent position, while the political will of the powerful will

continue to opt for the benefits of exporting their expertise.

This is not to say that the counterpart relationship is without merit. Much needed knowledge and skill has been successfully transferred using such a system. It is nevertheless important to be aware of flaws and difficulties inherent in the basic structure of the model. The following two sections deal with more specific problems resulting from the counterpart system.

2.3 Counterpart Training Defined

Counterpart training, in which an individual from a developing country is taught required skills on a one-to-one basis by an acknowledged subject matter expert "on loan" to that country, takes place in a peculiar context. The process which led these two individuals to the point of working together to transfer expertise was probably lengthy, often tortuous in its complications and setbacks, and motivated by social, political and economic factors of great weight on a macro level. Yet it is in a micro setting that the expert/advisor interacts with the counterpart. Their dyad occurs away from the larger political machinations and considerations of the project, yet the success or failure of the learning endeavour can have great impact on the outcome of future projects between the two parties.

In principle, each expert sent to work on an overseas project containing a mandate to train or transfer knowledge is supposed to have a designated counterpart. The appointment of a counterpart is considered a necessary part of the aid process, especially for transmitting the new techniques to be implemented by the expatriate expert. Lethem & Cooper (1983) state: "the counterpart-advisor (apprentice-teacher) relationship is based on the view that development consists mainly of the diffusion or transfer of skills and technologies" (p. 39). Both counterpart and advisor appointments

should be made with the aid agency and be considered an integral part of the design, not an afterthought (Gordenker, 1976).

Spitzberg (1978), states that "the traditional paradigm is that of an apprenticeship system, where the master craftsperson is an expatriate from a post-industrial country and where the apprentice is a Third World national" (p. 2). The counterpart learns by watching, mimicking, and receiving criticism from the master. The counterpart relation, although common in the Third World, is also found in apprentice situations throughout the industrialized world (Altbach, 1978). There are of course many variations on the basic dyad. For instance the expert may oversee a group of junior nationals who are supposed to learn from the expatriate while carrying out their duties. The expatriate may also act as an advisor, allowing the counterpart to draw upon the expertise while learning the skills individually. Yet another possibility is the expert as university professor, acting as role model as well as teacher (Spitzberg, 1978). A foreign scientist can be appealing to.counterparts desiring affiliation and contact with a global scientific system (Eisemon,1978). The positions of the advisor and the counterpart in the dyad also influence the interaction. Again, three main patterns emerge. Both expert and counterpart may enjoy similar levels and status in their position and view each other as colleagues and equals from the outset. In another setting, the expert may have higher status than the counterpart and, finally, the counterpart may have the higher status. Each setting encourages different relationships, although the more extreme differences may help to keep the relationship more performance and task-oriented (Stone, 1978).

No matter what the situation, however, the primary aim of the dyad is more concerned with implementation of technology than with transfer and retention of knowledge. Usually the expatriate has no idea of how to train someone and the national is equally unprepared to receive the knowledge. Spitzberg (1975) says:

> Most counterparts waste their time. They sit at the knee of their master and comprehend very little of what he is doing; and most masters don't know the first thing about explaining what they are doing to a nonexpert which, by definition, a counterpart who is supposed to be trained must be (p. 4).

Counterparts interviewed in the 1988 Nordic study criticized the inadequate training ability or inexperience of many technical assistance personnel saying "This is not learning-by-doing but learning-by-looking" (p.51).

The traditional interpretation of counterpart training assumes that one individual will be prepared to replace the expert. Experience has shown too often that the concept is unsound and a more practical approach would be to develop staff capabilities as a team (Raman, 1973). A variation of this approach, training several subordinate counterparts one of which would be chosen to take over from the advisor when the project ends, would lessen the stress of depending on a single person who may leave the project at its termination, taking the expertise along.

Counterpart training takes place between adults, usually on a one-to-one basis. As mentioned earlier, too few expatriate experts have even rudimentary knowledge of the applications of andragogy, theories and models of learning and education, etc. let alone their adaptation to a foreign setting filled with cultural, political and linguistic differences. The selection criteria of expatriates may not take into account pedagogical training, motivational factors for accepting the assignment, or communication ability (Lethem & Cooper, 1983). Nonetheless, the counterpart system "implies a learning-teaching contract and hence is a form of non-formal education, aimed at decreasing dependency of one party on another" (Draper, 1978, p. 131). Not only do experts require teacher training, especially adult-to-adult, but they need to see the training process as more than a simple transfer of limited skills. The more the counterpart is able to view the training as educational and empowering in the larger context of the

project or technical assistance, the more likely it is that the expert-counterpart dyad will be successful (Spitzberg and Stone, 1978). According to Draper (1978), "a basic understanding of learning and teaching principles can contribute greatly to the effectiveness and humaness of sharing, which is the intent of the counterpart system" (p. 132).

2.4 The role of the expert

In 1983, approximately 80,000 teachers, experts and volunteers were involved in DAC technical assistance overseas. At the same time, over 90,000 students and trainees from developing countries, sponsored by DAC members, studied abroad (Poats, 1985). There were 701 Canadian experts participating in bilateral projects in 1983, as well as ongoing support for in-Canada and third country training for trainees from developing countries (Canadian International Development Agency, 1983). Despite these numbers, the effective exchange of expertise remains a major problem. Caustin (1974) says, "it is remarkable that there is no significant literature on the role an expert is expected to play in his country of assignment, over and above the purely technical or professional responsibilities for which he is recruited" (p. 4).

In a major report on Canadians in development commissioned by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), Hawes and Kealey (1980) found that the very concept of overseas success lacked definition. The study examined some 100 variables on adaptation and effectiveness of 160 technical assistance personnel working in six countries. The authors determined that overseas effectiveness is essentially comprised of three components: a) intercultural interaction and training; b) professional effectiveness; and c) personal/family adjustment and satisfaction. Canadians generally were not found to be particularly well-trained in intercultural

interaction nor very adept at skills transfer (p. xxi).

Lack of consensus about the reasons preventing successful transfer is in itself a problem (Brasseur, 1976). The picture of the boorish, unilingual, insensitive expatriate living in luxury while overseas on assignment, and collecting a handsome salary, is all too familiar. While arrogance and ethnocentrism are very serious and common obstacles to technical assistance, there are many others.

Often the expert assigned to go overseas receives little to no briefing or training be it cultural, country-specific, linguistic, political or technological (Glaser, 1975). In response to the Hawes and Kealey study, CIDA now offers a minimum of five days pre-departure training to cooperants including on average 15 hours of training on intercultural interaction (50%), seven hours on personal/family adjustment (24%), and four hours or 13% on professional effectiveness, usually specific project briefing (Van Balkom, 1985, p. 23). The study examined 15 Canadian NGO's with access to CIDA's Briefing Center and revealed that 31% offered no training whatsoever and 38% supplied two days or less (VanBalkom, 1985).

The nature of overseas work is usually that of short-term assignments ranging from three months to three years and the experts have little or no policy-making power (Gordenker, 1976). Assignments may be pre-arranged by one expert with nothing further done by either the donor or the host country prior to the arrival of the cooperant assigned to the project. The new advisor may be unaware of the technologies and methods in use already, especially if the country uses aid from different sources (Glaser, 1975). Some important lessons to be learned are the need for better project preparation and appraisal with clear objectives and flexible design; more attention paid to local conditions and existing technology; better selection of personnel and strengthened training; and finally, involvement of the host in the project design (Poats, 1985).

Closely related to the above problems are the questions of both personal and professional anxiety levels for the expatriate. Expatriate staff and their families may experience culture shock and become demoralized when confronted with a new social, physical or professional environment (Lethem & Cooper, 1983). Many embark upon assignments without any definite plans for afterward, creating insecurity and stress for both individual and family. Often experts receive little credit for scientific or political work accomplished overseas that would be recognized at home. Glaser (1975) states that "publications resulting from projects are usually written by counterparts. Since footnotes of acknowledgement or joint by-lines are not customary in many countries, the contributions of the expert are not recorded" (p. 23). Equally, cultural misunderstandings can hurt the career of an individual returning home early or dissuade others from going overseas for fear of leaving the fast-track (McCaffrey & Hafner, 1985).

The most common term for a cooperant or change agent in technical assistance is that of the expert. The label of advisor is applied frequently too. Although merely labels, there can be a large difference in role perception between those who are viewed as "experts" (executors of tasks with training as a secondary element), and those who are considered "advisors" with skill transfer and training as the primary task. According to Kerr (1978), "the implication of communication is strong when we use 'advisor', but is missing when we use 'expert' " (p. 85). Not all experts are effective trainers or advisors. For instance, even if a TOR specifies training as part of the expert's repsonsibilities, technical competence might be the only necessary qualification for the assignment, or no specific time or amount would be set aside for the additional work involved in training (Lethem & Cooper, 1983). Such a distinction in terminology and meaning is seldom made clear to the cooperant when the project is assigned yet can make a world of difference once immersed in the realities of the project (Kerr, 1978).

A serious communication problem often occurs between a Western expert and the counterpart. It is in part linguistic, as the counterpart's mother tongue is seldom that of the expert. It also stems from the fact that experts are not accustomed to interacting with individuals whose qualifications and cultural background are so very different from their own. On the contrary, the expert's communication skills are usually limited to fellow experts from the same milieu who speak and understand the technical language of the subject. Brasseur (1976) states that "it would be much cheaper and more effective to select experts for technical assistance schemes, not so much on the basis of their highest level of sophistication, but rather on the basis of their ability to communicate with unsophisticated nonexperts" (p. 16).

A factor that further complicates the communication problem, however, is the frequently limited availability of qualified expatriate professionals. Developing countries often request the most qualified individual to be associated with the project. This reduces the size of the pool from which the cooperant can be selected and de-emphasizes the importance of personal suitability, focussing again on technical competence and training instead (Kealey, 1988).

Finally, one of the most frustrating elements hindering successful technical assistance is the serious lack of adequately prepared counterparts. Most advisors are supposed to have a counterpart assigned to them for training but the condition is rarely met (Spitzberg, 1975). Few experts complete a project with the same counterpart or may lose the counterpart altogether. Small wonder that many experts experienced in development projects spend little time training their apprentice, preferring to do the work themselves to ensure its completion before the final phase of the project. In the final analysis, most consultants know that their performance will be judged on their ability to produce desired outcomes on time, rarely on their ability to train a counterpart (unless that is considered a desired outcome). As mentioned earlier, in some instances

the cooperant's contract failed to provide training support (Lethem & Cooper, 1983). In a study involving six countries from francophone Africa that examined deficiencies in the administrative system of developing countries as well as the attitudes of experts and their local counterparts toward the nature of their work and interpersonal relations, Globerson (1973) found that many experts indeed worked alone or with fellow expatriates: "I prefer not to waste too much of my time on training counterparts, the way the young experts do, because if I am not going to do the work myself nobody else will do it " (p. 163). For many Westerners the performer model is more satisfying anyway. Indeed, it is an inherent weakness of the counterpart-advisor dyad that "long -term advisors slip easily into the performer role when the counterpart is unavailable or unassertive" (Lethem & Cooper, 1983, p. 39).

A common complaint from experts is that many counterparts either use their position for personal profit and try to keep power restricted to a select few, or simply are not terribly interested or motivated to work and learn (Globerson, 1973). There are individuals who feel that they will not learn under the counterpart system, preferring to conduct rather than observe- a fundamental adult learning principle (Lethem & Cooper, 1983). Sometimes, when a counterpart is mandated in the project, poorly qualified government officials who perform their assigned job indifferently are spared to work on the project (Gordenker, 1976). These counterparts may be temporarily involved in the project having been seconded from other important assignments just to meet conditions set by the donor agency (Lethem & Cooper, 1983). In the Hawes & Kealey report (1980), of 160 cooperants surveyed only 50% worked with a counterpart (p. 22). They felt that the absence of qualified counterparts or their loss to the private sector made the task of training a difficult if not impossible undertaking at times (p.183).

These then, are the principal problems facing the overseas expert. From them stem

myriad variations and complications to hinder effective training.

2.5 The role of the counterpart

Much less has been written about the problems of the counterpart in the dyad. In some cases, the problems are shared by both advisor and apprentice, as in the chronic shortage of qualified manpower for training purposes and the loss of many highly trained individuals to more sophisticated and technologically advanced countries. The brain drain has severely hampered many developing economies desperately in need of their trained people. Also, aid projects have traditionally trained individuals for government or parastatal positions, but frequently lose them to the private sector when the training is completed. In the civil service of many countries the link between job performance and reward is tenuous. There is little incentive to seek training or to remain on the job after receiving it. While it is true that the expertise may remain in the country and provide a supply of trained individuals, thus benefitting development, in their report on PRT Lethem and Cooper (1983) found "in some countries it has become difficult to obtain national staff for development projects because many well-trained and motivated staff are attracted by the opportunities in the Middle Eastern countries, where they can earn more" (p. 54).

