

**A JOINT EVALUATION
OF AID/BURMA'S
PARTICIPANT TRAINING PROGRAM.**

August 1987

A JOINT EVALUATION
OF AID/BURMA'S
PARTICIPANT TRAINING PROGRAM

The Evaluation Team

U.S. MEMBERS:

Mr. Tom Moser
Ms. Laurel Elmer

BURMESE MEMBERS:

U Htin Kyaw
U Aung Khin
U Thet Lwin

Report Prepared for USAID/Burma
Under Contract With:
The Pragma Corporation

August 15, 1987

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Executive Summary	i
Acknowledgements	vi
List of Tables	vii
I. INTRODUCTION	
A. Purpose.	1
B. Burma Context.	1
C. Training Evaluation State-of-the-Art	3
II. METHODOLOGY	
A. Data Collection.	4
B. Total Participant Population and Survey Sample . .	5
C. Data Analysis.	6
D. Description of the Total Participant Population. .	6
E. Sample Representativeness.	12
III. SURVEY FINDINGS	
A. Pre-Departure Phase.	13
● Personal Motivations	
● Advance Notice	
● Preparation for Training	
B. Training Implementation.	15
● Arrival Orientation	
● Social-Cultural Adjustment	
● English Language Ability	
● Social and Recreational Activities	
● Administrative Support	
● Advice to Other Participants	
C. Quality of Training.	18
● Training Appropriateness	
● Overall Satisfaction	
● Satisfaction with Program Components	
● Other Benefits from Training	
● Suggested Improvements	
D. Post-Training Experience	22
● Re-Entry and Job Status	
● Training Utilization	
● Transmission of Training	
E. Professional Development Activities.	26

TABLE OF CONTENTS, cont'd

	PAGE
IV. INTERVIEWS WITH SENIOR GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS.	28
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	33

APPENDICES

- A. Survey Instruments
- B. Survey Sample: Statistical Representativeness
- C. Survey Findings: Statistical Tables
- D. List of Participants: Returned and In-Training
- E. List of Senior Officials Interviewed
- F. Special Report - Energy Participants
- G. Training Institution Case Studies
- H. Participant Statements on Future Training Priorities
- I. Proposed Pre-Departure Orientation
- J. Proposed Complementary Program (Re-Entry Workshop)
- K. Proposed Follow-up Questionnaires

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PURPOSE

The U.S. Agency for International Development in Burma (AID) and the Burmese Government agreed to undertake a joint review of overseas training under the auspices of AID's Participant Training Program. The purpose of this review was to learn how both parties might make future participant training programs more productive and successful in pursuit of mutual program objectives. The review consisted of an assessment of the effectiveness of AID/Burma's participant training activities to date through an examination of individual participants' experiences, the various phases of participant programming, and the impact of the training in general. Based on this review, suggestions are made for improvements in the design, implementation, and follow-up of AID-sponsored training in Burma.

BURMA CONTEXT

Approximately 1,000 Burmese are sponsored for overseas academic and technical training each year. Eighty percent of these are funded through bilateral donor arrangements with twenty percent sponsored by U.N. agencies and other multilateral organizations. While not yet a major sponsor of overseas training, AID/Burma's training activities have been increasing in recent years. Since 1979, a total of 202 participants have returned to Burma from AID-sponsored academic and technical training, and another 54 were in training at the time of this evaluation. Planning is now underway for a substantial increase over the next several years.

METHODOLOGY

The evaluation team was comprised of two U.S. training specialists under contract with Pragma Corporation, and three Burmese Government officials, respectively from the Ministry of Education, Ministry of Agriculture and Forests, and the Foreign Economic Relations Department of the Ministry of Planning and Finance. The information presented in this report was gathered by the team in Burma and the United States during May-July 1987 through a cross-sectoral survey of former and current AID participants, and interviews with senior Burmese Government officials, USAID/Burma personnel, and U.S. training coordinators. While the U.S. team members conducted most of the oral interviews in Burma, the Burmese team interviewed participants currently in training in the United States. The Burmese team also participated in a training experience in the United States to become familiar with the procedures and program objectives of AID's Participant Training Program.

The total participant population at the time of the evaluation consisted of 256 Burmese sponsored for technical and academic training in the United States and other countries since 1979. Of these, a total of 144 participants completed written questionnaires (112 in Burma; 32 in the United States), and 74 were personally interviewed (56 in Burma; 18 in the United States). The survey sample was found to be fairly representative of the total participant population. The data from the written questionnaires and oral interviews with both former participants in Burma and those currently studying in the U.S. were tabulated and analyzed in Washington, D.C. The evaluation team met once in Washington and twice in Boston to share their respective findings, interpret the survey results, and prepare the final report.

DESCRIPTION OF THE TOTAL PARTICIPANT POPULATION

The majority of Burmese sponsored for training by AID are male and have participated primarily in short-term technical programs in the United States. A smaller number has been sent for training in Thailand, Philippines, and India. In recent years, the number of female participants and the proportion of academic training has increased. Until recently, the majority of participants has been concentrated in the Ministries of Agriculture and Forests, Energy, and Health.

The average age of participants in the survey sample is 42. While technical programs averages three months in length, the average for academic programs is 24 months, largely at the master's level. More than one-third of all returned participants are currently working outside the capital, three are now retired, and two are currently out of the country.

MAJOR FINDINGS

o Planning Training. The survey findings do not suggest that one form of training is more valuable than another, largely because the overall sample is too small to draw any meaningful distinction. However, the survey findings and interviews with both returned participants and senior Burmese Government officials indicate strong interest in further AID sponsored technical and academic training, preferably in the United States, but also regionally and in-country. Interest was also expressed by numerous government officials in participating in the annual planning of training with AID on an informal basis.

o Preparation for Training. Less than one third of the participants surveyed received a pre-departure briefing from the AID office before leaving Burma, and the majority reported being only moderately prepared for their programs.

o Training Implementation. The majority of participants receive an orientation upon arrival in the United States. Most

Burmese participants experience few serious social or cultural adjustment problems and appear highly adaptable. Participants seem to be having more problems with English language ability in recent years. Most participants are very satisfied with the assistance provided to them in program, personal, and administrative matters. However, there seems to have been a recent increase in problems associated with participants' travel arrangements and financial concerns.

o Training Quality. The majority of participants report being very satisfied with their overall training experiences. Satisfaction was high with the content of participants' programs and with the training facilities. In addition to the technical aspects of their programs, many participants identified the cross-cultural experience as a valuable by-product. Participants seemed less satisfied with the short length of some programs, the amount of practical training, and the relevance and applicability of training to conditions in Burma. Energy and health participants, in particular, reported less satisfaction with training relevance and applicability. This may be due to an improper match between participants' backgrounds and the training program or institution, or to the fact that some ideas and techniques used in the United States are not entirely transferable to conditions in Burma, particularly in the energy and health fields.

o Suggested Program Improvements. The most frequently-mentioned area for improvement in the overall training design was the need for more practical training experiences, including field trips and on-the-job attachments. This suggestion was followed by the need for technical publications and refresher courses to help participants keep current with their respective technical expertise, and more social and recreational activities.

o Re-Entry and Job Status. All of the participant surveyed returned to their sponsoring Ministry, and most returned to the jobs they held before their training. Participants do not seem to experience any readjustment problems. Although the majority claim that their AID training has had a favorable impact on their career development, there does not seem to be a notable increase in job responsibility over time.

o Training Utilization. A majority of participants reports that they are using their training in their jobs, even though some of the ideas and methods learned in training are not entirely applicable to conditions in Burma. Again, health and energy participants report lower levels. A small number of participants claims to encounter some constraints to using their training, of which the lack of resources and equipment is the most often mentioned. There also appears to be a trend of declining use over time, which might possibly be in response to the persistence or increasing number of various constraints.

o Transmission and Maintenance of Training. Interest appears high by participants' colleagues and supervisors in the ideas and skills they have brought back from training. Participants report a moderate sharing of their training, mostly on an informal basis, within the work environment. Most of the participants are in occasional personal contact with people met through their training; more than half receive professional publications; and most participants have received a certificate of achievement from the AID Office in Burma. Although most participants have visited the AID Office upon return, continuing contact is infrequent. Almost everyone would recommend their training to others.

RECOMMENDATIONS

o Planning Training. AID/Burma should continue to offer a mix of technical and academic training primarily in the United States based on an annual training plan, formulated within the AID/Burma office with informal input from the various Burmese ministries. Consideration could also be given to more-in-country training to complement and reinforce overseas training.

o Pre-Departure Orientation. AID/Burma should provide departing participants with a better pre-departure orientation, especially in the areas of AID rules and regulations governing financial matters, travel arrangements program details, and information on practical living conditions in the country of training. A review of the U.S. educational system is very important to academic participants, especially regarding the flexible course selection process, grading, and expected workload. Suggestions for a pre-departure program are presented in Appendix I.

o English Language Training. AID/Burma might consider providing some English language training with an emphasis on "American English" to supplement the language instruction offered at the Institute of Foreign Languages in Rangoon (see suggested material in pre-departure package, Appendix I).

o Program and Candidate Selection. AID/Burma should provide the Government of Burma with enough details of the training program to help them identify appropriate and relevant training programs, as well as select qualified candidates. Particular attention should be paid to pre-requisite courses for degree programs in determining the appropriate training duration. University catalogues from the USIS library and the annotated list of U.S. technical training programs provided to AID/Burma should be useful.

o Practical Training. Consideration should be given to include a practical application component (e.g., field

trips, on-the-job attachment, internship, etc.) in participants' programs when not a part of the core program.

o Complementary Programs. Planners should also allow enough time in programs for leisure activities and complementary programs where appropriate (e.g., Mid-Winter seminars, homestays). In particular, AID/Burma might consider incorporating a re-entry workshop in participants' programs to complement their training (a proposal is presented in Appendix J.) The purpose is to provide participants with the necessary skills for adapting their training to their home country conditions, and for better communicating their training with colleagues back home.

o Follow-up Activities. As an essential first step for organizing follow-up activities, AID/Burma should computerize its records to facilitate periodic follow-up of returned participants. The Training Office should also adopt a system for periodically evaluating the Mission's overall participant training activities. A sample plan is attached in Appendix K.

o Follow-up. AID/Burma should improve its follow-up activities for the purpose of encouraging and assisting returned participants in fully utilizing their training and, if possible, transmitting that training to others. This could be done in the form of in-country workshops organized around technical subjects, perhaps with the participation of a participant's former faculty advisor or training coordinator.

Other follow-up activities to consider include keeping returned participants' professional publications subscriptions up-to-date; sponsoring an alumni association if appropriate; or sponsoring a newsletter or library. At a minimum, the AID office should provide a list of returned participants to USIS for their mailing list (a current list is attached as Appendix D).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The evaluation team would like to express its appreciation of the time and assistance given by individuals within the Burmese Government, the AID Office in Burma, and the Pragma Corporation in carrying out this study.

We would especially like to thank U Soe Thwin, Director General of the Foreign Economic Relations Department, Ministry of Planning and Finance, and members of his staff for organizing the oral interviews with participants and senior officials at the various Government Ministries and for coordinating the distribution and retrieval of the written questionnaires in Burma.

We would also like to thank the AID Representative, Earl Young and his Program Officer, Terry Barker, for their interest and cooperation in this study, as well as members of the AID/Burma staff who provided the U.S. team with such excellent administrative support. Assistance provided by members of the Pragma Corporation, Ms. Maggie Chadwick and Ms. Robin Ridley, during the U.S. component of the evaluation is also appreciated.

LIST OF TABLES

		PAGE
1	Total Participant Population and Survey Sample	5
2	Distribution of Total Population by Gender	7
3	Distribution of Total Population Type of Program	7
4	Distribution of Total Population by Training Location	7
5	Distribution of Total Population by Sponsoring Ministry	8
6	Average Age of Survey Sample Overall and by Type of Program	10
7	Average Program Length of Survey Sample (In Months) .	10
8	Location of Total Returned Participants	11
9	Distribution of Total Population and Returned Participant Survey Sample by Geographical Distribution	App B
9.2	Distribution by Type of Training Program	App B
9.3	Distribution by Gender	App B
9.4	Distribution by Training Location	App B
9.5	Distribution by Year Returned	App B
9.6	Distribution by Ministry	App B
10.1	Distribution of Total Population & In-Training Participants by Ministry	App B
10.2	Distribution by Type of Training	App B
10.3	Distribution by Gender	App B
11	Important Reasons for Attending Training (In Percentages)	App C
12.1	Average Days Notice	App C
12.2	Level of Preparation Overall and by Type of Training Program (In Percentages)	App C

12.3	Level of Preparation by Year Returned (In Percentages).....	App C
13.1	Pre-Departure Orientation Overall (In Percentages) ..	App C
13.2	Pre-Departure Orientation by Year Returned	App C
13.3	Usefulness of Pre-Departure Orientation	App C
13.4	Pre-Departure Orientation Topics	App C
14.1	Arrival Orientation Overall	App C
14.2	Location of Arrival Orientation	App C
14.3	Usefulness of Arrival Orientations	App C
15	Social and Cultural Adjustment (In Percentages)	App C
16.1	Participation in Social Activities by In-Training Participants	App C
16.2	Participation with Whom?	App C
17.1	English Language Problems Overall	App C
17.2	English Language Problems by Year Returned (N=112) ..	App C
17.3	English Language Training (ELT) Location for Participants In-Training (N=32) (In Percentages)	App C
17.4	Average ELT Length (In Weeks)	App C
17.5	ELT Usefulness	App C
18.1	Administrative Problems Overall (In Percentages)	App C
18.2	Administrative Problems by Year Returned (N=112).....	App C
19	Technical Level of Program (In Percentages)	App C
20	Program Length (In Percentages)	App C
21	New Knowledge and Skills (In Percentages)	App C
22.1	Overall Program Satisfaction (In Percentages)	App C
22.2	Overall Satisfaction by Gender	App C

22.3 Overall Satisfaction by Program	App C
22.4 Overall Satisfaction by Sponsoring Ministry - Returned Participants Only (In Percentages)	App C
22.5 Overall Satisfaction by Year Returned	App C
23.1 Satisfaction with Program Components (In Percentages)	App C
23.2 Satisfaction with Program Components Over Time (N=112)	App C
24.1 Relevance to Work by Type of Program (In Percentages)	App C
24.2 Relevance to Work by Sponsoring Ministry	App C
25.1 Applicability to Burma by Type of Program	App C
25.2 Applicability to Burma by Sponsoring Ministry (Returned Participants Only)	App C
26.1 Balance of Theory & Practice by Type of Program (In Percentages)	App C
26.2 Balance of Theory & Practice by Sponsoring Ministry .	App C
27 Re-Entry Adjustment	App C
28 Job Status Upon Return	App C
29.1 Relevance of Training to Job by Ministry (In Percentages)	App C
29.2 Relevance of Training to Job by Ministry (In Percentages)	App C
30.1 Level of Job Responsibility by Type of Program (In Percentages)	App C
30.2 Job Responsibility by Year Returned	App C
31.1 Impact of AID Training on Career by Type of Program .	App C
31.2 Impact of AID Training on Career by Ministry	App C
32.1 Utilization of Training Upon Return (In Percentages)	App C
32.2 Utilization of Training by Gender	App C

32.3	Utilization of Training by Ministry	App C
32.4	Utilization of Training by Year Returned	App C
32.5	Constraints to Utilization	App C
33	Interest of Others in Knowledge and Skills from Training	App C
34.1	Share Training with Others by Type of Program	App C
34.2	Share Training with Others by Gender	App C
34.3	Share Training with Others by Ministry	App C
35.1	Methods of Sharing Knowledge and Skills from Training (In Percentages)	App C
35.2	On-the-Job Training by Type of Program	App C
35.3	On-the-Job Training by Ministry	App C
35.4	Formal Workshops/Seminar by Type of Program	App C
35.5	Formal Workshops/Seminars by Ministry	App C
36.1	Greater Professional Involvement by Type of Program (In Percentages)	App C
36.2	Greater Professional Involvement by Ministry (In Percentages)	App C
37.1	Training - Related Correspondence by Type of Program	App C
37.2	Training - Related Correspondence by Year Returned ..	App C
38	Receive Publications	App C
39	Joined Professional Association	App C
40	Visit USAID	App C
41	Received Certificate by USAID in Recognition of Training	App C
42	Recommend Training to Others	App C

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose

The U.S. Agency for International Development in Burma (AID) and the Burmese Government agreed to undertake a joint review of overseas training under the auspices of AID's Participant Training Program. The purpose of this review was to learn how both parties might make future participant training programs more productive and successful in pursuit of mutual program objectives. The review consisted of an assessment of the effectiveness of AID/Burma's participant training activities to date through an examination of individual participants' experiences, the various phases of participant programming, and the impact of the training in general. Based on this review, suggestions are made for improvements in the design, implementation, and follow-up of AID-sponsored training in Burma.

B. Burma Context

Approximately 1,000 Burmese are sponsored for overseas academic and technical training each year. Eighty percent of these are funded through bilateral donor arrangements with twenty percent sponsored by U.N. agencies and other multilateral organizations. Major bilateral donors include Britain, Australia, Holland, Germany, Japan and the United States. The policies and procedures governing overseas scholarships and training extend to all donors alike and adhere generally to the following process.

Offers for overseas training are coordinated through the Foreign Economic Relations Department (FERD) of the Ministry of Planning and Finance. Selection of candidates begins after the training offer has been approved by the Sub-Cabinet Committee for Overseas Training. Project-related training offers are transmitted through the sponsoring Ministry, whereas non-project training offers are routed through FERD. The training offer must include the course of study and qualifying criteria, location, approximate duration, and provisions for funding. The Sub-Cabinet Committee consists of a panel of six senior Ministers, who decide whether to accept the offer and which Ministry(ies) should respond.

After a Ministry has been awarded the training offer by the Sub-Cabinet Committee, two procedures are followed for selecting candidates, depending on the type of training involved:

- Non-Degree Technical Programs (conferences, seminars, short training courses and study tours): The Ministry solicits nominations from the appropriate Department and chooses the best candidate(s), pending approval by the Minister, based on a credential review and interviews.

- Academic Programs (degree, diploma or certificate program): The Ministry decides which departments would be authorized to solicit applications for the proposed training. Candidates must take a technical and english language qualifying exam, and undergo a rigorous oral interview at the ministry level. Based on these exams, candidates are selected and are proposed to the Sub-Cabinet Committee for final approval.

In addition, candidates for overseas training must meet the following requirements:

- A candidate must be a permanent government employee with at least three years service in the Department (for academic programs).
- Type of training must be work-related.
- A candidate, his/her spouse and immediate family, must be nationals of Burma.
- A candidate must be under 45 years of age (for academic programs).
- A candidate's spouse must not be residing abroad during the tenure of the proposed training.
- There must be a period of three years before a trainee can be considered for another overseas training program.
- Candidates must sign a bond to serve ten years with government upon return from training. (If the trainee attends a second program, the duration of that program is added to the ten-year commitment.)

In AID's experience, the selection of technical candidates can take from one to three months; whereas, the time involved for selecting academic candidates can take from three to six months.

Once a candidate has been approved by the Sub-Cabinet Committee, additional procedures are followed for securing government clearance and departure formalities. An official acceptance letter must be submitted to FERD from AID/Burma, with a copy to the Ministry concerned, specifying the exact dates of the proposed training. The receipt of this letter initiates the procedures for obtaining a deputation order to authorize the trainee's travel, a passport, and a standard amount of foreign exchange for transit in the case of project-related training. The time involved in this final process requires one to two weeks.

While not yet a major sponsor of overseas training, AID/Burma's training activities have been increasing in recent

years. Since 1979, a total of 202 participants have returned to Burma from AID-sponsored training, another 54 were in training at the time of this evaluation, and planning is now underway for a substantial increase over the next several years.

The findings in this review are designed to benefit both the AID Office in Burma and the Burmese Government in optimizing the use of future training opportunities available under the AID program.

C. Training Evaluation State-of-the-Art

Although the evaluation was designed to explore the impact of AID training in general, no standard methodology yet exists to measure or quantify training impact. There is no general consensus regarding the number and type of variables which might influence the impact of training, nor are there generally established criteria for measuring such impact at the institutional or national level. Even at the individual level, a comparison of the experience of AID participants with that of a similar sample having other or no training experience is an important factor in gaining a more complete and balanced picture of the overall training impact.

In light of the conceptual and practical limitations to a more rigorous impact study, the survey component of the current evaluation effort addresses impact at the individual level, in terms of the returned participants' general impressions as well as indicators related to their job performance and the utilization of their training. The following section describes the methodological approach used in this study, and presents the basic characteristics of the total participant population under review.

II. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation team was comprised of two USAID contractors and three Burmese Government officials, respectively from the Ministry of Education, Ministry of Agriculture and Forests, and the Foreign Economic Relations Department of the Ministry of Planning and Finance. A fourth member of the team, U Tin Tun, Ministry of Energy, was on a different schedule which prevented him from participating directly in team discussions and preparation of the final report. However, he briefed the U.S. team members prior to their departure for Burma and assisted in the preliminary research design. He also interviewed a number of participants during his U.S. program and prepared a summary report which is presented in Appendix F. The information presented in this report was gathered by the team in Burma and the United States during May-July 1987 through a cross-sectoral survey of former and current AID participants which involved written questionnaires and oral interviews.

The review also included extensive interviews by the U.S. team members with a number of senior Burmese Government officials, USAID/Burma personnel, and U.S. training coordinators and contractors for their views and experiences relevant to AID's participant training program in Burma. While the U.S. team members conducted most of the oral interviews in Burma, the Burmese team interviewed participants currently in training at the University of Hawaii, University of California-Los Angeles, and Ohio State University. In addition, the Burmese team participated in a training experience in the United States to become familiar with the procedures and program objectives of AID's Participant Training Program. The research design involved the following steps.

A. Data Collection

The evaluation team designed and pre-tested a written questionnaire in Burma which included approximately 45 closed-ended questions covering the areas of participants' job status, the quality and appropriateness of their training experiences, the utilization of training, the transmission of training to others, and other professional development issues. Guidelines were also developed for oral interviews with a smaller number of former participants using an open-ended approach with questions paralleling the major areas of the written questionnaire. The written questionnaire was slightly modified for examining the experience of Burmese participants currently in training in the United States. (The survey instruments are presented together in Appendix A.)

Although an attempt was made to protect the anonymity of participants in the survey, the questionnaires were distributed through participants' respective ministries and were returned to

the team through these same channels which may have compromised the confidentiality of responses. Also, the U.S. team members noted a general lack of criticism in the oral interviews by returned participants despite assurances that the discussions were confidential.

B. Total Participant Population and Survey Sample

The total participant population at the time of the evaluation consisted of 256 Burmese sponsored for technical and academic training in the United States and other countries since 1979. Of these, 202 had returned to Burma, (see Appendix D for Lists of Participants Returned and In-Training) and 54 were in various stages of training in the United States. The survey of returned participants in Burma involved the distribution of the written questionnaire through host government channels and oral interviews with a selected number of former participants in Rangoon and Mandalay to supplement the survey. A total of 112 completed questionnaires were received and included in the analysis, representing a 55% rate of response; and interviews were conducted with 56 returned participants (47 in Rangoon; 9 in Mandalay).

For the survey of Burmese participants currently in training in the United States at the time of the evaluation, 18 of 54 were visited by the Burmese members of the evaluation team who administered the "in-training" questionnaire (12 at the University of Hawaii, 2 at the University of California in Los Angeles, and 4 at Ohio State University). The remaining participants in training were mailed a copy of the questionnaire. Of these, 32 completed questionnaires were received and included in the analysis.

Thus a total of 144 of 256 participants completed written questionnaires (112 in Burma; 32 in the United States), and 74 were personally interviewed. (It should be understood that some of the participants interviewed also participated in the written survey.) Table 1 below presents a breakdown of the total participant population at the time of the evaluation and the corresponding survey samples of returned participants and those still in training.

