

PN-AAR-990
ISBN: 39.957

PARTICIPANT

TRAINING PROGRAM

THAILAND 1951-1960

AN
EVALUATION
SURVEY

volume II :
the appendix

PN-AAR-990

LAN 39954

PARTICIPANT TRAINING PROGRAM

THAILAND 1951-1960

**A Follow-up Evaluation Survey of the Program for Training
Thais Abroad Operated Jointly by the Thai Government and
the U. S. Agency for International Development**

Volume II:

The Appendix

5100
6750

**The Agency for International Development
United States of America Operations Mission to Thailand**

000210

**This study was carried out by Business Research Ltd,
35 Suriwongse Road, Bangkok
1963**

0041165

Participant Training in Thailand

1951 - 1960

A sample interview survey of Thai participants sent to the United States or selected third countries for technical training or as participants in seminars from U. S. Fiscal Year 1951 to March 31, 1960. The program is under the joint auspices of the Thai Technical and Economic Cooperation of the National Economic Development Board, and the United States Operations Mission to Thailand of the Agency for International Development. The survey also includes interviews with the immediate supervisors of the sampled participants, and interviews with the USOM Technical Advisors assigned to the Projects under which the participants' training was programmed.

The results of the Survey are presented in two volumes:

Volume I:	The Report
Volume II:	The Appendix

The Report gives the basic findings of the study and recommendations based on these findings, together with supporting tables.

The Appendix includes a full description of the methodology employed as well as additional tables not included in Volume I.

Solely because of cost considerations, only a limited number of copies of Volume II: The Appendix have been published. These are available on special request from the Training Division, USOM/Thailand.

PREFACE

This study was conducted by Business Research Ltd. under contractual agreements with USOM/Thailand. The survey and report were financed by counterpart funds made available by joint agreement between the Thai Government and USOM/Thailand.

The research project was under the direction of Frederic L. Ayer, Technical Director of Business Research Ltd., and carried out in collaboration with the USOM Training Office and a Thai-American Research Advisory Committee.

Table of Contents

APPENDIX

	<u>Page</u>
Appendix 1: Methodology	1
Appendix 2: Additional Tables Not Elsewhere Reported	13
Section 1: Characteristics of Participants Interviewed	20
Section 2: Utilization of Training	31
Section 3: Satisfaction with Training	44
Section 4: Non-Technical Aspects of Training	53
Section 5: Administrative Practices and Procedures	60
Section 6: Relationship of Year of Departure and Training Field of Activity to the Conduct of the Training Program	89
Appendix 3: Tabulations of Responses from Up-country Participants	140
Appendix 4: Construction of Utilization Scores	228
Appendix 5: Questionnaires	247

- 1 -

Appendix 1

Methodology

APPENDIX 1

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The Evaluation Survey of Returned Participants in Thailand was carried out under contract by Business Research Ltd., a commercial marketing research agency located in Bangkok.

The Training Office of USOM served as the official USOM representative in negotiating contract arrangements under which the Contractor was retained, and assisted the Contractor in the several phases of the undertaking to the extent that staff and time permitted.

In general, in conducting the survey, the instructions given in the various guidelines provided by AID/W (ICA) were followed. The only known deviations occurring were those dictated by local conditions.

The purpose of the following report from Business Research Ltd., the Contractor, is to describe the procedures actually followed so that any limitations may be kept in mind and given proper consideration when looking at the survey results.

USOM RETURNED PARTICIPANT SURVEY METHODOLOGICAL REPORT

Background

The present study was first conceived and planning initiated early in 1959 by Mr. Raymond Towle, then Training Officer of USOM/T with the consultant service of Dr. James Mosel, at that time a Ford scholar in Thailand, as well as a member of the consultant staff of Business Research Ltd. In its initial conception, the study visualized the interviewing of approximately 500 former participants selected on a random sampling procedure, using an interview schedule of about 45 minutes in length.

During pre-contract negotiations, USOM/T received word that ICA/W was planning a world-wide evaluation of training, and that design should be delayed pending further instructions from Washington. The first material received was a statement of the objectives and general pattern contained in ICATC Circular A-175 dated November 5, 1959, followed shortly by a preliminary participant questionnaire with instructions, and guidelines.

Pre-testing guidelines and additional material were received in early 1960, and the Training Office, then under the direction of Mr. J. Otis Garber, decided to shelve the local study in favor of full participation in the ICA study, with some local adaptations. In line with this decision, the ICA/W questionnaires for participants, supervisors, and technicians were pre-tested in May 1960. Ten participants, seven supervisors, and one technician were interviewed, and results and recommendations forwarded to Washington in June.

At this time permission was requested and received to carry out participant interviews in a central neutral location on an appointment basis, and arrangements were made to use the premises of the Faculty of Education of Chulalongkorn University for this purpose during the October holidays in 1960.

In September of 1960, the Mission was visited by a Survey Research Specialist, Dr. Albert D. Biderman, representing ICA/W, who further clarified procedures and forwarded to us what purported to be a final copy of the English version of the participant questionnaire. This questionnaire was received on October 12, 1960 and was immediately translated and duplicated, and re-arrangements made for interviewing. Since a minimum of two weeks' notice was necessary for appointments, the interviewing schedule, originally planned for two consecutive weeks in October, was shifted to eight consecutive Saturdays in November and December. Final questionnaires and guidelines for interviewing and translation were not received until November 12th.

About half the interviews with participants were completed by the end of 1960, with most of the remainder completed in January of 1961, coincidentally with the completion of interviews with supervisors. The last participant interviews were finished in December 1961. During this time valuable assistance was given the Contractor in securing participant interviews by a joint advisory committee appointed by the Director of USOM Thailand with the assistance of the Director of TTEC,

Technician Interviews were delayed pending receipt of final questionnaires from ICA/W, and difficulty in securing and retaining suitable interviewers, together with recurring non-availability of the technicians themselves further delayed completion of technician interviews until April 1962.

Coding of the completed participant questionnaires was not begun until September 1961 after receipt of coding instructions which were delivered in person by Mr. Valter V. Monroe on his arrival in Bangkok to join the Training Office with the primary assignment as liaison with the contractor. Coding instructions for the supervisor's questionnaire and technician's questionnaire were received several months later.

Description of Methods Used

Questionnaires

The questionnaires used for the survey were developed by ICA/W from versions originally sent out for pre-testing. Separate questionnaires were used for participants, their immediate supervisors, and the USOM technicians assigned to the joint project for which they worked.

The participant and supervisor questionnaires were translated into Thai for the pre-test, and a back-translation matched with the original English version to uncover as many discrepancies in translation as possible. Wherever ambiguities were disclosed the translation was revised. The final English version of the questionnaires was processed the same way, and pre-tested on the interviewers before finalizing. Appendix 5 contains a back translation of the final version used, which can be compared with the original English.

In spite of the care taken in translation, some questions remained difficult to answer with certainty. In others the question did not elicit precise responses, and a sufficient probe pattern was not developed during the interviews. Where these difficulties occurred, notes are appended to the appropriate tables.

Sampling

In considering and planning the survey of returned participants as directed by AID/W, referenced CIRC A-175, the population of concern

was defined as all participants who had completed an ICA training program in the United States or third country and had returned to Thailand as of March 30, 1960. During the early planning of the survey it was decided that USCM/Thailand would attempt to evaluate only those returnees who were located in Bangkok. It was believed that the probability sample of 400 from the entire universe of returned participants, as had been directed by Washington guideline, could not be processed with the resources known to be available. Furthermore, based on the information available at the time, Business Research Ltd. did not feel that the gain which might be realized by their inclusion would justify the high cost of interviewing participants located in the Kingdom's seventy-three provinces. In respect to returnees who were up-country, it was decided that one or two provincial cities in which up-country participants were concentrated would be arbitrarily selected and all participants found there be interviewed. In practice, only 52 up-country interviews could be obtained in three towns up-country.

The rationale for this advice and decision rested on 6 points:

1. All Thai participants are ipso facto government officials, and the extremely high centralization of the Thai government puts all but a minimum number of the government officials in Bangkok, with even the provincial officials being rotated to the capital at frequent intervals.
2. Most training was being undertaken on a national level, so that even in the fields of Agriculture and Community Development, returned participants were likely to be in Bangkok training rural workers. The only college level agricultural training institution -- the Agricultural University -- for example, is located in the metropolitan area of the capital city.
3. Of the 1697 returned participants listed in the USCM/December 1958 Directory of Returned Participants, with supplements up through March, 1960, 1373, or 81%, were listed with Bangkok addresses.
4. Statistical comparison of the Factual Data of the "Total Universe" of 1697 participants and the "Bangkok Universe" of 1373 participants on the dimensions of Sex, Number of Training Countries, Field of Activity (Functional Field of Training), Year of Birth, and Year Returned, revealed statistically significant differences only in Sex (76% male in the whole country, 74% male in Bangkok) and the Field of Training (22% of the participants in the whole country in Agriculture, 20% of Bangkok participants in that field; 14% of the whole country in Public Administration and 16% in Bangkok).
5. The above led the contractor and the Advisory Committee to believe that the four-fifths of the returned participants listed as being in Bangkok were not materially different in other respects to the universe.
6. In terms of time and cost, then, it was not believed worthwhile to take a strict probability sample of the up-country group during the first survey. If the results on the up-country group indicated significant differences, these indications would be reported, and later surveys would incorporate the up-country participants in the sample.