Ironically, a common problem, especially in less developed countries, is one of too much aid at one time. The coordination of aid monies by several donor agencies simultaneously can be chaotic and burden recipient countries with logistical nightmares (World Bank Technical Assistance Reports , 1987). This can also cause a serious shortage of manpower and resources for administration of the projects (Poats, 1985). According to Glaser (1975), "some host countries have been given so much aid and are required to supply so many counterparts to projects that their Ministries are disrupted

and understaffed in their regular work" (p. 13).

One of the reasons that recipient countries hesitate to provide counterparts is that they must pay both the salary of the counterpart as well as that of the counterpart's replacement. For instance, absorbing the expenses of nationals sent abroad for training while expatriates fill in can be very costly to developing governments even though it may seem insignificant to the donor. (Spitzberg, 1975). Sometimes the cost per month of an expatriate while the counterpart is away receiving training can be ten to thirty times local salaries (Lethem & Cooper, 1983).

Study programs and fellowships to universities in post-industrial countries constitute an important element in the training and preparation of counterparts. It is also one of the few measurable elements of technical assistance, monetarily, if not in terms of success rates. For example, DAC members spent approximately $600 million in 1980 and $650 million in 1983 (about 13% of bilateral technical assistance) to support 100,000 students and trainees around the world (Poats, 1985, p. 226). For the World Bank, overseas fellowships accounted for 21% of the PRT lending budget in 1984 (Barker & Sterling, 1985).

An increasing number of trainees and students are selected for specific development needs and projects and they are obliged to return home to take up the posts for which they are being trained. Unfortunately, many nationals use fellowships for personal gain or are awarded study grants as political favours. Education remains an elite privilege and many individuals are penalized because of their inferior station in society (Raman, 1973). It can be said that the elite are also the future policy makers who will influence development decisions in their country so the training could still provide overall benefits to the country. Still, the sheer cost of sending individuals abroad discourages many bright students not eligible for fellowships. There is growing support for at-home education and training, not simply for financial reasons, but

because many developing countries now have adequate facilities. The Nordic study (1988) found that local programs seem to function best when building up local manpower in a certain sector through training institutions or when designed to meet the specific needs of a project. The study also noted that in-country training programs are particularly useful when new acitivies or technology are introduced to the country.

Local training programs can ultimately become part of the industrial training concept of each country by integrating as many locally-based companies as possible. Often each company is too small to support its own training program so that a cooperative training effort can have immediate payoff (Richter, 1985). The World Bank has been actively promoting the development and use of local capacities for training and consulting in order to offer TA that is more responsive and less expensive to the recipient country (World Bank Technical Assistance Report, 1987).

All of the literature emphasizes and re-emphasizes the need to involve local nationals in projects from their inception. Effective transfer of technology must consider the local work force, customs, educational levels etc. (Copeland, 1986). The meeting of post-industrial and developing societies for developmental purposes should facilitate the development of appropriate technology for the country and its unique culture, not force Western technology as-is upon an unprepared society (Murrell, 1984). The concept of appropriate technology for developing countries is an important one. Spielman (1981) defines appropriate technology as adapting "the resources available to him to create techniques and tools which are consonant with his particular circumstances" (p. 82). The concept implies that the responsibility to ensure that the transfer occurs rests with the client. If, as is often the case, no one briefs the counterpart about the project or the counterpart receives conflicting information, there may well be differences in expectations, perceptions and roles (Glaser, 1975). Training would undoubtedly improve if the counterpart received a more formal

introduction to the components of the project and learned more about the relationship between the skills to be acquired and the larger context (Spitzberg, 1975).

A further problem in technology transfer is the dependence upon expert interest and availability for a project. As the transfer is person-to-person, the projects are of necessity planned on a relatively small scale and for limited duration, with the outcome dependent upon the counterpart's training for a multiplier effect (Caustin, 1974). In the survey conducted by Globerson (1973) comparing perceptions of their roles by 151 counterparts and 248 experts, 76% of the counterparts viewed shortage of materials and capital as more serious than lack of motivation on their part. This directly contradicted the feelings of 79% of the experts who felt that human and administrative problems accounted for most of the problems (p. 175).

Almost all nationals would prefer increased numbers of locally qualified people to head projects, with the expert in a consultant and advisory role only (Salvi, 1975). They would prefer to use expatriates to build their national capacity but not to run the show (Solomon, Heegaard, and Kornher, 1978). While firmly believing that foreign expertise is necessary to development, nationals prefer aid from multilateral agencies because they often feel that bilateral aid reduces their involvement in project management (Globerson, 1973).

Not least in importance is the value nationals attach to the attitudes of foreign experts while on assignment in their country. Overwhelmingly, they rank human relations skills, cultural awareness, and adaptability as the most important attributes (Johnston, 1974). These findings are further supported by those of the 1980 Hawes and Kealey report on overseas effectiveness. Knowledge of the host country's official working language is considered desirable but not crucial, nonetheless, CIDA places increasing emphasis on language training through embassies prior to a cooperant going overseas (CIDA, 1983). Many other agencies are also providing basic language

training as a means of facilitating communication and technology transfer. Whatever the languages used, communication is critical to success and as Glaser (1975) says, "the expert and the counterpart must gradually define their tasks and working relationships (p. 11), and many problems between expert and counterpart arise from a persistent failure to establish continuous and frank communication between donors and hosts" (p.13).

In the most recent CIDA-sponsored study examining the cross-cultural adaptation and effectiveness of Canadian technical advisors overseas the data were not encouraging. Only 50% of the Canadians surveyed made a concerted effort to learn the local languages. Similarly, only 50% opted to become very familiar with and involved in the culture of the country. The rest spent most of their spare time with other foreign nationals and Canadians, with an average of less than 15% of leisure time spent with nationals (Kealey, 1988).

In the same study, only 20% of the cooperants were ranked as highly effective by the researchers and they were judged the most likely to transfer skills and knowledge. To quote Kealey (1988): "It is clear that the task for which Canadian advisors are sent to developing countries is extremely demanding and difficult. It takes an exceptional person to be effective at transferring skills and knowledge to counterparts. The task requires a high level of energy and commitment for which there are few incentives" (p. 169). It is far simpler to leave the challenge to others and remain in the comfort of the expatriate "ghetto". Ironically, those who did make the effort to be more involved with local people and their culture were often seen as trying to be better than the other Canadians and were treated as 'turncoats' (Kealey, 1988).

The critical importance of cultural sensitivity in successful skills and knowledge transfer then, must be taught and reinforced whenever an expert prepares to travel and work in a foreign country.

To conclude, it appears that the expert-counterpart dyad remains important to the transfer of technology. Although newer forms of training such as developing a team or a group of qualified individuals to perfom tasks or assume responsibilities are now increasingly common, they run in conjunction with, and not as a replacement for, the counterpart system. The strength of the concept lies in its personalized, tailored training, while its weaknesses remain the inadequate preparation of the expert as trainer, the shortage of counterparts available to be trained and lack of follow-up. Although the 1980's have seen the advent of ex post evaluations to examine the effects of aid upon project completion, project-related institutional TA itself is only just beginning to be analysed extensively or rigorously and there is a lack of systematic data to be used to strengthen it (Poats, 1985). Indeed, because institutional TA implies a behaviour change in the recipient and is therefore difficult to measure, almost none of the literature reviewed contained empirical data and analysis. Many authors commented on the need for such material and also felt that the data exist in unpublished aid agency reports. It is hoped that this study will contribute to that body of knowledge.

3.0 Framework of Analysis

In conducting research on advisors and their counterparts and the problems of technology transfer, Scott-Stevens (1987) examined a number of suggested practices recommended for transfer by researchers and practitioners. She found that, while there was no consistent set of practices recommended for accomplishing the goal of skill and knowledge acquisition, there were a number suggested which occurred in more than one source. They were as follows: 1) establish a clear set of defined goals or objectives, which are *clearly* understood by both parties to the transfer process; 2) establish a degree of rapport with people in the other culture; 3) have a set of criteria by which people are selected for work overseas; 4) have some form of pre-departure "preparation" or training for foreign consultants; and 5) have the local people or trainees actively participate in the training process using an incremental approach and including physical demonstrations as much as possible (p. 36-38).

If the practices cited above constitute an "ideal" for the transfer of technology, a 1988 study of technical assistance personnel (TAP) in Africa commissioned by the Nordic countries provided a sobering commentary on the counterpart system:

> In one third of the projects there was no formal training plan or element, or the training was introduced very late, often after several years of project life. In another third, training was primarily or only on-the-job training, possibly including a few scholarships, but without any concrete manpower development plan. And only in one third of the projects was training made a more systematic, integrated and planned part of work plans for TAP and projects (p. 49).

One conclusion from their analysis of training was:

> . . . that counterpart systems are seldom effective. A minimum condition is that such systems are parts of more formal and systematic manpower development plans included in project plans from the beginning, based on time planning, career development plans for nationals working as counterparts or studying and on more systematic training plans (sic) (p. 52).

In order to provide a context with which to evaluate the effectiveness of counterpart training, it is important to have a frame of reference for comparative purposes. There is no reason to believe that counterpart training is fundamentally different from other forms of training which can be used for comparison. Indeed,counterpart training has traditionally been based upon the apprenticeship model still commonly used in industry today.

Whether a training program is highly structured and formalized or more informal in its approach, it generally follows a series of steps that strive to ensure the transfer of knowledge and skills. The basic steps used by industry in ensuring an effectively designed training program are:
1) diagnosing the problem and determining the role of training; 2) defining goals and objectives; 3) selecting instructional methods and techniques; 4) planning a favourable learning climate; and 5) preselecting evaluation criteria (Donaldson and Scannell, 1985).

Effective training programs should be results oriented. There should be some observable change that takes place in the behaviour of those receiving training. An effective program therefore, has built in evaluation criteria for results expected. Indeed, the first evaluation that should be made when considering a training solution is whether training is really what is needed. Not all problems can be solved, and not all skills can be properly acquired through training.

When training is used as a means for skill acquisition, however, it is often a combination of formal and informal training. The apprenticeship system uses both classroom and on-the-job training for learning the different skills required. Ideally, the apprentice learns concepts and theory in the class and then has an opportunity to practice them under supervision on the job. Training on the job requires no extra equipment or space and allows the trainee to practice exactly what the job will require when the training period ends. Reinforcement of the skill use is immediate and relevant. As long as the individual who coaches the trainee is capable of sustaining an atmosphere conducive to the learning process and not the productivity of the trainee, some skill acquisition should occur (Bass and Vaughan, 1966).

The effectiveness of counterpart training by Canadian cooperants was analysed by comparing results against the principles of effective training in industry (Donaldson & Scannell, 1985) and variables specific to project-related training. The analysis of the training differs from that of Scott-Stevens in that it looked at training as a goal system that could be adapted to most situations requiring some exchange of expertise. The aspects examined were: 1) the role of training in the project; 2) the definition of learning goals or objectives; 3) the instructional methods or techniques used; 4) the pre-departure preparation or training of the advisor; 5) the preparation of the counterpart for the exchange of knowledge; 6) the learning climate established; 7) the evaluation criteria selected to determine effectiveness; and; 8) the results or effects of the training.

3.1 Research Questions

The following questions guided the research and data analysis:

1.0 In CIDA sponsored overseas development projects using counterpart training, who

is involved in the counterpart training dyad?

1.1 What experience does the cooperant have in training or teaching in their field of expertise?

1.2 Has the cooperant experience in working in the ThirdWorld?

1.3 What is the educational background of the counterpart?

1.4 Is the counterpart adequately prepared or qualified to receive training?

1.5 Does the counterpart possess sufficient language competence to communicate with the cooperant in order to learn?

2.0 What are the expected roles of the cooperant and the counterpart?

2.1 What is expected of the cooperant and the counterpart?

2.2 How are those expectations specified?

3.0 Does planning for the transfer of skills and technology between the cooperant and the counterpart through training incorporate elements of successful training progams?

3.1 What does the cooperant know of the counterpart's technical background and learning needs?

3.2 Are learning needs or goals defined?

3.3 Is the cooperant briefed on the transfer of knowledge expected to occur before arriving on site?

3.4 What criteria are used to design the program?

3.5 How could the design be improved?

4.0 What is the nature of the teaching-learning process used?

4.1 What instructional methods and techniques are used?

4.2 Is the counterpart involved in other educational programs?

4.3 What learning climate is established?

4.4 How much time does the cooperant spend on counterpart training?

4.5 What are the measures of success?

4.6 How are programs evaluated?

4.7 How are the cooperant and counterpart evaluated?

4.8 How could the evaluation methods be improved?

5.0 How effective is the training?

5.1 What are the major factors affecting the training outcome?

5.2 Is the training retained?

5.3 Is the training used?

5.4 How could the effectiveness be improved?

5.5 Were the training objectives achieved?

6.0 What are the advantages and disadvantages of counterpart training?

6.1 What are the advantages?

6.2 What are the constraints and limiting factors?

4.0 Methodology

4.1 Introduction to the Living and Working Overseas study

Continuing the research of Hawes and Kealey in Canadians in Development (1980), the Canadian International Development Agency sponsored a study from 1986 to 1988 that attempted to explain and predict the cross-cultural adjustment and effectiveness of Canadian technical advisors overseas. Participants in the study were Canadians posted to developing countries to work on international development projects sponsored by CIDA for a minimum of one year. The study was longitudinal in design and followed a group of 277 advisors posted to 20 developing countries in the four regions of Asia, anglophone Africa, francophone Africa and the Caribbean through the process from pre-departure to their return to Canada. It also included a sample of 251 returned advisors. A total of 120 nationals were also interviewed for the study (Kealey, 1988). The field data were collected by four teams of researchers, each mission conducting interviews in the four regions. My role was that of field researcher for two of the missions in the Caribbean and anglophone Africa, as well as to complete a sub-report detailing the advisors' perception of the success or failure of technology transfer (Pritchard & Kealey 1988).