TABLE 1 - TOTAL PARTICIPANT POPULATION AND SURVEY SAMPLE

PARTICIPANTS	TOTAL	QUESTIONNAIRE SAMPLE	INTERVIEW SAMPLE
RETURNEES	202	112	56
IN - TRAINING	54	32	18
TOTAL	256	144	74

C. Data Analysis

The data from the written questionnaires and oral interviews with both former participants in Burma and those currently studying in the U.S. were tabulated and analyzed in Washington, D.C. The evaluation team met once in Washington and twice in Boston to share their respective findings, interpret the survey results, and make some recommendations for future AID training activities in Burma.

D. Description of the Total Participant Population

Tables 2-5 below present statistical descriptions of the 256 Burmese who have been sponsored by AID for technical and academic training in the United States and third countries since 1979. The tables include a breakdown of the total population by those returned (202) and those still in training (54) and demonstrate the ratio between males and females, type of training program (technical or academic), location of training (U.S. or third country), and representation among the various government ministries.

The majority of AID participants are male (80.5%) and have been sponsored for short-term technical training (84.4%) primarily in the United States (84.0%). Eleven percent of the group have been sent for training at regional centers in Thailand, Philippines, and India. A smaller percentage were trained in both U.S. and third countries. Tables 2 and 3 suggest a recent increase in the number of female participants as well as in the proportion of academic participants in AID training programs.

Table 5 shows that the majority of participants (75%) are concentrated in the Ministries of Agriculture and Forests (102), Energy (51), and Health (38), with smaller numbers in the Ministries of Cooperatives (16), Education (11), Livestock Breeding and Fisheries (10), Trade (8), Labor (7), Planning and Finance (7), and several others (the Ministry of Home and Religious Affairs, Ministry of Mines, and the Central Accounts Office). This breakdown reflects the predominance of Mission project training activities in the agriculture and health sectors, and a large centrally-funded Energy Project. Other training has been conducted on an ad hoc basis. However, Table 5 also shows that training has more recently been spread out among other areas of government, which corresponds to training under the recent Burma Development Training Project (BDTP).

TABLE 2 - DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL POPULATION BY GENDER

SEX	RETURNED		IN-TRAINING		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
MALE	165	81.7	41	75.9	206	80.5
FEMALE	37	18.3	13	24.1	50	19.5
TOTAL	202	100%	54	100%	256	100%

TABLE 3 - DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL POPULATION
TYPE OF PROGRAM

TYPE OF PROGRAM	RETURNED		QUESTIONNAIRE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
TECHNICAL	178	88.1	38	70.4	216	84.4
DEGREE	24	11.9	16	29.6	40	15.6
TOTAL	202	100%	54	100%	256	100%

TABLE 4 - DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL POPULATION BY TRAINING LOCATION

COUNTRY OF TRAINING	RETURNED		IN-TRAINING		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
USA	171	84.6	44	81.5	215	84.0
THIRD	23	11.4	0	0	23	9.0
BOTH	8	4.0	10	18.5	18	7.0
TOTAL	202	100%	54	100%	256	100%

TABLE 5 - DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL POPULATION BY SPONSORING MINISTRY

SPONSORING MINISTRY	RETURNED		IN-TRAINING		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	91	45.0	11	20.4	102	39.8
LIVESTOCK BREEDING & FISHERIES	0	0	10	18.5	10	4.0
ENERGY	48	23.8	3	5.6	51	19.9
HEALTH	34	16.8	4	7.4	38	14.8
COOPERATIVES	14	6.9	2	3.7	16	6.3
EDUCATION	2	1.0	9	16.7	11	4.3
TRADE	2	1.0	6	11.1	8	3.1
LABOR	5	2.5	2	3.7	7	2.7
PLANNING & FINANCE	1	.5	6	11.1	7	2.7
CENTRAL ACCOUNTS OFFICE	2	1.0	1	1.9	3	1.2
HOME & RELIGIOUS AFFAIRS	2	1.0	0	0	2	.8
MINES	1	.5	0	0	1	.4
TOTAL	202	100%	54	100%	256	100%

Table 6 shows that the average age of participants in the survey sample is 42, with technical participants slightly older than those in degree programs. As shown in Table 7, the average length for technical programs is three months, with an average program length of 24 months for academic participants. Interestingly, the length of technical training for more recent participants (i.e., the In-Training group) is somewhat longer than that for the returned group. Academic training has largely been at the masters' level, although two participants currently pursuing doctorate degrees.

Table 8 shows that of the 202 returned Burmese participants, more than one-third of all trainees are currently working outside the capital, three are now retired, and two are currently out of the country. Given this generally positive rate of return to date, USAID/Burma apparently does not risk a "brain-drain" problem.

TABLE 6 - AVERAGE AGE OF SURVEY SAMPLE OVERALL AND BY TYPE OF PROGRAM

SURVEY SAMPLE PARTICIPANTS	TECHNICAL PROGRAM		DEGREE PROGRAM		OVERALL	
	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	AGE	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	AGE	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	AGE
RETURNED	94	44	18	41	112	44
IN-TRAINING	21	37	11	39	32	38
TOTAL	115	43	29	40	144	42

10

TABLE 7 - AVERAGE PROGRAM LENGTH OF SURVEY SAMPLE (IN MONTHS)

SURVEY SAMPLE PARTICIPANTS	TECHNICAL PROGRAM		DEGREE PROGRAM	
	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	NUMBER OF MONTHS	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	NUMBER OF MONTHS
RETURNED (112)	94	2.8	18	24
IN-TRAINING (32)	21	4.0	11	24
TOTAL (144)	115	3.0	29	24

TABLE 8 - LOCATION OF TOTAL RETURNED PARTICIPANTS

WORK LOCATION	RETURNEES	
	#	%
RANGOON	119	58.9
OUTSIDE RANGOON	78	38.6
OVERSEAS	2	1.0
RETIRED	3	1.5
TOTAL	202	100%

E. Sample Representativeness

Comparisons of basic characteristics of both survey samples (e.g., the returned participant sample and the in-training sample) with those of the total participant population were made to ascertain how representative the samples are of the total population. Based on the tables presented in Appendix B, both samples appear to be fairly representative in terms of gender, type of training program, and sponsoring ministry. This suggests that the survey findings generally reflect the experiences and patterns among the total Burmese participant population.

III. SURVEY FINDINGS

The following section summarizes the major findings from the evaluation covering the pre-departure phase (advance notice, preparation for training); training implementation (orientation, social-cultural adjustment, language problems, administrative support during training); the quality of training (appropriateness, content, relevance, unintended benefits, suggested improvements); the post-training experience (re-entry and job status, training utilization, transmission of training); and other professional development activities.

Although the differences or absolute numbers involved may be too small to demonstrate statistical significance, inferences have been made in cases where such trends have also been suggested in the oral interview component of the study. Notable differences and apparent trends among selected subgroups of the total sample are also discussed where appropriate (e.g., male/female, technical/degree training; and sponsoring ministry). Some of the findings were also analyzed over time according to the year of participants' return from training (i.e., between 1980-83, and between 1984-present). The statistical tables corresponding to the following discussion are presented together in Appendix C.

Because the questions pertaining to the pre-departure and implementation stages of the training process were virtually the same for both survey groups, a discussion of the findings for these phases is based on both samples (144 responses). However, the statistical tables include a breakdown of both samples in order to demonstrate possible differences between the two groups and trends over time. The discussion of the post-training experience is limited to the returned participant sample (112 responses).

These findings from the written survey are supplemented where applicable with information gathered by the evaluation team both in Burma and the United States from oral interviews with returned participants and discussions with both administrators at training institutions and placement contractors.

A. PRE-DEPARTURE PHASE

• Participants' Personal Motivations. Most participants consider the pursuit of knowledge and skills and contributing to Burma's development as the most important personal reasons for participating in training. Establishing professional contacts and visiting the United States were considered less important.

As demonstrated in Table 11, there is not much variance between the returned and those still in training, although the latter expressed stronger opinions than the returned group about contributing to Burma's development and gaining more knowledge and skills.

- Notice for Departure. On an average, participants were given about a month's notice regarding their actual departure date, with technical participants reporting an average of five weeks' notice compared to only three weeks for degree candidates. Also, participants in training averaged two weeks less notice than the returned group (see Table 12). This may reflect a recent surge of interest by the Burmese Government to take advantage of increasing numbers of training opportunities under the new Development Training Project.

- Preparation for Training. Less than half of the total survey sample (47%) reported being well prepared for their training program in terms of logistical arrangements and program orientation. Given the shorter advance notice reported by the group of participants in training, it is understandable that this group also reported being less well-prepared than the returned group (see Table 12.2). There is no notable difference between technical and academic participants in the level of preparation. Despite the fact that less than one third (29%) of the total survey group received a pre-departure orientation by the AID Office, only 14% felt unprepared for their training (see Table 13). The data further suggest that more participants are being briefed by the AID Office in recent years. Of the topics included in the pre-departure briefings, it appears that AID rules and regulations and program details are covered the least overall, compared to information on the country of training. However, it appears that the In-Training group has been better briefed on AID rules than the returned group.

Comments contained in the questionnaires regarding what kind of pre-departure information would be helpful included more details on the subject matter of the program as well as a course syllabus; a review of the U.S. educational system; information on U.S. social and cultural life including the media, communications and transportation systems, contemporary lifestyle, slang, history, climate, housing and food; and administrative details regarding travel (customs procedures, flight connections, etc.) and budgeting.

Most of the returned participants interviewed in Burma were generally satisfied with the assistance they received in preparing for their programs. Although a large number did not receive a pre-departure orientation as reflected in the survey findings, they did not seem to think this was too serious a problem. Academic participants, however, seemed the most concerned over the lack of an orientation. Several would have appreciated a better briefing on the U.S. educational system in

such areas as grading, course selection, and other U.S. educational processes that are very different from those in Burma. Several other participants missed their U.S. orientation because of short departure notice. One participant attended the WIC program at the end of this program because of delays. It was suggested that the call forward date allow more time for the final formalities of securing a passport and official travel orders when planning the itinerary. As discussed earlier, this final process can take up to one month.

B. TRAINING IMPLEMENTATION

● Arrival Orientation. The majority of participants (67%) attended an orientation upon arrival in their country of training (see Table 14). Of these, more than half (63%) received an orientation at their training site, and slightly less than half (45%) attended an orientation at the Washington International Center (WIC). According to Table 14.4, 60% of all participants who returned during or before 1983 attended WIC compared to only 20% since 1984, suggesting that orientations are increasingly being given at the training site. Most of the participants found these orientations useful. However, there is some indication that the AID/Burma pre-departure briefings are less useful than arrival orientations (see Tables 13.3 and 14.3). Although WIC orientations are rated slightly more favorably than orientations at the training site overall, this is not true for the In-Training group. Further discussion with a WIC representative revealed that some of the In-Training participants arrived late and others only participated in certain segments. The interviewed participants who attended WIC all spoke favorably of the program, including one who claimed that "the week at WIC was the best experience in my two years in the United States."

Training administrators at various institutions (both training institutions and placement contractors) were asked about the kind of orientation they offer at the training site. All of them incorporate an administrative orientation for all participants. Several prepare orientation packages which include information about the local community, shopping, international services, banking, procedures, cultural taboos, and films. The academic institutions provide an intensive orientation for participants upon arrival on campus which generally includes a tour of the facilities and an introduction to library procedures and local health services. Attempts are made to identify faculty advisors with knowledge of Burma or familiarity with the special requirements of international (LDC) students.

● Social-Cultural Adjustment. Very few participants experienced any serious adjustment problems to the social and cultural climate in their country of training, primarily the United States. However, many did report some problems with the food, climate, adjusting to the American lifestyle, and feeling homesick. Interestingly, the group of participants currently in

training report fewer problems with food, climate and lifestyle, but report being more homesick than the returned participants (see Table 15). One possible explanation for this might be that participants currently in training are in the process of coping with these cultural differences and are trying to minimize them. Returned participants, on the other hand, are reflecting back upon their experiences in which cultural differences possibly remain the most memorable.

Most of the participants interviewed also did not report any major social or cultural adjustment difficulties during their training. Not surprisingly, adjustment to American food was the most common comment, followed closely by language difficulties. There was also some concern about clothing costs and requirements for cold weather. Other difficulties mentioned included shopping, transportation and communications systems, and dorm life. The latter posed a problem for a female participant who was placed in a co-ed dorm with shared bathroom facilities which she found uncomfortable.

Several participants interviewed commented on the differing cultural orientation between Americans and Burmese. The most commonly-expressed observation was the extroverted and egalitarian nature of Americans in contrast to the more introverted and autocratic style of the Burmese. One participant was somewhat shocked by the informal behavior of students in the classroom, especially in terms of casual clothing and sloppy demeanor (e.g., propping one's legs on a desk). Many participants commented on the student-oriented American teaching process vs. the Burmese lecture-style in which students are not accustomed to question any of the instructors' presentations. While a professor is revered and shown deference in Burma, several participants mentioned the friendly and accessible attitude of American professors. Many participants also commented on the friendliness of Americans and how convenient and well-organized the United States is.

Interviews with training administrators in the United States also underscored the facility with which Burmese students have adjusted to the social and cultural climate. One person's comments captured the general reaction by U.S. training coordinators to working with Burmese: "delightful...model students, lovely people."

● English Language Ability. As demonstrated in Table 16, more than one third of the participants surveyed (38%) reported having some to much difficulty with their speaking ability in English, followed by comprehension (32%) and writing (22%). Only 7% of the participants indicated any problems with reading. There is some indication that these problems may be increasing, as the In-Training group and the most recently-returned group reported having more difficulty than their respective counterparts. U.S. training coordinators also cited English language as a problem for some participants; however, most agreed

that the Burmese in particular are so industrious and conscientious that even those with inadequate communication skills seem to manage effectively.

More than half of the in-training group (56%) received English language training either in Burma (6%), in the United States (13%), or both (38%), with an average length of two months. Most of these thought their training was only somewhat useful, with language training in the United States receiving more favorable comment.

● Social and Recreational Activities. The group of participants still in training was asked about its involvement in social and recreational activities and with whom they most often participated. Accordingly, Table 17 indicates that sightseeing is the most common social activity (87%), followed by visits with American families (84%) and picnics and parties (75%). Other activities undertaken to a lesser degree by participants include sports (38%), movies (28%), and attending plays or concerts (19%). Most participants (78%) reported attending these activities with mixed groups (e.g., Americans, Burmese, and other foreign nationals).

● Administrative Support. Overall, participants did not seem to have many logistical problems with obtaining visas, using medical insurance, the adequacy of their overall maintenance allowances, travel or housing arrangements, or getting support in personal or program matters (see Table 18). However, about one quarter of the surveyed participants reported having some to much difficulty in the areas of travel (28%), housing (24%), and maintenance allowance (22%). There is also some indication that the group of participants currently in training is experiencing more problems with travel and housing arrangements than the returned group. However, an analysis of returned participants over time indicates a slight decline in problems overall.

Some of the problems mentioned by participants in the questionnaires included delays in medical reimbursements; the high cost of housing and insufficient allowances in general; tight airline connections; and such traumatic experiences as not being met at the airport; and heavy workloads limiting time for social and recreational activities. These areas were also mentioned by U.S. training administrators as participants' biggest concerns. Although most of the interviewed participants were very satisfied with their overall program management, some administrative and financial problems were noted by participants in third countries where no AID office exists. Also, a number of third country participants were not entirely satisfied with the facility and some instructors at a third country training center.

A different kind of problem, however, was raised by several U.S. training coordinators regarding academic participants who are under rigid time-frames to complete their programs. Although

it was generally acknowledged that Burmese participants are very well qualified for their programs, degree participants may lack prerequisite courses in some cases given the differences in the U.S. and Burmese educational systems. Since program extensions are difficult to obtain, this situation places the participant under greater pressure to complete the requirements and limits the amount of time available for needed social and recreational activities.

- Advice to Other Participants Before Departure. Improving one's English language capability, particularly with speaking and becoming familiar with the American accent prior to leaving Burma was a frequent suggestion by interviewed participants. Many returned participants also stressed the importance for new academic participants to understand the U.S. educational structure and environment before beginning their program. One participant claimed that he would have benefitted significantly had he fully understood the flexible course selection process. He stated that the Burmese system is far more rigid with a prescribed set of courses and suggested that a pre-academic workshop on the American educational system would be extremely beneficial. Another participant cautioned academic participants not to commit themselves to more than they can realistically achieve regarding optional class assignments and electives.

Other suggestions include learning more about U.S. customs and culture, especially in the areas of travel, food and eating habits (e.g., fast food and restaurants), tipping, money management, clothing requirements (cost, climate), and housing information (e.g., dorm life, hotels with kitchenettes, rent deposits, etc.). Several participants suggested that returned participants be asked to brief departing participants, particularly those with a similar training experience.

C. QUALITY OF TRAINING

- Appropriateness of Training. Nearly all participants thought the technical level of their programs was about right (97%) and reported gaining a large amount of new knowledge and skills (81%). A lesser number felt the length was adequate (61%) with 37% claiming their programs to be too short. (See Tables 19, 20, and 21.) Many of the participants interviewed commented on the length of their programs and would have liked more time to absorb all the ideas and techniques that were presented. This was especially noted for the field trips or practical components of some programs.

While most of the complaints over program length came from technical participants, a number of degree participants also felt they were given an inadequate amount of time to complete all their program requirements, especially in cases where they lacked certain prerequisite courses. Several health participants felt their MPH degree programs were compressed in too short a time-frame for an adequate learning experience (e.g., 12 months at the

University of Hawaii; 18 months at Berkeley's School of Public Health). Another degree participant in agronomy complained of having to take several prerequisite courses in weed control and pest management which he said he could have taken in Burma using the same textbooks.

● Overall Satisfaction. 75% of participants surveyed are highly satisfied with their overall training experience. Academic participants also appear to be slightly more satisfied than technical participants (see Table 22). It's interesting to note that returned participants report higher levels of overall satisfaction than those still in training, which might reflect the tendency for participants still in training to withhold final judgment until they complete their programs. An analysis of satisfaction levels by sponsoring ministry shows that energy and health participants are slightly less satisfied with their training experience than participants from other ministries. There does not seem to be a notable difference in overall satisfaction levels over time (see Table 22.5).

Most of the interviewed participants were very satisfied with the quality of their training and spoke highly of the technical content, the competence of their instructors, and the overall experience.

● Satisfaction with Program Components. Table 23 indicates that participants are less satisfied with the relevance of their training (74% report high satisfaction levels), applicability of their training to conditions in Burma (65%), and with the balance of theory and practice in their programs (60%) than they are with their training facilities (82%) and with the content of their programs (78%). Interestingly, participants still in training report higher levels of satisfaction with each of these components than returned participants, but an analysis over time does not suggest a trend of decreasing satisfaction. It appears that the longer participants have been back, the higher the satisfaction with the content of their training and its relevance and applicability to conditions in Burma. This dip in satisfaction levels may reflect overly-high expectations by participants while they are in training in a controlled environment which drop in response to their frustrations with applying their training in another context upon return, but gradually rise as they learn how to adapt their training to local conditions.

As demonstrated in Tables 24, 25 and 26, academic participants seem slightly more satisfied with training relevance, applicability and theory and practice than technical participants. As with overall satisfaction, energy and health participants also report lower levels of satisfaction with these program components than participants from other ministries. This may be explained by the fact that the technology in the energy and health fields in the United States requires sophisticated and expensive equipment which may not be widely available in Burma.

Numerous examples were provided in the oral interviews of problems with the relevance and applicability of some of the methods, ideas and techniques presented in participants' training programs. Some participants commented that the level of technology they were exposed to was generally more advanced than what they had to work with in Burma; for example, the use of a computer in seed analysis or record keeping; mechanized agricultural methods for irrigation, planting and harvesting; and extension communication techniques using video, radio, graphics, telephone, etc.

Several health participants noted that since the U.S. curriculum is geared to the American context, it is not as relevant on an international level. For example, the delivery of public health information services in Burma is 85% home delivery; whereas, mass communication is used in the United States. Another example involved a nutrition education program in which overnutrition (obesity) was the focus of class discussion while malnutrition is a more important concern in Burma and most developing countries. Similarly, a public health participant was not too interested in the demonstration of seat belt and smoking cessation programs in his training course. Another participant mentioned that case studies on African problems in his program were not relevant to the Burma context. (This problem is discussed further in the case studies presented in Appendix G.) However, despite the fact that the level of technology is more advanced in the United States and that some ideas and techniques are not directly transferrable, most participants felt that the exposure to these new ideas and methods was valuable by itself for comparative purposes and future goals.

U.S. training administrators commented that U.S. training institutions are numerous, varied and flexible enough to meet the needs of international LDC students in providing relevant training. Placement contractors can generally identify an appropriate institution based on the candidate's background and training needs. Some programmers select institutions which have had experience with international students; some select larger institutions as they tend to have the resources to be more flexible; and some develop short-term study tours specifically tailored to the needs of the participant. However, problems in matching institutions to participants may arise in some cases. The U.S. training institution needs biographical data on candidates prior to acceptance. At the same time, on the Burmese side, the relevant department can name the candidate only after the formal approval of the training program by the sub-cabinet committee.

● Other Benefits from Training. Participants provided a range of examples in both the written questionnaires and oral interviews of benefits acquired beyond the specific skills and knowledge of their training programs, including a broadened perspective and understanding of their work; a general expansion

of their horizons; new professional contacts helpful to their current work; friendships; the cross-cultural experience; exposure to U.S. culture and society; and other social and recreational activities.

Many participants commented that exposure to new technologies, modern industry, and the American values and work ethic were beneficial by-products of their training. One participant was especially taken with the independent nature of Americans. Noting that "...at eighteen, Americans want to be on their own. They go to work, save money, and pay for their higher education." Another participant commented on the way Americans solve their problems by directly confronting them. One participant said the social contacts with Americans were most valuable: "Every Saturday, our professor invited us to his home for the evening. We prepared Burmese food, played volleyball, and had dinner. The hospitality was wonderful. We'll never forget it."

Many participants thought the knowledge gained of the American educational system was particularly valuable. Interviews with several instructors in Burmese higher education institutions yielded many examples. One remarked on the emphasis on self-study and participatory learning in the United States. The other participant was particularly impressed with the ability to proceed on a course of study (or major) even if one course is failed. He explained that in some disciplines in the Burmese system, one failure may mean repeating all subjects in the year, even if the student had passed all remaining subjects with distinction. He remarked on the flexibility of the U.S. system in course selection, as well as the discipline and enterprise of American students. He also liked the collegial atmosphere on campus where one can actually debate a professor which is not the custom in Burma.

Many participants also mentioned that exposure to other cultures and viewpoints in programs involving participants from other countries was especially valuable. This gave participants the opportunity to share experiences with professional peers and compare problems. One agricultural participant claimed that his new contacts from research centers in Pakistan and Nigeria gained from a third country study tour now enable him to obtain genetic materials directly from these regional centers.

Social activities and sightseeing were also frequently mentioned as a benefit of the training experience including homestays with American families, the Mid-Winter seminar, field trips, visits to museums, parks, the U.S. capital, Disneyland, and the 4th of July celebration.

● Suggested Improvements. Although participants in general were reluctant to criticize or identify any weaknesses of their programs in both the questionnaires and oral interviews, some did offer suggestions for possible improvements. The most

frequently-mentioned area was the desire for more field trips and practical applications, including workshops, visits to farms and factories, and on-the-job attachments. The second most frequent comment was the need for more technical publications and refresher courses to keep current in their fields. Other suggestions included more practice with computers, more English language training before beginning their programs, and more time in their programs for increased social and recreational activities. (See Appendix H for further description).

D. POST-TRAINING EXPERIENCE

Re-Entry and Job Status. Participants do not appear to experience readjustment difficulties with their job, lifestyle or family upon their return from training (see Table 27). All participants surveyed have returned to the same ministry which sponsored them at the time of training; and the majority (86%) have returned to the same job (see Table 28).