It was realized that the price to be paid by the foregoing decision was that the research completed would not permit a statistically objective determination of differences which might exist between Bangkok returnees and up-country returnees.

In developing the universe to be sampled, a team of clerks under the direction of Business Research Ltd. worked for four weeks in the USOM Training Office extracting factual data from participant files. The information thus collected was punched on IBM cards and provided the characteristics of 1697 returnees. These data supplied the answers to that first twenty (face sheet) questions of the participant questionnaire, and described the universe to be sampled.

In selecting the sample of Bangkok returnees, a USOM alphabetical directory of returned participants by functional field of training was used. The directory, developed in 1958, was supplemented by adding an attachment of all participants who had returned between 1958 and March 30, 1960.

In sampling, a random start and fixed take without regard to the addresses given was used. Following this procedure a total of 550 names was selected. These names were then checked for the address of record. The procedure resulted in the following Tables A1-1 and A1-2.

Table A1-1

Geographical Distribution of the "Initial" Sample According to the 1958 Directory of Addresses

<u>Listed Addresses</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Bangkok	428	77.8
Up-country	122	22.2
Total	550	100.0

The list of 122 having an up-country (outside Bangkok) address, for reasons stated earlier, was never processed. The list of 428 believed to be in Bangkok became the "Initial" sample of the survey and the field procedure (described elsewhere) resulted in the following:

Table A1-2

Field Results in Processing the "Initial" Sample of 428 Participants

		<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Eligible		334	78
Interviewed	286	66.8	
Not contacted	24	5.6	
Long sick leave	3	0.7	
Refused	21	4.9	
Not eligible		94	22
Abroad	22	5.1	
Up-country	59	13.8	
Dead	4	0.9	
Other*	9	2.1	
Total		428	100

* Interviewed on pre-test, interviewers, member of advisory committee, armed forces.

As the field work progressed and it became apparent that the desired number of interviews would not be completed, additional samples were drawn from the directory following the same procedure as that used in the initial sampling with the exception that in subsequent sampling the count excluded all names previously drawn and all names of participants with an up-country address. A total of 272 names were selected in this process, bringing the total number of names of participants selected, who were thought to be in Bangkok, up to 700.

The names thus drawn were contacted by letter (delivered by messenger or registered mail) requesting them to contact Business Research Ltd. for a convenient appointment for interview at the central location. Where contact was made and the participant's presence at the central interviewing point was impossible or inadvisable (because of high rank, for example), arrangements were made for an interviewer to go to the participant. If no word was received from the participant thus notified within one week, a second letter was sent, and telephone or personal contact was attempted. A total of four call backs was made for each non-responding participant.

As shown by Table A1-2, in processing the initial sample of 428, a complete record of the reasons for non-interview was kept. Unfortunately, in the rush of trying to clear up these interviews while the interviewers were still available, no record of individual reasons for refusals or other reasons for non-interview was kept in processing the subsequent sample draws, totaling 272 names.

Assuming that the reasons for non-interview for the 272 names selected distributed in approximately the same proportions as those recorded for the initial sample, the following table shows the results of the field work for the 700 participants selected.

Table A1-3

Field Results for Processing the Total Sample of 700 Participants¹

		<u>no</u>	<u>%</u>
Eligible		541	77.3
Interviewed	460	65.7	
Not contacted	41	5.9	
Long sick leave	5	0.7	
Refused	35	5.0	
Ineligible		159	22.7
Abroad	37	5.3	
Up-country	100	14.3	
Dead	7	1.0	
Other ²	15	2.0	
Total		700	100.0

As shown by the above Table A1-3, 541 of the 700 (about 77%) participants selected were eligible for the interview. Of the 541 eligible, 460 were interviewed, about 85%.

¹ 94 Non-interviewed participants for whom no record was kept are distributed according to corresponding pattern of initial sample.

² Interviewed on pre-test, interviewers, member of advisory committee, armed forces, etc.

Following field operations, Table A1-4 was developed, showing certain known characteristics of the total universe, the total sample and the interviewed and non-interviewed portions of the total sample.

At the close of the participant's interview, the participant was asked to give the name of his immediate supervisor, if he had no objection to the supervisor's being interviewed about his training program. Five of the participants had no supervisor; all the rest gave permission for the supervisor interview. Of these, the supervisors of 15 participants could not be contacted for interview, primarily because they were out of the country during the interviewing period.

The list of 460 names comprising the sample was forwarded to the USOM Training Office who furnished the contractor with the name of the USOM Technical Advisor assigned to those participants. Due mostly to phasing out of Projects and rotation of Technicians, only 357 participants in the sample were listed by the Training Office as having a Technician to whom they were assigned (Table A1-5).

Table A1-4

Characteristics of Participants Listed as Being in Bangkok Compared to the Characteristics of the Total Sample and the Interviewed and Non-Interviewed Portions of the Total Sample

	Bangkok			
	<u>Universe</u> ¹	<u>Total</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Total not</u>
	(1373) %	Sample (700) %	Interviewed (460) %	Interviewed (240) %
Male	74	74	72	79
Female	26	26	28	21
Trained in one country	85	85	86	84
Trained in two or more countries	11	11	14	5
No. of countries of training unknown	4	4	-	12
Functional Field of Training:				
Agriculture	20	23	20	30
Industry and Mining, Transport and Com- munications	10	10	10	10
Labor	1	1	1	1
Health	18	18	20	14
Education	24	24	25	23
Public Administration	16	17	15	20
Community Development + General and Miscellan- eous	3	2	3	-
Year of Birth:				
1880-1889	+	-	-	-
1890-1899	1	+	1	5
1900-1909	9	8	10	19
1910-1919	25	27	31	23
1920-1929	36	35	41	8
1930-1939	12	12	14	+
1940-1949	+	-	-	-
Unknown	18	18	3	45
Year Returned from Training:				
1960	5	4	4	5
1959	22	28*	24	37
1958	17	17	18	16
1957	13	13	14	13
1956	13	12	13	10
1955	11	10	11	9
1954	7	5	5	4
1953	8	6	8	3
1952	5	3	3	3
1951	1	+	-	1

¹ Returnees whose address of record was Bangkok.

Table A1-5**Number of Participants, Supervisors, and Technicians Interviewed, Bangkok**

		<u>Participant - Respondents Covered</u>	
Participants	460	460	%
Supervisors	237	440	95
Technicians	42	357	77

Interviewers and Training

A total of 45 instructors and lecturers from Chulalongkorn University and the Prasarnmitr College of Education were trained and utilized as interviewers of participants and supervisors. Since most of these had been trained abroad, many under USOM sponsorship, the Survey Research Specialist, Dr. Albert D. Biderman, gave special permission for these former participants to be used as interviewers.

The interviewers were given over nine hours of special training. At an initial briefing session the project was explained, interviewer Guidelines and questionnaires distributed, and the general local procedure outlined.

After an intervening week in which to study the questionnaire and the guidelines, another three-hour training session covered the questionnaire in detail item by item, and questions raised by the interviewers were discussed. A third session was devoted to practice interviews in a roleplaying situation, with the completed questionnaires then checked by the interview supervisors and the study directors. The fourth session was a critique of these practice interviews.

As has been mentioned above, the participant interviews were conducted in a central location, by previous appointment with the participant. Facilities were provided to interview 15 participants at any one time, and scheduling was set up so that no interviewer would be required to carry out more than three interviews in one day, or more than two in any half-day. In practice, we found that about one-third of those who had responded to the invitation for appointment would show up for the interview on the scheduled day. Therefore, after the first interviewing session we consistently made appointments with three times as many participants as could be accommodated.

For a general understanding of the mechanics of the interview, let us follow a hypothetical participant, number 523, a male official in the Ministry of Agriculture representing a typical case.

On November 12th a letter from Business Research Ltd., requesting his appearance at Chulalongkorn University at 9:00 a. m., November 26th, and enclosing a letter from the Thai Technical and Economic Committee explaining the project and requesting his cooperation, was delivered by hand to the Ministry of Agriculture. The main office of the Ministry was unable to tell the bearer what Division, Department, or Section of the Ministry Mr. 523 worked in, so

the messenger visited a succession of four friends and friends-of-friends in the Ministry until he found one who knew the respondent and could tell him where his office was. When the messenger arrived in Mr. 523's office, he was out, but expected back that afternoon. A return call in the afternoon found him in, and the letter was handed over personally, Mr. 523 informing the bearer that he would be able to come for the interview at 10:00 on the 26th.

On November 26th, Mr. 523 failed to appear. On Monday, November 28th, the Study Director telephoned Mr. 523 at his office, received his apologies for his illness, and his confirmation that he would come on Saturday, December 3rd.