4.2 Sources of data for analysis of counterpart training

It was decided to draw upon the experiences of a sample of the 251 returned advisors in order to conduct research into the training patterns of Canadians on posting. Although the thrust of the Living and Working Overseas study was that of adaptation and effectiveness, not counterpart training, many of the advisors indicated that they had

been involved in some form of training or exchange of expertise while on posting.

4.3 Data collection procedures

Because the returned cooperants lived in many different geographical areas of Canada, it was decided to use a telephone interview to collect the data. Prior to contacting the returnees a letter was sent from the Project Director of the Living and Working Overseas study inviting participation in the project on counterpart training methods. The letter outlined the nature of the study, the goals and methodology, and indicated that they should expect to be contacted by the researcher during the first two weeks of August, 1987 for a telephone interview that would last approximately 45 minutes to one hour (see Appendix A for complete text of the letter).

4.4 The sample

As 70 per cent of the countries represented in the Living and Working Overseas study were in Africa, it was decided to limit the sample for the telephone interview to cooperants who had worked in anglophone and francophone Africa. On July 27, 1987, 77 letters were mailed to Canadian cooperants who had already participated in the Living and Working Overseas study and returned to Canada from their posting between 1985 and 1987. Everyone sent a letter had indicated in the Returnee Questionnaire from the Living and Working Overseas study that they had worked with at least one counterpart during their posting.

From August 3 to August 14, 1987, 51 cooperants were contacted for interviews. It was impossible to reach the remaining 26 cooperants. Fully 20 had moved or changed phone numbers; six were on vacation and unavailable to be interviewed. All of the 51

advisors who were contacted were very amenable to the interview. However, despite indicating that they worked with a counterpart in the Living and Working Overseas data base, only 40 advisors truly were involved in counterpart training as defined by the literature (Table 1). The remaining 11 were involved in either classroom teaching or engaged in scientific research with an African colleague who required no training. In total, 13 countries were represented in the final sample, nine from anglophone Africa and four from francophone Africa (Table 2).

Table 1

Breakdown of respondents who worked with a counterpart

	Had counterpart	Unofficial counterpart
Anglophone Africa	32	3
Francophone Africa	5	

n = 40

4.5 Instruments

Since the data were to be gathered from telephone interviews, interview protocols were developed. Two protocols were used. One applied to those returnees indicating an official, assigned counterpart; the other for those who had no officially appointed counterpart but who nonetheless worked very closely with one individual to transfer skills and technology. Apart from several questions to determine the nature of the working relationship with the unofficial counterparts, the protocols were identical,

Table 2

Countries represented in final sample

	Number of respondents per country
Anglophone Africa	
Kenya	6
Tanzania	8
Ethiopia	4
Zambia	3
Botswana	1
Swaziland	5
Ghana	1
Egypt	2
Sudan	5
Total	35
Francophone Africa	
Zaire	1
Morocco	2
Niger	1
Rwanda	1
Total	5

permitting analysis of data in a consistent manner. The protocols were translated into French. Both protocols contained four principal sections dealing with a) background information on both the cooperant and the counterpart; b) training methodologies used; c) assessment of the transfer of training and; d) the effectiveness and limitations of the counterpart system (see Appendix B for complete text of both protocols). The questions were developed using preliminary interviews with three returned cooperants and the director of the Living and Working Overseas study for input into the design, then pilot tested with a group of five cooperants before administration to the target population.

4.6 Limitations of the study

There were several factors limiting the study.

1. The principal limitation lay in the fact that the advisors were interviewed after their return to Canada.

1.1 Some had been back for two years and their recollections were not always clear.

1.2 A retrospective analysis tended to paint a rosier picture of events than may have actually transpired during the posting. Difficulties and failures were glossed over and successes were emphasized. It seems only natural, when reflecting upon an assignment as radically different and challenging as a posting to a developing country, to remember bright moments and adventure.

2. A second important limitation of the study was that it was impossible to conduct interviews with the counterparts to have their perspective on the process of counterpart training and its effectiveness after the departure of the cooperant.

3. It was impossible to conduct research with cooperants and counterparts currently involved in projects overseas due to financial constraints.

4. Of the 77 cooperants who were sent letters, 26 were untraceable or not available to be interviewed.

5. A group of 11 of the 51 cooperants contacted for interviews revealed that they had not worked with a counterpart.

6. There were also advisors who worked with several counterparts during their assignment overseas which made it difficult to have a clear portrait of the training process with one individual.

7. Because only five of the 22 francophone cooperants sent letters were interviewed, it was difficult to determine an accurate portrait of the differences in counterpart training between anglophone and francophone cooperants.

5.0 Results: Description and Discussion of the Findings

5.1 Introduction

This chapter examines counterpart training from the perspective of the expertise, recollections, opinions, and perceptions of the cooperants interviewed. The findings are discussed at the end of each major section. A more detailed analysis and discussion of the implications of the findings will follow in the next chapter.

The 35 advisors from anglophone Africa who had counterparts made up most of the sample and as such form the core of the data analysis. Unless responses were radically different, the information gathered from the francophone advisors is discussed with the data from anglophone Africa.

In responding to the questions, the interviewees were asked to make any additional comments they deemed pertinent or necessary. Indeed, their personal observations and thoughts provide rich insights into the reality of incorporating the transfer of skills into the framework of a development project.

5.2 Profile of the cooperants

Data from the Living and Working Overseas study indicated the 40 cooperants worked in 10 different areas, had a wide variety of overseas experience ranging from none to over five years, education levels from high school to postgraduate degrees, and ages from 25 to over 60 years. Only three cooperants were female. See Table 3.

An overall picture of the cooperants surveyed for anglophone Africa then, shows the advisors as university educated males, from 40 to 60 years old, with 2 to 5 years experience in developing countries, working in either agriculture, water and sanitation.

Table 3

Profile of the cooperants surveyed

	Anglophone Africa	Francophone Africa
Principal sector of work		
agriculture	16	1
water/sanitation	7	
education	4	
infrastructure and construction	4	
mining		1
communications		1
transportation	2	
forestry	2	
community development		1
financial management		1
Experience in development project		
none	7	1
2 years or less	5	1
2 to 5 years	17	1
more than 5 years	5	2
Education		
high school	5	1
college	11	
university	9	2
postgraduate degree	9	2
Age		
25 - 29	1	
30 - 39	7	1
40 - 49	9	4
50 - 59	8	
60 and over	8	
Sex		
male	33	4
female	2	1

Because only five cooperants formed the data base for francophone Africa, it was difficult to form an accurate portrait. Nonetheless the sample indicates that the cooperant is male, university educated, in his mid-forties and has at least five years experience in development.

5.3 Individuals involved in the counterpart training dyad

5.3.1 Training or teaching experience of the cooperant

When asked what experience in training or teaching they had prior to their assignment, of the 35 who responded, only 12 had no training or teaching experience at all. The same number had previous experience in counterpart training. One interviewee, reflecting upon the ongoing problem of finding cooperants qualified to transfer skills and technology, commented that "an expert is someone who, when he receives his airline ticket, discovers his competence." Table 4 indicates the distribution of experience.

5.3.2 Other background characteristics

Of the entire sample of 40 cooperants, only eight had no prior experience in working on a Third World development project.

The educational level of the counterparts was high, with 22 possessing university or post graduate training (the same number as the cooperants).

Table 4

Cooperants' prior experience in training or teaching

	Anglophone Africa	Francophone Africa
formal teacher training	11	1
trained counterparts or apprentices	10	1
no previous training experience	10	2
trained or worked with Canadians	15	1
trained Canadian trainers	5	

5.3.3 Qualification and preparation of the counterpart for training

The cooperants were not asked specifically if they considered their counterparts to be adequately educated and qualified for the expected exchange of skills and expertise. Throughout the interview, however, 15 respondents mentioned that the counterparts were not prepared for the training, even if they were eager to learn. For example, one cooperant complained that the local government "wanted a mechanical foreman from a newspaperman" when questioned about counterpart qualifications. Some of the reasons affecting the readiness of the counterpart, as perceived by the cooperant, are found in Table 5.

5.3.4 Ability of cooperant and counterpart to communicate effectively

All of the cooperants worked in their own mother tongue with their counterpart and

Table 5

Factors affecting the preparedness of counterparts for training

	Anglophone Africa	Francophone Africa
local interference in counterpart's training	8	5
unqualified counterparts	8	
political selection of counterparts	7	2
inadequately educated counterparts	5	
counterpart never understood project goals	2	1

most felt that the national's knowledge of English or French was adequate for learning and acquiring new skills. In all, 28 cooperants said they had little or no knowledge of the local languages beyond greetings. Only four cooperants were able to work totally in the national's language. Comments from respondents indicated that lack of time, not lack of interest in learning, prevented them from learning the local languages.

Thus, when examining the individuals involved in counterpart training in terms of professional background and experience, no consistent pattern emerged. As CIDA sponsors many different types of projects worldwide, it was hardly surprising that cooperants come from various professions, with varying degrees of experience and exposure to the reality of working in a Third World setting. If one considers that most postings are two years or more in length it is a pity that the cooperants were not able to learn more of the local languages. It is interesting to note that the counterparts' level of education was generally very high, with both groups possessing the same number of university degrees. The picture that emerged on paper then, of the cooperants and

counterparts engaged in an exchange of expertise, was that of technically qualified individuals with the cooperants' overseas and training experience ranging from none to many years.

5.4 Expected roles of counterpart and cooperant

5.4.1 Roles of the cooperant and the counterpart

For the total sample, 37 of 40 cooperants were assigned a counterpart to work with them during their posting. Most reported that their counterpart stayed with them for the duration of their assignment, and 15 indicated that they worked with more than one counterpart, both officially and unofficially (see Table 6). Those who worked with several counterparts were asked to respond to questions by referring to the counterpart who stayed with them the longest.

The remaining three cooperants did not have an officially assigned counterpart but indicated they nonetheless worked very closely with a national in order to transfer skill and knowledge.

5.4.2 Specification of expected roles

Only 13 of the Canadian advisors and 12 African nationals were briefed or given any background information about their future partner and their respective training roles prior to meeting each other on site. A total of four had worked together in Canada prior to the posting. Generally, the advisors were told only that they would have a counterpart. Indeed, two cooperants said that, without any training background, they were expected to train an entire staff as well as their counterpart.

Table 6

Working relationship between cooperants and counterparts

	Anglophone Africa	Francophone Africa
cooperants assigned a counterpart	32	5
cooperants with several counterparts	12	3
cooperants selected own counterpart	2	
counterpart remained for entire assignment	26	3
counterpart studied abroad during posting	5	1
counterpart left mid-project, not replaced	4	2
counterpart was government appointee	2	

Most cooperants, then, worked with at least one counterpart during their posting. Before beginning the assignment, few of the cooperants were given any specific details about the counterpart assigned to work with them, nor what form the working relationship should take. Despite this, the cooperants thought that they had a good grasp of the learning needs and technical qualifications of their appointed counterpart.

5.5 Planning for successful training

5.5.1 Cooperant understanding of counterparts' learning needs or goals

The cooperants nonetheless felt they understood their partner's learning needs very

well. Some, however, reported there were early problems and conflicts because they were unable initially to grasp their counterparts' concerns, even though they felt the process ended positively (see Table 7). Several cooperants felt hindered by local politics, and still others felt that unfamiliarity with the nationals' educational systems caused some difficulties with understanding learning issues.

Table 7

Cooperant understanding of counterpart learning needs and concerns

	Anglophone Africa	Francophone Africa
understood needs/concerns very well	23	5
had initial problems or conflicts	7	
grasped technical learning needs only	6	3

5.5.2 Definition of learning needs or goals

An overwhelming majority of the cooperants said they were not given any mandated, measurable learning objectives to achieve with their counterparts. Indeed, only seven received formal training objectives. Without any specific plans as to how to accomplish the goal, 33 cooperants were told to have the counterpart fully prepared to take over their job at the end of the training period. Table 8 shows some typical training mandates reported by the cooperants.