Table 29 indicates that less than half of the returned participants feel that their training is very relevant to their job (44%), with 50% reporting their training to be somewhat relevant. Again, energy and health participants report lower levels of relevance. There does not appear to be any variance over time.

As shown in Table 30, 50% of the participants claim to have more job responsibility, with academic participants reporting somewhat more than technical participants. There does not seem to be any change in responsibility levels over time. However, slightly more than half (52%) report that AID training has had a very favorable impact on their career development (see Table 31).

Training Utilization. Table 32 indicates that very few participants report low levels of using their training in their jobs, although only slightly more than half (55%) report high levels. Female participants and academic participants appear to be slightly higher utilizers than their respective counterparts. It is understandable that energy and health participants report lower levels of utilization than participants from other ministries, given their lower satisfaction with training relevance and applicability as discussed above.

Only 25% of the returned survey group reported encountering any constraints to using their training. The more-recently returned group of participants has reported more constraints than participants who have been back for a longer period of time. Also, this group reports higher levels of using their training which may suggest a possible trend of decreasing use in response to constraints, or even increasing constraints, over time. However, more careful study would be required in order to determine whether or not this may be really a trend, and the reasons underlying it.

Despite these moderate utilization levels, most of the participants interviewed reported that their training is very useful in their jobs, even if some of the ideas or methods they have learned are not entirely transferable. The following examples from the interviews illustrate the varied ways and levels in which returned participants are introducing changes in their jobs and using the ideas and techniques gained through their training programs:

- Many of the agriculture participants in seed technology programs provided a variety of examples of how they are using their training. One stated that he was applying new skills in peanut production and seed multiplication techniques in the seed farms he manages for the Agriculture Corporation. Another discussed the benefits of his sunflower oil training program, in which he learned that some farmers were planting too many seeds, were not thinning the plants at the right time, and that spacing of plants and rows was not proper. When he returned to his job, he introduced correct measures with very good results. Another participant changed the depth for planting seeds from 5 inches to 2-3 inches which he learned would produce better results. He also initiated an irrigation system in his district, rather than relying upon the rains which is common among farmers in Burma.
- One participant who received an MS degree in Soil Fertility is now working on water projects where he has ample opportunity to apply his new skills. For example, he learned how to select crops that will be tolerant to saline water conditions and which fertilizers would be useful to overcome drought conditions on corn crops. His thesis focused on the application of potassium to overcome mid-season drought on corn which is a most appropriate topic for his work in the dry zone areas of the Mandalay Division.
- One participant stated that the modern teaching methods to which he was exposed in the U.S., particularly the use of audiovisual aids, have been directly applied at a training center where he is employed. Another participant who is responsible for project planning in the oilseed project said his course enabled him to learn the entire edible oilseed process from growing to marketing. One aspect that he found particularly appropriate in Burma was the use of plastic bottles at the retail level. On the other hand, he found the U.S. practice of removing odor from the oils inappropriate, as this would be unacceptable to Burmese tastes.
- One of the participants in an energy degree program who is now teaching at an institute has introduced many new topics in existing courses such as energy conservation

techniques, cogeneration, waste heat recovery systems, and energy auditing techniques. The other participant in an energy degree program who also teaches at the university-level has not yet introduced new courses but generally has upgraded the quality of his offerings. He claims he would use his training to a greater extent if the university provided petroleum geology courses. However, he states that he is able to undertake research that he was ill-equipped to handle prior to training.

- Many participants mentioned using the various project design and evaluation techniques they learned in training, including conducting feasibility studies and surveys. Several participants in a USDA short course on project analysis and evaluation find their training very useful in analyzing development projects in the Agriculture Corporation.
- Some participants are conducting training activities in their jobs as a result of their training programs. One participant in an MPH degree program now provides on-the-job-training at her health clinic to midwives and is conducting a survey of community health workers. Another participant has introduced case studies, role-playing techniques and group participation methods, all of which were learned during U.S training. Another participant reports training others in the use of computer graphics.
- A participant who received a masters degree in Agricultural Economics reported to be more confident and professional in analyzing, negotiating and appraising donor projects. For example, he is now negotiating a fertilizer project and claims that he is far more able to handle these discussions than he was prior to training.
- Several participants in Seed Production and Technology programs reported changing their methods of storing seeds as a result of their training programs. While one has plans to install fans and air conditioners in seed warehouses, another already has adapted this idea to the open-air bamboo storage sheds by coating the inside with mud to make them air-tight and cooler.
- Another participant mentioned using new techniques for selecting soybean varieties and hybrids and is conducting research on different yields for different climates and soils.
- One participant in a marketing management course claimed the most useful ideas in his program concerned how to market a new product. He recalled the "W-cubed principle": who sells what to whom; and the "P-4 principle": product, place, price, promotion.

- One participant in a Labor Statistics program is in the process of developing a proposal for a classification system on the labor force; and another labor participant is conducting a survey on the labor force, e.g., type of workers, employment, etc.
- Both participants in the GAO auditing program commented on the usefulness of their training, especially the operational audit course and in preparing audit reports.
- One energy participant explained how he was able to dissuade his department from converting the electric current from DC to AC by demonstrating the higher costs involved. Another energy participant explained how he was able to streamline some operations in a power station which reduced energy waste.
- Participants in a family planning program learned how to do laproscopic sterilization which is now being used to some extent in the larger hospitals, but only for women with medical problems. This technique, however, is more popular as a diagnostic tool.

In general, there was little indication in the oral interviews that participants face any constraints in applying their newly acquired knowledge and skills. Several did comment that resources are scarce. Of the few constraints that were mentioned, the lack of equipment and machinery was noted the most often. One agricultural participant cited the lack of equipment as a hindrance to mechanized planting or harvesting techniques. Several participants mentioned that the lack of electronic equipment prevented them from applying some of the communication methods they were exposed to in the United States. An agriculture extension officer explained he could not apply some of the extension methods used in the United States such as computers, videos, television, slides or films.

The lack of resources was cited by a public health officer as a constraint to carrying out the kind of educational campaigns presented in his training program. Another health participant who works at the township level mentioned transportation constraints, while another noted that basic medicines are often lacking in the hospital where he works, including antibiotics and IVs. Also, not enough medical research is being carried out, and the available medical journals are out-of-date because of expired subscriptions.

Other participants mentioned more subtle constraints, including the example of one extension agent's efforts to introduce new methods to farmers: "It takes a long time to teach uneducated farmers which seed varieties are best suited to their land." Another participant claimed he "had no right to propose

changes at the divisional level"; while another participant was very reluctant to complain about the lack of needed equipment.

Transmission of Training. A majority of participants (63%) reports that their colleagues and supervisors are very interested in the ideas and techniques they learned in their training programs (see Table 33). This was supported in the oral interviews. However, an even larger majority (74%) reports only a moderate sharing of their new knowledge and skills (see Table 34). Agriculture participants seem to be more active in sharing their training than those from other ministries.

As indicated in Table 35, informal discussion is the most common method used by returned participants for sharing their training (55%), followed by on-the-job training (22%). Formal training in workshops or seminars appears to be the least common method. Health participants appear to be the most active group in terms of on-the-job and formal training activities. Participants interviewed indicated that they mostly share their training with others on an informal, one-on-one basis within their work environment. Several participants referred to the reading materials and publications they brought back which are eagerly sought after by their colleagues and supervisors.

E. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Table 36 attempts to show levels of increased professional involvement in a number of areas which participants attribute to their training. Accordingly, more than half of the returned participants (53%) are more involved in improving programs or services as a result of their training, and almost half (48%) report more involvement in developing new projects. About one third participate more in planning committees (34%), in organizing training programs (31%), and in research activities (38%). Degree participants appear to be more active than technical participants in all these areas, with the exception of developing new projects.

Very few participants are in frequent correspondence with their training institution or a person met through training (see Table 37). Slightly less than half (48%) report some correspondence. Most of the interviewed participants reported having some contact with people they met during their training, mostly through occasional letters. Sixty percent of the returned participants do receive professional publications (Table 38).

Less than one third of the returned participants (29%) have joined professional associations, although it appears that this is increasing over time (Table 39). A majority (69%) indicated they have visited the AID Office upon their return (Table 40), and almost everyone (94%) has received a certificate of achievement from AID in recognition of their training experience (Table 41). Many of the interviewed participants had an initial contact with the AID Office or AID project manager in Rangoon

immediately upon their return. Continuing contact, however, appears to be infrequent. Almost everyone would recommend their training to others with similar backgrounds, although several indicated they would only if the program were extended (Table 42).

Participants were asked in the oral interviews and questionnaires to identify training priorities in their respective departments. Many participants did mention the need for more practical, hands-on training, but did not offer any preference for the optimal duration or type of training (i.e., technical vs. degree training), or training location (i.e., U.S. vs. third country training). Participants and senior officials alike asserted that all combinations are valuable for different purposes. A list of specific training areas identified by participants in the questionnaires is attached as Appendix H.

IV. INTERVIEWS WITH SENIOR GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

In addition to conducting oral interviews with 56 returned participants in Burma, the U.S. Team members conducted a series of unstructured interviews with a cross-section of senior Burmese Government officials, including some who are direct supervisors of returned participants. (See Appendix E for a List of Officials Interviewed). The objective was to obtain their views on AID training activities, both of a project and non-project nature, and to elicit from them suggestions as to how future programs might be improved. The discussions tended to vary from person to person and department to department, limiting the opportunity to aggregate responses to comparable questions. However, several themes clearly emerged:

- U.S. training is popular, prestigious and highly sought after;
- Burmese Government procedures for handling overseas training are quite rigid and adhered to;
- Most senior officials see a need for a combination of short-term and academic training;
- Departments currently with AID project training also desire non-project (BDTP) training;
- Nearly all departments would welcome periodic informal discussions with AID/Burma on BDTP training possibilities prior to the initiation of formal FERD involvement; and
- Most departments are interested in short-term, in-country training for their staff and constituency, but not as a substitute for more attractive overseas training opportunities.

The following presents the highlights of the discussions with senior officials in various government ministries and departments.

Foreign Economic Relations Department

The Director General explained his role in acting on requests for overseas training as the coordinator of all donor training activities. He is responsible for receiving training offers and submitting them to the Sub-Cabinet Committee for Overseas Training. The only exception to this procedure is in the case of project-related training, which is handled directly by the concerned ministries. He emphasized the importance the Burmese Government places on overseas training and how rigorous and objective the Government is in selecting courses and candidates. He also acknowledged the importance of in-country

training in the form of workshops and seminars, but indicated that sub-cabinet approval of such activities is difficult to obtain and should be approached by donors as a separate issue from overseas training.

In response to a comment that non-project training such as BDTP is rather ad hoc and lacks an annual plan, the Director General suggested that the AID office might consider writing to him proposing an annual BDTP plan which could be reviewed by the Sub-Cabinet Committee. Once approved in principle, such a plan might streamline the selection process by placing BDTP more in the category of project training. While this approach would have some advantages, it was recognized that it might "lock in" the use of BDTP and impinge on the program's flexibility, which is one of its greatest assets.

Department of Medical Education

The Department of Medical Education receives training offers from WHO, UNDP, UNFPA and AID, which meet many but far from all of its needs for external training assistance. The Department's current training needs include: Train the Trainers, and Production of Teaching Materials (e.g., slides, overhead transparencies, learning modules for teachers and students) and more specialized graduate work in public health such as Maternal and Child Health Care. A combination of long-term, short-term and in-country training would be useful. AID training is highly regarded and beneficial to the department in terms of broadening the trainee's education, contacts, and exposure to new techniques. One of the most useful techniques brought to the department through U.S. training is laparoscopy as a diagnostic tool, although this is only useful in the larger hospitals.

Department of Health (Division of Public Health)

The Division receives training assistance from WHO, the British Council and AID through the Primary Health Care Project. The most urgent training needs mentioned include management and administration, especially in Maternal and Child Health, and Health Economics. Some graduate programs would be useful in addition to short courses of not less than three months. U.S. training is well regarded, especially its theoretical and conceptual aspects. Practical field tours, however, should be more carefully selected to better suit the needs of developing countries. Hawaii, Navajo reservations, Alaska, and Mexico were cited as appropriate field sites. AID trainees have benefited from the theoretical exposure, but need more practical experience. Trainees tend to return with more enthusiasm and present proposals for improvements. The Division is currently undergoing a degree of decentralization which has helped to create an atmosphere conducive to change and innovative ideas. Project training is preferred by the Division because it is

planned. Non-project training such as BDTP is less desirable because of its ad hoc nature but is useful for short-term training or study tours.

A subsequent interview with the Mandalay Division Health Director explained that training programs must be approved at the center but indicated that donors should design their offers in such a way as to ensure that divisional and township-level people get involved. He said that it is at these levels where most public health activity takes place: For example, Mandalay Division has 29 townships, each with a hospital and doctor and 35 station hospitals to serve its 4 million population.

Department of Medical Research

The Director General and his senior medical staff indicated their strong interest in receiving AID participant training. They indicated their past efforts have not succeeded, but that they would like to try again. Training is needed both in-country and in the U.S. in a variety of short and long-term programs. The Director General plans to submit an informal list of priority training needs to AID by May 25, and would be pleased if we referred to this list in any subsequent correspondence with FERD. He would welcome an opportunity to receive some training offers under BDTP which he understands is of a non-project nature.

Agriculture Corporation

External training is sponsored largely through projects funded by the World Bank, Asian Development Fund, UNDP, FAO and other bilateral donors including AID. The Corporation has its own special committee on training and is beginning to realize the importance of manpower planning. They have been recruiting their staff largely from the Agriculture College. Because most overseas training is under projects, it was indicated that project agreements should be general enough to fit the Corporation's needs.

The Managing Director explained the role of the Agriculture Corporation as one of the major components of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forests. He described the Corporation's ten divisions and the large number of current development projects (26), most of which have substantial training components. Despite the magnitude of project-related training, however, he indicated that the Corporation has a need for non-project (BDTP) training in areas not covered by the projects. The Managing Director said that, while the Corporation cannot formally request training under BDTP, it would welcome informal discussions with the Mission's Agriculture Officer to exchange views on the most pressing training needs (overseas and in-country) which might be met by BDTP, as a precursor to formal action through FERD.

In a subsequent discussion in Mandalay, the Divisional Manager of the Agriculture Corporation appealed for more training in arid zone agriculture. Inasmuch as all donor training offers must be submitted to central Government channels, he stated that requests cannot be initiated at the Divisional level. However, if donors focused their offers on arid zone agriculture, he said there was a very good chance that his Division would be the beneficiary, given their arid zone location.

The Divisional Manager, an ex-participant himself, proposed a very interesting in-country training program. He was impressed with Amish farming practices during his three-months stay in Ohio and believes, with some modifications, Burmese farmers would benefit from exposure to Amish technology. He thinks Amish equipment such as seeders, ploughs, harrows and harvesters -- designed for bullocks rather than horses -- would be far better in the hard pan soils of the Mandalay Division than those presently in use. He indicated that traditional tools penetrate the soils no more than 2 to 3 inches, but if 6 inches penetration could be accomplished -- which would be possible with the stronger Amish technology -- moist, more fertile soil will be available for crops. His idea would be to invite a couple of leading Amish farmers to Burma to assess the local soils and existing farming methods and, if feasible, to plan and conduct short-term training courses for Agriculture Corporation staff and farmers. The Divisional Manager believes that the adapted Amish tools could be manufactured in-country and that this level of technology is far better suited to current Burmese conditions, given the high costs of mechanized equipment and diesel fuel.

He also suggested that more Burmese participants should receive training similar to his, except that emphasis should shift from the classroom to the field. Attachments or internships on farms should be arranged in which participants can have "hands-on" practical work experience at an appropriate level to conditions in Burma.

Department of Labor

The Director General of the Department of Labor indicated a need for overseas training of his staff, especially in manpower planning skills. He admitted that there was very limited experience in his department in this area and the need was great. ILO provides some assistance, but not enough. He would welcome more AID training offers for his department and any assistance in providing expertise on how to run training programs (TOTs). He would also welcome assistance in meeting his department's audio-visual and other training media needs.

Central Accounts Office

Training offers come largely from UNDP, with only two offers accepted from AID in the past. They would very much like to take advantage of more AID training, especially the GAO International Auditor Fellowship Program. They would like to send at least two people a year to this course as well as long-term candidates for studies in accounting and auditing at the graduate level. The areas of most interest include computerized auditing, operational auditing, and accounting. Although some of the methods taught in the U.S. are not the same, the principles can be adapted to Burmese conditions. The Director General said that the two AID trainees have contributed a lot to the Office as a result of their GAO program.

Ministry of Cooperatives and Energy

Brief discussions also were held with senior officials in these two ministries, both of which have had substantial numbers of participants in the past. While detailed notes were not taken, the highlights were that: a) the ministries were most appreciative of the training received to date, and b) they wish it to continue in the future. There were no notable suggestions made that would lead to specific program improvements.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

PRE-DEPARTURE PHASE

Planning Training. The survey findings do not suggest that one form of training is more valuable than another, in terms of type of training and length (i.e., technical vs. academic), in location of training (i.e., United States, third countries, in-country), or field of training, primarily because the overall sample is too small to draw any meaningful distinction (144 responses). Also, numbers within the various subgroups are disproportionate (e.g., 115 technical participants vs. 29 degree participants; 120 males vs. 24 females; and only 23 third country participants). However, the survey findings and oral interviews with both returned participants and senior Burmese Government officials generally support the view that the quality of AID training overall has been well-regarded, and that different types of training fulfill different needs. Further discussion with representatives of the various government ministries indicate strong interest in further AID-sponsored training, both technical and academic, preferably in the United States, but also regionally and in-country. Several officials also expressed interest in participating informally in annual planning of training under the Development Training project.

- Recommendation. AID continue to offer a mix of technical and academic training primarily in the United States based on an annual training plan, formulated by AID/Burma with informal input from the various Burmese ministries and departments. Consideration could also be given to more in-country training to complement and reinforce overseas training.

Preparation for Training. Less than one third of the participants surveyed received a pre-departure briefing from the AID Office before leaving Burma, and the majority reported being only moderately prepared for their programs. Also, the group of participants still in training appeared to be less prepared than the returned group and also received less advance notice for their departure.

- Recommendation. AID/Burma should provide departing participants with a better pre-departure orientation, especially in the areas of AID rules and regulations governing financial matters, travel arrangements, program details, and information on practical living conditions in the country of training. A review of the U.S. educational system is very important to academic participants, especially regarding the flexible course selection process, grading, instructional methods, and expected workload. Suggestions for a pre-departure program are included in Appendix I.

TRAINING IMPLEMENTATION

Orientation and Social-Cultural Adjustment. The majority of participants receive an orientation upon arrival in the United States, which has been conducted increasingly at participants' training site. This trend may well change given that participants are being sent to the Washington International Center (WIC) under the Development Training Project. There was some indication that WIC orientations are rated more favorably than those at the training site. However, most Burmese participants experience few serious social or cultural adjustment problems and appear highly adaptable. Indeed, the consensus in the training community is that Burmese are model students.

English Language Training. Participants seem to be having more problems with English language ability in recent years. A common problem seems to be with speaking and oral comprehension, primarily due to the various American accents.

Administrative Support. Most participants were very satisfied with the assistance provided to them in program, personal, and administrative matters. However, there seems to have been a recent increase in problems associated with participants' travel arrangements and financial concerns. These matters are currently being acted on by Pragma and AID/Burma in Rangoon.

- Recommendation. AID/Burma might consider providing some English language training with an emphasis on "American English" to supplement the language instruction offered at the Institute of Foreign Languages in Rangoon (see suggested material in pre-departure package).
- Recommendation. Pragma and AID/Burma must continue to give the highest priority to resolution of travel and financial problems currently affecting the morale and attitude of some participants toward their program.

TRAINING QUALITY

Overall Satisfaction. A sizable majority of the participants surveyed report being very satisfied with their overall training experience, especially the content of their programs and training facilities. In addition to the technical aspects of their programs, participants identified the cross-cultural experience as a valuable aspect of their training programs, especially their exposure to U.S. society and culture and the U.S. educational system. Many participants also benefited from the experience of exchanging views with professional peers from other countries. Participants seemed less satisfied with the relevance and applicability of training,

and the mix of practical experience in participants' programs. This was especially true for energy and health participants.

Length of Training. More than a third of the survey group thought their programs were too short. Most of the complaints came from technical participants who commented on the need for more time for field trips and opportunities for practical applications. However, a number of academic participants felt they were not given enough time to complete their programs, either due to the lack of certain pre-requisite courses or an unrealistic assessment of program requirements. Many participants also suggested the need for more time in their programs for social and recreational activities.

Relevance & Applicability of Training. A notable number of participants, especially those from the Ministries of Energy and Health, reported only moderate levels of satisfaction with the relevance and applicability of their training to their work environment in Burma. This may be due to an improper match between participants' backgrounds and the training program or institution, which reflects back to the candidate selection and placement process. As noted earlier, candidates are selected in Burma only after a training program has been approved by the Sub-Cabinet Training Committee. For highly specialized training, programmers find it difficult to identify appropriate training institutions without first reviewing the candidate's background and credentials. These moderate levels of training relevance and applicability may also be due to the fact that some ideas and techniques used in the United States are not entirely transferable to conditions in Burma. This latter may well explain the experience of health and energy participants.

Practical Training. The most frequently-mentioned area for improvement in the overall training design was the need for more practical training experiences, including field trips and on-the-job attachments. This was also one of the program components in which participants were less satisfied.

- o Recommendation. Consideration should be given to include a practical application component in participants' programs when not part of the core program (e.g., field trips, internships, etc.). Planners should also allow enough time in programs for social and recreational activities, (e.g., Mid-Winter seminars, homestays, other complementary programs).

POST-TRAINING EXPERIENCE

Re-Entry and Job Status. All of the participants surveyed returned to the same Ministry which sponsored their training, and most returned to the jobs they held before their training. Participants do not seem to experience any readjustment problems. This reflects positively on the Burmese Government's policy and

procedures for reintegrating participants upon return. Although the majority claim that their AID training has had a favorable impact on their career development, there does not seem to be a notable increase in job responsibility over time.

Training Utilization. A majority of participants reports moderate to high levels of using their training, even though some of the ideas and methods learned in training are not entirely applicable to conditions in Burma. Again, health and energy participants report lower levels. Most of the participants surveyed were able to give examples of changes or new ideas they have introduced in their jobs as a result of training. Only 25% of the survey group reported encountering any constraints to using their training, of which the most frequently-mentioned is the lack of resources or equipment and differing technologies. There also appears to be a trend of declining use over time. This trend might possibly be in response to the persistence or increasing number of various constraints.

Transmission of Training. Interest appears high by participants' colleagues and supervisors in the ideas and skills they have brought back from training. Participants report a moderate sharing of their training, mostly on an informal basis within the work environment.

Professional Development Activities. About half of the survey group reports being more involved in improving programs or developing new projects as a result of their training; and approximately one third reports more activity in committee planning, organizing training activities, and research activities. Most of the participants are in contact with people met through their training on an infrequent basis, mostly through personal letters. However, more than half (60%) receive professional publications. Most participants have received a certificate of achievement in recognition of their training by the AID Office in Burma and have visited the office upon return. However, continuing contact is infrequent. Almost everyone would recommend their training to others. Many participants also suggested the need for more technical publications and refresher courses to help them keep current in their respective fields.

- o Recommendation. AID/Burma should consider incorporating a re-entry workshop in participants' programs to complement their training (a workshop proposal is presented in Appendix J). The purpose is to provide participants with the necessary skills for adapting their training to their home country conditions, and for better communicating their training with colleagues back home.
- o Recommendation. AID/Burma should improve its follow-up activities for the purpose of encouraging and assisting returned participants to more fully utilize their training, and, if possible, to transmit their training to others. This could be done in the form of in-country

workshops organized around technical subjects, perhaps with the participation of a participant's former faculty advisor or training coordinator. Other follow-up activities to consider include keeping returned participants' professional publications subscriptions up-to-date; and sponsoring an alumni association if appropriate; or sponsoring a newsletter or library. At a minimum, the AID Office should provide a list of returned participants to USIS for their mailing list (a current list is attached as Appendix D).

