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The problem with which this study is concerned is the degree of utilization by foreign officers, who were selected for the United States International Military Education and Training Program (IMET), to train their fellow navy officers and men upon returning to their home countries. The purposes of this study are (1) to identify and evaluate methods that may be used to monitor and verify that the American training of foreign officers is being used as intended by Congress; (2) to examine the subsequent impact of such training on indigenous educational and training capabilities; (3) to examine the methods used to select the officers to be included in the IMET program; and (4) to examine funding allocations for IMET to discover if a rational budgeting process exists.

Since twenty-one foreign-aid countries utilized 87 per cent of IMET resources from 1980 through 1983, the United States officials were surveyed who oversee this program within each of these twenty-one countries (as identified from a list of the fifty-four foreign-aid countries provided by the Chief of Naval Operations). Responses, which were received from all contacted officials, are reported by frequency and percentage.
Following are selected conclusions that appear to be warranted by the numerous findings of this study. An evaluation of the effectiveness of the IMET program appears to depend entirely upon the degree of cooperation between on site officials of the United States and the foreign-aid countries in regard to both the officer selection and post-IMET assignment processes; such cooperation appears to be lacking in the majority of countries. The fact that there are no enforceable guidelines for IMET contributes to these problems, and United States funding restrictions also hamper adequate controls. While the United States and Thailand appear to have a cooperative, workable program, whether or not their procedures could be formulated into general guidelines is questionable given national differences.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Since 1961, foreign countries have been permitted to send military officers to the United States to receive functional training and to study in institutions of higher education. In 1976, a specific act of Congress (6) was passed to authorize foreign military aid in the form of higher education and training for these officers.

Upon returning to their home countries, it has been expected that these officers would be assigned to positions which would enable them to utilize the education they received in the United States. Very little information seems to be available concerning the actual placement of these officers upon their return.

Today, the United States is experiencing a greater demand for such military assistance not only from developing but industrialized nations (2). These requests stem in large measure from population unrest brought about by poverty, unemployment, and other socioeconomic dysfunctions in the developing nations and from the need to suppress disruption and promote orderly growth in the industrialized nations.
According to Hartmann (2, p. 11), military assistance was not considered as a vehicle for international assistance prior to World War II because of the United States' policy of isolation. Immediately following World War II, however, the United States did not return to the previous policy of isolationism; the position of foreign assistance was accepted when the need for military assistance arose in Greece and Turkey in 1947. On March 12, 1947, President Harry S. Truman made a commitment to accept our global responsibility for other countries, and this became known as the Truman Doctrine (2, p. 19).

According to Brown and Opie (1), the next important shift in foreign policy was occasioned by the outbreak of the Korean War in June of 1950. This threat of direct military action by a communist-bloc nation resulted in the passage of the Mutual Security Act of 1951. Since this act characterized military support as purely defensive, it did not involve education and training of foreign military personnel except for the on-the-job-training and technical assistance that was required to operate equipment furnished by the United States.

The Mutual Security Act of 1951 was replaced by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (5). Although this act does not specify foreign military education and training, it does imply that this facet should be considered as a part of military assistance. In 1976, the Arms Export Control Act
(6) was passed to include specific authority for military education and training, replacing the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. The legislative history of this significant law will be discussed in more detail in later sections of this dissertation.

It should be noted that the process of commitment by the United States to foreign military education and training was an evolutionary process and that, through this vehicle, a maximum effectiveness was intended to be attained in order for the foreign nations to contribute more to their own defense. The key issue is whether or not this type of assistance is actually being used for direct improvement by the individual branches of the foreign military forces.

Statement of the Problem

This study concerns the degree of utilization by selected foreign naval officers of their education and training in the United States to, in turn, train other officers and men in their own navy.

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to identify and evaluate methods that may be used to monitor and verify that the American-directed education and training of foreign officers is being utilized as intended by the United States Congress. This study examines the law and provides data to determine if changes are needed in the system in order both to satisfy
the intent of Congress and to improve indigenous self-
sufficiency.

Research Questions

Based on the problem and purpose of this study, the
following research questions were formulated to guide this research.

1. Is the intent of the law being carried out in regard to foreign officers' utilization of their American education and training upon return to the parent country?

2. Have the officers' American education and training been incorporated or implemented into the recipient country's formal military training programs?

3. What procedures are being used to provide specific data concerning the assignment and use of the returning foreign officer? Are new procedures recommended?

4. What factors are used by the Department of Defense to formulate the policy for determining the allocation of International Military Education and Training funds to the recipient countries?

5. What selection process is used by U.S. Foreign Assistance Officers to qualify a foreign officer for International Military Education and Training Program funding?

Limitations of the Study

Due to the lack of complete records in the U.S. Departments of the Army and Air Force, this study is limited to
and by the IMET Program records of the U.S. Navy. These Navy data cover the years from 1980 through 1983.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following terms are defined.

**IMET Program** is the International Military Education and Training Program of the United States, which is designed to train foreign personnel using United States appropriated funds.

**FAO** is the Foreign Assistance Officer, who is a civilian or military person attached to either the Office of the Defense Attaché or the Chief, Military Assistance Group.

**MAG** is the Military Assistance Group, that coordinates all military assistance programs in the foreign country and is directly responsible to the U.S. Ambassador.

**MASM** is the Military Assistance and Sales Manual, that prescribes all of the procedures for assigning and funding trainees.

**WCN** is the designation number used to identify the funding data for the student officer.

The Significance of the Study

At no other time in the history of the United States has the demand for military assistance for the free nations of the world been so great. Since 1961, according to Liestner and Friedman (4), approximately 24,000 foreign
naval officers have received functional training and graduate degrees in the United States. Prior to this time, the U. S. had spent billions of dollars in bilateral efforts (such as the lend-lease programs) and international projects (such as the United Nations and the World Bank). Subsequently, these authors continue, in March of 1946, worsening relations with Russia prompted Winston Churchill's "Iron Curtain" speech and, in 1947, the Communist pressures on Greece and Turkey caused the United States to implement the Truman Doctrine. American policy makers concluded, Hartman (2) reveals, that the security of the nation depended upon the consistent and permanent employment of United States' military power to halt the Soviet expansion.

On March 12, 1947, President Harry S. Truman stated that peace and freedom for the United States depended upon the preservation of the free world because totalitarian regimes imposed on free peoples, by direct or indirect oppression, undermined the foundations of international peace and hence the security of the United States (2). This commitment by the President to accept our global responsibilities became known as the Truman Doctrine.

Liestner and Friedman (4) point out that the next important shift in foreign policy was occasioned by the outbreak of the Korean War on June 25, 1950, which marked the first time that a Communist country attempted expansion through the form of direct military attack. This attack
on the Republic of South Korea emphasized the military power of the Soviet bloc and resulted in an increased emphasis on defense in the United States and Europe. Hartmann (2) says that this new orientation was responded to by enactment of the Mutual Security Act of 1951. The Act characterized the support as purely "defensive" and did not necessarily involve education and training of foreign military personnel except for the on-the-job-training and technical assistance required to operate equipment furnished by the United States.