At 10:15 on December 3rd, Mr. 523 arrived at the main entrance of the Faculty of Education, where he was met by one of the two interview supervisors who conducted him to the V. I. P. room, served him a soft drink, and checked with him the factual data on the face sheet of the questionnaire. This check completed, a page guided him to a private interview room and introduced him to the interviewer. The interview was completed at 11:45, and the interviewer then accompanied Mr. 523 back to the main entrance, thanked him, and returned to re-check the interview schedule.

At the end of the day Mr. 523's Questionnaire, together with the other two completed that day by the interviewer, was turned over to the interview supervisor, who checked and edited it during the ensuing week. The following Saturday the Questionnaire was filed to await final editing and coding, and the appropriate Supervisor Questionnaire numbered and prepared for later assignment.

About 60% of the interviews were completed on this pattern. The procedure followed in the remainder of the cases has been described in the section on sampling. High government officials and a few participants who persistently pleaded inability to come to the University for interviews were interviewed in their offices during week-day working hours.

Supervisor interviews were carried out in the respondents' offices during working hours by previous appointment, using about half of the interviewers who had done the participant interviews.

Technician interviews posed many difficulties. In the first place they were delayed pending receipt of final instructions and questionnaires. Secondly, the study requirement that they be carried out by a U. S. citizen not connected with USOM/T introduced recurring problems of finding and retaining suitable interviewers. Qualified American personnel became available sporadically, and after a few weeks would no longer have free time to interview during the time when Technicians and their records were available; available personnel would turn out to be undependable and poorly qualified; qualified and available personnel would be either USOM dependents or not of American nationality. Thirdly, not only were Technicians being rotated and replaced throughout the study, but they were also frequently out of office unpredictably, up-country, or out of the country entirely during the course of the study.

Not a-typical was the experience with one Technician with whom an appointment had been made for 10:00 a. m. :

When the interviewer arrived at his office at 9:50, she was told that he had been called out to a conference with his superior at 9:30, but would be back as soon as possible. He returned to his office at 10:35, apologetic, but had to leave for the airport to meet an important visitor at 11:00. A new appointment was made for the following week, but on telephoning for confirmation the day previous to that scheduled, the interviewer was informed that the Technician had gone to Manila for a conference and would not return for several days.

As a consequence, in spite of the utmost cooperation from the Training Office and from the Technicians themselves, these interviews took more than a calendar year to complete.

Coding

In conformation to the Coding Guidelines, twelve "bi-lingual" coders were employed and trained to carry out the coding operation. Most of these had some training abroad, and all but one were government officials. Four were university instructors or teachers.

Training of the coders began on January 4, 1962, and was carried out in three two-hour sessions. The training included lecture and discussion of the Guidelines and the general booklet "Coding Survey Data", and a Round Robin session with 4 packs (40) of Participant Questionnaires.

For the actual coding operation, which began on January 8, 1962, all questionnaires were divided into packs of 10 each with a covering transmittal sheet. Instruction, round-robin, and coding were carried out card by card in succession, all coding for card 01 being completed before beginning card 02, etc. At variance with the Guidelines, coding was carried out directly on the Questionnaire itself, for two reasons: to minimize copying error by the coders, and to provide an additional coding check during the process of copying to the Transfer Sheets.

All Participant and Supervisor Questionnaires were coded during evening hours and Saturdays between the 9th and the 27th of January. Coders worked in two four-hour shifts, with a team of six in each shift. One of the directors of the company and two of the regular data processing supervisors were present during each shift.

One complete pack for each coder was check-coded each shift, and a random sample of one Questionnaire from each pack (10%) was check-coded for the entire sample. The codes from the completed Questionnaires were transferred to the Transfer Sheets by the coding supervisors as a further check.

In spite of these precautions, many coding errors were revealed during tabulation, and some questions had to be completely re-coded by the supervisors. In addition to this, an airgram received by USOM/T in February listed some 32 corrections to the codes already used. While some of these corrections did not apply to our data, and some had already been made by us, the remainder required an additional check of all transferred data on some questions, including going

back to the original questionnaires for some items, and completely re-coding, re-punching, and re-verifying the applicable cards. A team of six coders worked during most of the month of March on this revision.

During this re-processing, the re-checking of responses coded "Other" which occurred in more than 10 cases per item was undertaken. This was originally planned to have been done after the first straight machine runs had revealed their extent. However, since other corrections and visual searches of the transfer sheets were being made, it was more economical of both time and money to take this step at the same time, so that where card corrections were indicated, one punch and verify operation would suffice.

This checking revealed a certain lack of "bi-lingualism" among the coders in ability to identify Thai concepts with English codes. Many of the responses coded "other" could be fitted to existing codes. Although this sometimes shifted the emphasis of the verbatim response, the process was consistent with the concept of content coding. In only two or three instances were responses in any one field frequent enough to indicate that an additional code category should have been provided, and in all these cases there were no free code numbers available. Appropriate footnotes are appended to applicable tables in the body of the report.

All coding and corrections were completed on April 10, 1962.

Tabulation

Business Research Ltd. 's two key-punch operators were supplemented by an additional two in April. Punching and verifying began on April 3rd and together with corrections was completed by the 24th. An IBM 011 and an 024 key-punch were used together with 051 verifiers.

Machine consistency checks and straight tabulation runs were begun on an 075 counter-sorter on May 3, 1962. With three operators handling the machine in relays, and inconsistencies corrected during the runs, these tabs were completed on the 20th of July, and marginals entered in the code books and in the recommended cross-tab dummy tables. Copies of these were delivered to USOM/T at the end of July 1962.

All tabulation runs were made at least twice, consistent with normal machine practice.

Appendix 2

Additional Tables Not Elsewhere Reported

APPENDIX 2**ADDITIONAL TABLES NOT ELSEWHERE REPORTED**

NOTE: This appendix consists of the published tables which relate to Sections 1 to 7 of Chapter IV, but which are not reported with the text.

The tables are arranged by section, and appear in approximately the same order in which the subject matter was treated in Chapter IV.

In addition to those reproduced here, there are unpublished tables on file with the USOM Training Office. Most of these are listed at the end of the appropriate sections of Chapter IV.

Section 1: Characteristics of Participants Interviewed

A2, 1-1	Area of Residence at Time of Departure
A2, 1-2	Major Field of Study in University prior to ICA Training
A2, 1-3	Type of Degree at Time of Departure
A2, 1-4	Orientation Classes at Home Country prior to Departure
A2, 1-5	Age in Years at Time of Departure BY Total Time in Field of Specialization at Time of Departure
A2, 1-6	Age in Years at Time of Departure BY Level of Position at Time of Departure
A2, 1-7	Age in Years at Time of Departure BY Number of People Supervised at Time of Departure
A2, 1-8	Age in Years at Time of Departure BY Sex of Participant
A2, 1-9	Amount of Time Spent in Training BY Level of Position at Time of Departure
A2, 1-10	Orientation Classes at Home Country prior to Departure BY Year of Departure
A2, 1-11	Year in Which Participants Were Interviewed
A2, 1-12	Number of Countries in Which Training Was Received
A2, 1-13	Length of Time in Country of Training
A2, 1-14	Type of Training Program
A2, 1-15	Name of University Attended in the Program
A2, 1-16	Technicians' Rating of Participants' Personality Attributes

Section 2: Utilization of Training

A2, 2-1	Number of People Supervised on First Job after Return
A2, 2-2	Number of People Supervised on Present Job
A2, 2-3	Kind of Position Expected without ICA Training BY Selector of Participant
A2, 2-4	Kind of Work Done at Time of Departure BY Major Field of Activity in Which Training Was Given
A2, 2-5	Kind of Work Done at Time of Departure BY Kind of Work Done at Time of Interview
A2, 2-6	Satisfaction with Training Program BY Kind of Position Expected without ICA Training
A2, 2-7	Contribution of Training to Participant's Job Performance BY Kind of Position Expected without ICA Training
A2, 2-8	Contribution of Training to Participant's Job Performance BY Supervisor's Opinion about Importance of Training to Participant's Work Abilities

A2, 2-9	Participant's Contact with USOM Technician since Return BY Participant's Utilization Score
A2, 2-10	Supervisor's Utilization Score BY Participant's Utilization Score
A2, 2-11	Technician's Contact with Participant BY Participant's Utilization Score
A2, 2-12	Technician's Contact with Participant BY Technician's Utilization Score
A2, 2-13	Helpfulness of Supervisor in Utilizing Training BY Technician's Satisfaction with Utilization of Training
A2, 2-14	Frequency of Participant's Contact with Technician BY Frequency of Technician's Contact with Participant
A2, 2-15	Age in Years at Time of Departure BY Supervisor's Utilization Score
A2, 2-16	Age in Years at Time of Departure BY Technician's Utilization Score
A2, 2-17	Job Changes between Departure and Return BY Participant's Utilization Score
A2, 2-18	Job Expectancy on Return BY Participant's Utilization Score
A2, 2-19	Technician's Rating of Participant's Job Importance to Country Economy BY Technician's Utilization Score
A2, 2-20	Sex of Participant BY Participant's Utilization Score
A2, 2-21	Primary Country of Training BY Participant's Utilization Score