- Recommendation. As an essential first step for organizing follow-up activities, AID/Burma should computerize its records to facilitate periodic follow-up of returned participants. Sample follow-up questionnaires are included in Appendix K and are intended to help keep the Training Office current, as well as provide periodic assessment of participant training activities.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

(Returned Participant Questionnaire
and Oral Interview Guidelines;
In-Training Questionnaire)

The Pragma Corporation

116 East Broad Street
Falls Church, Virginia 22046
(703) 237-9303
TELEX 203507 PRAGMA FSCH UR

SURVEY OF AID PARTICIPANTS IN TRAINING

The Office of the U.S. Agency for International Development (A.I.D.) in Burma and the Ministry of Planning and Finance have contracted with The Pragma Corporation to jointly undertake a study to assess, from a Burmese perspective, the effectiveness of past and present overseas training programs sponsored by A.I.D. The major purpose of this study is to assist in ascertaining the most effective and efficient manner to conduct future overseas training activities, both from a programmatic and managerial point of view.

Your views, as a current participant in the program, can make a most significant contribution to the success of this study. To this end, we would very much appreciate your completing the attached questionnaire. Please be assured of the confidentiality with which your completed questionnaire will be treated. Your name will not be associated with any of the responses which will be analyzed as part of the aggregate data.

The following instructions should guide you and the interviewer in filling out the questionnaire. Participants in short programs may find some of the questions not applicable. In such cases, please move on to the next question.

Your cooperation in this effort is greatly appreciated. Questionnaires must be returned by June 24, 1987 in order to be included in the study. Please use the enclosed self-addressed envelope to return your questionnaire. If you have any questions on this matter, please call either of the undersigned.

Tom Moser (703) 237-9303
Laurel Elmer (202) 462-6021

SURVEY OF AID PARTICIPANTS

Instructions For Questionnaire

1. The questionnaire can be completed either by the participant or jointly with the interviewer, depending on the wishes of the two parties.
2. The questionnaire includes both close-ended questions with a choice of answers; and open-ended questions requiring a written response. Please read each question carefully and answer all questions as candidly and completely as possible.
3. For close-ended questions with a choice of answers, please mark an "X" in the space provided. For example:
 - Did you attend English language training? Yes (X) No ()
 - Is the length of your program:
too long () too short () about right (X)
4. Some responses are provided on a sliding scale of 1 to 5. In such cases, please circle the appropriate number which best reflects your view. For example: How satisfied are you with your training overall?

Very Satisfied Moderately Satisfied Not Satisfied
1 2 3 4 5

5. If you wish to make a correction, please clearly mark out the original response as follows:

Very Satisfied Moderately Satisfied Not Satisfied
1 2 3 4 5

6. Please use pen (not pencil) to complete the questionnaire and write as legibly as possible. If you need more space for any question or wish to make further comments, feel free to use the "comments" section at the end of the questionnaire.

AID PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE

A. BIOGRAPHICAL DATA NAME: _____

1. Sex: Male () Female (); Age: _____ years

2. Sponsoring Ministry: _____

3. Work location before training: Rangoon () Other: _____

4. What kind of AID-sponsored training program are you attending?

<u>Technical Short-Term</u>	<u>Academic Long-Term</u>
() Short Course/Workshop	() Master's Degree
() Study Tour (Several Sites)	() Doctorate Degree
() Conference	() Diploma Program

5. Dates of Training (month/year): from _____ to _____

6. Training Institution(s) and Location(s): _____

7. Field of Training: _____

B. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

8. How important to you personally were the following aspects of the AID training program:

	<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Somewhat Important</u>	<u>Less Important</u>
Increase in knowledge and skills.....	()	()	()
Making professional contacts.....	()	()	()
Obtaining a degree or certificate.....	()	()	()
Contributing to Burma's development.....	()	()	()
Visiting the United States.....	()	()	()
Getting a better job after training.....	()	()	()

9. Did you attend an orientation at the USAID office in Burma before leaving for training? Yes () No ()

16. Have you experienced any of the following social or cultural adjustment difficulties during your stay in the United States?

	No Difficulty	Some Difficulty	Much Difficulty
Adjusting to the climate.	()	()	()
Adjusting to the food.	()	()	()
Adjusting to social-cultural life..	()	()	()
Feeling homesick.	()	()	()
Feeling lonely.	()	()	()
Communication with instructors. .	()	()	()
Communication with colleagues . . .	()	()	()

If you had any social or cultural adjustment problems, please explain: _____

17. Have you experienced any difficulties with the following administrative aspects of your training program?

	No Difficulty	Some Difficulty	Much Difficulty
Visa or immigration problems.....	()	()	()
Using medical insurance	()	()	()
Maintenance allowance/per diem ..	()	()	()
Travel arrangements	()	()	()
Accommodations	()	()	()

If you had any problems with the above, please explain: _____

18. How satisfied are you with assistance with the following:

	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	Not Satisfied		
Personal counseling at your training institution. . . .	1	2	3	4	5
Academic/technical guidance at your training institution. . .	1	2	3	4	5
Assistance from your AID contact person in the U.S. . . .	1	2	3	4	5

19. Please indicate whether you attended English language training in Burma or the United States before your program, and for how long:

Burma. () _____ Number of weeks/months
 USA. () _____ Number of weeks/months
 Did not attend ()

20. If applicable, how helpful was your language training?

	Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Of Little Help
Burma. ()	()	()	()
USA ()	()	()	()

21. Have you had any difficulties with the English language?

	No Difficulty	Some Difficulty	Much Difficulty
Understanding. ()	()	()	()
Speaking. ()	()	()	()
Reading. ()	()	()	()
Writing. ()	()	()	()

C. QUALITY OF TRAINING

22. How satisfied are you with your training program overall?

Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	Not Satisfied
1	2 3 4	5

23. How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your program:

	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	Not Satisfied
Quality of program content.....	1	2 3 4	5
Relevance of training to your work.....	1	2 3 4	5
Applicability of training to conditions in Burma.....	1	2 3 4	5
Balance of theory and practice.....	1	2 3 4	5
Adequacy of training facilities.....	1	2 3 4	5
Competence of instructors.....	1	2 3 4	5

If you are not satisfied with the quality of your training, please explain: _____

24. Is the technical level of your program:

Too Difficult () Too Elementary () About Right ()

25. Is the length of your program:

Too Long () Too Short () About Right ()

26. Is the amount of information (or courses) presented in your program:

Too much () Too Little () About Right ()

27. What amount of new knowledge and skills are you learning in your program?

Large Amount	Moderate Amount	Low Amount
1	2	3
		4
		5

D. SOCIAL AND RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES

28. Which of the following informal activities have you taken part in during your training program:

- Sports events. ()
- Going to picnics or parties. ()
- Going to movies. ()
- Going to concerts or plays. ()
- Going sightseeing. ()
- Visiting American homes. ()

29. With whom do you most often go to these informal activities?

- No one, most often alone. ()
- Most often with Americans. ()
- Most often with other Burmese. ()
- Most often with other foreign nationals. ()
- Most often with mixed groups (Americans, Burmese, or other foreign nationals). ()

30. What other social or recreational activities would you like to participate in but are not able to? _____

E. POST-TRAINING EXPERIENCE: Although you have not yet returned to Burma, please indicate to the best of your ability what you anticipate will be your experience in the following areas upon your return home:

31. Do you expect to have any difficulty in readjusting to your life back home when you return? Yes () No ()

If yes, what kind of readjustment problems do you anticipate?

32. Do you expect to return to the same job you held before your training? Yes () No ()

33. Compared to the level of responsibility in your job before training, will the job you return to have:

- More Responsibility ()
- Less Responsibility ()
- Same Responsibility ()

34. How would you rate the overall effect of your AID training on your career advancement?

Highly Favorable Favorable Less Favorable
 1 2 3 4 5

35. How much do you think you will be able to use the ideas and techniques you are learning from your program in your job upon return?

Large Amount Moderate Amount Low Amount
 1 2 3 4 5

36. Where applicable, do you expect to be more involved in the following activities as a result of your training, or about the same as you would have been without the training:

	Same Involvement	Greater Involvement
Initiate new projects or services. . . .	()	()
Improve programs or services.	()	()
Participate in planning committees. . .	()	()
Plan training workshops or seminars. . .	()	()
Participate in research activities. . . .	()	()

42. Would you recommend your training program to others with similar background? Yes () No ()

43. Besides acquiring new knowledge and skills, are there any other benefits from your training experience: _____

44. What could you recommend to improve your overall training experience?

* * * * *

COMMENTS:



AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

OFFICE OF THE
REPRESENTATIVE TO BURMA

AMERICAN EMBASSY
RANGOON, BURMA

SURVEY OF AID RETURNED PARTICIPANTS

The Office of the U.S. Agency for International Development (A.I.D) in Burma and the Ministry of Planning and Finance are jointly undertaking a study to assess from a Burmese perspective, the effectiveness of past and present overseas training programs sponsored by A.I.D. The major purpose of this study is to assist in ascertaining the most effective and efficient manner to conduct future overseas training activities, both from a programmatic and managerial point of view.

Your views, as a returned participant, can make a most significant contribution to the success of this study. To this end, we would very much appreciate your completing the attached questionnaire and returning it to your Ministry no later than May 22, 1987. Please be assured of the confidentiality with which your completed questionnaire will be treated. Your responses will be analyzed as part of the aggregate data.

The following instructions should guide you in filling out the questionnaire. Participants in short programs may find some of the questions not applicable. In such cases, please move on to the next question. Also, for those who have participated in more than one A.I.D.-sponsored program, please refer to the program of the longest duration.

If you have any questions about this survey or how to complete the questionnaire, please contact any member of the study team at the following numbers: Mr. Tom Moser or Ms. Laurel Elmer at the A.I.D. office (Tel: 82055, Ext. 292); U Htin Kyaw, FERD (Tel: 85011, Ext. 389); U Thet Lwin, Ministry of Education (Tel: 86726); U Aung Khin, Agriculture Corporation (Tel: 86034).

Your cooperation in this effort is greatly appreciated.

SURVEY OF AID RETURNED PARTICIPANTS

Instructions For Questionnaire

1. The questionnaire includes both close-ended questions with a choice of answers; and open-ended questions requiring a written response. Please read each question carefully and answer all questions as candidly and completely as possible.

2. For close-ended questions with a choice of answers, please mark an "X" in the space provided. For example:

• Did you like the training? Yes (X) No ()

• Was the length of your program:

too long () too short () about right (X)

3. Some responses are provided on a sliding scale of 1 to 5. In such cases, please circle the appropriate number which best reflects your view. For example: How satisfied are you with your training overall?

Very Satisfied Moderately Satisfied Not Satisfied
1 2 3 4 5

4. If you wish to make a correction, please clearly mark out the original response as follows:

Very Satisfied Moderately Satisfied Not Satisfied
1 2 3 4 5

5. Please use pen (not pencil) to complete the questionnaire and write as legibly as possible. If you need more space for any question or wish to make further comments, feel free to use the "comments" section at the end of the questionnaire.

Sp

AID RETURNED PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE

A. BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

1. Sex: Male () Female (); Age: _____ years
2. Present work location: Rangoon () Other: _____
3. What kind of AID-sponsored training program did you attend?

- | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------|
| <u>Technical Short-Term</u> | <u>Academic Long-Term</u> |
| () Short Course/Workshop | () Master's Degree |
| () Study Tour (Several Sites) | () Doctorate Degree |
| () Conference | () Diploma Program |

4. Dates of Training (month/year): From _____ To _____
5. Training Institution and Location: _____

6. Field of Training: _____

B. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

7. On what basis were you selected for training (check all that apply):

- Professional Experience... ()
Seniority..... ()
Competitive Exam..... ()
Other: _____ ()

8. How important to you personally were the following reasons for taking part in the AID training program:

	<u>Very</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Somewhat</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Less</u> <u>Important</u>
Increase in knowledge and skills.....	()	()	()
Making professional contacts.....	()	()	()
Obtaining a degree or certificate.....	()	()	()
Contributing to Burma's development.....	()	()	()
Visiting the United States.....	()	()	()
Getting a better job after training.....	()	()	()

9. Did you attend an orientation at the USAID office in Burma before leaving for training? Yes () No ()

10. If applicable, what topics were covered in this pre-departure orientation:

- a) USAID administrative policies and regulations for AID participants.()
- b) Information about the country of training...()
- c) Program details (content, schedule, etc.) ..()
- d) Other (specify): _____()

11. How much notice were you given regarding your departure date:

Number of days _____ Number of weeks _____

12. Based on the information and assistance given to you by the USAID office, how well prepared were you for your training program:

Well Prepared Adequately Prepared Not Well Prepared
1 2 3 4 5

13. Which of the following orientation session(s) did you attend upon arrival in the country of training (USA or third country)?

- Washington International Center()
- Training Institution()
- Other (specify)()
- Did not attend any orientation()

14. If you attended an orientation, how useful was it (they)?

	Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Less Useful
USAID orientation in Burma.....	()	()	()
Washington International Center..	()	()	()
Training Institution.....	()	()	()
Other: _____	()	()	()

15. What additional information would have been helpful to you in an orientation to the USA (or third country) and your training program:

52

16. During your training program, did you experience any of the following social or cultural adjustment difficulties?

	No Difficulty	Some Difficulty	Much Difficulty
Adjusting to the climate.	()	()	()
Adjusting to the food.	()	()	()
Adjusting to social-cultural life..	()	()	()
Feeling homesick.	()	()	()
Feeling lonely.	()	()	()
Acceptance by instructors.	()	()	()
Acceptance by colleagues.	()	()	()

If you had any social or cultural adjustment problems, please feel free to explain: _____

17. Did you have any difficulties with the following administrative aspects of your training experience?

	No Difficulty	Some Difficulty	Much Difficulty
Personal matters	()	()	()
Program matters	()	()	()
Visa or immigration problems.....	()	()	()
Using medical insurance	()	()	()
Maintenance allowance/per diem ..	()	()	()
Travel arrangements	()	()	()
Accommodations	()	()	()

If you had any problems with the above, please feel free to explain: _____

18. Did you have any difficulties with the English language in your program?

	No Difficulty	Some Difficulty	Much Difficulty
Understanding.	()	()	()
Speaking.	()	()	()
Reading.	()	()	()
Writing.	()	()	()

D. POST-TRAINING EXPERIENCE

24. Did you have difficulty with the following upon your return:

	No Difficulty	Some Difficulty	Much Difficulty
Readjusting to your job. . . .	()	()	()
Readjusting to cultural norms or lifestyle. . . .	()	()	()
Readjusting to family life. .	()	()	()

If you had any readjustment difficulties upon your return, please explain: _____

25. Did you return to the same job you held before your training program?

Yes () No ()

26. Is your current job with the same Ministry which sponsored your training? Yes () No ()

If not, please explain: _____

27. How relevant is your current job to your training?

Very Relevant () Moderately Relevant () Less Relevant ()

If not relevant, please explain: _____

28. Have you received a training-related promotion:

Yes () No ()

29. Compared to the level of responsibility in your job before training, does your current job have:

- More Responsibility ()
- Less Responsibility ()
- Same Responsibility ()

30. How would you rate the overall effect of your AID training on your career advancement:

Highly Favorable Favorable Less Favorable
 1 2 3 4 5

31. How much are you able to utilize the knowledge and skills from training in your present job?

Large Amount Moderate Amount Low Amount
 1 2 3 4 5

32. Where applicable, are you more involved in the following activities as a result of your training, or about the same as you would have been without the training:

	Same Involvement	Greater Involvement
Initiate new projects or services. . . .	()	()
Improve programs or services.	()	()
Participate in planning committees. . .	()	()
Plan training workshops or seminars. . .	()	()
Participant in research activities. . .	()	()

33. Could you give examples of any changes or new ideas you have introduced in your work as a result of your training program?

34. What specific ideas, skills, or techniques learned during your training do you consider to be of most value in carrying out your job responsibilities:

56

35. What problems, if any, have you encountered in applying your training in your job since your return?

E. TRANSMISSION AND MAINTENANCE OF TRAINING

36. How interested are your colleagues and supervisors in the new ideas and techniques learned through your training program?

Very Interested	Somewhat Interested	Less Interested
1	2	3
4	5	

37. Since returning from training, to what degree have you shared your knowledge from training with your colleagues:

Large Amount () Moderate Amount () Low Amount ()

38. How often have you used the following methods for sharing your training with your colleagues:

	Often	Sometimes	Rarely
Informal discussion.....	()	()	()
Formal training (seminars, etc.).....	()	()	()
On-the-job training.....	()	()	()
Written reports.....	()	()	()
Exchange of training materials.....	()	()	()
Other (specify): _____	()	()	()

39. Since your return, how often have you corresponded with an organization you visited or person you met during your training:

Often () Sometimes () Rarely ()

40. Have you joined a training-related American professional association since completing your program? Yes () No ()

41. Do you receive any professional publications? Yes () No ()

42. Would you recommend your training program to others with similar background? Yes () No ()

43. Besides acquiring new knowledge and skills, were there any other benefits from your training experience: _____

44. What could you recommend to improve your overall training experience?

45. In addition to your technical program, what other activities or programs do you wish you could have participated in during training?

46. Which are the most important fields of study in your department that you think are most in need of external training?

47. Did you visit the AID Training Office upon your return to discuss your training experience? Yes () No ()

48. Have you received a certificate from the AID Office in recognition of your training experience? Yes () No ()

* * * * *

COMMENTS:

ORAL INTERVIEW GUIDELINES

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

1. How satisfied were you with assistance in preparing for your training program (both in Burma and upon arrival in the country of training-e.g., ample notice, orientation, travel arrangements, etc.)
2. Did you have any social or cultural adjustment problems in the country of training (USA or third country) (Please provide examples)?
3. What advice would you give departing participants before leaving Burma for a training program in the USA (third country)? What are some things you wish you had been told ahead of time?
4. How satisfied were you with assistance provided (by your AID contact or at the training center) with administrative and/or program matters during your training program? How could the management of the program be improved?

QUALITY OF TRAINING

5. Overall, how satisfied are you with your AID training experience? How satisfied with quality of content and its relevance to conditions in Burma? (If not, why?)
6. Besides acquiring new knowledge and skills, were there any other benefits from your training experience? (Please provide examples)
7. What other activities or programs do you wish you had participated in during your program? (e.g., home visits, tours, field trips, etc.)

TRAINING UTILIZATION

8. How useful are the knowledge and skills learned during your training program to your current job responsibilities? (Please give examples)
9. Have you undertaken new activities or initiated any changes in your job as a result of your training? (Please provide examples)
10. What would facilitate a greater application of the knowledge and skills you acquired from training in your current job? (What constraints have you encountered in applying your training?)
11. Have your colleagues and supervisors been interested in using the new ideas and techniques you learned from training? (If not, why?)
12. Have you been able to share your training with others in Burma since your return? If so, how?

OTHER

13. Have you been in contact with the AID office in Burma since returning from training? (For what purpose?)
14. Since returning to Burma, have you corresponded with contacts made during your training experience? What kind of contacts? (e.g., letters to friends, professional inquiries, etc.)
15. What did you like best about your training experience?
16. What did you like least about your training experience?
17. What kind of training do you think your organization is in most need of? (What fields of study; degree or non-degree; short-term, etc.)

APPENDIX B

SURVEY SAMPLE:

Statistical Representativeness

(Tables 9 & 10)

TABLE 9 - DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL POPULATION AND RETURNED PARTICIPANT
SURVEY SAMPLE BY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION

LOCATION	RETURNED PARTICIPANT SAMPLE					
	TOTAL RETURNED		QUESTIONNAIRE		INTERVIEW	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
RANGOON	119	58.9	70	62.5	45	80.4
REGIONAL	78	38.6	42	37.5	11*	19.6
OTHER (3-retired;2-overseas)	5	2.5				
TOTAL	202	100%	112	100%	56	

*Two participants were interviewed in Rangoon

TABLE 9.2 - DISTRIBUTION BY TYPE OF TRAINING PROGRAM

PROGRAM	TOTAL RETURNED		QUESTIONNAIRE		INTERVIEW	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
TECHNICAL	178	88.1	94	83.9	43	76.8
DEGREE	24	11.9	18	16.1	13	23.2
TOTAL	202	100%	112	100%	56	100%

TABLE 9.3 - DISTRIBUTION BY GENDER

SEX	TOTAL RETURNED		QUESTIONNAIRE	
	#	%	#	%
MALE	165	81.7	96	85.7
FEMALE	37	18.3	16	14.3
TOTAL	202	100%	112	100%

TABLE 9.4 - DISTRIBUTION BY TRAINING LOCATION

LOCATION	TOTAL RETURNED		QUESTIONNAIRE	
	#	%	#	%
USA	171	84.6	99	88.4
THIRD	23	11.4	12	10.7
BOTH	8	4.0	1	.9
TOTAL	202	100%	112	100%

TABLE 9.5 - DISTRIBUTION BY YEAR RETURNED

YEAR	TOTAL RETURNED		QUESTIONNAIRE	
	#	%	#	%
1980 - 83	92	45.5	42	37.5
1984 - 87	110	54.5	70	62.5
TOTAL	202	100%	112	100%

TABLE 9.6 - DISTRIBUTION BY MINISTRY

MINISTRY	TOTAL POPULATION		QUESTIONNAIRE		INTERVIEW	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
AGRICULTURE/FORESTS	91	45.0	49	43.7	22	39.3
ENERGY	48	23.8	30	26.8	8	14.3
HEALTH	34	16.8	9	8.0	7	12.5
COOPERATIVES	14	6.9	13	11.6	10	17.9
LABOR	5	2.5	4	3.6	3	5.4
TRADE	2	1.0	1	.9	1	1.8
CENTRAL ACCOUNTS	2	1.0	0	0	2	3.5
HOME-RELIGIOUS	2	1.0	2	1.8	1	1.8
EDUCATION	2	1.0	2	1.8	2	3.5
PLANNING/FINANCE	1	.5	1	.9	0	0
MINES	1	.5	1	.9	0	0
TOTAL	202	100%	112	100%	56	100%

TABLE 10.1 - DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL POPULATION &
IN - TRAINING PARTICIPANTS BY MINISTRY

SPONSORING MINISTRY	TOTAL		SURVEY SAMPLE	
	#	%	#	%
AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	11	20.4	8	25.0
LIVESTOCK BREEDING & FISHERIES	10	18.5	10	31.3
HEALTH	4	7.4	3	9.4
ENERGY	3	5.6	0	0
TRADE	6	11.1	0	0
PLANNING & FINANCE	6	11.1	4	12.5
EDUCATION	9	16.7	6	18.8
COOPERATIVES	2	3.7	0	0
LABOR	2	3.7	0	0
CENTRAL ACCOUNT OFFICE	1	1.9	1	3.1
TOTAL	54	100%	32	100%

TABLE 10.2 - DISTRIBUTION BY TYPE OF TRAINING

TYPE OF TRAINING	TOTAL		SURVEY SAMPLE	
	#	%	#	%
TECHNICAL	38	70.4	21	65.6
DEGREE	16	29.6	11	34.4
TOTAL	54	100%	32	100%

TABLE 10.3 - DISTRIBUTION BY GENDER

GENDER	TOTAL		SURVEY SAMPLE	
	#	%	#	%
MALE	41	75.9	24	75.0
FEMALE	13	24.1	8	25.0
TOTAL	54	100%	32	100%

APPENDIX C

SURVEY FINDINGS:
Statistical Tables
(Tables 11 - 42)

TABLE 11 - IMPORTANT REASONS FOR ATTENDING TRAINING
(IN PERCENTAGES)