The Mutual Security Act remained valid until the passage of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; this law authorized the President to furnish military assistance to any friendly nation or international organization that the President believed would lend strength to the security of the United States and promote world peace (5). Although this act did not include specific provisions for foreign military education and training, Hovey (3) says that it was strongly stated by General Robert J. Wood, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Security Affairs, in his answer to the question, "What is military assistance?"

It is not economic aid, development loans, agriculture assistance, technical grants, food for peace, or other non-military endeavors. It is not money given to foreign governments. It is a program which provides military weapons and training to those allied and friendly nations which share our view as to the threat of international communism. It is a program which brings to our country several thousand foreign military students annually, exposing such students not only to the American military knowledge but also to the American way of life. It is an arm of the U.S.
foreign policy and an extension of the defense posture at bargain basement prices.

A great country cannot avoid either the responsibilities or the risks of greatness. In the world of today the United States bears the mantel of leadership. It must carry burdens which other great powers have carried in other days. To do less would not be in keeping with the legacy from its own past (3, p. 5).

In June, 1976, the Arms Export Control Act (6) modified the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (5) in that the modification included a specific section and authority for International Military Education and Training (IMET). The legislative history of the Act indicates that the U.S. House of Representatives' Foreign Relations Committee (7) conducted an in-depth review of security assistance programs and concluded the record of international military education and training programs had demonstrated that such programs are the most effective form of military assistance and should be retained.

The committee found that the program allowed individuals an opportunity to form lasting and durable relationships with their U.S. counterparts and that this was invaluable to U.S. security interests (7). This new section of the law (6) allows for attendance by foreign military officers at military educational and training facilities, special courses of instruction at schools and institutions of higher education and research, and observation and orientation visits to military facilities and activities in the United States and abroad.
The Congress declared that the purpose of the law was to encourage effective and mutually beneficial relations and understanding in the furtherance of the goals of international peace. Additionally, the second purpose was to improve the ability of the participating country to utilize indigenous resources, including U.S. defense articles, with maximum effectiveness in order to contribute to greater self-reliance (6). One of the major aspects that Congress does not desire is to retrain the foreign officer into a "mirror image" of his U.S. counterpart (6).

Since 1976, the Arms Export Control Act has authorized foreign countries to send approximately 14,000 military officers to enroll in various programs in U.S. training facilities and institutions of higher education (6). This study examines the policy for selecting the countries to receive IMET funds, the assignment of the foreign officers upon return home, the effectiveness of the post-training monitoring process, and it attempts to determine if the spirit of the law and the intent of Congress is being met.

The availability of more information concerning both the need for an improved monitoring procedure and the post-training utilization of the foreign officer could prove to be of significant value to the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief, Defense Security Assistance Agency, and others who are concerned with policymaking and allocation of funds to the various countries. Such information could assist
these organizations in determining future training requirements for foreign countries, which would also affect the budgeting process.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I introduces the study, states the problem, gives the purpose of the study, indicates the limitations, defines specific terms used in the study, and gives a brief overview of the procedures. Chapter II presents a review of related research. Chapter III describes the methods and procedures followed in organizing the research study and collecting data, indicates the manner in which the data were processed, and gives an overview of the policy that guides the various elements of the U.S. Department of Defense in the allocation of funds for the IMET Program. Chapter IV contains the findings, and Chapter V presents a summary of the study, conclusions, and recommendations.
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CHAPTER II
SURVEY OF RELATED RESEARCH

Introduction

To provide a background for this study, a review of the related literature is necessary in order to develop a conceptual understanding of the structures and processes involved in American foreign assistance—especially the area of military assistance. The literature relevant to the study is of three types: (a) that which deals with basic foreign assistance; (b) that which deals with international military education and training; and (c) that which examines policy and context evaluation.

History of American Foreign Assistance

The literature that examines American foreign assistance is extremely limited. Prior to World War II, foreign military assistance had not been developed; subsequent to the war, only economic aid was delivered until the expansion of communism became apparent in 1947 (25).

According to Hartmann (25), the United States has never experienced total economic or cultural isolation from the rest of the world. On the contrary, the government actively promoted foreign commerce, and American intellectual life owes much to the influx of European developments and ideals.
Although America enjoyed these commercial and intellectual relations with the rest of the world, American foreign policy was devoid of political commitment.

During the 1950s, a few literary works begin to appear to explain American involvement in foreign military assistance. Hartmann's (25) short work, *The Marshall Plan*, outlines the beginning of the foreign aid program and America's acceptance of global responsibility to maintain world peace. Brown and Opie (6) examine in detail our nation's early experience with different vehicles of foreign assistance in *American Foreign Assistance*. They cite the longstanding problem of adopting policies that will, by their effects, reduce or eliminate the need for continual dollar assistance (6, p. 452).

*United States Military Aid* by Hovey (27) provides a factual description and analysis of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. Hovey is one of the earliest writers to allude to the need to train foreign officers in the United States (27, p. 174). McClelland's (33) *U.S. Foreign Aid* gives an insight into the attempt by Congress to formulate a policy for foreign military assistance; however, since the policy did not evolve into a normal process due to the vacillation of Congress, the program has remained a controversial issue. *Arms Across the Sea* by Farley and others (21) explores the role of the United States in the world arms market, the development of the U.S. military aid and sales
program, the question of foreign co-production, and the kinds of choices policymakers face in offering to export armaments. The authors suggest criteria for evaluating the utility of military equipment transfers, and they conclude that the U.S. interests might best be served by practicing restraint in the exportation of arms and other military equipment and by striving to educate and train foreign military personnel in the United States.

Collective Defense and Foreign Assistance by Clem (9) emphasizes the need to share the burdens of defense; all nations should commit some resources—money, personnel, material, or basing facilities. Pranger and Tahtinen (36) present a model for analyzing military assistance programs and their view of incremental reforms in Toward a Realistic Military Assistance Program. Military Aid and Counter-revolution in the Third World by Wolpin (51) reviews the necessity for military aid to counter anti-democratic revolutionary movements in the Third World. He recommends in-country training for the pro-democratic forces.

Gervasi (23) considers it very necessary for America to maintain a military assistance program in order to control the flow of arms around the world and to increase intelligence development about otherwise unknown internal situations. Military assistance could be utilized as a method to control the level of aggressive activity.
Numerous articles (3, 7, 10, 22, 31, 43, 45) pertaining to military assistance stress the desire of Congress to maintain the program; however, since the basic rules fluctuate each year, policy formulation is difficult, and the congressional allocation of military assistance is still based on either political expediency in regard to a particular foreign country or the country's importance to a region.