Section 3: Satisfaction with Training

A2, 3-1	Negative Comments on Program
A2, 3-2	Supervisor's Name Given by Participant
A2, 3-3	Completion of Supervisor Questionnaires
A2, 3-4	Supervisor's Rating of Procedures by Which Participants Were Selected
A2, 3-5	Technician's Rating of Factors Related to Suitability of Participant Training
A2, 3-6	Satisfaction with Training Program BY Major Field of Activity in Which Training Was Given
A2, 3-7	Satisfaction with Training Program BY Total Amount of Time Spent in Training
A2, 3-8	Satisfaction with Training Program BY Program Arrangement on Arrival in Country of Training
A2, 3-9	Satisfaction with Training Program BY Opinion about Other Social Activities
A2, 3-10	Satisfaction with Training Program BY Type of English Language Difficulty
A2, 3-11	Opinion about Length of Program BY Total Amount of Time Spent in Training
A2, 3-12	Opinion about Suitable Length of Program
A2, 3-13	Comments on Most Useful and Valuable Experience in Country of Training
A2, 3-14	Comments on Least Useful Experience in Country of Training
A2, 3-15	Reasons for Considering Experience as Least Useful

Section 4: Non-Technical Aspects of Training

A2, 4-1	Suggestions for Improvement of Orientation Sessions in USA
A2, 4-2	Reasons for Opinion on Private Home Visits
A2, 4-3	Suggested Types of Social Activities Which Should Be Less

A2, 4-4	Suggested Types of Social Activities Which Should Be More
A2, 4-5	Satisfaction with Training Program BY Frequency of Meeting with Local People in Country of Training
A2, 4-6	Attendance at Seminar in Communications
A2, 4-7	Most Liked Values of Seminar in Communications
A2, 4-8	Things Least Liked about Seminar in Communications
A2, 4-9	Place Where Seminar Was Held
A2, 4-10	Use of Seminar Materials in Participant's Work
A2, 4-11	Usefulness of Seminar Materials
A2, 4-12	Reasons for Non-use of Seminar Materials
A2, 4-13	Membership in Professional Society of Countries Other Than USA

Section 5: Administrative Practices and Procedures

A2, 5-1	Technician's Pre-departure Contacts with Participants
A2, 5-2	Kind of Pre-departure Information Needed about Place of Program
A2, 5-3	Participant's Evaluation of Pre-departure Information about How to Use Restaurants
A2, 5-4	Kind of Pre-departure Information Needed about Restaurants and Public Facilities
A2, 5-5	Participant's Evaluation of Pre-departure Information about Colloquial Speech and Idioms
A2, 5-6	Kind of Pre-departure Information Needed about Colloquial Speech and Idioms
A2, 5-7	Participant's Evaluation of Pre-departure Information about the Use of Money
A2, 5-8	Kind of Pre-departure Information Needed about the Use of Money
A2, 5-9	Participant's Evaluation of Pre-departure Information about Manners and Customs
A2, 5-10	Kind of Pre-departure Information Needed about Manners and Customs
A2, 5-11	Participant's Evaluation of Pre-departure Information about Study Details BY Training Field of Activity
A2, 5-12	Kind of Pre-departure Information Needed about Study Details BY Training Field of Activity
A2, 5-13	Participant's Evaluation of Pre-departure Information about Place of Program BY Training Field of Activity
A2, 5-14	Kind of Pre-departure Information Needed about Place of Program BY Training Field of Activity
A2, 5-15	Participant's Evaluation of Pre-departure Information about Date of Departure BY Training Field of Activity
A2, 5-16	Kind of Pre-departure Information Needed about Date of Departure BY Training Field of Activity
A2, 5-17	Participant's Evaluation of Pre-departure Information about Length of Program BY Training Field of Activity
A2, 5-18	Kind of Pre-departure Information Needed about Length of Program BY Training Field of Activity
A2, 5-19	Participant's Evaluation of Pre-departure Information about Other Aspects of Program BY Training Field of Activity
A2, 5-20	Kind of Pre-departure Information Needed about Other Aspects of Program BY Training Field of Activity
A2, 5-21	Pre-departure Information about Level of Program BY Training Field of Activity
A2, 5-22	Source of Ideas for Major Portion of Program
A2, 5-23	Adequacy of Amount and Kind of Pre-departure Information Given about How to Get Along in Country of Training BY Orientation Classes at Home Country prior to Departure

A2, 5-24	Opinion about Helpfulness of Degree
A2, 5-25	Type of Degree Received from Program
A2, 5-26	Amount of Usefulness of Degree for Future Work
A2, 5-27	Position of Guidance Officer
A2, 5-28	Source of Information for Those Not Met on Arrival
A2, 5-29	Completion of Program
A2, 5-30	Program Satisfaction of Participants Requesting Extension BY Participants Receiving Extension
A2, 5-31	Opinion about Amount of Money Supplied by ICA BY Age in Years at Time of Departure
A2, 5-32	Kind of Work Done at Time of Interview BY Participants Claiming Project-connected Employment
A2, 5-33	Position at Time of Interview BY Availability of USOM Technician to Participant
A2, 5-34	Date Returned from Training Program BY Availability of USOM Technician to Participant
A2, 5-35	Date Left for Training Program BY Availability of USOM Technician to Participant
A2, 5-36	Kinds of Problem for Which Help Was Requested from USOM BY Kind of Work Done at Time of Interview
A2, 5-37	Kinds of Problem for Which Help Was Requested from USOM BY Training Field of Activity
A2, 5-38	Help Requested from USOM BY Training Field of Activity
A2, 5-39	Technician's Previous Acquaintance with Participant
A2, 5-40	Interference with Participant Contact

Section 6: Relationship of Year of Departure and Training Field of
Activity to the Conduct of the Training Program

A2, 6-1	Additional English Instruction on Arrival in Country of Training BY Date Left for Training
A2, 6-2	English Language Requirement of the Program BY Date Left for Training
A2, 6-3	Sex of Participant BY Date Left for Training
A2, 6-4	Kind of Work Done at Time of Departure BY Training Field of Activity
A2, 6-5	Number of People Supervised BY Training Field of Activity
A2, 6-6	University Degrees before ICA Training BY Training Field of Activity
A2, 6-7	Importance of Personal Ability in Participant's Decision to Go on Training Program BY Training Field of Activity
A2, 6-8	Importance of Job Requirements in Participant's Decision to Go on Training Program BY Training Field of Activity
A2, 6-9	Importance of Personal Contacts in Participant's Decision to Go on Training Program BY Training Field of Activity
A2, 6-10	Importance of Language Ability in Participant's Decision to Go on Training Program BY Training Field of Activity
A2, 6-11	Importance of Professional and Educational Qualifications in Participant's Decision to Go on Training Program BY Training Field of Activity
A2, 6-12	Participant's Evaluation of Pre-departure Information about How to Use Restaurants BY Training Field of Activity
A2, 6-13	Participant's Evaluation of Pre-departure Information about Colloquial Speech and Idioms BY Training Field of Activity
A2, 6-14	Participant's Evaluation of Pre-departure Information about Religious Practices BY Training Field of Activity

- A2, 6-15 Participant's Evaluation of Pre-departure Information about the Use of Money BY Training Field of Activity
- A2, 6-16 Participant's Evaluation of Pre-departure Information about Manners and Customs BY Training Field of Activity
- A2, 6-17 Orientation in Country of Training BY Training Field of Activity
- A2, 6-18 Amount of Attention or Guidance Received BY Training Field of Activity
- A2, 6-19 Office of Program Manager BY Training Field of Activity
- A2, 6-20 Opinion about Length of Program BY Training Field of Activity
- A2, 6-21 Opinion about the Scope of Program BY Training Field of Activity
- A2, 6-22 Changes in the Program BY Training Field of Activity
- A2, 6-23 Opinion about Amount of Money Supplied by ICA BY Training Field of Activity
- A2, 6-24 Time for Personal Interests during Program BY Training Field of Activity
- A2, 6-25 Opinion about Other Social Activities BY Training Field of Activity
- A2, 6-26 Attendance at Seminar in Communications BY Training Field of Activity
- A2, 6-27 Use of Seminar Materials in Participants Work BY Training Field of Activity
- A2, 6-28 Length of Time since Return BY Training Field of Activity
- A2, 6-29 Job Changes between Departure and Return BY Training Field of Activity
- A2, 6-30 Helpfulness of Supervisor in Utilizing Training BY Training Field of Activity
- A2, 6-31 Means of Conveyance BY Training Field of Activity
- A2, 6-32 Plans for Future Use of Training BY Training Field of Activity
- A2, 6-33 Membership in U. S. Professional Society BY Training Field of Activity
- A2, 6-34 Current Membership in a U. S. Professional Society BY Training Field of Activity
- A2, 6-35 Receipt of U. S. Professional Publications BY Training Field of Activity
- A2, 6-36 Major Difficulties Encountered in Using or Transmitting Training-acquired Skills and Knowledge BY Training Field of Activity
- A2, 6-37 Number of Outstanding Activities Reported BY Training Field of Activity
- A2, 6-38 Discussion with Participants about Things Learned BY Training Field of Activity
- A2, 6-39 Discussion with Participants about Non-program Experience BY Training Field of Activity
- A2, 6-40 Length of Time Supervisor Has Known Participant BY Training Field of Activity
- A2, 6-41 Means of Transmitting Knowledge Gained on ICA Program to Other People BY Training Field of Activity
- A2, 6-42 Interference with Participant Contact: Technician's Rating BY Training Field of Activity
- A2, 6-43 Contribution of Training to Participant's Job Performance BY Training Field of Activity
- A2, 6-44 Technician's Utilization Score BY Training Field of Activity
- A2, 6-45 Technician's Rating of Participant's Job Importance to Country Economy BY Training Field of Activity
- A2, 6-46 Technician's Rating of Participant's Job Ability BY Training Field of Activity