REASONS	VERY IMPORTANT			SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT			NOT IMPORTANT		
	RP*(112)	US*(32)	TOTAL(144)	RP(112)	US(32)	TOTAL(144)	RP(112)	US(32)	TOTAL(144)
GAINING KNOWLEDGE & SKILLS	83.9	93.8	86.1	14.3	6.3	12.5	0	0	0
MAKING PROFESSIONAL CONTACTS	25.0	25.0	25.0	49.1	56.3	50.7	18.6	9.4	16.7
BURMA'S DEVELOPMENT	78.6	87.5	80.5	17.9	6.3	15.3	.9	3.1	1.4
VISITING THE USA	15.2	9.4	13.9	46.4	75.0	52.8	21.4	12.5	19.4

*RP = RETURNED PARTICIPANTS

*US = PARTICIPANTS IN-TRAINING

68

TABLE 12.1 - AVERAGE DAYS NOTICE

PARTICIPANTS	AVERAGE NUMBER OF DAYS		
	TECHNICAL	DEGREE	OVERALL
RETURNED (112)	36	23	34
IN-TRAINING (32)	21	15	19
TOTAL (144)	33	20	30

TABLE 12.2 - LEVEL OF PREPARATION
OVERALL AND BY TYPE
OF TRAINING PROGRAM
(IN PERCENTAGES)

PARTICIPANTS	HOW WELL PREPARED		
	VERY	SOMEWHAT	NOT
RETURNED (112)	50.9	30.4	13.4
IN-TRAINING (32)	31.3	53.1	15.6
TOTAL (144)	46.5	35.4	13.9

TECHNICAL PARTICIPANTS	VERY	SOMEWHAT	NOT
RETURNED (94)	52.1	30.9	11.7
IN-TRAINING (21)	28.6	47.6	23.8
TOTAL (115)	47.8	33.9	13.9

DEGREE PARTICIPANTS	VERY	SOMEWHAT	NOT
RETURNED (18)	44.4	27.8	22.2
IN-TRAINING (11)	36.4	63.6	0
TOTAL (29)	41.4	41.4	13.8

TABLE 12.3 - LEVEL OF PREPARATION BY YEAR RETURNED
(IN PERCENTAGES)

YEAR RETURNED	HOW WELL PREPARED		
	VERY	SOMEWHAT	NOT
1980 - 83 (42)	59.5	16.7	16.7
1984 - 87 (70)	45.7	38.6	11.4
TOTAL (112)	50.9	30.4	13.4

TABLE 13.1 - PRE-DEPARTURE ORIENTATION OVERALL
(IN PERCENTAGES)

PARTICIPANTS	YES	NO
RETURNED (112)	27.7	71.4
IN-TRAINING (32)	34.4	65.6
TOTAL (144)	29.2	70.1

TABLE 13.2 - PRE-DEPARTURE ORIENTATION
BY YEAR RETURNED

YEAR RETURNED	ATTENDED ORIENTATION	
	YES	NO
1980 - 83 (42)	19.0	81.0
1984 - 87 (70)	32.9	65.7
TOTAL (112)	27.7	71.4

TABLE 13.3 - USEFULNESS OF PRE-DEPARTURE ORIENTATION

PARTICIPANTS	VERY	SOMEWHAT	NOT	NO RESPONSE
RETURNED (31)	32.3	29.0	0	38.7
IN-TRAINING (11)	63.6	36.4	0	0
TOTAL (42)	40.5	31.0	0	28.5

TABLE 13.4 - PRE-DEPARTURE ORIENTATION TOPICS

PARTICIPANTS	AID RULES & REGULATIONS	INFO ON COUNTRY OF TRAINING	PROGRAM DETAILS
RETURNED (31)	45.2	80.6	61.3
IN-TRAINING (11)	90.9	100.0	45.4
TOTAL (42)	57.1	85.7	57.1

TABLE 14.1 - ARRIVAL ORIENTATION OVERALL

(IN PERCENTAGES)

PARTICIPANTS	US OR THIRD COUNTRY ORIENTATION	
	YES	NO
RETURNED (112)	68.8	25.9
IN - TRAINING (32)	62.5	37.5
TOTAL (144)	67.4%	28.5%

TABLE 14.2 - LOCATION OF ARRIVAL ORIENTATION

ORIENTATION LOCATION	VERY			SOMEWHAT			NOT		
	RP	US	TOTAL	RP	US	TOTAL	RP	US	TOTAL
WIC (44)	88.2	10.0	70.4	11.8	80.0	27.3	0	10.0	2.3
TRAINING SITE (61)	61.2	83.3	65.6	38.8	16.7	34.4	0	0	0

TABLE 14.3 - USEFULNESS OF ARRIVAL ORIENTATIONS

YEAR RETURNED	US/TC ORIENTATION			
	WIC	TRAINING SITE	BOTH	NONE
1980 - 83 (42)	50.0	7.1	9.5	26.2
1984 - 87 (70)	16.7	57.1	2.9	25.7
TOTAL (112)	25.0	38.4	5.4	25.9

TABLE 15 - SOCIAL & CULTURAL ADJUSTMENT

(IN PERCENTAGES)

AREAS OF ADJUSTMENT	LEVEL OF DIFFICULTY								
	NONE			SOME			MUCH		
	RP(112)	US(32)	TOTAL(144)	RP(112)	US(32)	TOTAL(144)	RP(112)	US(32)	TOTAL(144)
CLIMATE	63.4	78.1	66.7	32.1	18.8	29.2	3.6	3.1	3.5
FOOD	58.0	71.9	61.1	38.4	21.9	34.7	2.7	6.3	3.5
LIFE STYLE	61.6	68.8	63.2	33.0	25.0	31.3	3.6	3.1	3.5
HOMESICK	72.3	50.0	67.4	25.0	40.6	28.5	1.8	9.4	3.5
LONELY	77.7	78.1	77.8	18.8	21.9	19.4	2.7	0	2.1
INTERACTIONS WITH INSTRUCTORS	90.2	93.8	91.0	8.0	6.3	7.6	.9	0	.7
INTERACTIONS WITH COLLEAGUES	84.8	93.8	86.8	13.4	6.3	11.8	0	0	0

TABLE 16.1 - PARTICIPATION IN SOCIAL ACTIVITIES BY
IN-TRAINING PARTICIPANTS

ACTIVITY	% OF PARTICIPANTS (N=32)
SPORTS	37.5
PICNICS/PARTIES	75.0
MOVIES	28.1
PLAY/CONCERTS	18.8
SIGHTSEEING	87.5
HOME VISITS	84.4

TABLE 16.2 - PARTICIPATION WITH WHOM?

ALONE	6.3
AMERICANS	12.5
BURMESE	53.1
FOREIGNERS	6.3
MIXED GROUPS	78.1

TABLE 17.1 - ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROBLEMS OVERALL

(IN PERCENTAGES)

LANGUAGE ABILITY	LEVEL OF DIFFICULTY								
	NONE			SOME			MUCH		
	RP(112)	US(32)	TOTAL(144)	RP(112)	US(32)	TOTAL(144)	RP(112)	US(32)	TOTAL(144)
COMPREHENSION	68.8	59.4	66.7	27.7	37.5	30.0	1.8	3.1	2.1
SPEAKING	64.3	46.9	60.4	33.0	50.0	36.8	.9	3.1	1.4
READING	94.6	81.3	91.7	3.6	18.8	6.9	0	0	0
WRITING	88.4	40.6	77.8	10.7	56.3	20.8	0	3.1	.7

TABLE 17.2 - ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROBLEMS
BY YEAR RETURNED
N=112

LANGUAGE ABILITY	LEVEL OF DIFFICULTY					
	NONE		SOME		MUCH	
	1980-83(42)	1984-87(70)	1980-83(42)	1984-87(70)	1980-83(42)	1984-87(70)
COMPREHENSION	73.8	65.7	23.8	30.0	0	2.9
SPEAKING	76.2	57.1	21.4	40.0	0	1.4
READING	97.6	92.9	0	5.7	0	0
WRITING	92.9	85.7	4.8	14.3	0	0

25

TABLE 17.3 - ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING (ELT)
 LOCATION FOR PARTICIPANTS IN-TRAINING
 N=32
 (IN PERCENTAGES)

ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING			
BURMA	USA	BOTH	NONE
6.3	12.5	37.5	43.7

TABLE 17.4 - AVERAGE ELT LENGTH
 (IN WEEKS)

LOCATION - ELT	NUMBER OF WEEKS
BURMA (14)	8.5
USA (16)	7.5

TABLE 17.5 - ELT USEFULNESS

ELT PARTICIPANTS	ELT USEFULNESS		
	VERY	SOMEWHAT	NOT
BURMA (14)	28.6	71.4	0
USA (16)	37.5	62.5	0

TABLE 18.1 - ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS OVERALL

(IN PERCENTAGES)

ADMINISTRATIVE ASPECTS	LEVEL OF DIFFICULTY								
	NONE			SOME			MUCH		
	RP(112)	US(32)	TOTAL(144)	RP(112)	US(32)	TOTAL(144)	RP(112)	US(32)	TOTAL(144)
PERSONAL	90.2			.9			0		
PROGRAM	89.3			.9			0		
VISA	94.6	93.8	94.4	4.5	3.1	4.2	0	3.1	.7
MEDICAL	86.6	68.8	82.6	6.3	3.1	5.5	0	0	0
ALLOWANCE	75.0	71.9	74.3	22.3	1.3	20.1	1.8	0	1.4
TRAVEL	83.0	31.3	71.5	16.1	31.3	19.4	0	37.5	8.3
HOUSING	76.8	56.3	72.2	19.6	31.3	22.2	.9	3.1	1.4

TABLE 18.2 - ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS BY YEAR RETURNED

(N = 112)

ADMINISTRATIVE ASPECTS	LEVEL OF DIFFICULTY					
	NONE		SOME		MUCH	
	1980-83(42)	1984-87(70)	1980-83(42)	1984-87(70)	1980-83(42)	1984-87(70)
MEDICAL	76.2	92.9	7.1	5.7	0	0
ALLOWANCE	71.4	77.1	26.2	20.0	0	2.9
TRAVEL	81.0	84.3	16.7	15.7	0	0
HOUSING	71.4	80.0	23.8	17.1	0	1.4

TABLE 19 - TECHNICAL LEVEL OF PROGRAM
(IN PERCENTAGES)

PARTICIPANTS	TOO HIGH	OK	TOO LOW
RETURNED (112)	.9	98.2	0
IN - TRAINING(32)	9.4	90.6	0
TOTAL (144)	2.8	96.5	0

TABLE 20 - PROGRAM LENGTH
(IN PERCENTAGES)

PARTICIPANTS	TOO LONG	OK	TOO SHORT
RETURNED (112)	0	62.5	35.7
IN - TRAINING(32)	0	56.3	40.6
TOTAL (144)	0	61.1	36.8

TABLE 21 - NEW KNOWLEDGE & SKILLS
(IN PERCENTAGES)

PARTICIPANTS	LARGE AMOUNT	MODERATE AMOUNT	LOW AMOUNT
RETURNED (112)	75.9	23.2	0
IN - TRAINING(32)	100.0	0	0
TOTAL (144)	81.3	18.1	0

TABLE 22.1 - OVERALL PROGRAM SATISFACTION

(IN PERCENTAGES)

PARTICIPANTS	LEVEL OF SATISFACTION		
	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
RETURNED (112)	76.8	15.2	3.6
IN - TRAINING(32)	68.8	18.8	0
TOTAL (144)	75.0	16.0	2.8

TABLE 22.2 - OVERALL SATISFACTION BY GENDER

GENDER (144)	HIGH			MODERATE			LOW		
	RP(112)	US(32)	TOTAL(144)	RP(112)	US(32)	TOTAL(144)	RP(112)	US(32)	TOTAL(144)
MALE (120)	76.0	66.7	74.2	14.6	16.7	15.0	4.2	0	3.3
FEMALE (24)	81.3	75.0	79.2	18.7	25.0	20.8	0	0	0

TABLE 22.3 - OVERALL SATISFACTION BY PROGRAM

PROGRAM(N=144)	HIGH			MODERATE			LOW		
	RP(112)	US(32)	TOTAL(144)	RP(112)	US(32)	TOTAL(144)	RP(112)	US(32)	TOTAL(144)
TECHNICAL(115)	74.5	66.7	73.0	16.0	19.0	16.5	4.3	0	3.5
DEGREE (29)	88.9	72.7	82.8	11.1	18.2	13.8	0	0	0

80

TABLE 22.4 - OVERALL SATISFACTION BY SPONSORING
 MINISTRY - RETURNED PARTICIPANTS ONLY
 (IN PERCENTAGES)

(N=112) MINISTRY	LEVEL OF SATISFACTION		
	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
AGRI/FORESTS (49)	79.6	12.2	4.1
ENERGY (30)	73.3	16.7	3.3
COOPERATIVES(13)	84.6	7.7	7.7
HEALTH (9)	66.7	22.2	0
LABOR (4)	100.0	0	0
OTHER (7)	57.1	42.9	0

TABLE 22.5 - OVERALL SATISFACTION BY YEAR RETURNED

YEAR RETURNED(N=112)	LEVEL OF SATISFACTION		
	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
1980 - 83 (42)	76.2	14.3	2.4
1984 - 87 (70)	77.1	15.7	4.3

TABLE 23.1 - SATISFACTION WITH PROGRAM COMPONENTS
(IN PERCENTAGES)

PROGRAM COMPONENTS	SATISFACTION								
	HIGH			MODERATE			LOW		
	RP(112)	US(32)	TOTAL(144)	RP(112)	US(32)	TOTAL(144)	RP(112)	US(32)	TOTAL(144)
CONTENT	76.8	81.3	77.8	22.3	9.4	19.4	0	0	0
RELEVANCE	70.5	84.4	73.6	22.3	12.5	20.1	5.4	0	4.2
APPLICABILITY	58.0	87.5	64.6	32.1	9.4	27.1	8.9	0	6.9
BALANCE	58.0	68.8	60.4	31.3	21.9	29.2	8.0	0	6.3
FACILITIES	79.5	90.7	81.9	13.4	6.3	11.8	4.5	0	3.5

TABLE 23.2 - SATISFACTION WITH PROGRAM COMPONENTS OVER TIME
(N=112)

PROGRAM COMPONENTS	SATISFACTION					
	HIGH		MODERATE		LOW	
	1980-83	1984-87	1980-83	1984-87	1980-83	1984-87
CONTENTS	81.0	74.3	16.7	25.7	0	0
RELEVANCE	73.8	68.6	16.7	25.7	7.1	4.3
APPLICABILITY	59.5	57.1	31.0	32.9	9.5	8.6
BALANCE	50.0	62.9	38.1	27.1	9.5	7.1
FACILITIES	78.6	80.0	14.3	12.9	2.4	5.7

TABLE 24.1 - RELEVANCE TO WORK BY TYPE OF PROGRAM
(IN PERCENTAGES)

(N=144) TYPE OF PROGRAM	LEVEL OF SATISFACTION								
	HIGH			MODERATE			LOW		
	RP(112)	US(32)	TOTAL(144)	RP(112)	US(32)	TOTAL(144)	RP(112)	US(32)	TOTAL(144)
TECHNICAL (115)	68.1	81.0	70.4	23.4	4.3	21.7	6.4	0	5.2
DEGREE (29)	83.3	90.9	86.2	16.7	9.1	13.8	0	0	0

TABLE 24.2 - RELEVANCE TO WORK BY SPONSORING MINISTRY

MINISTRY(N=112)	LEVEL OF SATISFACTION		
	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
AGRICULTURE/FORESTS	77.6	20.4	2.0
ENERGY	56.7	23.3	16.7
COOPERATIVES	76.9	23.1	0
HEALTH	66.7	33.3	0
LABOR	100.0	0	0
OTHER	57.1	28.6	0

TABLE 25.1 - APPLICABILITY TO BURMA BY TYPE OF PROGRAM

TYPE OF PROGRAM (N = 112)	LEVEL OF SATISFACTION								
	HIGH			MODERATE			LOW		
	RP	US	TOTAL	RP	US	TOTAL	RP	US	TOTAL
TECHNICAL(115)	59.6	85.7	64.3	28.7	9.5	25.2	10.6	0	8.7
DEGREE (29)	50.0	90.9	65.5	50.0	9.1	34.5	0	0	0

TABLE 25.2 - APPLICABILITY TO BURMA BY SPONSORING MINISTRY

(RETURNED PARTICIPANTS ONLY)

MINISTRY (N=112)	LEVEL OF SATISFACTION		
	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
AGRI/FORESTS (49)	63.3	34.7	2.0
ENERGY (30)	56.7	26.7	16.7
COOPERATIVES(13)	76.9	7.7	15.4
HEALTH (9)	0	88.9	11.1
LABOR (4)	50.0	50.0	0
OTHER (7)	71.4	0	14.3

84

TABLE 26.1 - BALANCE OF THEORY & PRACTICE BY TYPE OF PROGRAM

(IN PERCENTAGES)

TYPE OF PROGRAM	LEVEL OF SATISFACTION								
	HIGH			MODERATE			LOW		
	RP(112)	US(32)	TOTAL(144)	RP(112)	US(32)	TOTAL(144)	RP(112)	US(32)	TOTAL(144)
TECHNICAL (115)	56.4	66.7	58.3	33.0	19.0	30.4	8.5	0	7.0
DEGREE (29)	66.7	72.7	69.0	22.2	27.3	24.1	5.6	0	3.4
TOTAL (144)	58.0	68.8	60.4	31.3	21.9	29.2	8.0	0	6.3

TABLE 26.2 - BALANCE OF THEORY & PRACTICE BY SPONSORING MINISTRY

MINISTRY (N=112)	LEVEL OF SATISFACTION		
	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
AGRI/FORESTS(49)	63.3	34.7	2.0
ENERGY (30)	53.3	30.0	13.3
COOPERATIVES(13)	69.2	23.1	7.7
HEALTH (9)	33.3	16.7	3.3
LABOR (4)	75.0	0	25.0
OTHER (7)	42.9	14.3	14.3

88

TABLE 27 - RE - ENTRY ADJUSTMENT

(N = 112) AREAS OF ADJUSTMENT	LEVEL OF DIFFICULTY		
	NONE	SOME	MUCH
JOB	95.5	3.6	0
LIFESTYLE	97.3	1.8	0
FAMILY	98.2	.9	0

TABLE 28 - JOB STATUS UPON RETURN

(N=112) PROGRAM	SAME JOB		SAME MINISTRY	
	YES	NO		
TECHNICAL(94)	89.4	9.6	100.0	0
DEGREE (18)	66.7	33.3		
TOTAL (112)	85.7	13.4		

TABLE 29.1 - RELEVANCE OF TRAINING TO
JOB BY MINISTRY
(IN PERCENTAGES)

MINISTRY	VERY	SOMEWHAT	NOT
AGRI/FORESTS (49)	59.2	36.7	2.0
ENERGY (30)	30.0	70.0	0
HEALTH (9)	33.3	55.5	11.1
COOPERATIVES(13)	46.2	53.8	0
LABOR (4)	75.0	25.0	0
OTHER (7)	42.9	57.1	0
TOTAL (112)	47.3	50.0	1.8

TABLE 29.2 - RELEVANCE OF TRAINING TO
JOB BY MINISTRY
(IN PERCENTAGES)

YEAR RETURNED	RELEVANCE TO TRAINING TO JOB		
	VERY	SOMEWHAT	NOT
1980 -83 (42)	45.2	50.0	2.4
1984 -87 (70)	48.6	50.0	1.4

TABLE 30.1 - LEVEL OF JOB RESPONSIBILITY BY
 TYPE OF PROGRAM
 (IN PERCENTAGES)

PROGRAM TYPE	JOB RESPONSIBILITY		
	MORE	SOME	LESS
TECHNICAL(94)	46.8	50.0	1.1
DEGREE (18)	66.7	27.8	5.5
TOTAL (112)	50.0	46.4	1.8

TABLE 30.2 - JOB RESPONSIBILITY BY YEAR RETURNED

YEAR RETURNED(N=112)	LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY		
	MORE	SOME	LESS
1980 - 83 (42)	50.0	45.2	0
1984 - 87 (70)	50.0	47.1	2.9

TABLE 31.1 - IMPACT OF AID TRAINING ON
CAREER BY TYPE OF PROGRAM

PROGRAM TYPE	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
TECHNICAL(94)	53.2	39.4	5.3
DEGREE (18)	44.4	55.6	0
TOTAL (112)	51.8	42.0	4.5

TABLE 31.2 - IMPACT OF AID TRAINING
ON CAREER BY MINISTRY

MINISTRY (N=112)	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
AGRICULTURE (49)	52.2	38.8	0
ENERGY (30)	40.0	43.3	13.3
COOPERATIVES(13)	76.9	23.1	0
HEALTH (9)	22.2	77.8	0
LABOR (4)	50.0	50.0	0
OTHER (7)	42.9	42.9	14.3

TABLE 32.1 - UTILIZATION OF TRAINING UPON RETURN
(IN PERCENTAGES)

PROGRAM TYPE	TRAINING UTILIZATION		
	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
TECHNICAL(94)	54.3	39.4	4.3
DEGREE (18)	61.1	28.9	0
TOTAL (112)	55.4	39.3	3.6

TABLE 32.2 - UTILIZATION OF TRAINING BY GENDER

GENDER	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
MALE (96)	53.1	41.7	4.2
FEMALE (16)	68.8	25.0	0

TABLE 32.3 - UTILIZATION OF TRAINING BY MINISTRY

MINISTRY	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
AGRI/FORESTS (49)	67.3	28.6	2.0
ENERGY (30)	40.0	46.7	10.0
HEALTH (9)	44.4	55.6	0
COOPERATIVES(13)	61.5	38.5	0
LABOR (4)	75.0	25.0	0
OTHER (7)	28.6	71.4	0

TABLE 32.4 - UTILIZATION OF TRAINING BY YEAR RETURNED

YEAR RETURNED	TRAINING UTILIZATION		
	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
1980 - 83 (42)	45.2	45.2	4.8
1984 - 87 (70)	60.0	35.7	2.9

TABLE 32.5 - CONSTRAINTS TO UTILIZATION

YEAR RETURNED	CONSTRAINTS TO UTILIZATION		
	YES	NO	NR
1980 - 83 (42)	16.7	50.0	33.3
1984 - 87 (70)	30.0	35.7	34.3
TOTAL (112)	25.0	41.1	33.9

TABLE 33 - INTEREST OF OTHERS IN KNOWLEDGE
AND SKILLS FROM TRAINING

	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
TOTAL (112)	63.4	29.5	2.7

TABLE 34.1 - SHARE TRAINING WITH OTHERS
BY TYPE OF PROGRAM

PROGRAM TYPE	LEVEL OF SHARING		
	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
TECHNICAL(94)	14.9	72.3	8.5
DEGREE (18)	11.1	83.3	5.6
TOTAL (112)	14.3	74.1	8.0

TABLE 34.2 - SHARE TRAINING WITH OTHERS BY GENDER

GENDER	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
MALE (96)	13.5	72.9	9.4
FEMALE (16)	18.8	81.2	0

TABLE 34.3 - SHARE TRAINING WITH OTHERS BY MINISTRY

MINISTRY	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
AGRICULTURE (49)	22.4	69.4	4.1
ENERGY (30)	10.0	76.7	10.0
HEALTH (9)	0	100.0	0
COOPERATIVES(13)	7.7	84.6	7.7
LABOR (4)	0	50.0	25.0
OTHER (7)	14.3	57.1	28.6

APPENDIX H
PARTICIPANT STATEMENTS
ON
FUTURE TRAINING PRIORITIES

GH

TABLE 35.1 - METHODS OF SHARING KNOWLEDGE
AND SKILLS FROM TRAINING
(IN PERCENTAGES)

N = 112 METHODS USED	FREQUENCY OF SHARING		
	OFTEN	SOMETIMES	RARELY
DISCUSSION	54.5	39.3	4.5
FORMAL TRAINING	5.4	44.6	35.7
ON-THE-JOB	21.4	42.0	25.0
WRITTEN REPORTS	6.3	56.3	26.8
EXCHANGE MATERIALS	7.1	44.6	33.9