Table 8

Training objectives assigned to cooperants

	Anglophone Africa	Francophone Africa
counterpart to take over duties	30	3
no official directives	29	4
developed own objectives	13	4
get them up to speed quickly	9	1
received formal training objectives	6	1
work closely with counterpart	3	2
get project done on time, on budget	3	1

5.5.3 Cooperant predeparture preparation for training

Despite feeling optimistic about understanding their counterpart's learning needs, *34 of the 40 cooperants received no directives whatsoever during project briefings as to how the transfer of knowledge was to occur.* Five had no idea that they were even expected to train as part of their job responsibilities until they arrived on the project site. Table 9 provides a breakdown of the advisors' predeparture preparation on the "how-to" of transferring their expertise.

5.5.4 Criteria used to design the training program

None of the cooperants mentioned that they used any criteria to design a training

Table 9

Pre-departure briefing on how to transfer knowledge

	Anglophone Africa	Francophone Africa
no directives	30	4
assumption of ability and expertise	12	2
general discussion at briefing	7	2
told to work together and be friendly	5	1
told to train without budget/teaching aids	4	2
training secondary (time permitting only)	4	1

program specifically for their counterpart despite the range of teaching and training experience of the sample. The training tended to evolve as the assignment progressed and the need for training became evident.

5.5.5 Cooperant suggestions for improvement of training design

Cooperants were then asked what advice they would give to designers of development projects in terms of counterpart training. The majority felt that formal training should be designed into the project from the beginning with more input and responsibility from the host country in order to ensure technology and training appropriate to the project. This could include several planning trips to the country before the final project design. Along the same line, longer contracts with built in training money and time, as well as clear objectives emphasizing practical rather than

theoretical and result-oriented projects were strongly suggested. Many of the cooperants would like to have several counterparts simultaneously as well as other local nationals included in the training, and to have more involvement in the selection of counterparts to ensure a better match from the outset. Consulting and using the expertise of returned Canadians was also seen as a readily available and underutilized source of pertinent information (see Table 10).

Table 10

Cooperant advice on designing effective counterpart training

	Anglophone Africa	Francophone Africa
host country involved, formal objectives	24	2
less theory, more practice, longer contracts	23	
involve cooperant in selection	16	2
involve more people in learning process	16	2
consult returnees with training experience	12	3

There appeared to be little or no planning for the mandated exchange of expertise. The cooperants had no directives on how to go about training the counterparts; learning objectives and goals were developed on the project site as the need arose. When asked how to improve the design of the training, the cooperants felt the host country and the appointed cooperant should have more input into the design, that the contracts be longer with more emphasis on practical applications than theoretical, and that more than one counterpart be trained at a time. They also suggested that Canadians be less

paternalistic and become advisors instead of experts, with emphasis on proven training ability as well as technical expertise when hired.

5.6 Teaching-learning process used

5.6.1 Instructional methods and techniques used

The advisors were asked to identify three methods they employed to ensure the counterpart received the requisite knowledge and skills. In anglophone Africa, the cooperants overwhelmingly chose on-the-job-training, with the counterpart learning by doing the work, as the primary training method, followed by demonstrations and coaching. Discussions, lectures and seminars were the next most popular means of training. The francophone group unanimously selected both on-the-job training and discussions as their preferred training methods. A breakdown of training methods is shown in Table 11.

5.6.2 Counterpart involvement in other educational programs

When asked if their counterpart participated in any formal training or workshops while working with them, 15 from anglophone Africa indicated that they had done so, while all five from francophone Africa said their counterparts were involved in some other form of training (see Table 12). One cooperant sent as many of his counterparts to school as possible so that they would get both food and an education and would thus come back to work "as healthy as little bees".

Table 11

Training methods used by cooperants

	Anglophone Africa	Francophone Africa
on-the-job training or learning-by-doing	28	4
demonstrations	17	
discussions	17	5
coaching	16	
lectures and seminars	13	
assigned readings and discussions	6	1
classroom followed by demonstrations	6	
report writing and record keeping	5	2
involvement in meetings, presentations	5	3
being available to help	4	
observation	3	
role plays and simulations		1
memorization to keep dependent	1	

Table 12

Nature and duration of additional training counterpart received

	Anglophone Africa	Francophone Africa
Nature of training		
local training	12	2
studied in Canada during posting	4	
studied elsewhere in Africa	4	2
studied abroad	1	1
workshops	6	2
demonstration and practice sessions	4	1
formal courses	3	1
presentations and conferences	2	2
Duration of training		
1 to 3 days	8	1
several weeks	8	3
10 days	2	1
minimum of 1 year	2	

5.6.3 Learning climate established

When asked what was necessary to establish an effective working relationship with a counterpart overseas, the majority of cooperants mentioned mutual trust and respect,

as well as compatibility as critical elements. The perception that the onus for establishing that climate for learning lay on the shoulders of the cooperant is clearly reflected in their statements in Table 13.

Table 13

Elements necessary to establish an effective working relationship

	Anglophone Africa	Francophone Africa
mutual trust and respect	20	4
compatibility	11	2
establish a working relationship quickly	9	1
keep counterpart's needs in mind	7	
treat them honestly with a lot of feedback	7	
possess strong communication skills	7	
patience	5	
demonstrate competence at all times	5	2
bolster counterpart's self-esteem		3

The cooperants seemed to feel that a positive attitude on the part of both the counterpart and the cooperant was another primary ingredient for a successful training intervention. Generally, it was felt that the nationals were very receptive to the idea of training and eager to learn as much as possible. Only a few were indifferent or unreceptive, and two counterparts who were initially very negative became more positive as they became more involved in the training.

Most of the cooperants indicated that they worked closely with their counterpart. In a typical month 38 cooperants reported meeting with the counterpart daily. Often, cooperants shared the same office with their counterpart, which facilitated the exchange of information.

5.6.4 Time spent by cooperant on counterpart training

When asked how much time they spent actually training or sharing knowledge with their counterpart, the cooperants indicated their training hours ranged from entire working days spent together, to 4 to 6 hours training daily, to sharing 1 to 3 hours per day with their partner (see Table 14).

Table 14

Breakdown of time cooperants' spent with counterpart

	Anglophone Africa	Francophone Africa
1 to 3 hours per day	19	1
4 to 6 hours per day	12	2
8 hours per day	4	1
very little time to spare for training	3	
3 hours 3 times per week		1

5.6.5 Measures of success of training

The cooperants were asked to identify the methods they used to ensure an adequate

transfer of skills and technology after completion of the training. Skill demonstrations, obsevations, and performance reviews were the preferred methods for follow-up. A total of 24 used a combination of methods to measure success although none followed a consistent, structured format. A cooperant on an agricultural project felt that his training was successful because his counterparts "burned fewer clutches than the other farms". Table 15 gives an overview of the methods selected by cooperants to measure the success of the transfer of skills and knowledge.

Table 15

Methods used to measure the transfer of skills and knowledge

	Anglophone Africa	Francophone Africa
skill demonstrations	12	1
observation	10	1
performance reviews	8	
completion of assignments	8	
giving presentations and teaching others	5	3
increased counterpart's authority	4	3
no measurement of transfer	4	
counterpart wrote new procedures	3	2
discussions	3	1

5.6.6 Program evaluation

Only seven cooperants received any formal training objectives at the beginning of their assignment and there was little established in terms of evaluating the training program upon its completion. Generally, when the cooperant's assignment ended, so did the training. Given that just over half of the cooperants felt that their counterpart was prepared to take over their duties, any further training of the counterpart would be taken up by the next cooperant (if there was one assigned), usually with little to no time spent briefing the arriving cooperant on what had already transpired. No cooperant indicated that any follow-up reports or analysis of the training completed were required of them.

5.6.7 Evaluation of counterpart and cooperant

Similar problems to those of program evaluation surround the topic of evaluating the counterpart and the cooperant in terms of training success. Generally, the cooperants are evaluated on their ability to get their work done on budget and on time, not on their ability to train counterparts. Again, this is reflected in the lack of a clear training mandate for most of the cooperants.

5.6.8 Cooperant suggestions to improve evaluation methods

The cooperants were asked for suggestions to evaluate the effectiveness of counterpart training by Canadians on assignment overseas. Many ideas were offered but most frequently the cooperants suggested that the advisor be evaluated from multiple sources (the counterpart, both Canadian and national peers, superiors, and

subordinates, executing agencies, as well as an assigned training specialist). As much as possible the interviews would be held during the assignment and conducted on the project site with trained evaluators because distance from the project reality lead to overly positive recollections. It was also suggested that counterpart interviews be used as a primary source of information. Others thought only the advisor should be interviewed; that self-monitoring and evaluation would be viable; setting realistic training standards with a management committee and the counterpart to measure success; taking the age and status of the project into consideration when determining desired outcomes (see Table 16).

Table 16

Suggested evaluation methods of counterpart training

	Anglophone Africa	Francophone Africa
multiple evaluations	16	1
counterpart evaluations	14	2
establish realistic standards and measures	8	
interview cooperant	7	1
self-monitoring and evaluation	6	
consider stage of project when evaluating	6	
interview on site with evaluation team	3	1
comparative evaluation with similar project	3	

In summary, the preferred training method of the cooperants was on-the-job training. Demonstrations, observations, and performance reviews were most frequently used to measure the success of knowledge acquisition although there was no uniformity of approach. Half of the counterparts were involved in other educational programs of varying lengths during the training period. Indeed, some counterparts were studying abroad during the entire posting, forcing the cooperants to select and train someone else! The cooperants felt that mutual trust and respect formed the basis for a positive learning environment, and that the responsibility for establishing and maintaining that climate lay with them. Most cooperants worked closely with their counterpart and tried to set aside daily training time.

Consistent with the lack of formal training mandates, there was no evaluation of either cooperant or counterpart, nor of program success, other than completing the assignment within established time and budget restrictions.

When asked for their advice to evaluate Canadians involved in training counterparts, the respondents generally felt that cooperants should be evaluated on site, during the assignment, with trained evaluators as well as the individuals involved in the training.

5.7 Effectiveness of the training

5.7.1 Factors affecting training outcomes

The subject of attaining training goals occasioned many personal comments and observations on the difficulties encountered along the way. Many cooperants felt that, given adequate time, authority and flexibility, they would have had more success and that the counterparts would have been more involved during the training and more independent at the end of the training period. Table 17 illustrates some of the problems

mentioned by the cooperants in achieving their training objectives.

Table 17

Factors affecting training outcomes

	Anglophone Africa	Francophone Africa
needed more follow-up and time	12	1
lack of time spent together	7	1
advisor became discouraged	5	2
training not mandated into project	5	2
counterpart preferred to stay in office	3	1
national never understood project goals	2	1
local interference in counterpart's work		2
lost counterpart at end of project	2	

5.7.2 Retention of training upon completion of assignment

As no counterparts were interviewed for the study (see section on limitations) there is little data on just what was learned, retained, and used by the counterparts after the departure of the cooperant. Equally, possessing little in the way of training objectives and evaluation of training success, the cooperants had no criteria to measure the effectiveness of the transfer once they left the project, nor did they have any responsibility to ensure that the training was retained beyond the scope of their assignment.

5.7.3 Counterpart use of skills acquired

Few of the cooperants had any information on the success or failure of the counterpart(s) they had trained while on assignment overseas. For many of the returned cooperants, the interview for this study was the first time anyone had contacted them since their return to Canada. Only 25 advisors had communicated with their counterpart since their return to Canada, and most said the correspondence was for purely social reasons. There was little follow-up contact of a professional nature. Of those who had not communicated with their counterpart, none had plans to be in touch. They saw little need or reason to do so since their assignment was considered complete. Several advisors indicated they tried to remain in touch but received no response to their letters. Three said their counterpart was illiterate and two said the political situation in the host country made further communication difficult.

5.7.4 Methods to improve training effectiveness

All but one of the advisors found counterpart training a useful method for transferring knowledge and skills in developing countries, especially as a complement to formal teaching and research. If communication between the two was good, they felt that it was the only feasible means to train.

The respondents, however, noted a variety of methods to improve the current techniques of counterpart training (see Table 18). Principal among their suggestions were better counterpart selection, more training time, and some felt that clear training objectives would be of help. Several suggested a more thorough training of the trainers, especially what they should anticipate in terms of culture shock and normal periods of

Table 18

Suggestions to improve current training methods

	Anglophone Africa	Francophone Africa
better counterpart selection	10	1
more training time	9	
clear training objectives	9	1
involve many others when training	6	
send technical, not theoretical experts	5	
work as a team	4	1
build in time and realistic objectives	4	1
train in their own country when possible	4	
dependent upon mutual compatibility	3	2
get involved with counterpart selection	2	
pay counterpart more to keep them	2	
get rid of system altogether		2
better training of trainers	2	1
keep individual for entire project		1

discouragement. As one cooperant said, "When they lean their spear on a wall, you've got a ways to go." Depending upon the level of the counterpart, some cooperants suggested that in-country training for technicians would reinforce training institutes in the host country; that university education undertaken in neighbouring Third World countries would encourage the acquisition of appropriate technology; and that post-

graduate studies only be pursued outside of Africa. One cooperant said, "Generally, resist the temptation to bring counterparts to Canada for training because they really want to travel and are nonchalant toward training." Others thought that a practical solution would be to select nationals already being trained in an appropriate technical field and bring them to Canada for formal teaching skills only, with an obligation to return home to work for a minimum of two years. They could subsequently use their technical expertise to teach fellow nationals. Essentially, the training would be tied to a commitment to use it in the host country upon completion of the program. It is difficult to generalize these opinions to all development projects. They do, however, reflect a perceived need to ensure that acquired knowledge remain within the recipient country.