- A2, 6-47** **Orientation Classes at Home Country prior to
Departure BY Training Field of Activity**
- A2, 6-48** **Membership in Professional Society of Countries Other
Than USA BY Training Field of Activity**
- A2, 6-49** **Frequency of Meeting with Local People in Country of
Training BY Training Field of Activity**
- A2, 6-50** **Opinion about the Scope of Program BY Age in Years
at Time of Departure**
- A2, 6-51** **Attitude Toward Level of Program BY Age in Years at
Time of Departure**
- A2, 6-52** **Participant's Opinion about Other Social Activities BY
Age in Years at Time of Departure**

Section 1

Characteristics of Participants Interviewed

Table A2.1-1Area of Residence at Time of Departure¹

Base	(460)
	<u>%</u>
<u>Residence at time of departure:</u>	
Capital city area	97
Provincial city area	2
Outside country	<u>+</u>
Total per cent	100% [●]

Table A2.1-2Major Field of Study in University prior to ICA Training²

Base*	(365)
	<u>%</u>
<u>Field of study in university:</u>	
Agriculture	8
Arts	11
Education	5
Engineering	15
Fine Arts	2
Law, Commerce, Political Science	22
Medicine, Dentistry, Public Health	18
Science	10
Others	4
Don't know	<u>+</u>
Not ascertained	4
Total per cent	100% [●]

+ Less than 0.5%

● Due to rounding

* Reported only for those who attended university prior to ICA Training Program

1/Q P-1: Area of residence at time of departure

2/Q P-16: Major field of study in university prior to ICA Training

Table A2.1-3

Type of Degree at Time of Departure ¹	
Base*	(341) %
<u>Type of degree:</u>	
Below bachelor	3
Bachelor	61
Master	5
Doctor n.e.s. [‡]	1
Law	12
Medical	16
Dentistry & Doctor of Veterinary Medicine	1
Don't know	+
Not ascertained	1
Total per cent	100%

Table A2.1-4

Orientation Classes at Home Country prior to Departure ²	
Base	(460) %
Joined orientation classes	65
Did not join orientation classes	35
Don't know or can't remember	+
Total per cent	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

‡ Not elsewhere specified

* Reported only for those who received degree prior to ICA Training Program

1/Q P-18: Type of degree at time of departure

2/Q P-147: Did you join the orientation classes at AUA Language Center prior to your trip abroad? (Question added by USOM/Thailand).

Table A2.1-5

		Age in Years at Time of Departure ¹			
		BY			
		Total Time in Field of Specialization at Time of Departure ²			
		Time in field of specialization			
		10 years or more	5 to just under 10 years	None to just under 5 years	Not ascertained
Base	(460) %	(206) %	(128) %	(123) %	(3) %
<u>Age in years at time of departure</u>					
Under 25	4	+	4	11	33
25 - 29	21	3	24	46	33
30 - 34	23	15	38	20	-
35 - 39	18	26	16	10	-
40 - 44	15	25	10	5	-
45 - 49	10	17	4	7	-
50 and older	5	10	..	2	-
Not ascertained	3	4	4	-	33
Total per cent	100% [@]	100% [@]	100% [@]	100% [@]	100% [@]

Table A2.1-6

		Age in Years at Time of Departure ¹			
		BY			
		Level of Position at Time of Departure ³			
		Level of position			
		Policy maker	Management	Professional	Not ascertained
Base	(460) %	(36) %	(178) %	(245) %	(1) %
<u>Age in years at time of departure</u>					
Under 25	4	-	2	7	-
25 - 29	21	3	15	27	-
30 - 34	23	6	21	27	-
35 - 39	18	14	22	16	-
40 - 44	15	22	19	12	-
45 - 49	10	19	15	6	-
50 and older	5	28	3	3	-
Not ascertained	3	8	3	2	100
Total per cent	100% [@]	100%	100%	100%	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

1/Q P-7: Age in years at time of departure

2/Q P-4: Total time in field of specialization at time of departure

3/Q P-5: Level of position at time of departure

Table A2.1-7

Age in Years at Time of Departure¹
BY
Number of People Supervised at Time of Departure²

Base	(460) %	Number of people supervised				not as- certained (74) %
		500 or more (15) %	20-499 (112) %	1-19 (104) %	None (155) %	
<u>Age in years at time of departure</u>						
Under 25	4	-	1	5	6	7
25 - 29	21	-	17	23	23	23
30 - 34	23	13	17	25	29	19
35 - 39	18	7	19	20	18	19
40 - 44	15	33	19	16	11	15
45 - 49	10	40	18	7	7	5
50 and older	5	7	7	4	4	4
Not ascertained	3	-	2	-	3	8
Total per cent	100% [@]	100%	100%	100%	100% [@]	100%

Table A2.1-8

Age in Years at Time of Departure¹
BY
Sex of Participant³

Base	(460) %	Sex	
		Male (329) %	Female (131) %
<u>Age in years at time of departure</u>			
Under 25	4	4	6
25 - 29	21	18	28
30 - 34	23	22	24
35 - 39	18	19	16
40 - 44	15	16	14
45 - 49	10	12	6
50 and older	5	6	1
Not ascertained	3	2	5
Total per cent	100% [@]	100% [@]	100%

@ Due to rounding

1/Q P-7: Age in years at time of departure

2/Q P-6: Number of people supervised at time of departure

3/Q P-8: Sex of participant

Table A2.1-9

Amount of Time Spent in Training¹
BY
Level of Position at Time of Departure²

	Base (460) %	Level of position at time of departure			
		Top and Second- Level Policy Makers (36) %	Subordi- nate Ma- nagement (178) %	Professional, Sub-profes- sional and Supervisory (245) %	Not ascer- tained (1) %
<u>Amount of time spent in training</u>					
Less than 2 months	5	11	6	4	-
2 to 6 months	9	28	9	5	100
6 months to 1 year	24	33	31	18	-
1 to 2 years	54	28	48	63	-
3 years or more	8	-	5	9	-
Not ascertained	+	-	1	1	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Median =	1 year 4 months				

Table A2.1-10

Orientation Classes at Home Country prior to Departure³
BY
Year of Departure⁴

Base	(460) %	Year of departure			
		1951-1954 (132) %	1955-1956 (131) %	1957-1958 (159) %	1959-1960 (38) %
<u>Orientation classes at home country</u>					
Yes	65	43	79	73	53
No	35	56	21	26	47
Don't or don't remember	+	1	-	1	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

1/Q P-38+39: In going abroad for your training program, did you go to one country or many for your study?

Please tell me the names of countries where you went to study or where you went for working experience in the order of attendance. Where did you receive your first training and how long did it take you?

2/Q P-5: Level of position at time of departure

3/Q P-147: Did you join the orientation classes at AUA Language Center prior to your trip abroad?

4/Q P-page 1

Table A2.1-11

Year in Which Participants Were Interviewed		
	Base	(460) %
<u>Year</u>	<u>Month</u>	
1960		59
	November	10
	December	49
1961		40
	January	37
	February	2
	March	+
	May	+
	November	1
	December	+
Total per cent		100% [@]

Table A2.1-12

Number of Countries in Which Training Was Received ¹		
	Base	(460) %
<u>Number of countries:</u>		
	One only	85
	Two	9
	Three	3
	Four	1
	Five or more	2
Total per cent		100%

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

1/Q P-38+39: In going abroad for your training program, did you go to one country or many for your study?

Please tell me the names of countries where you went to study or where you went for working experience in the order of attendance. Where did you receive your first training and how long did it take you?

TABLE A2.1-13Length of Time in Country of Training¹

Base	Amount of time spent in train- ing (460) %	Length of time in primary country (460) %	Length of time in second country (66)* %	Length of time in third country (25) %
Less than one month	2	3	63	68
One to six months	12	12	33	24
Six months to one year	24	24	1	-
One to two years	54	53	-	-
Two to three years	7	6	-	-
Three years or more	1	1	-	-
Not ascertained	-	1	3	8
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table A2.1-14Type of Training Program²

Base	(460) %
Observation tours	52
On-the-job training	32
Attendance at a university	56
Special group program not at a university	12
Total per cent	152% ⁴

* Reported only for those who were trained in more than one country

⁴ Total adds to more than 100% because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-38+39: In going abroad for your training program, did you go to one country or many for your study?