The International Military Education and Training Program

The review of related literature on the subject of international military education and training is closely related to the types of education available in foreign countries because the major reason for foreign military people coming to the United States is to gain knowledge that is unavailable in the foreign environment. Berry (4) discusses the types of foreign education and their ineffective methods, especially in developing nations, in The Quality of Education in Developing Countries. D'Aeth (19, p. 10) states in Education and Development in the Third World that education would contribute to nation building by fostering a growing respect for each nation's culture and traditions and by aiding the development of political maturity. The combining of these two elements would bring about orderly leadership with freedom of thought, expression, and respect for individual rights.
In Foreign Students in the United States of America: Coping Behavior within the Education Environment, Hull (28) suggests that of the many problems that exist with the foreign student, one of the major factors is the adjustment to the American educational environment. For example, rote learning is not acceptable in the United States, but it is the predominant teaching and learning method used in most foreign countries. He emphasizes that American educators need to know about these difficulties so that they can both assist the foreign student to adapt to the American environment and help to create an atmosphere where the cultural shock is lessened. Nancy Parkinson (35) emphasizes in Educational Aid and Nation Development that the individuals who work with foreign students must be carefully selected advisors, experts, and teachers, all of whom should be aware of the social and economic conditions of the home countries and, most especially, the political situation which could be in constant flux. American teachers should know these factors in order to prepare these students to return to their countries as productive citizens, not indigenous expatriates. Simmon writes in The Education Dilemma (40, p. 2) that the cost of educating a foreign student in his own country takes funds away from more immediate needs of the indigenous society when he can receive a more comprehensive education in the United States.
The U.S. Navy Department's International Education Programs Index (44) outlines the various courses of instruction open to foreign students and details the congressional allocation for the specific fiscal year to fund IMET. In all of the congressional hearings (46, 47, 48, 49) the need for education and training is emphasized. The hearings outline the current belief that through continued education the foreign student will return to his country and educate his own personnel in fields required to promote self-sufficiency. To further this avenue of thought, Lefever (30) outlines the various phases of military assistance education and training, indicating that such aid is of paramount importance, if less reliance upon the U.S. military is to be expected.

Literature on Policy and Research Methodology

The literature for policy and policy process and research methodology is abundant but not especially relevant to this study except for purposes of definition. In the realm of policy formulation, as previously stated, since Congress has not established a formal policy on the allocation of foreign assistance funds, it is accomplished on a contingency basis. The allocation is done by the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force after the receipt of funds and passed to the countries. Wiessman (50) states in The Trojan Horse that military assistance is a sophisticated instrument of control and that well-defined formulated
policies are needed to insure its effectiveness. In *The Politics of Policy Implementation*, Nakamura and Smallwood (34) define the implementation of policy as a process of carrying out authoritative public directives, but they note that the process is neither easy nor automatic. The policy process involves a definite pattern that proceeds from policy formulation to implementation and evaluation, and many literary works (1, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 29, 32, 34, 39, 41) that outline the various concepts are discussed in Chapter III of this study.

One of the most helpful works used in the analysis of data is Stufflebeam's (42) *Educational Evaluation and Decision Making*. This work assisted in determining that context evaluation should be used for this study because it affords a rational method for determining if the objectives of the IMET Program are being realized. Babbie's *Survey Research Techniques* (2), Borg's *Educational Research* (5), and Holsti's *Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities* (26) guided in the construction of the questionnaire and the analysis of data.

Summary

The literature indicates that there is a growing need for international military education and training if the worldwide U.S. military presence is to be reduced. There is also a growing awareness of the fact that a formal policy
does not exist for the foreign military assistance field; without a definite policy, the allocated funds can not be prudently utilized. Lack of research deters the U.S. armed services departments from evaluating the IMET Program, gathering information concerning the utilization of his American education and training once the officer has returned to his parent service, and determining the types of programs required to bring the foreign military force to a point of self-sufficiency and a more positive defense posture.
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CHAPTER III

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES, METHODS, AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present both the program objectives of the International Military Education and Training Program and the methods and procedures used to obtain and analyze the data received for this research study. The survey method of research was used to examine the procedures by which a foreign officer is (a) selected for educational training, (b) monitored while he is a student, and (c) monitored during the post-training phase upon his return to his home country. The questionnaire which was answered and returned by the chiefs of the military assistance groups or the defense attachés is designed to reveal whether or not a new procedure is required in order to determine if the foreign officers' education or training is actually contributing to the self-sufficiency of the military establishment of the foreign country.

Program Objectives and Procedures of the Program

The program objectives of the International Military Education and Training Program are stated in the Military Assistance and Sales Manual (3). The stated five
objectives in providing education and training for foreign military personnel are

a. To create skills needed for effective operation and maintenance of equipment acquired from the United States;

b. To assist the foreign country in developing expertise and systems needed for effective management of its defense establishment;

c. To foster development by the foreign country of its own indigenous training capability;

d. To promote United States military rapport with the armed forces of the foreign country;

e. To promote better understanding of the United States, including its people, political system, and other institutions.

Initially, all of the objectives stated above should be pursued simultaneously with emphasis shifting progressively from operation and maintenance to management of in-country capabilities, and finally to the maintenance of military rapport. The ultimate objective is to limit programs to the latter and should be pursued as rapidly as possible consistent with the achievement of overall objectives.

To the extent consistent with the military requirement and the achievement of the objectives, emphasis should be placed on the following:

a. The training of individuals who are likely in the future to occupy key positions of responsibility within the foreign country's armed forces;

b. Education that encourages military professionalism and the interchange of military doctrine, particularly by attendance at United States schools at the advanced career and command and staff levels;

c. Training related to the management of resources at all levels with the foreign country's defense establishment (3, p. E-1).

A second element of the program concerns both the selection of the foreign officers and their monitoring upon
return to their home countries. The Military Assistance and Sales Manual explicitly states,

a. To the extent practicable, personnel trained under the auspices of this program, and particularly those attending United States schools, will be selected from career personnel likely in the future to occupy key positions in the foreign country's defense establishment. Except as may be authorized specifically by the Defense Security Assistance Agency, the requirement for selection of career personnel is mandatory for attendance at professional level (e.g., command and staff or equivalent and higher, college level) schools.

b. Under the direction and supervision of Commanders of Unified Commands, MAAG's and Defense Attachés are responsible for obtaining appropriate assurances that personnel trained under the auspices of this program are properly and effectively utilized. Such utilization is defined as prompt employment of the individual in the skill for which trained for a period of time sufficient to warrant the expense to the United States.

A system of periodic review of trainee assignments should be incorporated into the MAAG/ODC operating procedures. As a guide, optimum assignment periods are considered to be three years for flight instruction and highly technical training such as missile training, and not less than two years for other training, particularly instructor training.

c. To the extent consistent with available resources, MAAGs and ODCs are expected to maintain surveillance over utilization of United States trained personnel with emphasis on the more critical and higher level skills and personnel attending schools in the United States (3, p. E-3).