TABLE 35.2 - ON-THE-JOB TRAINING BY TYPE OF PROGRAM

PROGRAM TYPE	OFTEN	SOMETIMES	RARELY
TECHNICAL(94)	22.3	40.4	24.5
DEGREE (18)	16.7	50.0	27.8
TOTAL (112)	21.4	42.0	25.0

TABLE 35.3 - ON-THE-JOB TRAINING BY MINISTRY

MINISTRY(N=112)	OFTEN	SOMETIMES	RARELY
AGRICULTURE (49)	14.3	51.0	26.5
ENERGY (30)	26.7	30.0	26.7
COOPERATIVES(13)	30.8	38.5	23.1
HEALTH (9)	55.6	22.2	22.2
LABOR (4)	0	25.0	25.0
OTHER (7)	0	71.4	14.3

25

TABLE 35.4 - FORMAL WORKSHOPS/SEMINAR
BY TYPE OF PROGRAM

PROGRAM TYPE	OFTEN	SOMETIMES	RARELY
TECHNICAL(94)	5.3	41.5	38.3
DEGREE (18)	5.5	61.1	22.2
TOTAL (112)	5.4	44.6	35.7

TABLE 35.5 - FORMAL WORKSHOPS/SEMINARS
BY MINISTRY

MINISTRY	OFTEN	SOMETIMES	RARELY
AGRICULTURE (49)	4.1	57.1	26.5
ENERGY (30)	3.3	36.7	40.0
COOPERATIVES(13)	7.7	30.8	61.5
HEALTH (9)	22.2	44.4	22.2
LABOR (4)	0	50.0	25.0
OTHER (7)	0	14.3	57.1

TABLE 36.1 - GREATER PROFESSIONAL INVOLVEMENT

BY TYPE OF PROGRAM

(IN PERCENTAGES)

PROGRAM TYPE	NEW PROJECTS	IMPROVE PROGRAMS	PARTICIPATE IN PLANNING COMMITTEES	PLAN/ATTEND WORKSHOPS SEMINARS	RESEARCH
TECHNICAL(94)	48.9	51.1	31.9	25.5	31.9
DEGREE (18)	44.4	61.1	44.4	61.1	66.7
TOTAL (112)	48.2	52.7	33.9	31.3	37.5

TABLE 36.2 - GREATER PROFESSIONAL INVOLVEMENT

BY MINISTRY

(IN PERCENTAGES)

MINISTRY	NEW PROJECTS	IMPROVE PROGRAMS	PARTICIPATE IN PLANNING COMMITTEES	PLAN/ATTEND WORKSHOPS SEMINARS	RESEARCH
AGRI/FORESTS(49)	53.1	61.2	38.8	36.7	34.7
ENERGY (30)	40.0	46.7	33.3	20.0	33.3
HEALTH (30)	11.1	33.3	11.1	33.3	22.2
COOPERATIVES(13)	69.2	61.5	30.8	30.8	53.8
LABOR (4)	50.0	25.0	0	25.0	50.0
OTHER (7)	57.1	42.9	42.9	42.9	57.1

97

TABLE 37.1 - TRAINING - RELATED CORRESPONDENCE
BY TYPE OF PROGRAM

PROGRAM TYPE	FREQUENCY OF CORRESPONDENCE		
	OFTEN	SOMETIMES	RARELY
TECHNICAL(94)	0	45.7	53.2
DEGREE (18)	16.7	61.1	22.2
TOTAL (112)	2.7	48.2	48.2

TABLE 37.2 - TRAINING - RELATED CORRESPONDENCE
BY YEAR RETURNED

YEAR RETURNED	RELATED CORRESPONDENCE		
	OFTEN	SOMETIMES	RARELY
1980 - 83 (42)	2.4	42.9	52.4
1984 - 87 (70)	2.9	51.4	45.7

TABLE 38 - RECEIVE PUBLICATIONS

YEAR RETURNED	YES	NO
1980 - 83 (42)	64.3	33.3
1984 - 87 (70)	57.1	41.4
TOTAL (112)	59.8	38.4

TABLE 39 - JOINED PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION

YEAR RETURNED	YES	NO
1980 - 83 (42)	16.7	81.0
1984 - 87 (70)	35.7	62.9
TOTAL (112)	28.6	69.6

TABLE 40 - VISIT USAID

YEAR RETURNED	YES	NO
1980 - 83 (42)	52.4	45.2
1984 - 87 (70)	78.6	20.0
TOTAL (112)	68.8	29.5

TABLE 41 - RECEIVED CERTIFICATE BY USAID
IN RECOGNITION OF TRAINING

	YES	NO
N = 112	93.8	5.4

TABLE 42 - RECOMMEND TRAINING TO OTHERS

	YES	NO
N = 112	95.5	2.7

APPENDIX D

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

RETURNED

AND

IN-TRAINING

RETURNED PARTICIPANTS
August 1, 1987

NAME	MINISTRY	LOCATION	DATES OF TRAINING
JOSEPH H.K. PAN	EDUCATION	MANDALAY	08/11/83-08/10/85
U MYO MYINT	EDUCATION	RANGOON	08/24/83-08/23/85
U MG MG MYINT	ENERGY	RANGOON	06/02/85-08/26/85
U THAN MYAING	ENERGY	SITTANG	06/02/85-08/26/85
U SOE WIN MG	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	08/18/83-09/09/85
JOHN BA MAUNG	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	YEZIN	08/25/83-09/09/85
U SAW THET SWE	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	YEZIN	08/25/83-09/09/85
DR. KHIN M. THWIN	HEALTH	MYANAUNG	08/04/84-01/18/85
DR. KHIN MAR YI	HEALTH	MOULMEIN	08/04/84-01/18/85
DR. E TIN HTET	HEALTH	RANGOON	03/11/85-05/31/85
DR. NILAR WYNN	HEALTH	RANGOON	03/11/85-05/31/85
DR. TIN SOE	HEALTH	RANGOON	05/06/85-05/31/85
DR. WIN WIN MYO	HEALTH	RANGOON	05/06/85-05/31/85
U NU	ENERGY	RANGOON	05/17/85-10/04/85
U KYI SOE	ENERGY	RANGOON	05/17/85-10/04/85
U AUNG MYINT	ENERGY	RANGOON	07/29/85-11/11/85
U PE OO	ENERGY	RANGOON	07/29/85-11/11/85
U TIN SHEIN	ENERGY	RANGOON	09/03/85-12/13/85
U AYE KYU	ENERGY	RANGOON	09/03/85-12/13/85
U SOE LWIN	ENERGY	PROME	09/02/85-12/20/85
U SEIN SHWE	ENERGY	RANGOON	09/02/85-12/20/85
U SEIN MINN	ENERGY	RANGOON	01/12/86-08/01/86
U SAN LWIN	ENERGY	RANGOON	01/12/86-08/01/86
U MAUNG KO	ENERGY	RANGOON	05/07/86-09/19/86
U KHIN MG SHWE	ENERGY	RANGOON	05/07/86-09/19/86
U KYEE MYINT	ENERGY	PROME	05/07/86-09/19/86
U KHIN MG LATT	ENERGY	RANGOON	05/07/86-09/19/86
U HTAIN WIN	COOPERATIVES	RANGOON	09/29/85-10/05/85
U WIN SHEIN	COOPERATIVES	RANGOON	09/29/85-10/05/85
U KHIN NYO	CAO	BASSEIN	07/17/85-11/01/85
U KAUK YIN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	MAGWE	05/15/85-11/15/85
U THEIN AUNG	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	MAGWE	05/15/85-11/15/85
DAW AYE THANT TIN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	MAGWE	05/15/85-11/15/85
DAW MU MU HAN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	05/15/85-11/15/85
U TIN WIN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	MAGWE	08/25/83-12/15/85
U THAN HTAY	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	06/18/83-12/20/85
U TIN HTUT OO	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	08/18/83-12/15/85
U HLA MYINT	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	08/18/83-01/06/86
U HOKE SAN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	08/18/83-02/28/86
DR. MAUNG OHN	HEALTH	BUDDALIN	08/29/85-01/10/86
U TIN MYINT	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	SEBIN	05/25/86-09/12/86
U THAUNG	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	CHAUNG MAGYI	05/25/86-09/12/86
U SOE WIN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	NATTALIN	05/25/86-09/12/86
U NE WIN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	SEBIN	05/25/86-09/12/86
U KYAW SOE	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	SAGAING	06/18/83-09/30/86
U TINT LWIN	ENERGY	YENANGYAUNG	07/17/86-10/10/86
U THAUNG TIN	ENERGY	RANGOON	07/17/86-10/10/86
U WIN	ENERGY	RANGOON	07/17/86-10/10/86
U THEIN LWIN	ENERGY	RANGOON	07/17/86-10/10/86
U SOE KYAW	ENERGY	RANGOON	08/10/86-11/11/86
U SOE MYINT	LABOR	RANGOON	10/20/86-12/12/86
U BA THAN	LABOR	RANGOON	10/20/86-12/12/86
U SEIN HLAING	ENERGY	RANGOON	08/10/86-11/11/86
U MAUNG CHO	ENERGY	RANGOON	09/06/86-12/19/86/
U TUN SHEIN	ENERGY	SAGAING	09/06/86-12/19/86/
U SEIN MG WINT	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	09/30/86-10/25/86
U K. MYINT THAN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	PEGU	09/30/86-10/25/86
U KYAW MOE	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	YEZIN	05/28/84-12/01/86
U TIN NWE	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	05/28/84-12/01/86
U SAN NYUNT	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	06/12/84-12/31/86
U MYA THAN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	06/12/84-12/31/86
U THEIN HTOON	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	CHAUNG MAGYI	08/22/84-02/28/87
U SAW WIN	ENERGY	RANGOON	09/01/86-04/24/87
DAW HTAY HTAY WIN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	YEZIN	06/12/84-12/31/86
DR. LE LE YI	HEALTH	RANGOON	08/21/85-02/28/87
DR. N. N. THANE	HEALTH	RANGOON	08/21/85-02/28/87

RETURNED PARTICIPANTS
August 1, 1987

NAME	MINISTRY	LOCATION	DATES OF TRAINING
U SEIN WIN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	04/18/83-06/24/83
U NYI NYI	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	04/18/83-06/24/83
U MG MG KYAW	TRADE	RANGOON	06/20/83-08/29/83
U AUNG KYI	TRADE	RANGOON	06/20/83-08/29/83
U MYA MAUNG	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	04/18/83-08/05/83
U HLA OO	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	04/18/83-08/05/83
U AUNG SAN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	04/18/83-08/05/83
U HLA THAN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	YEZIN	05/01/83-07/31/83
DR. KAN TUN	HEALTH	RANGOON	08/01/82-08/10/83
DR. THAN HTUT	HEALTH	RANGOON	08/01/82-08/10/83
DR. HLA MIN	HEALTH	RANGOON	09/12/83-09/23/83
DAW KHIN SAN WAI	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	YEZIN	11/11/82-12/10/82
DAW NWE NWE AUNG	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	YEZIN	11/11/82-12/10/82
DR. NYO NYO MIN	HEALTH	RANGOON	08/23/82-09/01/83
DR. YIN YIN MAY	HEALTH	RANGOON	08/23/82-09/01/83
DR. MAY KHIN	HEALTH	RANGOON	09/12/83-09/23/83
DR. YE MON	HEALTH	MOHNYIN	05/05/84-09/11/84
DR. KHIN MG THI	HEALTH	DAUKTAW	05/05/84-09/11/84
U KO KO AUNG	COOPERATIVES	RANGOON	08/29/83-12/16/83
U SAW P. MYAING	COOPERATIVES	RANGOON	08/29/83-12/16/83
U KO KO	COOPERATIVES	RANGOON	08/29/83-12/16/83
U MYO MYINT	ENERGY	RANGOON	09/17/83-03/31/84
U SEIN WIN HLAING	CAO	RANGOON	07/13/83-10/28/83
U OSCAR MG SEIN	ENERGY	RANGOON	09/05/83-10/07/83
U KYAW SEIN	ENERGY	SYRIAM	09/26/83-11/09/83
U AUNG KYI	ENERGY	RANGOON	09/26/83-11/09/83
U KYI WIN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	09/06/83-12/24/83
U MG MG YI	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	08/28/83-12/28/83
U SAW AG HLAING	ENERGY	RANGOON	04/23/84-09/14/84
U TIN TUN	ENERGY	CHAUK	04/23/84-09/14/84
U NYO LWIN	MINES	RANGOON	03/05/84-03/30/84
U TUN THEIN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	YEZIN	05/28/84-08/31/84
DAW SHIRLEY SMELLIE	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	YEZIN	05/28/84-08/31/84
DAW NYUNT NYUNT WAI	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	YEZIN	05/28/84-08/31/84
U THEIN WIN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	01/22/84-08/31/84
U SEIN WIN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	YEZIN	01/22/84-08/31/84
U SEIN WIN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	MANDALAY	07/14/84-10/19/84
U HTWE	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	SAGAING	07/14/84-10/19/84
U WIN MYINT	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	IRRAWADDY	07/14/84-10/19/84
U TIN YI	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	MAGWE	07/14/84-10/19/84
U AYE THEIN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	IRRAWADDY	07/14/84-10/19/84
U HLA KYI	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	LETPADAN	07/14/84-10/19/84
U SOE WIN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	NATTALIN	07/14/84-10/19/84
U TUN THAN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	PEGU	08/16/84-11/15/84
U MYA	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	08/16/84-11/15/84
U MYA THA	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	MANDALAY	08/16/84-11/15/84
U KO LAY	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	MAYMYO	08/16/84-11/15/84
U HLA TOE	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	CHAUNGMYAGYI	08/16/84-11/15/84
U BO	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	MANDALAY	08/16/84-11/15/84
U MYINT THEIN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	SINGU	08/16/84-11/15/84
U AUNG MIN	ENERGY	RANGOON	08/19/84-11/30/84
U MAUNG MAUNG	ENERGY	RANGOON	09/05/84-12/06/84
U THAN TUN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	PEGU	06/27/84-12/15/84
U SIANG UK	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	PEGU	11/04/84-12/15/84
U PE MAUNG THEIN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	PEGU	11/04/84-12/15/84
DR. SOE TINT	HEALTH	NATAGOYI	08/14/84-01/06/85
DR. MAUNG AYE	HEALTH	MANDALAY	08/14/84-01/06/85
U MIN NYO	COOPERATIVES	RANGOON	02/28/85-03/31/85
U KYAW SOE	COOPERATIVES	RANGOON	02/28/85-03/31/85
U KYAW WIN	HOME/RELIGIOUS	RANGOON	04/20/85-05/04/85
U KYAWT MAUNG	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	PYAWBWE	07/14/84-05/04/85
U THAN HLA	HOME/RELIGIOUS	RANGOON	05/12/85-06/07/85
U HLAING MIN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	01/18/85-07/12/85
U SAN MYINT	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	01/18/85-07/12/85
U THAN HTAY	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	04/21/85-07/31/85
U SEIN WIN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	MANDALAY	04/21/85-07/31/85
U SOE MYINT	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	CHAUNGSU	04/21/85-07/31/85
U SOE TIN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	CHAUNGSU	04/21/85-07/31/85
U NYUNT	ENERGY	CHAUNGSU	08/16/83-08/15/85

RETURNED PARTICIPANTS
August 1, 1987

NAME	MINISTRY	LOCATION	DATES OF TRAINING
DAW KHIN THIN YI	HEALTH	RANGOON	09/05/79-09/23/79
DAW KHIN MYINT MYINT	HEALTH	RANGOON	09/05/79-09/23/79
U MYA THWIN LIN	HEALTH	LASHIO	02/04/80-02/15/80
U KYAW LIN	HEALTH	MONYWA	02/04/80-02/15/80
U MYAT WIN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	06/09/80-07/25/80
U THEIN MYINT	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	06/09/80-07/25/80
DAW THAN NWE	LABOR	RANGOON	07/14/80-08/22/80
U MYAT THA TUN	LABOR	RANGOON	09/08/80-10/17/80
DAW MYA THANDA	PLANNING & FINANCE	RANGOON	10/27/80-12/05/80
U AYE NGWE	LABOR	RANGOON	10/27/80-12/05/80
U YE MYINT	COOPERATIVES	MANDALAY	09/22/80-10/27/80
U TINT LWIN	ENERGY	RANGOON	09/02/80-01/16/81
U AUNG DIN	ENERGY	RANGOON	09/02/80-01/16/81
U KHIN MAUNG TINT	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	09/02/80-11/07/80
CAPT. KYAW SOE	ENERGY	RANGOON	09/08/80-12/19/80
U SAW A.D. BAIN	ENERGY	INSEIN	09/08/80-12/19/80
U WIN KYAW	ENERGY	RANGOON	06/08/81-07/13/81
U KHIN MG TINT	ENERGY	RANGOON	06/08/81-07/13/81
DR. TIN AUNG	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	07/20/81-07/24/81
DR. YI YI MYINT	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	YEZIN	07/20/81-07/24/81
DR. KHIN KYI NYUNT	HEALTH	RANGOON	10/03/80-10/25/80
DR. YEE YEE HLA	HEALTH	RANGOON	10/03/80-10/25/80
DR. TIN TIN OO	HEALTH	RANGOON	10/03/80-10/25/80
U MIN ZAW	ENERGY	RANGOON	08/20/81-12/23/81
U KHIN MG MYINT	ENERGY	CHAUK	08/20/81-12/23/81
U HTEIN LIN	ENERGY	RANGOON	02/22/82-06/04/82
U AUNG KHIN	ENERGY	RANGOON	02/22/82-06/04/82
U SANN MYINT	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	05/17/82-07/23/82
U T. TUN HLAING	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	05/17/82-07/23/82
U KYAW MYINT	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	05/17/82-09/03/82
U KHIN MG AYE	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	06/07/82-08/20/82
U MG MG	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	06/07/82-08/20/82
U AUNG SOE MYINT	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	06/07/82-08/20/82
U TUN SHWE	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	PROME	08/09/82-10/01/82
U KYAW KYAW NYEIN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	YAMETHIN	08/09/82-10/01/82
U SAING UK	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	08/23/82-10/01/82
U BA THAUNG	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	08/23/82-10/01/82
U KYAW KHIN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	BASSEIN	08/23/82-10/01/82
U HLA MYO	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	BASSEIN	08/23/82-10/01/82
U CHIT SAING	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RETIRED '87	08/23/82-10/01/82
U AYE MYINT TUN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RETIRED '85	08/23/82-10/01/82
DR. TIN MOE PHYU	HEALTH	RANGOON	09/14/81-10/05/81
DR. SAN SAN	HEALTH	RANGOON	09/14/81-10/05/81
DR. SAN YI	HEALTH	RANGOON	11/02/81-11/20/81
DR. KHIN MIMI LWIN	HEALTH	MANDALAY	11/02/81-11/20/81
DR. SAN SAN YIN	HEALTH	RANGOON	05/10/82-06/04/82
DR. TIN TIN WIN	HEALTH	RANGOON	05/10/82-06/04/82
DR. KHIN MON	HEALTH	RANGOON	09/13/82-09/24/82
DR. TIN NYO	HEALTH	MANDALAY	09/13/82-09/24/82
DR. MG MG GALE	ENERGY	RANGOON	09/20/82-11/11/82
U WIN MYINT	ENERGY	RANGOON	09/20/82-11/11/82
U BO KYIN	ENERGY	RANGOON	09/20/82-11/11/82
DR. WIN HTIN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	03/14/83-03/21/83
U SEIN WIN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	03/14/83-03/21/83
U MYINT THEIN	ENERGY	RANGOON	08/19/82-02/28/83
U TINT LWIN	COOPERATIVES	RANGOON	09/20/82-10/29/82
DAW AMY THAN	COOPERATIVES	RANGOON	09/27/82-10/27/82
DAW CHO CHO	COOPERATIVES	RANGOON	09/27/82-10/27/82
DAW KYI KYI NWE	COOPERATIVES	RANGOON	09/27/82-10/27/82
U HTAY AUNG	COOPERATIVES	RANGOON	09/27/82-10/27/82
U BA OO	COOPERATIVES	RANGOON	09/27/82-10/27/82
U AUNG THAUNG	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	10/13/82-11/19/82
U WIN TIN	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	10/13/82-11/19/82
U MYAT TWE	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	YEZIN	04/18/83-06/24/83
U THAN HTAY	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RANGOON	04/18/83-06/24/83
U KYAW MYINT	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	TAUNGGYI	06/13/83-08/12/83
U SOE HLAING	AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	RETIRED '87	06/13/83-08/12/83

PARTICIPANTS IN USA DURING REVIEW

COURSE	LOCATION	PARTICIPANT	TRAINING DATES	MINISTRY	SPONSOR
M.Sc Soc. & Econ. Stats.	BUCEN/GWU	Daw Khin Soe Thu	09/86-02/88	Education	BDTPII
M.Sc Mgmt. Info. Sys	BUCEN/GWU	Daw Khin Than Myint	09/86-01/88	Education	BDTPII
Computer Packages	Bureau of Labor Stats	U San Din	03/87-05/87	Labor	BDTPII
Computer Packages	Bureau of Labor Stats	U Kyi Toe	03/87-05/87	Labor	BDTPII
Computer Packages	Bureau of Labor Stats	Daw Sein Kyi	03/87-05/87	Planning & Finance	BDTPII
Computer Packages	Bureau of Labor Stats	Daw Khin Thaung Chit	03/87-05/87	Planning & Finance	BDTPII
Energy Plan. & Policy	U of Pennsylvania	U Kyaw Lwin	01/87-08/87	Energy	CETP
Energy Plan. & Policy	U of Pennsylvania	U Khin Maung Shwe	01/87-08/87	Energy	CETP
M.Sc Elec. Engineering	Rensselaer Polytech	U Thein Dan	08/86-06/87	Education	CETP
Health Stat./Demography	UCLA	Dr. Khin Mya May	01/87-06/87	Health	PHCII
Hatcheries Training	Philippines/Hawaii	U Kyaw Maung Than	02/87-05/87	Agriculture/Forests	BDTPII
Hatcheries Training	Philippines/Hawaii	U Kyaw Soe	02/87-05/87	Agriculture/Forests	BDTPII
Hatcheries Training	Philippines/Hawaii	U Myint Aung	02/87-05/87	Agriculture/Forests	BDTPII
Hatcheries Training	Philippines/Hawaii	U Tin Htoo Naing	02/87-05/87	Agriculture/Forests	BDTPII
Hatcheries Training	Philippines/Hawaii	U Philip Mya Thein	02/87-05/87	Agriculture/Forests	BDTPII
Hatcheries Training	Philippines/Hawaii	U Jaine Bahadur	02/87-05/87	Agriculture/Forests	BDTPII
Hatcheries Training	Philippines/Hawaii	U Saw Lah Paw Wah	02/87-05/87	Agriculture/Forests	BDTPII
Hatcheries Training	Philippines/Hawaii	U Zin Aung	02/87-05/87	Agriculture/Forests	BDTPII
Hatcheries Training	Philippines/Hawaii	U Aung Thein Win	02/87-05/87	Agriculture/Forests	BDTPII
Hatcheries Training	Philippines/Hawaii	U Win Sein Naing	02/87-05/87	Agriculture/Forests	BDTPII
Energy Development	Various cities, USA	U Tin Tun	03/87-05/87	Energy	CETP
M.Sc Agriculture	Ohio State Univ.	U Tin Saung	09/85-09/87	Agriculture/Forests	MOPP
M.Sc Agriculture	Ohio State Univ.	U Ba Hein	09/85-09/87	Agriculture/Forests	MOPP
M.Sc Agriculture	Ohio State Univ.	U Myo Nyunt	06/86-06/88	Agriculture/Forests	MOPP
Ph.D Agriculture	Ohio State Univ.	U Mya Maung	09/86-01/89	Agriculture/Forests	MOPP
Ph.D Agriculture	Mississippi State U	U Mar	09/86-01/89	Agriculture/Forests	MOPP
M.Sc Agriculture	Mississippi State U	U Aung Kyi	09/86-09/88	Agriculture/Forests	MOPP
M.Sc Agriculture	Mississippi State U	Daw Mar Mar Myint	09/86-09/88	Agriculture/Forests	MOPP
M.Sc Agriculture	Texas A & M	U Myo Chit	09/86-09/88	Agriculture/Forests	MOPP
MPH/MCH	UCLA	Dr. Thein Ngwe	09/86-03/88	Education	PHCII
M.Sc Educational Science	University of Hawaii	Daw Sein Mya	08/85-08/87	Health	PHCII
M.Sc Educational Science	University of Hawaii	Daw Tin Nwe	08/85-08/87	Health	PHCII
Program Mgmt/Analysis	Arthur D. Little	Daw Myo Nwe	05/87-09/87	Planning & Finance	BDTPII
Program Mgmt/Analysis	Arthur D. Little	U Yu Khin	05/87-09/87	Planning & Finance	BDTPII
Program Mgmt/Analysis	Arthur D. Little	U Tin Win	05/87-09/87	Planning & Finance	BDTPII
Program Mgmt/Analysis	Arthur D. Little	Daw Than Than Lin	05/87-09/87	Planning & Finance	BDTPII
Agriculture Economics	USDA/Boulder	U Thanu Pe	06/87-08/87	Agriculture	BDTPII
Agriculture Economics	USDA/Boulder	Daw Khin Mar Nyo	06/87-08/87	Planning & Finance	BDTPII
Computer Graphics	SUNY Utica	U Khin Zaw	06/87-12/87	Education	BDTPII
Comp. Maint & Trbl Shoot	SUNY Utica	U Soe Myint	06/87-12/87	Education	BDTPII
Xray Fluor.Spectrometry	U Missouri, Rolla	U Tin Aye Nyein	06/87-12/87	Education	BDTPII
Xray Diffractometry	Penn State U	U Than Htut Oo	06/87-12/87	Education	BDTPII
MSIS/Computer Science	American University	U Zaw Myint Tun	06/87-05/89	Education	BDTPII
MSIS/Computer Science	American University	U Maung Thi Ha	06/87-05/89	Education	BDTPII
Marketing Manangement	IMI/WTI	Daw Than Myint	06/87-08/87	Trade	BDTPII
Marketing Manangement	IMI/WTI	U Ko Ko	06/87-08/87	Trade	BDTPII
Marketing Manangement	IMI/WTI	U Maung Maung Thaung	06/87-08/87	Trade	BDTPII
Marketing Manangement	IMI/WTI	U Khin Maung Aye	06/87-08/87	Trade	BDTPII
Marketing Manangement	IMI/WTI	U Tin Hlaing	06/87-08/87	Trade	BDTPII
Marketing Manangement	IMI/WTI	U Myint Soe	06/87-08/87	Trade	BDTPII
Marketing Manangement	IMI/WTI	U Than Htay	06/87-08/87	Trade	BDTPII
Marketing Manangement	IMI/WTI	U Kyaw Tint	06/87-08/87	Trade	BDTPII
Marketing Manangement	IMI/WTI	U Myo Than	06/87-08/87	Trade	BDTPII
Marketing Manangement	IMI/WTI	Daw Win	06/87-08/87	Trade	BDTPII