Please tell me the names of countries where you went to study or where you went for working experience in the order of attendance. Where did you receive your first training and how long did it take you?

2/Q P-55: Now I would like to ask about your training program. Usually there are many types of training program for those who went. Can you please tell me what type was your training program? There are the Observation Tours which normally take from 3 to 8 weeks, On-the-job training where participants will have experience from working, Attendance at a University, and Program arranged specially for groups of participants not at a university and not Observation Tours.

Observation Tours

On-the-job training

Attendance at a University as an individual or a member of a group

In a special group program not at a university

Table A2.1-15

Name of University Attended in the Program ¹	
<u>University attended:</u>	<u>No. of Participants</u>
Alabama Polytechnic Institute; Auburn	1
American University; Washington	10
American University of Beirut; Beirut	1
Arizona, University of; Tucson	1
Ball State Teachers College; Muncie	2
Bank Street College of Education; New York City	1
Boston University; Boston	7
Bowman Gray School of Medicine; Winston-Salem	1
California State Polytechnic Institute; San Louis Obispo	2
California, University of; Berkeley	5
California, University of; San Francisco	1
Central Michigan University; Mount Pleasant	3
Chicago, University of; Chicago	1
Cincinnati, University of; Cincinnati	1
Clemson Agricultural College; Clemson	2
Colorado School of Mines; Golden	1
Colorado, University of; Boulder	1
Colorado, University of; Denver	1
Columbia University Medical Center; New York City	1
Columbia University; New York City	1
Columbia University Teachers College; New York	2
Connecticut State Teachers College; New Britain	1
Cornell University; Ithaca	4
Florida State University; Tallahassee	9
Florida, University of; Gainesville	8
Georgetown University; Washington D.C.	7
Georgia, University of; Athens	3
Harvard University; Cambridge	5
Hawaii, University of; Honolulu	2
Illinois, University of; Urbana	1
Illinois, University of; Champaign	1
Illinois, University of; Chicago	1
Indiana State Teachers College; Terre Haute	1
Indiana, University of; Bloomington	36
Indiana University, Indianapolis	1
Iowa State University; Iowa City	2
Johns Hopkins School of International Affairs; Washington, D.C.	1
Johns Hopkins University; Baltimore	1
Kansas State University; Manhattan	1
Louisiana State University; Baton Rouge	1
Maryland, University of; Baltimore	1
Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Cambridge	4
Miami University; Oxford	1
Michigan State University; East Lansing	4
Michigan, University of; Ann Arbor	10
Minnesota, University of; Minneapolis	3
Mississippi State University; State College	1
Missouri, University of; Columbia	1
Nevada, University of; Reno	1
New Hampshire, University of; Durham	1
New Mexico, University of; Albuguerque	1
New Paltz State Teachers College; New Paltz	1
North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering; Raleigh	4
North Carolina, University of; Chapel Hill, Greensboro, or Gastonia	2
Northwestern University; Evanston	1

1/Q P-57: Which universities did you attend? And how long did you spend at each place? (Reported only for the university attended longest)

<u>University attended: (cont'd.)</u>	<u>No. of Participants</u>
Ohio State University; Columbus	3
Ohio University; Athens	1
Oklahoma, University of; Norman	1
Oregon State College; Corvallis	6
Peabody College for Teachers; Nashville	1
Pennsylvania State University; University Park	2
Pennsylvania, University of; Philadelphia	7
Pittsburgh, University of; Pittsburgh	2
Purdue University; Lafayette	8
RCA (Radio Corporation of America) Institute; New York City	1
San Francisco State College; San Francisco	1
Smith College; Northampton	1
Syracuse University; Syracuse	2
Tennessee, University of; Knoxville, Memphis, Martin, or Nashville	1
Texas, University of; Austin	5
Tulane University; New Orleans	1
Vanderbilt University; Nashville	3
Washington State University, Pullman	1
Washington University; Saint Louis	2
Washington, University of; Seattle	3
Wayne State University; Detroit	9
Wayne University; Bloomington	4
Western Reserve University; Toledo or Cleveland	3
Western Washington College of Education; Bellingham	1
Wisconsin, University of; Madison	5
Yale University; New Haven	2
Any university in the United States, Canada, or Puerto Rico not listed above	5
University in Mexico	1
University in Philippines	3
University in United Kingdom	1
Other	<u>5</u>
Total	259

Table A2.1-16

Technicians' Rating of Participants' Personality Attributes

	Education qualifica- tion-	Intelli- gence	Language know- ledge	Attitude toward training	Attitude toward job
Base*	(167)	(167)	(167)	(167)	(167)
	%	%	%	%	%
Adequate	78	87	80	80	74
Inadequate	10	11	10	5	10
Can't rate	11	1	10	15	16
Not ascertained	-	-	+	-	-
Total per cent	100% [@]	100% [@]	100%	100%	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

* Reported only of those whose technician was interviewed and who remembered the participant

1/Q T1-6: In order that a training program be successful, participants must have certain personality attributes so that they may benefit from the training and later be able to apply it in their jobs. I'd like you to rate each of the participants in these attributes as they may have affected the success of his training. Please feel free to comment on any of the responses you give.

How about:

- A. Have his/her educational qualifications been adequate or inadequate? Or can't you rate this?
- B. How about the intelligence of Mr./Miss/Mrs. _____? Has he/she shown it to be adequate or inadequate?
- C. Was his/her knowledge of the language in which training was given adequate or inadequate?
- D. How about his/her attitude toward his/her training program?
- E. And how about the attitude toward the present job?

Section 2

Utilization of Training

Table A2.2-1

Number of People Supervised on First Job after Return ¹	
Base*	(108)
	<u>%</u>
<u>Number of people supervised:</u>	
None	30
1 - 19	42
20 - 499	24
500 - 1000	1
Not ascertained	<u>3</u>
Total	100%

Table A2.2-2

Number of People Supervised on Present Job ²	
Base**	(223)
	<u>%</u>
<u>Number of people supervised:</u>	
None	19
1 - 19	36
20 - 499	37
500 or more	6
Don't know or don't remember	+
Not ascertained	<u>1</u>
Total per cent	100% [@]

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

* Reported only for those whose first job after return was different from one at time of departure

** Reported only for those whose present position is different from the one held on first return

1/Q P-111: How many people did you supervise in that job?

2/Q P-116: How many people do you supervise on this job?

Table A2.2-3

Kind of Position Expected without ICA Training¹
 BY
 Selector of Participant²

Base*	(457) [‡] %	Selector			
		Super- visor (378) %	Other** (91) %	Don't know (2) %	Not ascertained (8) %
<u>Kind of position expected:</u>					
About the same as present job	38	37	42	100	25
Better than present job	10	11	9	-	-
Not as good as present job	46	47	40	-	75
Don't know	5	5	8	-	-
Not ascertained	1	-	2	-	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100% [@]	100%	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

‡ Total adds to more than 457 because some respondents gave more than one answer

* Reported only for those who were employed

** Other than supervisor

1/Q P-118: Supposing you had not gone for the training program, do you think you would be working in the same position as you have now?

2/Q P-22: Who selected you?

Table A2.2-4

Kind of Work Done at Time of Departure¹
BY
Major Field of Activity in Which Training Was Given²

Kind of work done	Base (460) %	Training Field of Activity					
		Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety
		(90) %	(75) %	(94) %	(114) %	(57) %	(30) %
Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries	8	40	-	-	-	-	-
Mining and Quarrying	2	1	7	-	-	2	-
Manufacturing, maintenance and repair	2	3	8	-	-	2	-
Engineering and Construction	5	3	21	-	-	7	-
Electricity, Gas, Water and Sani- tary Services	2	1	8	3	-	-	-
Transport, Storage and Communica- tion Services	4	-	21	-	-	5	-
Commerce, Banking and Insurance	2	8	1	-	-	4	3
Educational Services	37	16	1	49	92	11	-
Medical Services	10	1	1	45	-	4	-
Welfare, Community Development, Housing	2	1	-	1	1	7	3
Other Government Services includ- ing Public Safety	25	26	31	2	6	60	93
Total per cent	100% [@]	100%	100% [@]	100%	100% [@]	100% [@]	100% [@]

[@] Due to rounding

1/Q P-5: Kind of work done at time of departure

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.2-5

Kind of Work Done at Time of Departure¹
 BY
 Kind of Work Done at Time of Interview²