A major constraint in the IMET program is that of funding. Since the funding policy is inconsistent from fiscal year to fiscal year and is not well defined in the myriad of Department of Defense instructions and memorandums, funding has not been made a part of nor will be discussed in this research.
Methods and Procedures of the Study

**Population Identification**

The Office of the Chief of Naval Operations (Security Assistance Division) and the Chief of Naval Education and Training provided the data for all foreign officers trained under U.S. Navy funding for the fiscal years 1980 through 1983 (1). This list served as the primary source document to determine the population for this research study. The study is limited to data from the Department of the Navy because these data seem to be the most comprehensive and complete from the three United States armed forces.

**Sample Size**

Fifty-four countries are identified as recipients of IMET funds for the fiscal years 1980, 1981, 1982, and 1983. Of the 54 countries, 21 countries utilized approximately 87 percent of the funding for the four fiscal years and thereby constitute an adequate sample. These 21 countries provided 2,063 of the 2,369 total trainees.

**Training Programs**

The formal training, post-graduate training, and management training programs are conducted at the level of higher education in the United States, not the post-secondary level. Only the officers' functional instructor training is conducted at the level of post-secondary education in the United States.
The formal training is conducted at the Command and Staff Colleges, the National War College, and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces. This training is considered to be on the master's level of education. Formal training at the Command and Staff Colleges instructs senior-grade officers in the methods of conducting various types of conventional and nuclear warfare, communications, logistics, and strategic planning. This phase of formal training gives the United States an opportunity to demonstrate its concept of how a war should be conducted; therefore, if its friendly nations would adopt a common methodology for conducting warfare, a greater coordination would be possible in the case of global or localized conflicts. The National War College affords senior-grade officers the opportunity to both gain a global view of geo-politics and study the various political situations that exist in the world today. This type of study is unusual because many countries do not permit the study or discussion of other nations' politics or political ideologies. Additionally, unclassified intelligence assists foreign officers in contributing to the strategic planning for their home countries.

The Industrial College of the Armed Forces is one of the most remarkable military educational facilities in the world today. The college enrolls senior-grade officers for the purpose of teaching and demonstrating the functions of the industrial-defense complex of the United States. After
one year of study, students are taken to both industrialized and developing nations to observe how such nations have created and are creating their indigenous industrial-defense complexes. Advanced management techniques and innovative planning are stressed at the Industrial College of the Armed Forces.

The post-graduate training is conducted at major universities in the United States and at the Navy Post Graduate School in Monterey, California. It is extremely advantageous to the United States to conduct this training because the officers who are attending the courses of study are the future key officers of their countries. The foreign officers not only obtain advanced degrees but also the length of time spent in the United States strengthens rapport between the foreign officers and the United States military officers. Although post-graduate training normally has been directed toward technical degrees, in recent years the training has broadened to include personnel administration, a master's in business administration, and degrees in higher education. This innovation demonstrates an awareness that qualified personnel are necessary to all facets of an armed force, not only the technical sectors.

Management training is conducted over various lengths of time, from three months to nine months, at selected defense installations and defense-contractor locations throughout the United States. Most of the training
terminates at the Department of Defense in Washington, D.C. The management training is directed toward the senior officers and is used mostly by countries that are developing an industrial-defense complex or that depend upon heavy logistic support from the United States. The training curriculum, which includes all aspects of logistics, production, and contracts, is a major tool in developing the foreign country's self-sufficiency.

The Functional/Instructor Training program is used to train officers of all ranks in the operation and maintenance of the equipment that is furnished by the United States. This knowledge is then used to upgrade the foreign country's training facilities and curricula. Table I contains the names of the twenty-one selected countries and how they utilized the IMET program.

The data in Table I indicate that the highest utilization of educational training is by those countries which are developing and creating an industrial-defense complex—Egypt, Greece, Indonesia, Korea, the Philippines, Thailand, and Turkey. These countries exist with the constant threat of armed conflict. Of the total training and educational billets allocated to the twenty-one selected countries, Egypt used 6.4 per cent; Indonesia used 9.9 per cent; Korea used 19.5 per cent; the Philippines used 8.2 per cent; Thailand used 11.7 per cent; and Greece and Turkey, the
eastern cornerstone nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, used 15 per cent. In contrast to this high

Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Formal Training</th>
<th>P/G Training</th>
<th>Management Training</th>
<th>Functional/Instructor Training</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6/67</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31/00</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15/00</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35/00</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>78/04</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>121/00</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9/00</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100/15</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21/00</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>196/19</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53/00</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/00</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12/00</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41/02</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>101/06</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45/02</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>118/00</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri-Lanka</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11/00</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>170/14</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11/00</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>65/05</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>225</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>226</td>
<td><strong>1,240/67</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,063</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining 33 Countries</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>183/05</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>302</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>259</td>
<td><strong>1,423/72</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,369</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

utilization, the remaining thirty-three countries used only 13 per cent of the total IMET billets allocated for the four fiscal years from 1980 through 1983.
Development of the Survey Instruments

The survey instruments (Appendices A and B) used to conduct this research study are questionnaires that are designed by the researcher and based on information in federal laws and policies as well as knowledge gained from several years of personal experience in foreign military assistance. The questionnaires reflect the research questions in this study and also permit the respondents to interject personal opinions. The instruments were designed to provide a simple answering process because of the large number of responses required from some of the United States officials.

A panel of experts (Appendix C) was contacted concerning a content evaluation of the questionnaires. The first drafts of the questionnaires were presented to the doctoral committee, and some revisions were made as suggested by the committee. Subsequently, the panel of experts agreed that the revisions were valid.

Survey

The questionnaires, along with an appropriate cover letter (Appendix D) that explains the purpose of the research study, were mailed with a preaddressed return envelope to the chiefs of the military advisory groups or the defense attachés in the twenty-one selected countries. In order to ensure delivery in remote countries that do not maintain Fleet Post Offices (FPO) or Army Post Offices (APO), the United States Department of State permitted the researcher
to use Department of State diplomatic pouches from Washington, D.C., to the appropriate United States embassies overseas. In order to record responses, a record was maintained indicating the address of the military assistance groups or defense attachés, the date the questionnaires were mailed, the number of students from each country, and the date that each response was received. A followup telephone call was made four weeks after mailing in an effort to obtain the largest possible response rate. Within six weeks, responses had been received from all twenty-one selected countries.

Processing the Data

As the questionnaires were returned from the various offices, a tally sheet was made for each country and each question. Since most of the items on the Student Officer Questionnaire were designed to permit the respondents to answer objectively, percentage and frequency were selected as an appropriate method of analysis for these data.