5.7.5 Cooperant achievement of training objectives

Given their own expectations, only 18 of the 33 cooperants felt they had achieved the training objective of preparing the counterpart to assume complete responsibility for their new position (see Table 19). Interestingly, when the cooperants' previous overseas experience was compared to the attainment of that same training objective, those with no previous experience enjoyed a degree of success similar to the seasoned cooperants (see Table 20). Of those whose aim was not to have the national take over, five indicated that they planned only to work very closely with the counterpart in order to transfer as much knowledge as possible. None of the cooperants had any information on how much of the training was subsequently retained by the counterpart.

Table 19

Degree of counterpart preparedness at end of training

	Anglophone Africa	Francophone Africa
ready to take over	16	2
almost ready to take over	9	
far from ready to take over	5	1

Table 20

Cooperants' previous overseas experience in relation to readiness of counterpart to assume job responsibilies

	Anglophone Africa	Francophone Africa
with previous overseas experience	23	3
ready to take over	15	2
almost ready to take over	3	
not ready to take over	5	1
without previous overseas experience	7	
ready to take over	5	
almost ready to take over		
not ready to take over	2	

From the perspective of the cooperants, then, the best ways to improve training effectiveness lay in more thoughtful selection of counterparts, clear training objectives, and more training time and follow-up. Finally, the absence of mandated training goals with corresponding accountability for success, meant that the cooperants had no responsibility or authority to ensure that the training was both retained and used by the counterpart once the assignment was completed. While just over half of the cooperants who expected to have their counterpart take over from them at the end of the assignment felt that the counterpart was prepared to do so, previous overseas experience did not appear to be a factor in achieving training objectives

5.8. Advantages and disadvantages of counterpart training

5.8.1 Advantages of counterpart training

The advisors found the most benefit in the two-way flow of communication, the freedom to work with the counterpart in a one-on-one context, and the colleague to colleague relationship. Table 21 cites other strengths mentioned by the cooperants.

When asked what factors contributed the most to their effectiveness overseas outside of their actual job mandate, there was a wide variety of responses. Most felt that working as a team with fellow cooperants as well as the local and Canadian project management played a key role in their success. The ability to establish and maintain positive and reciprocal channels of communication with their counterpart, as well as local support staff, was also considered critical to a positive outcome. Climate, lifestyle and pace, good facilities and accommodations, prior experience overseas, the desire to accomplish something lasting for the host country, a sense of adventure, all contributed in some way to the cooperants' perception of a successful posting (see Table 22).

Table 21

Additional strengths of the cooperant-counterpart dyad

	Anglophone Africa	Francophone Africa
practical	10	
makes work meaningful	7	
counterpart teaches cooperant	6	2
understand local, unique problems	5	1
understand project background quickly	4	2
understand and learn local language	3	1

Table 22

Factors contributing to success and effectiveness of posting

	Anglophone Africa	Francophone Africa
good local and Canadian management	9	2
excellent relationship with counterpart	7	1
excellent facilities	4	1
prior overseas experience	4	2
desire to succeed	3	
great lifestyle and climate	2	1

5.8.2 Constraints and limiting factors of counterpart training

Based on their own experiences and recollections, the cooperants were asked to respond to 12 statements using a 3 point scale that described commonly cited reasons that counterpart training fails to transfer knowledge and skills in development projects. The major reasons for failure mentioned by the advisors lay in unclear objectives, lack of time, and the fact that counterpart training was not built into the project from the outset. Table 23 indicates the reasons given by the counterparts. Interestingly, the issues of cultural and linguistic barriers, stressful living conditions, shortages of qualified counterparts, and lack of training theory were not seen as problematic in their own particular case, although many said that other cooperants frequently experienced those problems. Most felt they had a good counterpart and they both enjoyed a positive work and personal relationship. It is worth noting that of the entire sample of 40

Table 23

Reasons for failure of skill and technology transfer

	Anglophone Africa	Francophone Africa
unclear training objectives	20	1
insufficient time to train	13	4
training not built into project	12	1
unclear roles of cooperant and counterpart	12	1
loss or change of counterpart	10	
need 6 months to adjust mutually	6	
shortage of counterparts	5	2
no training objectives	5	1
inexperienced as a trainer	4	
training secondary to project		3
lack of training tools	2	
no system to handle conflicts	2	
Canadian methods different from British	2	
host country bias against aid money	2	2

cooperants, 32 said they had no problems bridging cultural barriers and 34 had no perceived communication difficulties with their counterpart. All but one of the advisors found counterpart training a useful method for transferring knowledge and skills in developing countries, especially as a complement to formal teaching and research. If communication between them was good, they felt it was the most feasible way to train.

Primary weaknesses cited by the cooperants were personality clashes with their counterpart, insufficient time to train properly, unqualified counterparts, lack of training evaluation or structure, and no follow-up to ensure an adequate transfer of skills (see Table 24). Only five felt there were no weaknesses at all.

The cooperants were then asked if there were circumstances beyond their personal control that hindered their effectiveness. There were a variety of sectors, but most problems centered around the counterpart and ranged from personality clashes, poor selection and political appointments, to the abysmal pay, poor nutrition and living conditions that forced many to work two jobs to make ends meet (see Table 25). The lack of or inadequate equipment, supplies, parts, and facilities were also mentioned along with local interference in the project. The vast difference in available technology between Canadian and African projects posed serious training problems even for those with experience. Said one cooperant, "In Canada, I trained Canadian counterparts on computers. In Tanzania we had to work with manuals just like those we had in the fifties when I started working."

Overall, the cooperants felt that counterpart training was a viable way to exchange knowledge and expertise. They enjoyed the closeness of working with one individual, establishing professional relationships with the host nationals, as well as maintaining open channels of communication. Many cooperants felt that the support of project management and fellow Canadians were crucial to their success overseas.

Consistent with the problems mentioned throughout the interviews, time constraints, inexperience, lack of objectives, priorities other than training, and problems with counterparts, were again cited as constraints to a successful training intervention. The cooperants felt that they had no cross cultural or communication difficulties with their counterparts, yet personality conflicts were given as the major weakness of counterpart training by 30% of the respondents.

Table 24

Weaknesses of counterpart training

	Anglophone Africa	Francophone Africa
personality conflicts	12	
lack of time to train properly	8	
unqualified counterparts	8	
lack of structure and evaluation	8	
lack of follow-up	7	1
loss or absence of counterpart	7	
political selection of counterparts	5	2
inadequately educated counterpart	5	
low pay and few incentives	3	
Canadian do work instead of training	3	
inappropriate technology for country		3
keeps counterpart inferior		2
no training objectives		1
cultural learning differences		1
no weaknesses in the system	4	1

Table 25

Factors hindering effectiveness overseas

	Anglophone Africa	Francophone Africa
problems with counterpart	11	2
inadequate equipment, facilities	8	2
local interference	8	3
Canadian management	6	2
African bureaucracy	5	3
negative Canadian attitudes	5	1
getting money released for project	5	2
no training money or teaching aids	3	1
unqualified Canadians	3	1
unclear project mandate from agency		3

6.0 Discussion of Results

Results from the study of the patterns and effectiveness of counterpart training by Canadian cooperants in overseas development projects were mixed. What emerged from the data was a picture of inconsistency of approach to training. Essentially it would appear that the counterpart training system has changed little over the years and that it still does not work well. The intent of counterpart training is to transfer knowledge using combinations of on-the-job training, study programs, and apprenticeship to designated cooperants in order to enable the counterparts to take over the cooperant's job at the end of the assignment. The effect, however, is that less than half of the counterparts trained by cooperants in the study were actually ready to assume the duties fulfilled by the expatriates.

What are the apparent reasons for this limited success of counterpart training? Clearly, the cause was not the technical qualifications of either the counterpart or the cooperant, for both groups were well-educated. Nor was previous overseas experience on the part of the cooperant a predictor of training success, since the range of experience was varied and those who had never worked in a developing country had as much success as those with experience. Kealey (1988) found that previous overseas experience was not necessarily a predictor of success and the findings of this study support that research.

Awareness and participation in local cultures was found to be more predictive of success in project-related training than previous overseas experience (Kealey, 1988). The study by Scott-Stevens (1987) revealed that "as the lack of knowing another language served as a constraint, a minimum proficiency in another language served to facilitate the transfer of knowledge. It indicated respect for the other person as an individual, and for his culture" (p.126). The Nordic study of technical assistance

personnel in Africa also found that they "must make every effort to learn the local language, even if it means adding several weeks of preparation for the job. It is arrogant and insensitive to continue insisting that Kiswahili is not needed when almost 100% of local personnel think it is indeed necessary" (p.108). Thus, while language competence is not critical to success, it is still important. The 70 percent of the cooperants in this study who could not communicate in the counterpart's language beyond simple greetings may have been somewhat limited in their ability to be involved in host cultures outside of a professional context..

The crux of the problem, however, seems to lie in the training process itself. From the outset, most cooperants indicated that the training was haphazard. Indeed, only *seven of forty cooperants* were given clear training objectives before arriving on site. Most knew nothing about the counterpart they were to work with, nor did they receive directives on what roles and relationships were expected of them during their assignment. There was even less planning for the exchange of expertise. In short, there were no directives on how to train and no specifications to meet. Training seemed to evolve as the need arose and as time permitted. If time was short, the cooperant performed the work in order to ensure that project deadlines were met; training became a poor second to financial and time constraints. These results echo those of cooperants detailed in a CIDA sub-report of the Living and Working Overseas study (Pritchard & Kealey, 1988). When asked about their involvement in training local people, the cooperants felt "restricted and frustrated by the lack of a training mandate and system as well as the need to solve immediate problems due to inadequate planning and time management" (p. 25).

Parallel to the vague approach to including training in the project were the training methods used. Although most of cooperants used some form of on-the-job training with their counterpart, there were few clearly identified measures of success beyond

witnessing that a task was completed correctly. While half of the counterparts participated in other educational programs during their training period, there were no indications that the study programs were built into the training from the outset as a critical reinforcement of the on-the-job training occurring on site. This supports the findings of the 1988 Nordic study on technical assistance personnel (TAP) which stated:

> Many TAP find themselves inexperienced and poorly prepared to organise training of local personnel. Very often the unprecise term "on-the-job-training" covers little more than sitting together in the same office or the same department. The most visible token of concern for training is seen in the recommendations for scholarships. However a well thought out plan to integrate the scholarship studies with institution building in the projects is rarely observed (p. 115).

It is hardly surprising then, that there were no evaluations of either cooperant or counterpart, nor of program success upon completion of the assignment. Thus, there was no record of how much of the training was retained and subsequently used by the counterpart. The true measure of success of the cooperant remained the ability to get a job completed on time and on budget, not training proficiency.

In essence, the study revealed that *none* of the eight aspects used to measure a successful training intervention were consistently present in the cooperant-counterpart training dyad of those interviewed. Those aspects were: 1) that training had a role in the project; 2) that learning goals or objectives were defined; 3) that recognized instructional techniques were used; 4) that there was predeparture preparation or training of the cooperant; 5) that the counterpart was prepared for the exchange of knowledge; 6) that a climate conducive to learning was established; 7) that there were criteria to evaluate and measure effectiveness, and; 8) that the training demonstrated sustainable results.

Problems encountered time and again by the cooperants were time constraints, their own inexperience in training (especially in the context of a development project), unclear or nonexistent objectives, lack of authority, and priorities other than training. Other issues related to difficulties with counterparts such as personality conflicts, political appointments, differences in status, unqualified individuals, losing a counterpart to anther project or position, and political interference (from both donor and recipient). Yet, despite those problems, the cooperants skirted the possibility of cross cultural or communication conflicts and the corresponding impact on successful training. There was great reluctance to admit to any difficulties of either nature with their counterparts. It was pointed out by 30% of the sample that *other* cooperants had those problems but that they had been personally lucky and managed to avoid such issues. Curiously, the same percentage indicated that personality conflicts were a major weakness of counterpart training, although generally occurring with others, not themselves. While unwilling to see it in personal terms, it appears that such conflicts could easily indicate cross cultural problems. Previous studies indicate that such reluctance is not unusual. Kealey (1988) found that Canadians tend to deny experiencing any culture shock or acculturative stress, perceiving it as a sign of weakness in adaptation. While many cooperants participate in cross cultural workshops prior to departure, it does not tend to focus on the differences in the world of work and "the consultant today still finds himself frustrated by the quality and dimensions which the work assumes, which are subtly different than the same work at home" (Scott-Stevens, 1987, p.103). Thus cooperants may be well versed in the norms, values, and behaviour patterns of a society, but ill prepared for the different work values of individual counterparts. As Scott-Stevens (1987) notes, "whether or not a foreign consultant has had an orientation program; whether or not he is a first-timer or has had extensive overseas experience; he is rarely prepared for, or spared

from, cultural role shock" (p. 105).