25

APPENDIX E
LIST OF
SENIOR OFFICIALS
INTERVIEWED

LIST OF SENIOR OFFICIALS INTERVIEWED

Foreign Economic Relations Department

(1) U Soe Thwin .. Director General

Ministry of Cooperatives

Cooperatives

(1) U Myo Myint .. Director General

Cottage Industries Department (CID)

(2) Dr. U Than Htaik .. Director General
(3) Major Ba Htwe .. Director

Health

(1) Dr. U Tin U .. Director General (DOH)
(2) Dr. U Ba Tun .. Director (Public Health Division (DOH-78723))
(3) Dr. U Lun Wai .. Deputy Director (DOH)
(4) Dr. U Mya Win .. Deputy Director (Rural, MCH & School of Health)
(5) Dr. U Than Sein .. Program Officer, WHO, Asst Prog Manager, PHC-BHS
(6) Dr. U Kyaw Sein .. Health Director, Mandalay Division

Department of Medical Research

(1) Dr. Khin Maung Tin .. Director General
(2) Dr. Thane Toe .. Deputy Director (Research)
(3) Dr. Thein Maung Myint .. Deputy Director (Research)
(4) Dr. Myint Lwin .. Head of Parasitology Research Div.
(5) Dr. U Thein Hlaing .. Head of Epidemiology Research Div.

Department of Medical Education

(1) Professor U Pe Thein .. Director General
(2) Professor May May Yi .. Director
(3) Dr. Win May (Mrs) .. Medical Educationist

Energy

- (1) U San Aung .. Head of Office (Acting)
- (2) U Soe Myint .. Deputy Director, Planning Department
- (3) U Tin Maung Aye .. Managing Director, Myanmar Oil Corporation

Agriculture Corporation

- (1) U Khin Win .. Managing Director
- (2) U Aung Khin .. General Manager, Applied Research
- (3) U Khin Maung Tint .. General Manager, Administration
- (4) Dr. U Myint Thein .. General Manager, Planning
- (5) U Soe Win Maung .. Senior Officer, Planning
- (6) U Sein Win .. Divisional Manager, Mandalay Division

Directorate of Labor

- (1) U Thane Myint .. Director General
- (2) Lt. Col. Aung Ba Kyi .. Director
- (3) U San Maung .. Deputy Director (Admin)

Trade

- (1) .. Director General

Education

- (1) U Saw Htun .. Director (Foreign Studies)
- (2) Daw Sein Sein .. Deputy Director (Foreign Studies)

Central Accounts Office

- (1) U Sein Win Hlaing .. Head of Office
- (2) Ms. Khin Than Tin .. Director General
- (3) U Soe Nyunt .. Deputy Director General
- (4) Dr. Maung Shein .. Member (Council of People's Inspectors)
- (5) U Khin Nyo .. Head of Divisional Accounts, Irrawaddy Division, Bassein

APPENDIX F

SPECIAL REPORT-
ENERGY PARTICIPANTS
(by U Tin Tun, Head of Office,
Ministry of Energy)

Narrative Report on Discussions with Energy Participants

This narrative report is written in response to the request of the Rangoon USAID mission.

In his study tour of various Energy Training Centers, U Tin Tun, Head of Office, Ministry of Energy, SRUB, met the following energy participants:

U Kyaw Lwin	University of Pennsylvania
U Knin Maung Shwe	University of Pennsylvania,
U Thein Dan	Rennselaer Polytechnic Institute.
U Saw Wai	General Electric, Schenectady.

Discussion with the participants reveal that predeparture preparation and orientation had been short and brief, advances to meet unforeseen expenditures en route had been given, and the journey to the USA had gone according to schedule. The participants arrived safely and proceeded to their respective destinations in accordance with predeparture instructions. They encountered no difficulties. They feel, however, that it would be more convenient to be met on arrival because travel procedures are different from place to place and numerous directions had to be sought. At the same time they are pleased with the response and cooperation of US citizens in helping strangers without which they would have been lost in the very large and long airport terminals and the heavy traffic of US cities.

These four participants found no problems in adjusting to the social and cultural conditions prevailing in the US because they had been very conveniently accommodated close to their training centers and on arrival they had been given orientation sessions. I have not been able to discuss the nature of the orientation they received, so I comment from personal experience at the orientation sessions I attended at the Washington International Center. The welcome addresses were very warm and Mr. Robert Schnaffer of the USAID, in particular, addressed the participants with clarity, expressing the objectives of the cooperation extended to developing countries and the wish that on completion of the training in the USA, the participants would return to their home countries and be able not only to serve better but also to relay the training received here to their colleagues thereby contributing directly to the improvement of their countries which was the main objective of USAID.

The orientation sessions strove to familiarize the participants with the United States of America in a sophisticated way. Perhaps the orientation session I attended was fragmentary. Describing, in the most direct manner, the geography and history of the nation, the manners and habits of the people, how to go about the places, how to eat, where to eat, and some local customs and other such common place things would perhaps be more effective than orienting the participants with discussions of behavioral patterns.

One serious adjustment required was found to be the weather. Participants who arrived in winter were shocked by the cold. I arrived in the beginning of spring and found the weather to be colder than the cold season in Rangoon. Participants need to be informed about the real weather conditions.

In general, the assistance rendered by the US managers may be deemed satisfactory. To make the training more effective, participants should be closely questioned about their experience with computers and required training given. Since the computer training may not be available in the home country and even if available, may not have the required software. The pre-academic training with computers should be given by the institution conducting the training.

Quality of Training

All the participants have found the quality of training very high and practical. The courses have been very intensive and rigorous. They feel that more field visits would enable them to observe and correlate the theoretical training with the practical results being achieved. They feel that the training upgraded their knowledge and skills highly and that they would be able to perform better on their return home. They are keenly aware that their improved knowledge and skills should be used effectively to improve the work and to create a rippling effect in their respective organizations. They might be able to rationalize and plan energy requirements, simulate models, apply sound methodology and proper management techniques.

U kyaw Lwin, U Khin Maung Shwe and U Saw Wai return to the Ministry of Energy to continue their work in non academic fields. U Thein Dan returns to the Ministry of Education to continue work in the academic field. They feel that the knowledge and skills acquired have direct reference to the work environment in Burma and would apply to a scale appropriate to the presently existing conditions.

Comments and Impressions of US Training

Training places visited during the study tour are:

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA
Pittsburgh Applied Research Corp., Pittsburgh, PA
Westinghouse Electric Corp, Pittsburgh, PA
Rensselaer Polytechnical Inst., Troy, NY
General Electric Company, Schenctady, NY
Arthur D. Little Inc., Cambridge, MA
Tennessee Valley Authority, Chattanooga, TN
Southern Engineering Co., Atlanta, GA
Professional Training Resource Int'l.,Tulsa, OK
Oil and Gas Consultants Int'l., Tulsa, OK

National Institute for Petroleum Energy Research,
Bartlesville, OK
Institute of Gas Technology, Chicago, IL
Stanford Research Institute Int'l, MenloPark, CA
Bechtel National, San Francisco, CA

The above mentioned institutions and organizations have complete coverage of Conventional Energy Training Courses each covering specific fields with high training capabilities. The following observations have been made:

- o training is highly computer based, very intensive and rigorous
- o laboratory facilities are expensive
- o research and development is very advanced
- o training models were found to be tailored to developing country situations
- o the training courses cater to multiple country participants and do not relate to single country requirements
- o the knowledge and skills imparted will be useful to a very high degree in scaled down measures relevant to home country conditions wherein the participants would have to adjust appropriately
- o academic post graduate courses giving; 1) broader theoretical benefits for longterm application and 2) nonacademic, job-specific courses for short term application, would create a more desirable program
- o in place of the post graduate courses which span a period of 12-18 months, a non academic course of 12-16 weeks including pre-academic computer training coupled with 36 weeks of hands-on experience would be preferred, and
- o business organizations are willing to receive internships, but due to employment regulations cannot provide any remuneration.

Interview of Four Burmese Participants of the BLS Training Program.

A group interview on a very informal basis was held with the following participants:

Daw Khin Thauang Chit
Daw Sein Kyi
U San Din
U Kyi Toe

Bureau of Labor Statistics
Computer Packages Program

Since they belong to a different ministry, a formal interview could create misunderstanding. The response to this interview is strictly personal and should be referred to only as an indication of the feelings of the participants.

The participants had no predeparture training and though they were themselves not experienced with the operation of computers,

they were involved in supervising data processing done with computers. They feel that a two week predeparture training on computer operations would have prepared them to absorb the US training, especially because the computer software models demonstrated to them during their training were very numerous and presented over a very short period of time.

The travel instruction and briefing was given at the Rangoon Mission. It is not clear whether payment of the usual \$200 Travel Advance money was arranged in Rangoon or whether the participants themselves refused to receive it because they voiced their concern that the payment of advance without endorsement by Myanan, the Foreign Exchange Control could lead to unpleasantness at the Rangoon airport. U San Din in particular was not entitled to the outfit allowance form the government of SRUB, therefore, ne carried only a petty cash allowance of \$65 in hopes that no delays would occur en route.

Arrival reception and orientation in the USA was satisfactory to them. Due to their experience and maturity they had no social or cultural problems. The total maintenance allowance indicated in Table 2: program costs: of the 1987 Labor Statistics Seminars Program Booklet (sponsored by USAID) was \$2295 for the seminar on Computer Packages for Beginners and \$2715 for the seminar on Labor Statistics Computer Software Packages, apparently totaling \$5010. However, since the two packages were continuous, the actual amount paid was \$1700 for the 1st month and \$900 for each of the following months totalling \$3500, an apparent difference. An explanatory note to this table would save misunderstanding.

The participants were impressed by the quality of training and the knowledge and skills imparted to them. They feel that the reference to the work environment in Burma would be about 75% due to software availability constraints. Regarding knowledge and skills being learned and how they might be applied upon return home, the participants generally expressed that they will return to their previous duties better equipped to supervise computer operations in collection and management of labor statistics.

I am constrained to give any comments on applications in fields other than energy.

I wish to thank Pragma corporation for the excellent arrangement made to make my training evaluation work very convenient and pleasant. Miss Maggie Chadwick and Miss Robin Ridley have given me the utmost cooperation and close attention without which I would have lost my way and a great amount of valuable time. Mr. Tom Moser and Miss Laurel Elmer although our meeting was short, were very flexible and accommodating. They gave me more of their time than deserving which I appreciate very much. Last, but not least, to all the other members of the Pragma Corp. who helped me but I fail to name any service, thanks for everything. U Tin Tun

APPENDIX G
TRAINING INSTITUTION
CASE STUDIES

Case Study #1 : Marketing Management Program (IMI), and
Export Market Entry Strategies (WTI)

Number of
Participants : Ten

Dates : June 8, 1987 - August 15, 1987

Description: The ten participants spent the first three days in the U.S. at the Washington International Center, then travelled to Boston where they attended the six-week Marketing Management Program (June 15 - July 24, 1987) of the International Marketing Institute (IMI). The course was held at Boston College in the convenient Boston suburb of Chestnut Hill. The Burmese participants formed part of a group of some forty foreign nationals from a wide range of developing and developed countries. All forty participants lived and ate on campus and rapidly congealed into an integrated group. The course was divided into three segments, the first one primarily devoted to marketing concepts as they relate to the participant's home situation. The second segment was the Corporate Visitation Program in which actual marketing management practices were studied at selected U.S. corporations. The third segment covered strategic planning, competitive analysis, and marketing forecasting. The course was not tailored specifically for Burma, rather it was the 27th annual seminar given by IMI, updated and upgraded to meet the changing marketing environment. There had been one Burmese participant in a prior course. The ten Burmese in this year's program constituted the largest number from any one country.

The six-week IMI course was followed by a special two week Export Market Entry Strategies program arranged by the World Trade Institute (WTI), World Trade Center, New York City. The WTI program was specifically tailored to meet the interests and needs of the Burmese participants and featured study of US imports of Burmese products and what can be done to improve the quality and quantity of such trade. The ten Burmese participants were the only participants in the two week session. WTI was careful to plan a program that followed logically the more theoretical IMI course. The two institutions, working together and both aware of the A.D. Little product identification team report, built a training experience that the participants found highly valuable. The WTI course emphasized the practical "hands on" side of the subject. During the two weeks the participants learned about pricing, shipping, U.S. government regulations, and distribution, in addition to meetings with buyers, importers and customs specialists.

In the debriefing prior to departure the members of the marketing team stated that they were very satisfied with the training both at IMI and WTI. Several of the participants recommended that the WTI part of the training be increased by one

or two weeks. Contacts with buyers was mentioned by several participants as a highly beneficial part of the total program.

Observations: The IMI program appears to have been very successful and well suited to the needs of the Burmese participants, all of whom have official responsibilities for various aspects of export market development. The uniquely tailored WTI course was also very useful. The overall two month experience was highly successful and can serve as a model for future participant programs. Major ingredients contributing to its success include:

- o A well qualified, experienced and motivated group of participants.
- o A training program that is geared to the participants' interests and training objectives.
- o Management, at least at IMI, that places great emphasis on team building and individual as well as group morale. A conscious effort was made to generate a broader reason for being in the program beyond marketing per se. A close, collegial atmosphere engendering warmth and togetherness was a major ingredient in the program's success.
- o Subject matter that is not overly technical or scientific in nature yet important and relevant to Burma's needs.
- o A good mix of theory as well as practical and observational study.
- o Good program planning and pre-departure arrangements on the part of all concerned parties, i.e. AID/Burma, The Burmese Government, Pragma, IMI and WTI, as reflected by the correspondence in the files.

Note: Ten participants from one country is somewhat large in proportion to a total of forty in the overall group. While the Burmese contingent fared well, a smaller number would have increased the opportunities to mingle with other nationalities and cultures.

Case Study #2 : Project Analysis and Program Management Programs, Arthur D. Little Management Education Institute, Inc. (MEI)

Number of Participants : 7

Dates : June 1 - August 14, 1987

Description: The Project Analysis and Program Management segments actually are two different courses which have been designed so that they can be taken either separately or in sequence. Attendance in both programs is designed for analysts, planners and managers who need to understand the main techniques of successful project management. The first course, Project Analysis, typically is attended by managers or financial analysts charged with identifying, formulating, analyzing and preparing projects for financing. The course objectives are to provide participants with the skills needed to assess private or public sector projects. It involves 100 hours in class with lectures and case studies, and includes week-long field trip to visit projects. During the last week, participants develop their own project proposal.

The latter course, Program Management, is primarily for mid-level officers who are, or will become, responsible for managing executing or monitoring development projects or broad sectoral programs. The objectives of this course are to provide the skills needed to implement projects. The structure of both courses is similar, combining classroom instruction, case studies, field trips and integrated case exercises. However, the Project Analysis course requires more rigorous use of financial analysis and accounting tools. The MEI brochure states that "...a basic knowledge of the principles of accounting and finance is essential." A pre-course two-week tutorial program is encouraged for participants' without adequate background. Our participants were requested to take the tutorial by MEI after a cursory review of their credentials. Four of them took it.

MEI does not provide living accommodations so our participants made their own arrangements. The seven Burmese participants were among fifty-two participants in the program, representing many countries as well as public and private sector organizations.

Observations: While some of the Burmese participants were pleased with the two courses, three or four of the seven were not, primarily because they were not adequately grounded in financial analysis and accounting skills to deal with the rigorous course material in the project analysis course. All participants fared better in the program management phase inasmuch as quantitative skills were not as necessary. The problem was particularly severe in the case of the three senior participants who were also members of the training evaluation

team. These three officers were least well prepared in terms of experience and education for the project analysis course and should not have been placed in it. (On the other hand, at least three of the remaining four Burmese participants were well prepared and claimed the course was very helpful to them and useful to their work in Burma).

In interviews with Pragma staff, and MEI officials, including the Dean of MEI and the two course Directors, it became clear that:

- virtually all applicants, particularly those sponsored by such donors as AID, are automatically admitted by MEI on the assumption that sponsor would not nominate a person who did not possess appropriate background. The two-week tutorial would have helped but almost certainly would not have been sufficient for the three unprepared Burmese. It is misleading to infer that major educational or experiential gaps can be remedied in two weeks.
- It appears that better communications between MEI, Pragma, AID/Rangoon and SRUB could have avoided the problem. From discussions and a review of the files, there is no indication that SRUB or the selected candidates were aware of the course's prerequisites as indicated in the brochure. While Pragma claims to have sent the brochure to AID/Rangoon, it is quite possible that AID/Burma, in corresponding with SRUB, did not mention or emphasize the need for financial analysis and accounting.

In the future, greater care should be taken in Burma to be aware of prerequisites for courses, particularly given the present SRUB planning and selection process, which generally does not nominate individuals until courses are selected, making it impossible for the "matching" to take place at Pragma or at other placement organizations. On the other hand, Pragma, as project manager, should be more sensitive to course qualifications and insure that such information is disseminated to AID/Burma and, to the extent possible, to SRUB.

Such short term courses as those at IMI, WTI and MEI are very expensive. For example, - tuition alone for the eleven weeks of Project Analysis and Program Management at MEI is \$8,000. When international travel, orientation and living costs are added, the total cost of the three-month experience is approximately \$16,000. Given these high costs, it is imperative that training courses and participants be very carefully selected and matched not only to meet Burma's needs (which these courses are) but also to meet the qualifications of the participants.

Another drawback in the MEI program is that the physical and social environment did not engender the kind of warmth and

collegiality among the students and faculty which were so obvious at IMI. This might partly be a function of the more technical nature of the course content but quite likely also is a reflection of the arrangements where participants are essentially left on their own. Pragma should more carefully investigate such non-technical aspects of various training programs to be assured that Burmese participants are in a friendly environment conducive not only to effective learning but also to a pleasant and fruitful social experience.

APPENDIX H
PARTICIPANT STATEMENTS
ON
FUTURE TRAINING PRIORITIES

PARTICIPANT STATEMENTS ON FUTURE TRAINING PRIORITIES

WHICH ARE THE MOST IMPORTANT FIELDS OF STUDY IN YOUR DEPARTMENT THAT YOU THINK ARE MOST IN NEED OF EXTERNAL TRAINING?

AGRICULTURE & FORESTS	HEALTH	ENERGY	EDUCATION/LABOR/TRADE
COMMUNICATION	MICROSURGERY/ONCOLOGY	ENERGY CONSERVATION	MORE TRAINED SPECIALISTS
CONTROL OF PLANT DISEASE	ULTRASONOGRAPHY/FETAL MONITORING	LUBRICATION	OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY
LEGUME BREEDING	COLPOSCOPY	HEAT TRANSFER	HEALTH INSPECTION
AGRONOMY	MED EDCTN	WORKSHOP: WELDING	CENSUS OPERATION
STRAIN SELECTION	RESEARCH	LONGTERM ENERGY PLANNING	EXPORT PROMOTION
HYBRIDS: PHYSIOLOGY/BREEDING	PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	POWER PLANT MANAGEMENT	MARKET RESEARCH
QUALITY CONTROL	QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS	POWER SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	LANDSLIDE STUDIES
AGRICULTURE ECONOMICS	ENDOCRINOLOGY	OIL & GAS PRODUCTION	GROUND WATER EXPLORATION
AGRO TECHNIQUES	PHC: INT'L ISSUES IN LDC'S	NEW CRUDE OIL TECHNIQUES	FIRE PROTECTION
WATER MANAGEMENT		DRILLING TECHNOLOGY	
MUTATION BREEDING	COOPERATIVES	INVESTMENT CRITERIA	
IRRIGATION		FINANCIAL ACCOUNTING	
SOIL-PLANT-WATER RELATIONSHIP	PROJECT MGMT:MONITOR/REPORT	PRACTICAL PROJECT ANAL/MGMT	
SOIL MICROBIOLOGY/BIOCHEMISTRY	PRAWNS/SHRIMP CULTURE	OIL EXPLORATION	
PEANUT CULTIVATION	BUSINESS MGMT	MODERNIZED PET INDUSTRY MGMT	
FARM MANAGEMENT	MGMT CUNSLTANCY FOR COOPS	"BLOW OUT" PREVENTION	
SESAME PRODUCTION	OPERATION OF OIL MILLS	HYDROCARBON EXPLORATION	
CROP LOSS CONTROL	MGMT PRINCIPLES/STRUCTURES	MEASURE/CONTROL: TURBINE/GENERATOR	
EXTENSION-TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER	COOP EDUCATION	USE OF RENEWABLE SOURCES	
UNDERSTAND USDA AND ITS WORK	MGMT FINANCE PERSONNEL	SUBSTITUTION FUELS	
CROP BREEDING/MASTERS DEGREE	FOOD TECHNOLOGY	LOAD FORECASTING	
COMPUTER EVALUATION TRAINING	MARINE FISH CULTURE	RESERVOIR GEOLOGY	
OILSEED CROP PRODUCTION	QUALITY CONTROL/OIL PROCESSING		
FARM WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	EQUIPMENT DESIGN		

IN ADDITION TO YOUR TECHNICAL PROGRAM, WHAT OTHER ACTIVITIES/PROGRAMS DO YOU WISH YOU COULD HAVE PARTICIPATED IN DURING TRAINING?