The questionnaire for the Foreign Assistance Officers was designed to ascertain if the student officers were (a) chosen, (b) monitored while in the United States, and (c) followed up adequately upon return to their home countries in accordance with the directives of the Military Assistance and Sales Manual (3, p. E-3). The questionnaire requires an opinion from the respondent and is considered to be
appropriate for the evaluation of the data using context evaluation.

According to Stufflebeam and others,

Context evaluation is one of the most basic types of evaluation. Its purpose is to provide a rationale for determining objectives. Specifically it defines the relevant environment, describes the desired and actual conditions pertaining to that environment, identifies unmet needs and unused opportunities, and diagnoses the problems that prevent needs from being met and opportunities from being used. Diagnosis of problems provides an essential basis for developing objectives whose achievement results in program improvement.

The methodology of context evaluation can be divided into two modes: contingency and congruence. In the contingency mode, context evaluation searches for opportunities and pressures outside of the immediate system to promote improvement within it. The second mode of context evaluation—congruence—compares actual and intended system performance (2, p. 218).

The congruence mode of context evaluation is used in this research since it examines the system to determine whether or not goals and objectives are being achieved as intended by the United States Department of Defense. The contingency mode is not discussed or used in this research paper.

The statistical tables, based on frequencies and percentages, are presented in Chapter IV. After the presentation and summarization of the data are presented for each question in the questionnaires, an evaluation is made based on the respondents' evaluation of the IMET Program in the twenty-one selected countries.
Summary

The program objectives of the IMET Program are to create skills, develop the foreign country's management system for the defense establishment, develop an indigenous training capability, promote a greater intercountry rapport, and promote a better understanding of the United States, its culture, social aspects, political facets, and general way of life. The second element of the program concerns the selection and subsequent monitoring of the foreign officers after their return to their home countries.

The survey method of research is utilized to determine the procedures and processes by which a foreign officer is selected and monitored, both during and after training, to find out if the policy as outlined in MASM (3) is being carried out. The population was identified from computer lists furnished by the Chief of Naval Operations. The survey instruments were developed by the researcher and evaluated by the doctoral committee and a panel of experts. Usable returns were obtained from all twenty-one selected countries, which equals a 100 per cent response rate.
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CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSES OF DATA

Introduction

This chapter presents the analyses of data collected from responses to the survey instruments. These data are presented in tabular form by frequency and percentages. The format of the analysis follows the sequence of the research questions as they appear in Chapter I.

The Survey

The questionnaires were developed and the resulting data are used to evaluate the actual occurrences within the International Military Education and Training Program and to determine if the objectives of the program, as stated in the Military Assistance and Sales Manual (3), are being met. The questionnaires, which were developed by the researcher, were evaluated by the doctoral committee and a panel of experts (see Chapter III).

The survey method of research was used because it is the most efficient means of communicating with the United States officials in the twenty-one selected countries. This method also made it possible to obtain responses from different cultural, social, and military environments.
The population was identified from a computerized list provided by the Chief of Naval Education and Training with the permission of the United States Navy, Chief of Naval Operations. The twenty-one countries were selected because they utilized approximately 87 per cent of the IMET funding for the four fiscal years from 1980 through 1983.

Copies of the questionnaires, along with an explanatory cover letter, were mailed to the chiefs of military assistance groups or to the United States defense attaches in countries that did not maintain a military assistance group. Subsequent telephone calls to the commands that had not responded after four weeks results in a 100 per cent response rate.

Analyses of Data

Chapter I presented the research questions for this study. The data analyses follow the sequence of these research questions.

Utilization of the Foreign Officer after Returning Home

Research question one asks, "Is the intent of the law being carried out in regard to foreign officers' utilization of their American education and training upon return to the parent country?" The Military Assistance and Sales Manual states,

Under the direction and supervision of Commanders of Unified Commands, MAAGs/ODCs/Missions are responsible for obtaining appropriate assurances that
personnel trained under the auspices of this program are properly and effectively utilized. Such utilization is defined as prompt employment of the individual in the skill for which trained for a period of time sufficient to warrant the expense to the United States. A system of periodic review of trainees' assignments should be incorporated into MAAGs/ODCs/Missions operating procedures. As a guide optimum assignment periods are considered to be three years for flight instruction and highly technical training and post graduate training, particularly instructor training (3, p. E-3).

Survey question one on the Student Officer Questionnaire (Appendix B) requests the respondents to indicate how the officer was utilized upon return to his home country. The responses are presented in Table II.

Table II indicates that the assignment of 37.4 per cent of the officers returning home is unknown. The trend appears to be that the countries with the highest utilization are not revealing the assignments of the returning officers to United States' authorities. The second trend indicates that 27.7 per cent of the officers are being assigned to operational billets that have no training involvement; only 7.9 per cent of the returnees are being assigned to billets that are primarily educational and training jobs. This would indicate that the officers' U.S. training is being given token recognition by the recipient country and not the emphasis required by MASM (3). The 5.9 per cent of the U.S.-trained personnel who are assigned to operational billets that involve training indicates that quality training is not being passed on in the foreign country. Quality training is difficult aboard ship because the proper
TABLE II
OFFICER UTILIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a*</td>
<td>b*</td>
<td>c*</td>
<td>d*</td>
<td>e*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Assignment to educational training billet;
  b. Assignment to an operational billet, part-time training;
  c. Assignment to an operational billet, no training involved;
  d. Assignment unknown;
  e. Training not completed when survey made.

Nevertheless, an interpretation of Table II data indicates that the great majority of the returning officers are not...
being utilized as the MASM prescribes, and these stated objectives of the program are not being met.

**Improvement in the Recipient Country's Training Program**

Research question two asks, "Have the officers' American education and training been incorporated or implemented into the recipient country's formal military training programs?" The Military Assistance and Sales Manual states that one of the objectives of the IMET Program is to "foster development by the foreign country of its own indigenous training capabilities" (3, p. E-3). Question two of the Student Officer Questionnaire requests respondents to indicate to what degree the formal military education and training curriculum has been modified as a result of United States training. Table III data show the result of the survey.

The data in Table III show that the chiefs of the military assistance groups or the defense attachés do not know what happens to the foreign officers when they return home. Of the returning officers, it is "unknown" what impact 38.5 per cent of these U.S. trained officers have on the education and training capabilities of their recipient countries. This is an indication that surveillance efforts cannot be maintained by U.S. authorities, and this deters the U.S. from being of maximum benefit to their foreign counterparts. Of the returning officers, 29.4 per cent are known to have no impact upon the training capabilities of their armed force.
### TABLE III

DEGREE OF CHANGE IN FOREIGN MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING CURRICULUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Major Change</th>
<th>Minimal Change</th>
<th>No Change</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>TI*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
<td><strong>222</strong></td>
<td><strong>291</strong></td>
<td><strong>160</strong></td>
<td><strong>756</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>38.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Training incomplete.

These data indicate that a total of 67.9 per cent of the returning officers may not be being utilized to improve the indigenous military education and training capabilities.