As mentioned earlier, it is natural to view the past through rosy glasses and forget or minimize any problems that occurred on very human terms. Clearly, the breakdown of communication, no matter how understandable, is not acceptable in the eyes of the cooperants. Individuals on assignment overseas obviously pride themselves on their communication as well as their technical skills. Probably peer and counterpart ratings on the issue of cross cultural effectiveness would have revealed a somewhat more realistic picture. It is hardly surprising then, that the results of the study echo the failure of the cooperant-counterpart model in institutional PRT as chronicled in the literature review by authors such as Spitzberg, 1975; Spitzberg, 1978; Lethem & Cooper, 1983; Scott-Stevens, 1987, the Nordic study, 1988; and Kealey, 1988.

What hope then for counterpart training? Despite the many constraints and problems, there were positive elements and indicators from the cooperants. Even given the limitation that recollections tend to be rosier than reality, the cooperants interviewed felt that their training endeavours were not complete failures. If willingness and eagerness to try to do something positive and lasting by transferring expertise and knowledge have any impact, then those surveyed probably enjoyed some success. Results parallel those from the Living and Working Overseas sub-report which stated that nationals indeed gained from working with cooperants, but that cooperants had to accept that the process of transfer occurs at a much slower pace and not necessarily according to project needs or deadlines (Pritchard & Kealey, 1988). In this study, most of the cooperants thoroughly enjoyed the intimacy of working so closely with a counterpart and attempted to devote time daily to some aspect of training. They tried to establish a positive and open atmosphere based on mutual trust and respect and felt that it was their responsibility to maintain that climate. Their recommendations for improving the current method of counterpart training were thoughtful and reflected

nothing less than accepted guidelines for an effective training program! The cooperants recommended: 1) input on training needs and design from the host country (and the appointed cooperant if possible) from the outset; 2) more practical training with less emphasis on theory; 3) hiring advisors with proven training ability; 4) a more thoughtful selection of counterparts; 5) unambiguous training objectives with mandated accountability and authority to ensure that those objectives be met; 6) sufficient time and resources allocated for the training and follow-up; 7) evaluation of the cooperant on site during the assignment to monitor the progress of the training; 8) some form of follow-up to ensure that the training is used and to evaluate the long term success of the intervention. In other words, had they been given the proper tools, scope, and authority to train, there probably would have been even more visible and sustainable success stories. The Nordic study (1988) supports these findings:

> Many TAP have a good professional background, but lack management experience and experience in more formal training. They have an open and positive attitude. But the combination of poor forward planning and lack of training and manpower development plans on the one hand, and understaffing and acute problems on the other hand can lead to situations where ad hoc solutions become the main priority, and where TAP never get the time to be challenged by real training and institution building functions (p. 117).

An interpretation of the data implies that the onus for developing training systems should not lie with the cooperants. Most of the cooperants were probably quite capable of *working within* a training program, but *not developing* them. The Nordic study states that "one of the most significant handicaps of expatriates is their weak theoretical and practical base on institutional development. They should to a larger extent analyse training needs, plan and implement training programmes- but their ability to do so is

limited" (p.106). It is daunting enough for the cooperant to be thrust into the reality of working in the Third World and all its corresponding challenges and frustrations without worrying about designing a workable training program- something for which the cooperant probably has little preparation no matter how sophisticated the level of technical expertise. That task should be left to the training experts or, ideally, developed by both cooperant and counterpart under the supervision of a training expert.

The difficulty in spelling out the specifics of a training program relates directly to the problems cited by Lethem & Cooper (1983) in their analysis of institutional technical assistance. Because institutional TA tends to involve diagnostic and prescriptive assistance requiring a behavioural change in the recipient, quantitative measurements of progress and success are more problematic. Designing institutional TA to integrate with engineering TA requires a great deal of time and effort before the project begins to ensure that the design meets the project Terms of Reference (TOR) and that the training component fits in well with other project mandates.

In conclusion, the traditional model of counterpart training does not work well as an isolated training intervention on overseas development projects. As one element in a series of training components, however, counterpart training can provide invaluable benefit by virtue of working on an individual basis with an acknowledged expert and acquiring some hands on experience under the guidance of the cooperant. Counterpart training is best undertaken in conjunction with other learning activities such as planned classroom sessions, study periods abroad or in neighbouring countries with good facilities, or workshops and conferences. The more there is variety and reinforcement of learning, the more it is likely that skills acquired will be used in the future.

Unless, however, training is built into the TOR of a project from the outset as a clear, unambiguous, and mandated priority with corresponding accountability, it is too easy for the cooperant to do the work and overlook training a counterpart. Successful

and sustainable training must enjoy the same importance as time and budget goals. If counterpart training is selected for a project, the cooperants chosen should possess proven training ability and be well versed in the culture of the counterpart (ideally with some knowledge of the local language, too). The cooperant should follow a comprehensive training program, complete with time frames, evaluation checkpoints, and follow-up plans. Equally, the cooperant should expect to be evaluated on the progress of the training during the assignment. Above all, the cooperant should have the authority to ensure that the training does occur. Of course, rare is the project that unfolds in such a simple and trouble free manner. Delays may occur, counterparts may disappear, political mandates may change project mandates, cooperants may fail . . . Still, without a specific framework for training events, experience has shown time and again that the training simply will not occur.

Project related training is now recognized as an integral part of overseas technical assistance and its importance will continue to grow as the state of the art becomes more comprehensive and the lessons of success more quantifiable. The counterpart-cooperant training method has been a traditional means for transferring skills and knowledge, although often unsuccessful. To remain viable however, counterpart training must be subject to the same rigorous standards and measurements as any training program in order to ensure that it is relevant, reliable, adequate, and sustainable over time.

References

Altbach, P.G. (1978). Damned if you do--damned if you don't: Counterparts, neocolonialism, dependency and the international balance of power. In I.J.Spitzberg Jr. (Ed.), Exchange of expertise: the counterpart system in the new international order (pp.65-76). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Barker, H.W, & Sterling, C.R. (1985). Analysis of lending operations in training in Bank/IDA financed projects, Fiscal 1984 (Report No. EDT19). Washington, DC: World Bank Education and Training Series.

Barnes, R.L. (1985). Across cultures: the Peace Corps training model. Training and Development Journal, 10, 46-49.

Bass, B.M., & Vaughan, J.A.(1966). Training in industry. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Bocaranda, G., & Anders, G.Z. (1973). Comments from a project management team. IDR/Focus, 4, 20-21.

Brasseur, R.E. (1976). Constraints in the transfer of knowledge. IDR/Focus, 3, 12-18.

Canadian International Development Agency. (1977). Annual aid review 1976. Ottawa: Canadian International Development Agency.

Canadian International Development Agency. (1983). Annual aid review 1982. Ottawa: Minister of Supplies and Services Canada.

Canadian International Development Agency. (1984). Annual aid review 1983. Ottawa: Minister of Supplies and Services Canada.

Caustin, H. (1974). The search for new methods of technical co-operation (Conference Report no.4). New York: UNITAR.

Copeland, L. (1986). Skills transfer and training overseas. Personnel Administrator, 31 (6), 101-117.

Donaldson, L., & Scannell, E.E. (1985). Human resource development. Don Mills, ONT: Addison-Wesley.

Draper, J.A. (1978). The contribution of learning principles to the counterpart relationship. In I.J.Spitzberg Jr. (Ed.), Exchange of expertise: the counterpart system in the new international order (pp.113-135). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Eisemon, T. (1978). Counterpart training: the implications for scientific and educational policy in emergent scientific communities. In I.J.Spitzberg Jr. (Ed.), Exchange of expertise: the counterpart system in the new international order (pp.197-211). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Forss, K., Carlsen, J., Frøyland, E., Sitari, T., & Vilby, K. (1988). Evaluation of the effectivenss of technical assistance personnel. Study commissioned by the Danish International Development Authority (DANIDA), the Finnish International Development Agency (FINNIDA), the Royal Norwegien Ministry of Development Cooperation (MCD/NORAD), & the Swedish International Development Authority (SIDA).

Glaser, W.A. (1975). Improving communication in the technical cooperation relationship. IDR/Focus, 3, 10-14.

Glaser, W.A. (1975). Making better use of technical assistance experts. IDR/Focus, 4, 21-25.

Globerson, A. (1973). Le rôle des experts et de leurs homologues dans le développement: auto-évaluation. IDR/Focus, 3, 13-17.

Globerson, A. (1978). Interaction between foreign assistance personnel and local counterparts. In I.J.Spitzberg Jr. (Ed.), Exchange of expertise: the counterpart system in the new international order (pp. 159-179). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Gordenker, L. (1976). International aid and national decisions. Princeton, N.J.: University Press.

Harari, D. (1974). The role of the technical assistance expert. Paris: OECD.

Hawes, F., & Kealey, D.J. (1980). Canadians in development. Ottawa: Canadian International Development Agency.

Hawes, F., & Kealey, D.J. (1981). An empirical study of Canadian technical assitance: adaptation and effectiveness on overseas assignment. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 5, 239-258.

Johnston, M.B. (1974). Training needs of overseas Americans as seen by their co-workers. IDR/Focus, 4, 21-25.

Kealey, D.J., & Ruben, B.D. (1983). Cross-cultural personnel selection: criteria, issues, and methods. In D. Landis & R. Brislin (Eds.), Handbook of intercultural training, 1, 155-175, New York: Pergamon Press.

Kealey, D. J. (1988). Cross-cultural effectiveness: a study of Canadian technical advisors overseas. Doctoral dissertation, Queen's University: Kingston, Canada.

Kerr, G.B. 1978). Rethinking the change agent role in the technical assistance process to facilitate the new international order. In I.J.Spitzberg Jr. (Ed.), Exchange of expertise: the counterpart system in the new international order (pp. 81-97). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Lethem, F., & Cooper, L. (1983). Managing project-related technical assistance: the lessons of success. World Bank Staff Working Papers No. 586. Washington, DC: World Bank Management and Development Series.

McCaffrey, J., & Hafner, C. (1985). When two cultures collide: doing business overseas. Training and Development Journal, 10, 26-31.

Murrell, K.L. (1984). Training and development for developing countries. Journal of European Industrial Training, 8 (4), 25-32.

Oakley, P., & Garforth, C. (1985). Guide to extension training. FAO Training Series, 11, Rome: Food & Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Poats, R.M. (1985). Twenty-five years of development cooperation: a review. Paris: OECD.

Pritchard, P.J., & Kealey, D.J. (1988). Canadian advisors overseas (Report No.1). Ottawa: Canadian International Development Agency.

Raman, N.P. (1973). Training of national staff in technical cooperation projects. Some perceptions and prescriptions. IDR/Focus, 4, 17-19.

Richter, H. (1985). Establishing cooerative commercial apprenticeships. Training and Development Journal, 10, 40-41.

Salvi, S. (1975). Amélioration des rapports entre les experts et leurs homologues. IDR/Focus, 1, 24-26.

Scott-Stevens, S. (1987). Foreign consultants and counterparts. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Solomon, J., Heegaard, F., & Kornher, K.L. (1978). An action-training strategy for project management. IDR/Focus, 1, 13-19.

Spencer, J. (1978). Colonial antecedents of the counterpart system in British and French Africa. In I.J.Spitzberg Jr. (Ed.), Exchange of expertise: the counterpart system in the new international order (pp. 41-63). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Spielman, J.D.B. (1981). Developing strategy for transfer of technology. Training and Development Journal, 35 (10), 79-83.

Spitzberg, I.J., Jr. (1975). The counterpart system: some suggestions for change. IDR/Focus, 3, 3-9.

Spitzberg, I.J., Jr. (1978). Some thoughts about counterparts: the political, ethical, and educational aspects of the relationship. In I.J.Spitzberg Jr. (Ed.), Exchange of expertise: the counterpart system in the new international order (pp. 21-40). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Stone, R.A. (1978). Interpersonal relations in the counterpart system: some variations on the model. In I.J.Spitzberg Jr. (Ed.), Exchange of expertise: the counterpart system in the new international order (pp. 99-112). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Technical assistance report: calendar year 1987.(1987). Washington, DC: World Bank.

Van Balkom, W. D. (1985). Briefing at the Canadian International Development Agency and thirteen non-government organizations. Unpublished manuscript, McGill University, Department of Administration and Policy Studies, Montreal.

Viet, Jean (Ed.). (1985). Macrothesaurus: for information processing in the field of economics and social development. New York: United Nations.

Wigglesworth, D.C. (1985). Auditing technology transfer. Training and Development Journal, 10, 42.