	Base*	Kind of work done at time of									
		Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries	Mining & Quarrying	Manufacturing, Maintenance and repair	Engineering & Construction	Electricity, Gas, Water and Sanitary Services	Transport, Storage and Communication Services	Commerce, Banking and Insurance	Educational Services	Medical Services	Welfare, Community Development, Housing
Kind of work done at time of departure:	(457) %	(35) %	(8) %	(8) %	(22) %	(5) %	(27) %	(170) %	(43) %	(8) %	(124) %
Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries	8	95						1	-	-	1
Mining and Quarrying	2	-						-	-	-	-
Manufacturing, Maintenance and repair	2	-	-	100	-	-	5	-	-	-	1
Engineering and Construction	5	-	-	-	95	-	5	-	-	-	1
Electricity, Gas, Water and Sanitary Services	2	-	12	-	5	100	-	-	-	-	2
Transport, Storage and Communication Services	4	-	-	-	-	-	85	-	-	-	-
Commerce, Banking and Insurance	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	92	-	-	-
Educational Services	37	3	-	-	-	-	-	8	94	7	4
Medical Services	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	93	1
Welfare, Community Development, Housing	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100
Other	25	3	-	-	-	-	5	-	2	-	90
Not ascertained	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

+ Less than 0.5%
 @ Due to rounding

* Reported only for those who were employed
 1/Q P-5: Kind of work done at time of departure

Table A2.2-6

Satisfaction with Training Program¹
BY
Kind of Position Expected without ICA Training²

	Base*	Position expected without ICA Training				
		Better than present job	About the same as present job	Not as good as present job	Don't know	Not ascertained
	(457) %	(45) %	(174) %	(211) %	(25) %	(2) %
<u>Satisfaction with training program</u>						
Very satisfied	50	64	45	50	60	50
Moderately satisfied	40	22	48	38	32	50
Not satisfied	10	13	7	11	8	-
Not ascertained	+	-	-	+	-	-
Total per cent	100%	100% [@]	100%	100% [@]	100%	100%

Table A2.2-7

Contribution of Training to Participant's Job Performance³
BY
Kind of Position Expected without ICA Training²

	Base**	Position expected without ICA Training				
		Better than present job	About the same as present job	Not as good as present job	Don't know	Not ascertained
	(167) %	(18) %	(64) %	(75) %	(9) %	(1) %
<u>Contribution of training to participant's job performance</u>						
Major	62	56	64	67	33	-
Minor	25	22	31	19	33	-
No importance	2	6	2	-	11	100
Reduced usefulness	1	-	-	3	-	-
Don't know	10	17	3	12	22	-
Total per cent	100%	100% [@]	100%	100% [@]	100% [@]	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

* Reported only for those who were employed

** Reported only for those whose technicians were interviewed and who remembered their participants well enough to rate them

1/Q P-144: In general, how satisfied were you with the training program, very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, not so satisfied, or not satisfied at all?

2/Q P-118: Supposing you had not gone for the training program, do you think you would be working in the same position as you have now, or in a better one, or not as good?

3/Q T1-5: Next, I would like you to rate the contribution that each participant's training program has made to his ability to perform his present job well.

Table A2.2-8

Contribution of Training to Participant's Job Performance ¹					
BY					
Supervisor's Opinion about Importance of Training ²					
to Participant's Work Abilities ²					
Base*	(163)	Program's degree of importance to participant's abilities training			
		Essential	Very Important	Helpful	Don't know
	(%)	(41)	(113)	(8)	(1)
	%	%	%	%	%
<u>Contribution of training to participants' job performance</u>					
Major	63	66	63	50	-
Minor	25	17	25	50	100
No important	2	2	3	-	-
Reduced usefulness	1	-	2	-	-
Don't know	9	15	8	-	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100% [@]	100%	100%

Table A2.2-9

Participant's Contact with USOM Technician since Return ³				
BY				
Participant's Utilization Score				
Base	Total	High	Low	Correlation
	(460)	(96)	(108)	
	%	%	%	
Contacted USOM Technician	65	65	57	0
Had no contact	35	35	43	0
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	

[@] Due to rounding

* Reported only for those whose technician and supervisor were interviewed and who remembered their participants

1/Q T1-5: Next, I would like you to rate the contribution that each participant's training program has made to his ability to perform his present job well.

2/Q S1-17: Regarding the work abilities of (participant) at present, how important do you think was the fact that he had been on the training program? Most important, very important, useful but not so important, not useful, or would it have been better that he had not gone for the training?

3/Q P-129: Since your return, have you made any contact with USOM?

Table A2.2-10

Supervisor's Utilization Score
BY
Participant's Utilization Score

Base	<u>Total</u> (460) %	<u>High</u> (96) %	<u>Low</u> (108) %
<u>Supervisor's utilization</u>			
High	77	79	73
Low	10	5	13
No total score	8	8	10
Supervisors not interviewed	4	7	4
Total per cent	100% [@]	100% [@]	100%

Table A2.2-11

Technician's Contact with Participant¹
BY
Participant's Utilization Score

Base*	<u>Total</u> (167) %	<u>High</u> (38) %	<u>Low</u> (33) %	<u>Correlation</u>
<u>Contact with participant was:</u>				
Frequent	36	47	30	+++
Less than frequent	64	53	70	---
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	

[@] Due to rounding

* Reported only for those whose technician was interviewed and who remembered the participant

1/Q T1-3: Here I am interested in how much contact you have had with each of these participants since his return, aside from contact of a strictly social type.

Table A2.2-12

Technician's Contact with Participant¹
BY
Technician's Utilization Score

Base*	Total (167) %	High (87) %	Low (32) %	<u>Correlation</u>
<u>Contact with participant was:</u>				
Frequent	36	38	50	0
Less than frequent	64	62	50	0
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	

Table A2.2-13

Helpfulness of Supervisor in Utilizing Training²
BY
Technician's Satisfaction with Utilization of Training³

Base*	(167) %	Satisfaction with utilization of training			
		Satisfied (122) %	Dissatis- fied (12) %	Can't Rate (29) %	Not ascer- tained (4) %
<u>Helpfulness of super- visor in utilization:</u>					
Considerably helpful	49	48	42	55	50
Somewhat helpful	32	34	42	17	25
Not helpful at all	15	15	16	14	25
Indifferent, not ever interested	2	2	-	7	-
Had no supervisor	1	1	-	-	-
Not ascertained	1	-	-	7	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Reported only for those whose technician was interviewed and who remembered the participant

1/Q T1-3: Here I am interested in how much contact you have had with each of these participants since his return, aside from contact of a strictly social type.

2/Q P-121: Now, talking about the supervisor of your present job. How much does he help you to apply the knowledge acquired usefully?

3/Q T1-8A: Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the utilization of (participants') training by his/her present supervisor?

Table A2.2-14

Base*	(93) %	Technician's Contact	
		Frequently (38) %	Less than Frequently (55) %
<u>Participants' contact:</u>			
Always in touch	33	24	47
See him occasionally or never	67	76	53
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%

Table A2.2-15

Base**	Total (440) %	High (355) %	Low (47) %	No total score (38) %
Under 25	5	3	11	8
25 - 29	20	22	17	11
30 - 34	24	26	23	3
35 - 39	19	16	23	37
40 - 44	15	16	11	13
46 - 49	10	10	9	16
50 and older	4	4	6	5
Not ascertained	3	3	-	8
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100% ^②

② Due to rounding

* Reported only for those whose technician was available and interviewed

** Reported only for those whose supervisor was interviewed

1/Q P-132: Do you always keep in touch with him (the technician who is available), or occasionally, or you never see him at all?

2/Q T1-3: Here I am interested in how much contact you have had with each of these participants since his return, aside from contact of a strictly social type.

3/Q P-7: Age in years at time of departure.

TABLE A2.2-10

Age in Years at Time of Departure¹
BY
Technician's Utilization Score

Base*	Total (167) %	High (87) %	Low (32) %	No total score (48) %
<u>Age in years:</u>				
Under 25	5	6	3	4
25 - 29	20	24	13	17
30 - 34	19	20	9	25
35 - 39	19	18	22	19
40 - 44	17	17	22	15
45 - 49	12	11	13	12
50 and older	5	2	13	4
Not ascertained	4	1	6	4
Total per cent	100% [@]	100% [@]	100% [@]	100%

Table A2.2-17

Job Changes between Departure and Return²
BY
Participant's Utilization Score

Base	Total (460) %	High (96) %	Low (108) %	<u>Correlation</u>
Returned to same job	77	67	79	---
Returned to different job	23	33	21	++
Not ascertained	+	-	-	
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

* Reported only for those whose technician was interviewed and who remembered the participant

1/Q P-7: Age in years at time of departure

2/Q P-108: Talking about the first job you had after your return from the training program, was it the same as the one you had prior to your departure?

Table A2.2-18

Job Expectancy on Return¹
BY
Participant's Utilization Score

Base*	<u>Total</u> (108) %	<u>High</u> (32) %	<u>Low</u> (23) %	<u>Correlation</u>
<u>Job expectancy:</u>				
Returned to expected job	73	84	74	0
Returned to job not expected	19	13	22	0
Don't know or don't remember	7	3	4	
Not ascertained	1	-	-	
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	

Table A2.2-19

Technician's Rating of Participant's Job Importance to
Country Economy²
BY
Technician's Utilization Score

Base**	<u>Total</u> (167) %	<u>High</u> (87) %	<u>Low</u> (32) %	<u>Correlation</u>
<u>Technician's rating of</u> <u>job importance:</u>				
High	43	49	47	
Fairly high	16	21	13	++
Average	30	25	31	
Low	5	5	9	--
Don't know or don't remember	6	-	-	
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	

* Reported only for those whose first job after return was different from the job had at departure

** Reported only for those whose technician was interviewed and who remembered the participant

1/Q P-109: Was this the job you expected to have when you returned?