Only 1.6 per cent of the foreign officers will be factors in making changes in their country's military education and training capability, and only 9.4 per cent will make minimum contributions to change. The Military Assistance and Sales
Manual (3) clearly states that the objective of the IMET Program is to foster the development of the indigenous training capability. Considering the small percentage of officers who make an impact upon their country's educational and training capability, the United States authorities are not fulfilling—due to circumstances, may be unable to fulfill—their tasks as directed by the MASM.

Improvement of the Monitoring of Returning Foreign Officers

Research question three asks, "What procedures are being used to provide specific data concerning the assignment and use of the returning foreign officer? Are new procedures recommended?" Question one of the United States foreign assistance officer's questionnaire (Appendix A) asks how the monitoring could be improved. The Military Assistance and Sales Manual states,

To the extent consistent with available resources, MAAGs/ODCs/Missions are expected to maintain surveillance over United States trained personnel with emphasis on the more critical and higher level skills and personnel attending United States Schools. Periodic reports rendered by appropriate foreign authorities normally will satisfy this requirement (3, p. E-3).

Table IV data show the aggregate opinions of the 21 selected chiefs, military assistance groups, and defense attachés.

Table IV data indicate that 9 of the 21 chiefs of military assistance groups or defense attachés are of the opinion that if the foreign country would inform U.S. authorities of the U.S.-trained officer's assignments, then
TABLE IV

OPINIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE OFFICER MONITORING PROCESS

The Process Could Be Improved if: Number of Opinions

| Better records were maintained by the FAO | 2 |
| Better records were maintained by the recipient country | 5 |
| Periodic follows were conducted by the FAO | 3 |
| Foreign officers' assignments were made available to FAO | 9 |
| Other suggestions | 2 |

Total 21

the U.S. authorities would be able to fulfill the requirement of mandatory surveillance and, at the same time, the foreign country could fulfill its obligation. Two respondents willingly admitted that their records are incomplete and require better maintenance; 5 of the respondents believe that better maintenance of records by the recipient country is necessary if U.S. authorities are to carry out the monitoring function; 3 offices indicated that, in their opinion, U.S. authorities should maintain a periodic followup in order to discharge their assigned responsibilities. This group of ten responses shows that these respondents do not understand their responsibilities and what methods should be used to meet the requirements of the MASM (3). Only the Defense Attaché in India and the Chief of the Military Assistance Group, Thailand, stated that they could not ask for better records or cooperation from their Indian or Thai counterparts.
Allocation of IMET Funds

Research question four asks, "What factors are used by the Department of Defense to formulate the policy for determining the allocation of International Military Education and Training funds to the recipient countries?" The United States Department of Defense has to struggle constantly to obtain funding for the IMET Program; each year the funding request must be rejustified to the Congress. Illustrating this yearly rejustification is the following statement by Ernest Graves, who is a Lieutenant General and Director of Security Assistance Affairs, that was made before a House Committee:

I am concerned about the level of support for IMET funding. This committee has consistently supported the IMET program submitted by the President. Over the past four years, it approved and the House authorized close to the full amount sought by the President. Unfortunately, this support has not held through the entire appropriations process (4).

Since no consistent policies have been formulated by the United States Congress, the researcher interviewed Henry Garza (1) by telephone on February 24, 1984; Garza holds a General Service Rating 15 (GS-15) and is assigned to the office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Foreign Assistance Division. Garza, who has been in foreign assistance for eleven years and is now the International Military Education and Training Program Manager for the Pacific and Far Eastern Commands, stated that the IMET funds are allocated to the Department of Defense in a lump-sum amount, and
requirements would be difficult to project prior to the Congressional allocation. After receipt of the funds, the Department of Defense, in concert with the United States Department of State, allocates funds to certain countries that are called "cornerstone" countries. At the present time, these countries are Egypt, Greece, Indonesia, Korea, the Philippines, Portugal, and Turkey. Any remaining funds are allocated to countries with which the United States needs to maintain a political profile, and through these funds the foreign country can make changes in their training and educational facilities to improve their indigenous defense establishment. So far as IMET funding is concerned, there is no rational policy for allocation; IMET funding is made according to the winds of politics (1).

Selection of Foreign Officers for United States Training

Research question five asks, "What selection process is used by U.S. Foreign Assistance Officers to qualify a foreign officer for International Military Education and Training Program Funding?"

To the extent practicable, personnel trained under auspices of this program, and particularly those attending United States schools, will be selected from career personnel likely in the future to occupy key positions in the foreign country's defense establishment. Except as may be authorized by the Director of Security Assistance Affairs, the requirement for the selection of career personnel is mandatory for attendance at professional level (e.g., command and staff or equivalent and higher, college level) schools (3, p. E-3).
Question three of the Foreign Assistance Officer Questionnaire (Appendix A) specifically asks, "How are the officers selected to participate in the IMET Program?" Table V lists these methods for officer selection.

**TABLE V**

**OFFICER SELECTION METHODS FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE IMET PROGRAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Methods Used</th>
<th>Meets IMET Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Interview; prior training; political</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Favoritism; English ability</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Military class standing</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Career designate; needs of service</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Special promise</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Career designate; performance; academic</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Career designate; performance; academic</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Career designate; performance; academic</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Socioeconomic standing in the Kingdom</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Political; needs of service</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Availability; political; loyalty</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Career designate; performance</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Loyalty to government; political</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>English ability; political; personal dress and impression</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Political; Spanish screening board</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Family ties; Sandhurst graduate</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Career designate</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Availability; professional ties</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table V shows that six countries—Ecuador, Greece, India, Indonesia, Peru, and Thailand—adhere to the criteria for choosing officers to receive training under the auspices of IMET. The Dominican Republic chooses the officers on the basis of class standing upon graduation from the National Military Academy; although the officers who graduate from the National Military Academy are normally career designated, this does not qualify them according to the MASM (3).

The remaining fourteen countries use the age-old method of selection based on political ties, socioeconomic standing, and other nonprofessional criteria. The selection process used by the Chief, Joint United States Military Advisory Group, Thailand, is one of the most comprehensive selection methods outlined by any of the respondents. This respondent, who is Chief of the Training Programs Branch, Joint United States Military Advisory Group, Thailand, says,

The Republic of Thailand's selection process is rather like crawling through successively smaller knot holes. At the time when the operational units receive their training quotas (June to August before the fiscal year), the unit commanders announce quotas and publish eligibility requirements. Eligibility depends on English capabilities, specialty tests, rank, job, and command recommendation. Personnel who have returned from off-shore training during the previous three years cannot apply. All things being equal, seniority spells the difference in selection. The lists of most primary and alternate candidates are ready during October of the FY. On the part of JUSMAGTHAI, we take the top three candidates proposed by the Thais and administer English language tests, review their records and occasionally interview the candidates. The Thais select from among those who meet all of our eligibility criteria (2).
Table V reveals major deviations from the criteria listed in MASM (3).