Zeira, Y., & Pazy, A. (1985). Crossing national borders to get trained. Training and Development Journal, 10, 53-57.

Agence canadienne de développement international
200, Promenade du Portage
Hull (Québec)
CANADA
K1A 0G4

Canadian International Development Agency
200 Promenade du Portage
Hull, Quebec
CANADA
K1A 0G4

Votre référence Your file

Notre référence Our file

HULL, QUEBEC
July 27, 1987

Dear Returnee:

I am writing to thank you for completing our Living and Working Overseas research questionnaire. Over 80% of the people to whom we sent a questionnaire have responded. Clearly this demonstrates the interest that returned Canadians maintain in contributing to the future development of Canada's foreign aid program. With this in mind, we have selected you as someone who could provide more input on the job-related aspects of an overseas development posting.

As you may know, one of CIDA's program priorities is the development of human resources in developing countries. The transfer of skills and knowledge through counterpart training remains one of the favoured mechanisms for achieving this goal. We need, however, a better assessment of the critical factors at play in establishing an effective counterpart training system. To this end, we would like to interview you by telephone to discuss your experience in counterpart training.

Pamela Pritchard, who is currently working with me as a research assistant, will be conducting the telephone interviews. Approximately two weeks after receiving this letter, Pamela will be telephoning you to ask some questions. The interview should last about 30 minutes and will cover the following areas - background information about you and your counterpart; methods used for training, skill or knowledge transfer; the transfer of training; the effectiveness of the training; and, finally, constraints and limitations of counterpart training.

.../2

Agence canadienne de développement international
200, promenade du Portage
Hull (Québec)
CANADA
K1A 0G4

Canadian International Development Agency
200 Promenade du Portage
Hull, Quebec
CANADA
K1A 0G4

Votre référence Your file

Notre référence Our file

HULL, QUEBEC
Le 31 juillet, 1987

Monsieur/Madame,

Nous tenons à vous remercier d'avoir complété le questionnaire retour du projet de recherche vivre et travailler à l'étranger. Plus de 80% des gens à qui un questionnaire avait été envoyé ont complété celui-ci. Ceci est une preuve que les Canadiens et les Canadiennes qui reviennent d'une affectation à l'étranger veulent contribuer à améliorer le programme d'aide canadien. A partir de cela, nous vous avons choisi afin que vous puissiez nous fournir des renseignements sur les aspects reliés au travail dans les pays en voie de développement.

Comme vous le savez, les programmes de l'ACDI ont parmi leur priorités le développement des ressources humaines dans les pays en voie de développement. Le transfert de connaissances et de compétences par la formation d'un homologue durant le projet demeure l'un des moyens adopté pour atteindre cet objectif. Afin de poursuivre cette priorité, il nous faudrait des données plus précises sur les éléments clés qui jouent un rôle dans l'établissement d'un système efficace pour la formation des homologues. A cette fin, nous vous téléphonerons pour discuter de vos expériences dans la formation des homologues.

Pamela Pritchard, qui travaille avec moi comme recherchiste fera les entrevues par téléphone. Dans les deux semaines qui suivront la réception de cette lettre, Pamela vous contactera afin de vous poser quelques questions. L'entrevue durera approximativement 30 minutes portant sur les éléments suivants: des renseignements généraux sur vous et votre homologue; les méthodes utilisées pour la formation ou le transfert de connaissances et de compétences; l'application de la formation; l'efficacité de cette formation; et, finalement, les contraintes et les limites de la formation des homologues.

.../2

THE COOPERANT IN COUNTERPART TRAINING TELEPHONE INTERVIEW PROTOCOL A

** Please note: The interview protocols also served as data collection sheets. Where there is a list of possible choices, it is for ease of data collection only and not given to respondents to choose from.

A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. a) Were you assigned a counterpart while overseas? Yes No

   b) Did the counterpart remain with you for the duration of the assignment? Yes No

comments:

In the remaining questions, if you worked with several counterparts, please respond referring to the counterpart who stayed with you the longest.

2. a) Was the counterpart briefed about you and the training? Yes No

   b) Were you briefed about the individual prior to meeting? Yes No

Comments:

3. What was the educational background of the counterpart? _____

4. Did you understand the counterpart's learning needs and concerns ?

   very well fairly well not very well

Comments:

5. During project briefings, did you receive any directives as to how the transfer of knowledge was to occur? Yes No

Comments:

6. In what language did you work? _____

7. Did the counterpart have an adequate knowledge of that language to learn effectively? Yes No

Comments:

8. To what extent were you able to communicate in the counterpart's language?

fully quite a bit hardly at all

Comments:

B. Training methodology

9. What experience in training or teaching did you have prior to this assignment?

formal teacher training trained counterparts before none at all

comments:

10. Were you given any formal, measureable objectives to achieve with your counterpart? Yes No

comments:

11. Did you work closely with the individual? Yes No

comments:

12. a) In a typical month, how many times did you meet with the counterpart? _____

b) How many training hours did that represent? _____

comments:

13. Can you tell me three methods you used to train the counterpart?

lectures/seminars critiques on-the-job training

demonstrations coaching audio visual

pen & paper tests discussions self-directed

others:_____

comments:

14. a)Did the counterpart participate in any formal training or workshops while working with you? Yes No

b) Where? (locally, within the country, in Canada, etc.?_____

c) What type of training was it? _____

d) How long did it last? _____

comments:

C. Transfer of training

15. Given your own expectations, were the training objectives achieved? Yes No

comments:

16. a) Was your goal for the counterpart to take over your position at the end of your assignment? Yes No

b) Was the individual

ready to take over almost ready far from ready

c) If the goal was not for the counterpart to take over, what was it?

17. How receptive was the national to the training?

very receptive indifferent unreceptive

Comments:

18. What methods did you use to ensure an adequate transfer of skills and technology after completion of the training?

manuals systems & procedures books progress reports

tests performance reviews refresher seminars
skill demonstrations discussions

comments:

19. Have you communicated with your counterpart since your return to Canada? Yes No

comments:

20. What were the reasons for the communication?

social	send information	pertinent articles	personal
problem solving	follow-up	training	receive information

others: _____

comments:

21. If you have not communicated since, do you intend to? (Why? Why not?) Yes No

D. Effectiveness and limitations of the training

22. The following statements are often used to describe the reasons counterpart training fails to transfer knowledge and skills in development projects. From your own experience, please indicate to what degree were they issues.

1. inability to bridge cultural barriers and differences	+	=	-
2. communication problems (linguistic)	+	=	-
3. no knowledge of how to train effectively	+	=	-
4. unclear training objectives	+	=	-
5. difficult and stressful living conditions	+	=	-
6. lack of counterparts	+	=	-
7. loss or change of counterpart during project	+	=	-
8. unqualified counterparts	+	=	-
9. counterpart uninterested in learning	+	=	-
10. training not built into project design	+	=	-
11. roles of counterpart and cooperant unclear	+	=	-
12. insufficient time to train adequately	+	=	-

Comments:

23. In your opinion, what are the strengths of the cooperant-counterpart dyad?

flexible | one-on-one | individualized | continuous

permits two-way flow of information | colleague to colleague relationship

incorporates varied training methods | accepted, traditional method

others:_____

comments:

24. What are its weaknesses?

unprepared expert | unprepared counterpart | lack of follow-up

lack of counterparts | disinterested counterparts | cultural learning differences

linguistic barriers | cultural barriers | no training objectives

no time to train | unqualified counterpart

others: _____

comments:

25. Is counterpart training useful as a means to transfer knowledge and skills in developing countries? Yes No

comments:

26. What, in your opinion, does it take to establish an effective working relationship with a counterpart overseas?

27. How would you improve the current method of counterpart training?

more briefing | more training time | better counterpart selection

no professional counterparts | clear training objectives

keep counterpart for duration | training considered priority

training built into project | training of trainer

comments:

28. a) Were there circumstances beyond your personal control which hindered your effectiveness overseas? Please explain.

b) Were there any special circumstances which made it easy for you to work effectively overseas? Please explain.

29. Have you any suggestions on ways to evaluate Canadians currently on assignment in terms of effectiveness in counterpart training?

30. In conclusion, if you could give one piece of advice to those designing development projects with training of a counterpart mandated into the process, what would it be?

THE COOPERANT IN COUNTERPART TRAINING TELEPHONE INTERVIEW PROTOCOL B

A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. a) Were you assigned a counterpart while overseas? Yes No

   b) Were you supposed to have a counterpart? Yes No

comments:

2. If you did not have a counterpart, did you work closely with a foreign national for purposes of skill and knowledge transfer? Yes No

comments

In the remaining questions, if you worked with several individuals please respond referring to the one who stayed with you the longest.

3. a) Was the individual briefed about you and the training? Yes No

   b) Were you briefed about the individual prior to meeting? Yes No

Comments:

4. What was the nature of your working relationship?

   peer subordinate superior

   teacher-student apprentice coach

   other:_____

comments:

5. What was the educational background of the national? _____

6. Did you understand the individual's learning needs and concerns ?

   very well fairly well not very well

Comments:

7. During project briefings, did you receive any directives as to how the transfer of knowledge was to occur? Yes No

Comments:

8. In what language did you work? _____

9. Did the national have an adequate knowledge of that language to learn effectively? Yes No

Comments:

10. To what extent were you able to communicate in their language?

fully quite a bit hardly at all

Comments:

B. Training methodology

11. What experience in training or teaching did you have prior to this assignment?

formal teacher training trained nationals before none at all

comments:

12. Were you given any formal, measureable objectives to achieve with the individual? Yes No

comments:

13. Did you work closely with the individual? Yes No

comments:

14. a) In a typical month, how many times did you meet with the individual? _____

b) How many training hours did that represent? _____

comments:

15. Can you tell me three methods you used to train?

lectures	critiques	on-the-job training
demonstrations	coaching	audio visual
pen & paper tests	discussions	self-directed

others:_____

16. a)Did the individual participate in any formal training or workshops while working with you? Yes No

b) Where? (locally, within the country, in Canada, etc.?) _____

c) What type of training was it? _____

d) How long did it last? _____

comments:

C. Transfer of training

17. Given your own expectations, were the training objectives achieved? Yes No

comments:

18. a) Was your goal for the person to take over your position at the end of your assignment? Yes No

b) Was the individual

ready to take over	almost ready	far from ready

c) If the goal was not to take over, what was it?

comments:

19. How receptive was the national to the training?

very receptive	indifferent	unreceptive

Comments:

20. What methods did you use to ensure an adequate transfer of skills and technology after completion of the training?

manuals	systems & procedures books	progress reports
tests	performance reviews	refresher seminars
skill demonstrations	discussions	self-evaluations

others:_____

comments:

21. Have you communicated with the individual since your return to Canada? Yes No

comments:

22. What were the reasons for the communication?

social	send information	pertinent articles	personal
problem solving	follow-up	training	receive information

others: _____

23. If you have not communicated since, do you intend to? Yes No
(Why? Why not?)

D. Effectiveness and limitations of the training

24. The following statements are often used to describe the reasons counterpart training fails to transfer knowledge and skills in development projects. From your own experience, please indicate to what degree were they issues.

1. inability to bridge cultural barriers and differences	+	=	-
2. communication problems (linguistic)	+	=	-
3. no knowledge of how to train effectively	+	=	-
4. unclear training objectives	+	=	-
5. difficult and stressful living conditions	+	=	-
6. lack of counterparts	+	=	-
7. loss or change of counterpart during project	+	=	-
8. unqualified counterparts	+	=	-
9. counterpart uninterested in learning	+	=	-
10. training not built into project design	+	=	-
11. roles of counterpart and cooperant unclear	+	=	-
12. insufficient time to train adequately	+	=	-

Comments:

25. In your opinion, what are the strengths of working closely with one or two individuals?

flexible | one-on-one | individualized | continuous

permits two-way flow of information | colleague to colleague relationship

incorporates varied training methods | accepted, traditional method

others:_____

comments:

26. What are its weaknesses?

unprepared expert | unprepared national | lack of follow-up

uninterested national | cultural learning differences

linguistic barriers | cultural barriers | no training objectives

no time to train | unqualified individual

others: _____

comments:

27. Is counterpart or one-on-one training useful as a means to transfer knowledge and skills in developing countries? Yes No

comments:

28. What, in your opinion, does it take to establish an effective working relationship with an individual overseas?

29. How would you improve the current method of one-on-one training?

more briefing | more training time | better counterpart selection

no professional counterparts | clear training objectives

keep counterpart for duration | training considered priority

training built into project | training of trainer

comments:

30. a) Were there circumstances beyond your personal control which hindered your effectiveness overseas? Please explain.

b) Were there any special circumstances which made it easy for you to work effectively overseas? Please explain.

31. Have you any suggestions on ways to evaluate Canadians currently on assignment in terms of effectiveness in training?

32. In conclusion, if you could give one piece of advice to those designing development projects with training mandated into the process, what would it be?