AGRICULTURE	HEALTH	ENERGY	EDUCATION/LABOR/TRADE
CULTURAL & SIGHTSEEING	PERFORM OPERATIONS	FIELD TRIPS TO OIL INDUSTRIES	FIELD WORK/OBSERVATION
FIELD VISITS	WARD WORK	FIELD TRIPS TO ENERGY PLANTS	VISIT FACTORIES
CONFERENCES/SEMINARS	SURGICAL EXPERIENCE	PROGRAM BREAK TO TRAVEL	INTENSIVE ELT
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	HOSPITAL OBSERVATIONS	PRODUCTION/DRILLING ACTIVITIES	COMPUTER TRAINING
WORKSHOPS	OPERATION/DIAGNOSTIC EXPERIENCE	ATTACHMENT TO OIL COMPANY	TRAVEL
PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS	CULTURAL PROGRAMS: COOKERY	FIELD TRIPS/SOCIAL ACTIVITIES	STUDY TOURS
PROFESSIONAL SEMINARS	JOIN ASSN/ANNUAL CONFERENCES	VISIT RELEVANT ORGANIZATIONS	SOCIAL ACTIVITIES
SEED SEMINARS	OPERATION TECHNIQUES	VISIT FACTORIES	
ENGLISH TRAINING	LABOR MANAGEMENT	COMPANY ATTACHMENT	
SOCIAL ACTIVITIES	MEDIA PRODUCTION PROGRAMS	STUDY TOURS	
OTHER TECHNICAL ACTIVITIES		OILGAS EXPLORATION TECHNIQUES	
COURSES AT USDA	COOPERATIVES	COMPUTER SEMINAR	
SPORTS		PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE	
SOCIAL ACTIVITIES	EXCHANGE KNOWLEDGE	STUDY POWER STATION LAYOUTS	
PEANUT VARIETAL EXPERIMENTS	SOCIAL ACTIVITIES	HANDS-ON EXPEREINCE	
WORKSHOP: USE OF PEANUT/SOYBEAN	MORE FIELD TRIPS	SPORTS	
TRAINING IN VEGETABLE SEEDS	SHARE BURMESE CULTURE	WORLD ENERGY REVIEWS	
	SPORTS		

APPENDIX I

PROPOSED PRE-DEPARTURE
ORIENTATION PROGRAM

PROPOSED PRE-DEPARTURE ORIENTATION

PROGRAM OUTLINE

The content of the pre-departure program includes four major areas: AID policies and procedures; an introduction to the social and cultural life of the United States with practical information on living conditions; the U.S. educational system; and program details. Each of these topics should be discussed with departing participants, preferably in a group session with participation by returned participants the Training Officer, Mission technical staff, and others where appropriate. The following outline is suggested as a guide for developing a pre-departure program for Burmese participants:

1. AID Policies and Procedures. The Training Officer and other Mission personnel should present the rules and regulations governing the participant's specific program, and the conditions for training. Essential logistical information should be presented regarding the following: visa and immigration; travel arrangements; medical insurance; contact persons in the country of training; and a detailed financial breakdown of the participant's program with suggestions for budgeting. The following documents should be distributed to participants:

- S&T/IT's brochures: The AID Participant Training Program; Pre-Departure Information; and Handbook for Travelers in the U.S.A. (these are available from AID/S&T/IT).
- Conditions of Training (Mission document to be signed by participants - see handbook for sample)
- A handout should be prepared as a reference document for participants to highlight the salient administrative guidelines governing their respective program (e.g., insurance and travel information, living allowances, etc.)

2. Information on the Country of Training. A package of materials should be developed/gathered to cover both the social and cultural conditions in the country of training (for the United States and third countries), as well as practical living conditions. Of particular importance is information on climate and regional differences, clothing, food (restaurants and tipping), shopping, hotels & housing options, security concerns, and transportation and communications systems. The following materials are suggested as guidelines:

- USIA's Pre-Departure Orientation Booklet (this publication is available from USIS and contains a variety of practical information on life in the United States)

- A Handbook for Visitors to the U.S.A., B. Rohrlich, New Day Publishers. (See annotation and ordering information on attachment)

- How to Survive in the U.S.A., Nancy Church and Anne Moss, Cambridge University Press. (This is a resource tool designed for improving American English skills through language exercises with a tape cassette. The package also provides practical information about living in the United States. (See annotation and ordering information on attachment.)

- Video and/or Films from the USIS Library

3. U.S. Educational System & Instructional Methods. While an overview of the U.S. educational structure and environment is particularly important for degree participants, a discussion of various instructional methods (e.g., case studies, group exercises, role plays, simulations, quizzes, etc.) would be helpful for all participants. The following resources might be more useful for academic participants:

- Higher Education in the U.S., USIS publication (available from USIS, introduces the reader to the U.S. educational system and the role of the foreign student)

- USIS video/film on Graduate Study in the U.S. (available from the USIS Library)

4. Program Details. Participants should understand the content, schedule and objectives of their program before their departure. At best, program requirements and a course syllabus could be provided. At least, a brochure of the program (for technical participants) and a description of the University and program (for academic participants) should be given to departing participants.

- Technical Programs: brochure, cable description or program profile from the annotated list of technical training programs attached in Appendix J, if available.

- Academic Programs: University catalogues are available from USIS.

Contents

<i>Introduction and self-study guide</i>	viii
<i>1 Welcome to the U.S.A!</i> 	2
Arriving at the airport; going through Customs; asking for and giving directions; making a connecting flight.	
<i>2 Communicating by phone and mail</i> 	12
Using pay phones; talking to the operator; taking and leaving messages; sending and picking up mail and telegrams.	
<i>3 See America by rent-a-car</i> 	22
Renting a car; asking for and giving detailed information; driving and taking care of a car.	
<i>4 Getting around</i> 	32
Riding public transportation in the city; turning down people's offers; reading schedules; getting from city to city by train, car, bus and plane.	
<i>5 Places to stay</i> 	42
Finding a room for the night; having things done for you; taking care of your clothes; finding out what's nearby.	
<i>6 Handling your money</i> 	52
Banking and carrying money with you – cash, credit cards and travelers checks; having money wired; asking how long something will take; going shopping.	
<i>7 Getting something to eat</i> 	62
Finding restaurants you like; reading the menu and ordering; asking about and describing food; going grocery shopping.	
<i>8 In case you get sick</i> 	72
Getting medicines and prescriptions you need; asking and talking about your health; making appointments; describing your symptoms to the doctor.	
<i>9 Enjoying your free time</i> 	82
Using the newspaper to find out what's happening; asking about what there is to do; reading ads and posters about concerts and other events.	

How to Survive in the U.S.A.

English for travelers and newcomers

Nancy Church and Anne Moss

Cambridge University Press
Cambridge
London New York New Rochelle
Melbourne Sydney

P U B L I C A T I O N S

Editor's note: Our editorial policy is to announce in this section, without charge, documents published by any organization or individual. However, the following conditions apply: (1) In the editor's judgement, the publication must seem to be of interest to at least some ISECSI members. (2) The publication must be obtainable, with or without charge, by anyone who wants a copy. (3) The person who wishes to have the publication announced must submit to the editor a complete abstract or description of the publication plus information regarding how it may be obtained. Note that announcement of a publication in these pages does not necessarily constitute a judgement by the editor regarding its merit or worth.

BOOKS, MANUALS, MONOGRAPHS, PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

* A Handbook for Visitors to the U.S.A. New Day Publishers (1986)

Authored by Beulah Rohrllich of Syracuse University, this very small (4" x 7", 112 pages) paperback includes chapters entitled Making Contacts, Playing the Game, Speaking in Public, Shopping American Style, Finding the Right Size, Food and Drink, and Leisure Time, among others. One chapter, Getting Settled, has advice regarding the finding of an apartment, including information about reading newspaper listings and maps, plus detailed advice regarding leases. The two chapters on shopping also include much information of practical value. New Day Publishers, P.O. Box 167, Quezon City 3008, Philippines. Available in the U.S.A. for \$6.00 from The Cellar Book Shop, 18090 Wyoming, Detroit, MI 48221.

Overseas Living. International Orientation Service (periodically)

This monthly publication looks like a newsletter but seems instead to be a series of short articles with practical information about living overseas. Articles deal with matters of interest to newcomers to the U.S. as well as to Americans abroad. It is published by the International Orientation Service, which assists business, government, universities, non-profit organizations, and individuals in more than 50 countries with a variety of services including "on-site trouble shooting." A one-year subscription to Overseas Living costs \$36.00; add \$15.00 for airmail to foreign addresses. International Orientation Service, P.O. Box 3567, Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27515, U.S.A.

Published by the Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1RP
32 East 57th Street, New York, NY 10022, USA
296 Beaconsfield Parade, Middle Park, Melbourne 3206, Australia

© Cambridge University Press 1983

First published 1983

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress cataloging in publication data

Church, Nancy

How to survive in the U.S.A.

1. English language—Text-books for foreign speakers.
2. English language—United States.
3. Readers—United States.

I. Moss, Anne. II. Title.

PE1128.C584 1983 428.3'4 83-5185

ISBN 0 521 27206 8 book

ISBN 0 521 25111 7 cassette

British Library cataloging in publication data

Church, Nancy

How to survive in the U.S.A.

1. English language—Text-books for foreigners
2. English language in the United States

I. Title II. Moss, Anne

427'.973 ; PE1128

ISBN 0 521 27206 8 book

ISBN 0 521 25111 7 cassette

10 *Being a welcome guest*  92

Staying at someone's home; agreeing to your host's suggestions or getting out of something politely; being invited to parties; arranging to get together again.

Teacher's guide 102

Answers and notes 107

Tapescript 125

APPENDIX J

PROPOSED COMPLEMENTARY PROGRAM

(Re-entry Workshop)

Proposed Burmese Re-Entry Program
for USAID Participants Who Have
Been Studying in the United States
Robert Kohls

As valuable as AID-sponsored academic and technical training is to recipient countries, there are often minor deficiencies which, if rectified, could increase the training effectiveness many-fold.

The Problem: Technological Differences

The American classroom, for example, focuses increasingly on ever-narrower areas of specialized knowledge. At the same time, large scale development projects in third world countries require of their staffs an ability to see the broader picture and an understanding of how their narrow specialization fits into the larger whole. What is required is specialists who are also able to generalize, who know something about all of the pieces of the job into which their specialty fits.

Most often, too, the technology being transferred to students -- domestic and foreign alike, without discrimination -- is "state of the art," "high tech," fully computerized, and ill-fitting the needs of a developing nation. It cannot be otherwise, for to expect American professors to be aware of conditions in the 60 countries where AID missions exist is unrealistic. Unless the foreign recipient of both academic and technical education is able to adapt what he/she has learned in this country, the utility of the training is greatly reduced.

Further, the nature of overseas development projects requires people who are problem solvers in their approach. This is not a capability which third world cultures seem to produce, at least not to the same degree that we do in the United States, where we tend to see the whole world as if it were a series of problems, eager and waiting for us to solve them.

In addition, developing countries need technicians who can manage. Almost all foreign students sponsored by USAID return home to positions in which they will manage or administer people and programs. Few of them take management courses as part of their study program, and while they may know everything required in their specialized field, they most often lack the project management skills to get that knowledge across.

Philosophical and Value Differences

So far we have addressed only the deficiencies and problems related to the areas of technical and professional training, but there is also another aspect which fails to achieve all it might, and , in doing so, reduces the all-over effectiveness of AID's participant training effort. That is the misinterpretation of the environment (and often even the ascribed motive) in which the training takes place. No one can say exactly how many recipients of American assistance have ended up disliking their donor, but suffice it to say, it is not a rare occurrence.

The American political system is probably the best known and least understood of any in the entire world. Its uniqueness makes it difficult for the foreigner to comprehend. Even our underlying values defy belief -- especially when the traditional values of the participant's home country are so radically different from our own.

Yet (all of) these aspects of American society can easily be explained by those who are experienced in doing so.

The Solution

Having pointed out the multiple ways USAID-sponsored training is sometimes ineffective, we do not have to simply give up. Both the technological and the philosophical deficiencies described can be remedied.

The solution for the AID/Burma lies in creating a Burmese Re-entry Program, one which has been carefully tailored to address the needs of the Burmese participants as they have been delineated above.

The proposed 10-day program would cover these specific areas:

- 1) Understanding the United States and the American People (3 days)
- 2) How to manage the New Professional and Technical Information You Have Received (5 days)
- 3) How to Adapt What You Have Learned to the Actual Needs of Burma (2 days)

Time estimates are based on past experience and the ease or difficulty of making the basic points. They may need to be altered slightly after the proposed pilot program to reflect the actual needs of Burmese participants.

The intervening weekend, between weeks one and two, will be spent in touring San Francisco and the surrounding area. Of course certain basic touristic information will be provided and all questions will be answered, but the emphasis of the field trips will be on reinforcing points already made in the classroom activities.

Within the scheduled sessions of the program itself, an informal, frank and open atmosphere will be established from the start and this will encourage the participants to ask pointed questions and to make frank comments. Without this candor, mistaken ideas and false interpretations cannot be surfaced, dealt with openly, and corrected in so short a time as the duration of this program.

With it, and with the multiple experiences of all of the participants, the first session will begin with an open-ended discussion of what the participants found to be most surprising, confusing or disturbing about their interaction with Americans while in this country. The causes they have assigned to these incidents will be discussed and corrected as necessary. These sessions obviously require an experienced, objective facilitator.

Methodologies:

A large number of training methodologies will be used throughout the ten days, but they will include, at least, the following:

- o Question and Answer Sessions
- o Discussion
- o Mock Debate Between Americans (to demonstrate the range of beliefs within the United States)
- o Comparisons (around predetermined points)
- o Assigning Causative Values to Specific Phenomena
Observed
- o Videotaped Scenarios (to be analyzed)
- o Case Studies
- o Role Play (to the extent the group is able to accept this more "threatening" activity)
- o Field Trips with Specific Task Assignments
- o Polling Americans to Learn Their Opinions
- o Lecturettes
- o Shifting Positions and Defending the New One

Site

The proposed training site for this Burmese Re-entry Program is the campus of San Francisco State University (SFSU), which is a convenient port of departure for Burmese participants. With an enrollment of 25,000, SFSU is one of the 40 largest institutions of higher learning in the United States. Yet, in spite of its size and its location in one of America's most cosmopolitan cities, SFSU is also one of America's most "personable" and caring institutions. Thirteen percent of its student body is from foreign countries.

Located on a 93-acre campus in the suburbanized southwest corner of the city, the campus is less than one mile from the Pacific Ocean and only 20 minutes from downtown San Francisco.

Staffing

The Proposed Burmese Re-entry Program will be designed and provided by Dr. Robert Kohls, Director of the Office of International Programs at SFSU, and one of the best known cross-culture trainers in the United States. He has trained thousands of foreign nationals from 150 countries around the world to understand and adjust to living, working and studying in the United States. Entry and Re-entry are his specialties.

Dr. Kohls resume is attached. He will be assisted by SFSU staff, as necessary and appropriate, to provide the full services of this contract.

Budget

An itemized budget will be developed when the actual program is designed, but for the purposes of this proposal, a "ball park" estimate of \$670.00 per participant per week (\$1340 for the two week session) is anticipated. This includes all program costs except room and board for the students during training. It is assumed that living arrangements can be made, at reasonable costs, in the student dormitories and cafeterias.

Cost estimates are based on an anticipated minimum of seven students per two-weeks iteration. SFSU would be pleased to offer a pilot session and then, if satisfactory, to continue the course as often as requested throughout the year.

ROBERT KOHLS is a Director of the Office of International Programs at San Francisco State University in San Francisco, California. Robert Kohls served, from 1983 through 1987, as Vice President of Meridian House International and Executive Director of the Washington International Center in Washington, D.C. The Washington International Center is the oldest organization anywhere in the world designed to prepare people from other countries to understand American institutions, values and customs.

Robert Kohls is a cultural historian by training, having received his bachelor's degree from Drake University, his master's degree from Columbia University and his Ph.D. from New York University. Dr. Kohls has taught for 17 years, including posts at New York University and The New School for Social Research in New York City. His professional career also includes seven years in private industry (Westinghouse and Time Inc.), ten years in the Federal Government (at the GS-16 "supergrade" level) and five years working with non-profit organizations. He has lived abroad for eight years, and he has spent more than 25 years in the intercultural field.

For more than a decade (1974 - 1984), Dr. Kohls had full responsibility for the training and development of the Cultural Attachés and Press Attachés who represent the United States at American Embassies around the world. In addition, since the mid-60's he has trained literally thousands of Americans -- business executives and their spouses, Peace Corps volunteers, military officers, missionaries, diplomats, teachers, students and Fullbright scholars -- to adjust more successfully to overseas living and to function more effectively abroad. Fifty of the Fortune 500 companies have been his clients as well as ten of the largest agencies of the U.S. Federal Government. He has also prepared thousands of foreign nationals, from 150 countries in all geographic regions of the world, to understand the United States and the American people, and to get more out of their study experience in this country.

Dr. Kohls serves as president of ISECSI (the International Society for Educational, Cultural and Scientific Interchanges). He is a senior cross-cultural trainer for NTL (the National Training Labs), BCIU (the Business Council for International Understanding) and SIETAR (the Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research). Dr. Kohls is considered one of the top trainers of other cross-cultural trainers in this country. He has created and field tested nearly thirty experiential exercises to develop intercultural awareness in culturally naive groups.

Robert Kohls has lived, worked and traveled in 80 countries in all parts of the world. He is the author of several books on intercultural understanding and cross-cultural adjustment. His book Survival Kit for Overseas Living is considered a "classic" because of the simple and straight-forward way it explains the complex psychological adjustment process to a lay audience. His booklet The Values Americans Live By not only enunciates the most

fundamental mainstream American values but also contrasts them with the counterpart values of many Third World countries. He is presently preparing a manuscript entitled Benchmarks in the Development of the Field of Intercultural Communication in the United States, which will be the first history of the field to be written.

APPENDIX K

SAMPLE FOLLOW-UP

QUESTIONNAIRES

APPENDIX K

PROPOSED FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRES

The following forms are suggested as guidelines for developing a follow-up and evaluation plan for the Mission's participant training program. To facilitate periodic assessment of the program's effectiveness, information from these forms should be computerized.

The first form represents participants biographical information, available from an application form or PIO/P. This information will serve as baseline data for program monitoring and eventual follow-up.

The second form, exit interview questionnaire, can be administered either by the AID contractor prior to participant's return or at the mission immediately upon return. The purpose of this exit interview is to assess the overall quality of the training and identify any problems that may need attention.

The follow-up questionnaire should be administered to participants a year after their return to monitor their job status and assess the utilization of their training.

GUIDELINES FOR FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE
(To be administered to participants by the AID Office
within one year after return.)

Name of Participant _____
Date of Return _____
Program Attended _____

1. Have you changed job positions since returning from training? If so, does your current position have more, less or the same responsibility?
2. Is your present position in the same field for which you were trained under the AID program?
3. Overall, how satisfied are you now with your training experience?
4. To what extent are you now satisfied with the following aspects of your program?
 - a) content
 - b) technical level & program length
 - c) relevance to your work
 - d) applicability to home country conditions
 - e) competence of instructors
 - f) training resources (equipment, library)
 - g) practical experience
5. To what extent are the knowledge and skills learned in your training program useful in your job?
6. Which skills are the most useful?
7. Overall, how much do you think your training increased your professional competence?
8. Have you experienced any change in attitudes as a result of your training experience? If so, please describe:
9. Have you experienced problems in applying the knowledge and skills acquired in training in your present job? Please describe:
10. How successful have you been in introducing new ideas and/or changes in your job? If not, why?
11. As a result of your training, are you involved in the following activities more, less, or about the same (where applicable):

- a. develop/revise policy
 - b. develop/revise operating procedures
 - c. participant in planning
 - d. develop new programs or services
 - e. develop educational or training materials
 - f. plan or coordinate workshops
 - g. research
 - h. publishing
12. Have you corresponded with your training institution or a professional contact made during training? If so, how frequently?
13. Are you in contact with other AID participants?
14. How much have you used each of the following methods to share knowledge from training with others?
- a. informational discussion
 - b. on-the-job training
 - c. formal presentations
 - d. exchange of training material
 - e. written reports
15. Have you had any of the following problems since returning from your training?
- a. finding a training-related position
 - b. adequate resources to carry out job duties
 - c. acceptance by colleagues and/or superiors
 - d. readjusting to your job
 - e. readjusting to lifestyle
 - f. readjusting to family
16. Are you a member of a professional association?
17. Do you receive professional publications?
18. Would you recommend this program to others of similar background?

Comments

EXIT INTERVIEW: GUIDELINES FOR QUESTIONNAIRE

(To be administered either before participants' return and forwarded to sending mission or in the AID Office immediately upon return).

Name of Participant: _____

Return Date: _____

EMPLOYMENT STATUS

1. Are you returning to your former employer? If not, why?
2. Are you returning to the same position you occupied before training? If not, will your new position have more, less or the same responsibility?

Preparation of Training

3. To what extent were you involved in planning your program (content, objective, schedule)?
4. Are you satisfied with assistance provided by the AID mission in preparing for your departure (e.g., placement, visa, travel arrangements)? If not, why?
5. Did you receive a pre-departure orientation before leaving your home country (covering administrative, programmatic, and cultural information)? If so, how useful was it?
6. How could the USAID orientation be improved?

In-Training Experience

7. Are you satisfied with support from your program manager in the U.S., e.g. Pragma, IIE, etc.?
8. During training, did you have any problems with the following: If so, please explain:
 - a) receipt of allowance
 - b) amount of allowance
 - c) living arrangements
 - d) program changes
 - e) academic counseling
 - f) personal counseling
 - g) health insurance plan
 - h) travel
9. Did you have language problems during training? If so, please explain.

Quality of Training

10. Overall, how satisfied are you with your training experience? If not, why?
11. How would you rate the following characteristics of the institution/program/you attended (poor, fair, good)
 - a) competence of instructors
 - b) academic program/curriculum
 - c) practical experience
 - d) availability of training materials
 - e) library facilities
 - f) laboratories/workshops
 - g) other research facilities
 - h) computer facilities
 - i) condition of equipment
 - j) available medical services
 - k) services for foreign students
 - l) transportation
 - m) access to restaurants/food
12. Do you think the knowledge and skills learned in your training program will be useful in your job?
13. Which skills do you think will be most useful?
14. What are the strengths, if any, of your program?
15. What are the weaknesses, if any?
16. How could this program be improved?
17. Would you recommend this program to others of similar background?

Comments

PARTICIPANTS BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

Personal Information

LAST NAME
FIRST NAME
GENDER
BIRTHDATE
MARITAL STATUS
PLACE OF BIRTH
HOME ADDRESS
EMERGENCY CONTACT/ADDRESS

Educational Information

TOTAL YEARS COMPLETED (12-13, ETC.)
HIGHEST DEGREE OBTAINED
SCHOOLS ATTENDED (Name/Dates/Field of Study/Degrees)
OVERSEAS TRAINING EXPERIENCE (country-dates-sponsor)

Employment Information

PRESENT EMPLOYER (Ministry)
DEPARTMENT
LOCATION
TEL:

POSITION/OCCUPATION
MAIN DUTIES
DATES OF EMPLOYMENT (from _____ to present)
NAME OF SUPERVISOR
OF EMPLOYEES SUPERVISED

Proposed Training

TRAINING PROGRAM/FIELD
TRAINING INSTITUTION
DATES OF TRAINING
LOCATION OF TRAINING (City/Country)
DEGREE OBJECTIVE (for academic participants)

*Need back -
8 amount info -
- size of photo -
- name & pas photo -
- national level
- no. his occa -
- position of
- Estimation of
social class
(multiple
choice)*