Summary of Data Findings

Analysis of the data collected as responses to the research questions produced the following major findings.

1. The United States authorities are uninformed of the assignments of 37.4 per cent of the foreign officers after the officers return to their home countries.

2. Only 7.9 per cent of the returning foreign officers are being assigned to full-time positions that involve the use of their U.S. education and training.

3. Of the returning foreign officers, 27.7 per cent are being assigned to operational billets that do not involve any use of their U.S. education and training.

4. The United States authorities do not know what impact 37.5 per cent of the foreign officers will have upon the indigenous educational and training capabilities because they cannot monitor their assignments.

5. Only 1.6 per cent of the United States trained foreign officers will make major changes in the indigenous education and training capabilities.

6. Less than 30 per cent of the foreign officers will be assigned billets that will have no impact upon their defense establishment's education and training capability.

7. United States officials in 9 of the 21 surveyed countries are of the opinion that monitoring of the
returning foreign officers could be substantially improved if the foreign countries would release information about the officers' subsequent assignments.

8. United States officials in 10 of the 21 surveyed countries do not appear to understand their responsibilities in IMET and what methods should be used to monitor the returning foreign officers.

9. The United States officials in two countries do not maintain records that are adequate for monitoring the returning officers.

10. The Chief, United States Joint Military Advisory Group, Thailand, maintains a monitoring system that could be used as a model by all United States commands involved in the International Military Education and Training Program.

11. The allocation of funds for the International Military Education and Training Program are not disbursed on an "as required" basis but according to U.S. political considerations.

12. No rational budgeting process exists for the International Education and Training Program.

13. Only six of the surveyed 21 countries—Ecuador, Greece, India, Indonesia, Peru, and Thailand—adhere to the IMET criteria for choosing officers to participate in the International Education and Training Program.

14. Fourteen of the surveyed 21 countries use unprofessional methods (i.e., political ties, political loyalty,
socioeconomic status, nepotism) to select the officers for education and training under the auspices of the International Military Education and Training Program.

15. The Chief, Joint United States Military Advisory Group, Thailand, uses the most comprehensive screening process for the selection of officers to receive education and training under the International Military Education and Training Program.
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CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Introduction

This chapter summarizes the problem, purposes, methods and procedures, analyses of the data, and findings of the study. Conclusions and recommendations are presented based upon the findings in the study.

Summary

The problem with which the study was concerned is the degree of utilization by selected foreign officers of their education and training in the United States to, in turn, train other officers and men in the navy of their home country. The purposes of the study were to identify and evaluate methods that may be used to monitor and verify that the American-directed education and training of foreign officers is being utilized as intended by the United States Congress. Additionally, the study examined the impact of the officers' United States education on indigenous educational and training capabilities and the methods used to select the officers for training in the United States. The allocation of funds for the International Military Education
and Training Program was examined to see if a rational budgeting process exists.

Data for this study were collected by using two questionnaires which were devised by the researcher with the recommendations of the doctoral committee and a panel of experts. The survey method of research was used because it is the most efficient means of communicating with the United States' officials in the twenty-one selected foreign countries. This method also made it possible to obtain responses from different political, social, and cultural environments. The population was identified from a computerized list of fifty-four countries which was provided by the United States Navy, Chief of Naval Operations. The twenty-one selected countries utilized 87 per cent of the resources of the International Military Education and Training Program for the four fiscal years from 1980 through 1983. Responses to the survey instrument were received from respondents in all twenty-one countries.

In order to provide the most appropriate responses for the research questions, percentages and frequencies were used whenever possible in treating the data. It was necessary, however, to analyze some of the data using context evaluation. The congruence mode of context evaluation was used because this mode compares actual and intended system performance. For the most part, the data are presented in tabular form.
Summary of Major Data Findings

Analysis of the data collected as responses to the research questions produced the following findings.

1. The United States authorities are uninformed of the assignments of 37.4 per cent of the foreign officers after the officers return to their home countries.

2. Only 7.9 per cent of the returning foreign officers are being assigned to full-time positions that involve the use of their U.S. education and training.

3. Of the returning foreign officers, 27.7 per cent are being assigned to operational billets that do not involve any use of their U.S. education and training.

4. The United States authorities do not know what impact 37.5 per cent of the foreign officers will have upon the indigenous educational and training capabilities because they cannot monitor their assignments.

5. Only 1.6 per cent of the United States trained foreign officers will make major changes in the indigenous education and training capabilities.

Less than 30 per cent of the foreign officers will be assigned billets that will have no impact upon their defense establishment's education and training capability.

7. United States officials in 9 of the 21 surveyed countries are of the opinion that monitoring of the returning foreign officers could be substantially improved
if the foreign countries would release information about the officers' subsequent assignments.

8. United States officials in 10 of the 21 surveyed countries do not appear to understand their responsibilities in IMET and what methods should be used to monitor the returning foreign officers.

9. The United States officials in two countries do not maintain records that are adequate for monitoring the returning officers.

10. The Chief, United States Joint Military Advisory Group, Thailand, maintains a monitoring system that could be used as a model by all United States commands involved in the International Military Education and Training Program.

11. The allocation of funds for the International Military Education and Training Program are not disbursed on an "as required" basis but according to U.S. political considerations.

12. No rational budgeting process exists for the International Education and Training Program.

13. Only six of the surveyed 21 countries--Ecuador, Greece, India, Indonesia, Peru, and Thailand--adhere to the IMET criteria for choosing officers to participate in the International Education and Training Program.

14. Fourteen of the surveyed 21 countries use unprofessional methods (i.e., political ties, political loyalty, socioeconomic status, nepotism) to select the officers for
education and training under the auspices of the International Military Education and Training Program.

15. The Chief, Joint United States Military Advisory Group, Thailand, uses the most comprehensive screening process for the selection of officers to receive education and training under the International Military Education and Training Program.

Discussion of the Findings

The data findings of this study indicate that there is a general lack of knowledge on the part of United States authorities concerning their responsibilities in regard to the International Military Education and Training Program. The United States military officers who are responsible for the proper execution and management of the military education and training program appear to be more concerned with the operational matters of the foreign defense establishment than increasing the foreign country's self-sufficiency. The reason for this may be that the United States middle-grade military officers are not equipped with the management tools or given the training to manage a multimillion-dollar program in either the United States or a foreign aid country. Additionally, a lack of expertise in the education and training field may leave the United States officer deficient and unprepared to advise a foreign country on how to improve their indigenous facilities and methods.
The data results imply that there is a need for more aggressive management of the International Military Education and Training Program. Management, in this case, means having a greater depth of understanding about what is evolving in the assigned foreign country's defense establishment. This includes maintaining a rapport with the foreign officers in order to ascertain the methods used to select, monitor, assign, and utilize the returning IMET-trained officers in billets that will lead to a reduction of the country's dependence on the education and training facilities of the United States.