LE ROLE DU COOPERANT DANS LA FORMATION DES HOMOLOGUES
GUIDE D'ENTREVUE : A

A. Renseignements généraux

1. a) Avez-vous travaillé avec au moins un homologue du pays sur place? Oui Non

   b) Est-ce que le homologue a travaillé avec vous pendant tout l'affectation? Oui Non

commentaires:

Dans les questions suivantes, si vous avez eu a changé de homologue pendant le projet, veuillez répondre en utilisant l'homologue qui a demeuré avec vous le plus longtemps.

2. a) L'homologue a-t-il reçu des informations à propos de votre rôle dans le projet et la formation il suivrirait? Oui Non

   b) Est-ce que vous avez reçu des informations au sujet de l'homologue avant de le rencontrer? Oui Non

commentaires:

3. Quel était le niveau d'instruction de l'homologue? _____

4. Avez-vous bien compris les besoins et les problèmes d'apprentissage de l'homologue? Oui Non

commentaires:

5. Avez-vous reçu des explications concernant le transfert de connaissances? Oui Non
6. Dans quelle langue avez-vous travaillé? _____

7. Est-ce que l'homologue était assez à l'aise avec cette langue pour bien apprendre? Oui Non

commentaires:

8. A quel point avez-vous appris la langue locale?

entièrement suffisamment très peu

commentaires:

B. Méthodes de formation

9. Quel était votre expérience dans l'enseignement ou dans la formation avant ce projet?

enseignant déjà entrainé les homologues aucune expérience

commentaires:

10. Votre mandat de formation de l'homologue était-il clair, avec objectifs quantitatifs et mesurable? Oui Non

commentaires:

11. Avez-vous travaillé étroitement avec l'individu? Oui Non

commentaires:

12.a) Dans un mois typique, combien de fois avez-vous rencontré l'homologue? _____

b) Ca représentait combien d'heures de formation? _____

commentaires:

13. Pouvez-vous me dire 3 méthodes que vous avez utilisé pour entrainer l'homologue?

lectures critiques formation sur place

démonstrations répétitions audio-visuel

tests écrits discussions auto-dirigé

autres: _____

14. a) Est-ce que l'homologue a participé dans d'autres programmes de formation ou ateliers pendant son séjour avec vous?

Oui Non

b) Où? (en ville, dans le pays, au Canada, etc.?) _____

c) Pour combien de temps? _____

commentaires:

C. Transfert de la formation

15. Selon vos attentes personnelles, avez-vous atteint les objectifs de formation? Oui Non

commentaires:

16. a) Est-ce que votre rôle principal était d'assurer à ce que l'homologue assume votre position à la fin du projet? Oui Non

b) Est-ce que l'individu était

prêt à l'assumer presque prêt loin d'être prêt

c) Si votre but était différent, que est-ce que c'était?

commentaires:

17. Est-ce que l'homologue était réceptif à la formation?

très réceptif indifférent pas de tout réceptif

commentaires:

18. Une fois la formation terminée, de quel moyen avez-vous assuré un transfert adéquat de compétences et de technologie?

manuels livres de systèmes et procédures tests
évaluations de progrès révisions de performance
seminaires "refresher" démonstrations de compétence
discussions autres: _____

commentaires:

19. Avez-vous eu raison de communiquer avec l'homologue depuis votre retour au Canada? Oui Non

20. Quelles étaient les raisons pour la communication?

social envoyer info. articles pertinents personnel

résoudre un prob. suivi formation recevoir info.

autres:_____

21. Si vous n'avez pas eu des communications avec l'homologue depuis votre retour, avez l'intention de le faire? Oui Non (Pourquoi? Pourquoi pas?)

D. Efficacité et contraintes de la formation

22. On entend souvent les phrases suivantes afin de décrire les raisons qui nuisent à la formation des homologues et le transfert de connaissances et de compétences dans les projets de développement. Selon vos expériences, veuillez indiquer à quel degré ils vous ont touché.

1.	incapacité de surmonter les différences et. barrières culturelles	+	=	-
2.	problèmes de communication (linguistique)	+	=	-
3.	manque d'expérience en formation	+	=	-
4.	manque de clarté dans les objectifs de formation	+	=	-
5.	difficultés et stress dans l'habitation	+	=	-
6.	manque de homologues	+	=	-
7.	perte ou changement de homologue pendant projet	+	=	-
8.	pas de homologue qualifié	+	=	-
9.	manque d'intérêt de la part de l'homologues	+	=	-
10.	manque de mandat de formation dans le projet	+	=	-
11.	aucune clarté dans rôles coopérant et homologue	+	=	-
12.	manque de temps pour d'entrainer efficacement	+	=	-

commentaires:

23. Selon vous, quel sont les forces du duo coopérant-homologue?

flexible un-sur-un individualisé continu

permet échange d'info. à 2 sens relation collègue-collègue

permet plusieurs méthodes de form. méthode traditionnelle, accepté

autres: _____

commentaires:

24. Quelles sont les faiblesses?

manque de préparation de l'exp manque de prép. de l'hom.

manque de suivi manque de hom. manque d'intérêt hom.

diff. culturelles d'apprentissage contraintes linguistiques

contraintes culturelles manque d'objectifs de form.

manque de temps à entrainer homologue non qualifié

autres: _____

commentaires:

25. Pensez-vous que la formation des homologue est un moyen utile pour le transfert de connaissances et de compétences dans les pays en voie de développement? Oui Non

commentaires:

26. Selon vous, quels sont les éléments nécessaires pour établir une relation de travail efficace avec un homologue à l'étranger?

27.Avez-vous des suggestions afin d'améliorer la formation actuelle des homologues?

meilleure description du mandat	plus de temps pour entrainer
meilleur sélection des hom.	pas de hom. "professionnels"
garder l'hom. pour tout le proj.	objectifs de formation clairs
formation une priorité	formation fait partie du projet
formation de l'entraîneur	autres:_____

commentaires:

28. a) Y a-t-il eu des facteurs hors de votre contrôle personnel qui ont nuit à votre efficacité à l'étranger? Enumérez-les ici.

b) Y a-t-il eu des facteurs qui ont facilité votre efficacité à l'étranger? Enumérez-les ici.

29.Avez-vous des suggestions afin d'évaluer les canadiens actuellement en affectation à l'étranger en termes de formation des homologues?

30. En conclusion, si on vous demandait un seul conseil pour ceux qui montent les projets de développement avec la formation d'un homologue mandaté, que serait-il?

LE ROLE DU COOPERANT DANS LA FORMATION DES HOMOLOGUES
GUIDE D'ENTREVUE : B

A. Renseignements généraux

1. a) Avez-vous travaillé avec au moins un homologue du pays sur place? Oui Non

   b) Est-ce qu'un homologue aurait du travailler avec vous? Oui Non

commentaires:

2. Si vous n'avez pas travaillé avec un homologue, avez-vous travaillé étroitement avec un national pour le transfert de connaissances et de compétences? Oui Non

Dans les questions suivantes, si vous avez travaillé avec plus qu'un national pendant le projet, veuillez répondre en utilisant l'individu qui a demeuré avec vous le plus longtemps.

3. a) L'individu a-t-il reçu des informations à propos de votre rôle ds. le projet et la formation qu'il suivrirait? Oui Non

   b) Est-ce que vous avez reçu des informations au sujet de l'individu avant de le rencontrer? Oui Non

commentaires:

4. Quel était le statut de vos relations?

   égal subordonné supérieur entraîneur

   prof-élève apprenti autre: _____

5. Quel était le niveau d'instruction du national? _____

6. Avez-vous bien compris les besoins et les problèmes d'apprentissage de l'individu? Oui Non

commentaires:

7. Avez-vous reçu des explications concernant le transfert de connaissances? Oui Non

commentaires:

8. Dans quelle langue avez-vous travaillé? _____

9. Est-ce que l'individu était assez à l'aise avec cette langue pour bien apprendre? Oui Non

commentaires:

10. A quel point avez-vous appris la langue locale?

entièrement suffisamment très peu

commentaires:

B. Méthodes de formation

11. Quel était votre expérience dans l'enseignement ou dans la formation avant ce projet?

enseignant déjà entrainé les nationaux aucune expérience

12. Votre mandat de formation du national était-il clair, avec objectifs quantitatifs et mesurable? Oui Non

commentaires:

13.Avez-vous travaillé étroitement avec l'individu? Oui Non

commentaires:

14.a) Dans un mois typique, combien de fois avez-vous rencontré l'individu? _____

b) Ca représentait combien d'heures de formation? _____

commentaires:

15. Pouvez-vous me dire 3 méthodes que vous avez utilisé pour entrainer l'individu?

lectures	critiques	formation sur place
démonstrations	répétitions	audio-visuel
tests écrits	discussions	auto-dirigé

autres: _____

16. a) Est-ce que l'individu a participé dans d'autres programmes de formation ou ateliers pendant son séjour avec vous? Oui Non

b) Où? (en ville, dans le pays, au Canada, etc.?) _____

c) Pour combien de temps? _____

commentaires:

C. Transfert de la formation

17.Selon vos attentes personnelles, avez-vous atteint les objectifs de formation? Oui Non

commentaires:

18.a) Est-ce que votre rôle principal était d'assurer à ce que l'individu assume votre position à la fin du projet? Oui Non

b) Est-ce que l'individu était

prêt à l'assumer	presque prêt	loin d'être prêt

c) Si votre but était différent, que est-ce que c'était?

commentaires:

19.Est-ce que le national était réceptif à la formation?

très réceptif indifférent pas de tout réceptif

commentaires:

20. Une fois la formation terminée, de quel moyen avez-vous assuré un transfert adéquat de compétences et de technologie?

manuels livres de systèmes et procédures tests

évaluations de progrès révisions de performance

seminaires "refresher" démonstrations de compétence

discussions autres: _____

commentaires:

21.Avez-vous eu raison de communiquer avec l'individu depuis votre retour au Canada? Oui Non

commentaires:

22.Quelles étaient les raisons pour la communication?

social envoyer info. articles pertinents personnel

résoudre un prob. suivi formation recevoir info.

autres:_____

23. Si vous n'avez pas eu de communications avec lui depuis votre retour, avez-vous l'intention d'en avoir? Oui Non (Pourquoi? Pourquoi pas?)

D. Efficacité et contraintes de la formation

24. On entend souvent les phrases suivantes afin de décrire les raisons qui nuisent à la formation des homologues et le transfert de connaissances et de compétences dans les projets de développement. Selon vos expériences, veuillez indiquer à quel degré ils vous ont touché.

1.	incapacité de surmonter les différences et barrières culturelles	+	=	-
2.	problèmes de communication (linguistique)	+	=	-
3.	manque d'expérience en formation	+	=	-
4.	manque de clarté dans les objectifs de formation	+	=	-
5.	difficultés et stress dans l'habitation	+	=	-
6.	manque de homologues	+	=	-
7.	perte ou changement de homologue pendant projet	+	=	-
8.	pas de homologue qualifié	+	=	-
9.	manque d'intérêt de la part de l'homologues	+	=	-
10.	manque de mandat de formation dans le projet	+	=	-
11.	aucune clarté dans rôles coopérant et homologue	+	=	-
12.	manque de temps pour d'entrainer efficacement	+	=	-

commentaires:

25. Selon vous, quel sont les forces de travailler de très près avec un ou deux individus?

flexible un-sur-un individualisé continu

permet échange d'info. à 2 sens relation collègue-collègue

permet plusieurs méthodes de form. méthode traditionnelle, accepté

autres: _____

commentaires:

26. Quelles sont les faiblesses?

manque de préparation de l'exp	manque de prép. du national
manque de suivi manque de nat.	manque d'intérêt nat.
diff. culturelles d'apprentissage	contraintes linguistiques
contraintes culturelles	manque d'objectifs de form.
manque de temps à entrainer	individu non qualifié

autres: _____

commentaires:

27. Pensez-vous que la formation des homologues ou la formation un-sur-un est un moyen utile pour le transfert de connaissances et de compétences dans les pays en voie de développement? Oui Non

commentaires:

28. Selon vous, quels sont les éléments nécessaires pour établir une relation de travail efficace avec un individu à l'étranger?

29. Avez-vous des suggestions afin d'améliorer la formation actuelle des homologues?

meilleure description du mandat	plus de temps pour entrainer
meilleur sélection des hom.	pas de hom. "professionnels"
garder l'hom. pour tout le proj.	objectifs de formation clairs
formation une priorité	formation fait partie du projet
formation de l'entraîneur	autres:_____

commentaires:

30. a) Y a-t-il eu des facteurs hors de votre contrôle personnel qui ont nuit à votre efficacité à l'étranger? Enumérez-les ici.

b) Y a-t-il eu des facteurs qui ont facilité votre efficacité à l'étranger? Enumérez-les ici.

31. Avez-vous des suggestions afin d'évaluer les canadiens actuellement en affectation à l'étranger en termes de l'efficacité de formation?

32. En conclusion, si on vous demandait un seul conseil pour ceux qui montent les projets de développement avec la formation mandaté, que serait-il?