Since United States military officers are not usually trained in needs assessment, they do not possess this management tool, which could assist the foreign country to make a prudent assessment of their educational and training requirements. This factor appears to be a major deterrent in instituting a Strategic Training and Education Program. The capability to make accurate assessments of a foreign country's needs, and forwarding the assessment to the proper United States defense agency, could lead to a more rational budgeting procedure and allocation of resources.

Generally, it appears that the United States military assistance groups and the offices of the defense attachés do not have adequately trained personnel to ensure that the directives promulgated by the United States Department of Defense are being adhered to by both United States officials
and the officials of the foreign countries. Apparently, many United States officers establish rapport with their foreign counterparts on the social rather than the technical or professional aspects of foreign aid. Professional rapport is built on knowledge of the specifics of foreign military assistance, by adhering to the dictates of the United States Department of Defense, and by managing the foreign aid programs in the best interests of both the United States and the foreign recipient. A professional rapport would lead to a more viable and productive International Military Education and Training Program.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions appear to be warranted.

1. Unless more control can be exercised by United States authorities over the post-IMET assignments of foreign officers, there appears to be no way for the United States to evaluate the effectiveness of the IMET program according to its specified purposes as stated in the Military Assistance and Sales Manual.

2. Unless there is more cooperation between the United States and those foreign-aid countries that benefit from the IMET program in regard to the selection process of officers who receive this training, IMET billets may continue to be regarded by most of the designated foreign countries as
"political plums" to be awarded to favored officers who do not meet established U.S. selection criteria.

3. In view of the foregoing conclusions, it also may be observed that the United States is contributing (wittingly or unwittingly) to the apparent misuse of the IMET program by failing to have enforceable guidelines for the foreign officers' selection process, the subsequent foreign officers' assignment process, and by its loose (in some instances, apparently inept) supervision of the program by the inadequately trained foreign-based U.S. authorities who oversee the program.

4. Given that the IMET program is considered advantageous to the United States by the upper echelon of the Departments of State and Defense in Washington, more care should be given to the selection and training of foreign-based U.S. personnel who direct the program in regard to the intricacies of its technical and professional aspects. If data were produced to show preferred results within the indigenous military complexes, continued funding justifications might be lessened and further budget requests more readily considered and appropriated.

5. While there is a very workable and commendable U.S. supervision program in existence in Thailand, there are no guarantees that this specific program would also produce similar results in other foreign countries. Nevertheless, the success of the on-site program in Thailand suggests that
it could be used to formulate guidelines for the establishment of mutual rapport among authorities within other foreign countries that benefit from the IMET program.

Recommendations for Further Research

Future research should be directed at providing answers to the following questions.

1. Why is the monitoring process for the returning foreign officers so inadequate, and how can a uniform monitoring process be enforced throughout all foreign countries that benefit from IMET?

2. Why does the United States exercise so little control over the selection process for foreign officers, especially in regard to their qualifications for higher education study in the United States? What method is feasible to ensure that the selection process is uniform world-wide?

3. Why are qualified United States military personnel or civilian educators not used to evaluate the education and training systems of the foreign countries?

4. What steps can be taken to achieve a rational and consistent budgeting process?

5. Why is there no five-year strategic training and education program used (instead of the present year-to-year plan) in order to enhance the budgeting process?

6. What is the feasibility of using written contracts to ensure that the returning foreign officers will be utilized in the manner prescribed by the applicable directives?
7. What is being done by the United States Department of Defense to assist the United States military personnel to build a more positive rapport with their foreign counterparts (e.g., language training, social, cultural, and political orientation)?

8. What can be done to improve the military assistance groups and the offices of the defense attachés to make them more aware of their responsibilities to and the importance of the International Military Education and Training Program?
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APPENDIX A

U.S. FOREIGN ASSISTANCE OFFICER QUESTIONNAIRE

1. In order to ascertain if the U.S. education and training are being utilized to the maximum effectiveness (to the improvement of the foreign officer's navy and personnel), the monitoring process could be improved if

a. better records were maintained by the FAO __

b. better records were maintained by the recipient country ___

c. periodic followups were conducted by the FAO representative ___

d. if foreign officer assignments were made available to FAO ___

e. other suggestions (Please be specific.)

2. To what degree is this education/training mutually beneficial to the U.S. and the recipient country? (Indicate degree.)

High___ Average___ Minimal___ None___ Unknown___

3. How are the officers selected to participate in the IMET Program?

4. What type of orientation is given prior to departure for the U.S.?

5. How is the student officer monitored while in the U.S.?

6. What are the general comments made by students upon their return to their country (curriculum, social, cultural aspects)?

USE BACK OF THIS PAGE FOR COMMENTS IF NECESSARY.
APPENDIX B

STUDENT OFFICER QUESTIONNAIRE

Country: ___________  Rank: ___________  Date of Training ___________

Type of Training (MASL) ______________  WCN ______________

1. Upon return to the parent country, the officer was assigned
   a. an educational/training billet __
   b. an operational billet, training collateral duty __
   c. an operational billet, no training collateral duty __
   d. assignment unknown __

2. The formal education/training curriculum in the recipient country has been modified as a result of the U.S. training (Indicate degree.)
   Major Change __________  Minimum Change ________  No Change __________  Unknown __________

3. The student officer has been interviewed ___ times since returning to his country. (Number of interviews)
   One _____  Two _____  Three _____  More than Three _____  None _____

4. This course of instruction was of mutual benefit to the United States and the recipient country to what degree?
   High _____  Average _____  Minimal _____  None _____  Unknown _____
PANEL OF EXPERTS FOR CONTENT EVALUATION


27 January 1984

To: Chief, MAAG-ODA-

From: Weldon J. Bowling

Subj: Dissertation Assistance, Request for

Encl: Questionnaires

1. I am a doctoral candidate at North Texas State University in Denton, Texas. My dissertation is based on the premise that the foreign officer trained or educated in the United States is not being utilized in accordance with the spirit and intent of the Arms Export Control Act of 1976. This means that the officer is not being assigned within a reasonable length of time to a billet that will allow him to disseminate the knowledge that he has acquired in the U.S. in order to improve the training and education capabilities of his own military establishment.

2. While on active duty I was attached to the Military Assistance Group-Korea and the Joint U.S. Mission, Military Aid to Turkey and from this experience I consider my premise to be valid. In order to evaluate what is actually occurring in the IMET Program, I would appreciate very much if your staff would complete the enclosures as completely as possible and return to me in the self-addressed envelope as soon as possible. The Office of the Chief of Naval Operations (OP-631E) and the Chief of Naval Education and Training have provided me with the student data concerning your country.

3. Your assistance is greatly appreciated.

Very respectfully,

Weldon J. Bowling
CDR. USN(Ret)

First Endorsement: Date: __________________________

1. Returned.

Signed: ______________________________
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