2/Q T1-9A: In comparison with the jobs of other participants whom you know, how would you rate the importance of job to the over-all economic development of this country? Would you say his/her job is of high importance, average, or low importance?

Table A2.2-20

Sex of Participant¹
BY
Participant's Utilization Score

	<u>Total</u> (460)	<u>High</u> (96)	<u>Low</u> (108)	<u>Correlation</u>
Base	%	%	%	
Male	72	74	79	0
Female	28	26	21	0
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	

Table A2.2-21

Primary Country of Training²
BY
Participant's Utilization Score

Base*	(173)	<u>High</u> (27)	<u>Low</u> (48)
	%	%	%
<u>Primary country of training:</u>			
U.S.A.	81	81	77
Third country	19	19	23
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%

* Reported only for those whose total program was less than one year
1/Q P-8: Sex of participants
2/Q P-38+39: In going abroad for your training program, did you go to one country or many for your study?

Please tell me the names of countries where you went to study or where you went for working experience in the order of attendance. Where did you receive your first training and how long did it take you?

Section 3

Satisfaction with Training

Table A2.3-1Negative Comments on Program¹

Base*	(4)
	<u> %</u>
<u>Negative comments:</u>	
Training was not appropriate to my needs	75
Program lacked organization, was poorly handled; time was wasted	<u>25</u>
Total per cent	100%

Table A2.3-2Supervisor's Name Given by Participant²

Base	(460)
	<u> %</u>
Supervisor's name was given	99
Had no supervisor	<u>1</u>
Total per cent	100%

Table A2.3-3

Completion of Supervisor Questionnaires

Base	(460)
	<u> %</u>
<u>Supervisor questionnaires were:</u>	
Completed	96
Not completed	<u>4</u>
Total per cent	100%

* Reported only for those who mentioned that the program was a pure waste of time
 1/Q P-146: Why do you feel like that?
 2/Q P-last page

Table A2.3-4

Supervisor's Rating of Procedures by Which Participants Were Selected¹

Base*	(237) %
<u>Participant's selection was:</u>	
Satisfactory	55
Unsatisfactory	36
Can't rate	8
Not ascertained	<u>1</u>
Total per cent	100%

Table A2.3-5

Technician's Rating of Factors Related to Suitability of Participant Training²

	Pre-de- parture prepa- ration	Type of pro- gram	Subject -matter cover- age	Level of pro- gram	Length of pro- gram	Coun- try of train- ing	Appro- priate mater- ials
Base**	(167) %	(167) %	(167) %	(167) %	(167) %	(167) %	(167) %
<u>Technician's rating:</u>							
Satisfactory	45	75	75	77	77	80	78
Dissatisfactory	5	8	8	5	7	-	5
Can't rate	47	12	13	14	12	15	11
Not ascertained	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Reported only for supervisors who were interviewed

** Reported only for those whose technicians were interviewed and completed answer record form

1/Q S2-1A: For this section, I would like to have your suggestions regarding the ICA training program in general. I am going to read the headings to you and would like to have your opinion about each as to whether it is good or not. And if you should find any which is not good, please also tell me what makes you feel so?

A: Consideration in selecting people to send.

2/Q T1-7: A training program must also be suitable for the participant and for the work he will be doing. Here I would like you to rate the following aspects of the participant's program. Could you tell me whether they did or did not satisfy the needs of the participant's PIO/P?

A. For example, would you rate the preparations of before his/her departure as satisfactory? Or can't you rate this?

B. How about the type of program he/she took part in -- was it satisfactory or unsatisfactory for his/her needs?

C. Was the subject-matter coverage satisfactory or unsatisfactory?

D. How was the level of his/her training program?

E. The length of the program?

F. The country of training?

G. The practicality of experience provided? Was he trained in the use of appropriate materials, equipment, and techniques?

Table A2.3-6

Satisfaction with Training Program¹
BY
Major Field of Activity in Which Training Was Given²

	Base	Training field of activity						
		(460) %	(90) %	(75) %	(94) %	(114) %	(57) %	(30) %
			Agriculture and Natural resources	Industry & Mining and Transportation	Health and Sanitation	Education	Public Administration, Labor, Community Development, Miscellaneous	Public Safety
Satisfaction with training program:								
Very satisfied	50	48	52	52	46	56	50	
Somewhat satisfied	40	40	37	38	46	35	37	
Not satisfied	10	12	11	9	8	9	13	
Not ascertained	+	-	-	1	-	-	-	
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	

Table A2.3-7

Satisfaction with Training Program¹
BY
Total Amount of Time Spent in Training³

	Base	Total Amount of Time Spent in Training ³						
		(460) %	(35) %	(250) %	(111) %	(39) %	(23) %	(2) %
			2 years or more	1 to 2 years	6 months to 1 year	4 to 6 months	Less than 4 months	Not ascertained
Satisfaction with training program:								
Very satisfied	50	57	46	54	64	39	100	
Somewhat satisfied	40	37	41	40	33	43	-	
Not satisfied	10	6	13	6	3	17	-	
Not ascertained	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100% [Ⓢ]	100%	

+ Less than 0.5%

Ⓢ Due to rounding

1/Q P-144: In general, how satisfied were you with the training program, very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, not so satisfied, or not satisfied at all?

2/Q P-page 1

3/Q P-38+39: In going abroad for your training program, did you go to one country or many for your study?

Please tell me the names of countries where you went to study or where you went for working experience in the order of attendance. Where did you receive your first training and how long did it take you?

Table A2.3-8

Satisfaction with Training Program¹
BY
Program Arrangement on Arrival in Country of Training²

Base	(460) %	Program arrangement on arrival in country of training	
		Arranged in com- plete or partial detail	Did not set up at all or don't know or don't remember
		(413) %	(47) %
<u>Satisfaction with training program:</u>			
Very satisfied	50	49	62
Somewhat satisfied	40	41	30
Not satisfied	10	10	8
Not ascertained	+	+	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%

Table A2.3-9

Satisfaction with Training Program¹
BY
Opinion about Other Social Activities³

Base	(460) %	Too many	About enough	Too few	Not ascer- tained
		(21) %	(334) %	(99) %	(6) %
<u>Satisfaction with training program:</u>					
Very satisfied	50	43	49	53	83
Somewhat satisfied	40	43	41	36	-
Not satisfied	10	14	9	11	17
Not ascertained	+	-	+	-	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100% [@]	100%	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

- 1/Q P-144: In general, how satisfied were you with the training program, very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, not so satisfied, or not satisfied at all?
- 2/Q P-48: When you arrived in (underlined in Q. 39) did they arrange the program for you in complete detail or just partly, or did they not prepare anything at all?
- 3/Q P-84: Now speaking about other social activities, did you think that there were too many or too few of these which were arranged for you?

Table A2.3-10

Satisfaction with Training Program¹
 BY
 Total Amount of Time Spent in Training²

	Base*	Type of English language difficulty				
		None	In being under- stood	In under- standing others	Both	Not ascertained
	(406)	(175)	(67)	(40)	(123)	(1)
	%	%	%	%	%	%
<u>Satisfaction with training program:</u>						
Very satisfied	50	50	52	43	50	100
Somewhat satisfied	40	37	42	53	41	-
Not satisfied	10	12	6	5	9	-
Not ascertained	+	1	-	-	-	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100% [@]	100%	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

* Reported only for those whose program required English

1/Q P-144: In general, how satisfied were you with the training program, very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, not so satisfied, or not satisfied at all?

2/Q P-99: If you had had difficulties with your English during the program, was it more so in making yourself understood, or was it to understand other people, or both?

Table A2.3-11

Opinion about Length of Program¹
 BY
 Total Amount of Time Spent in Training²

	Base (460) %	Total amount of time spent in training								
		Less than 1 month	1 to 2 months	2 to 4 months	4 to 6 months	6 months to 1 year	1 to 2 years	2 to 3 years	3 years or more	Not ascertained
		(8) %	(15) %	(17) %	(22) %	(111) %	(250) %	(32) %	(3) %	(2) %
<u>Length of program was:</u>										
About right	45	50	33	59	45	55	38	63	67	-
Too long	6	-	-	6	9	6	6	3	-	50
Too short	49	50	67	35	45	39	56	34	33	50
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100% [@]	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

[@] Due to rounding

1/Q P-64: Did you think that the length of your training program was too long, just right, or too short?

2/Q P-38+39: In going abroad for your training program, did you go to one country or many for your study?

Please tell me the names of countries where you went to study or where you went for working experience in the order of attendance. Where did you receive your first training and how long did it take you?

Table A2.3-12Opinion about Suitable Length of Program¹

Base*	(252)
	<u>%</u>
<u>Suitable length of program:</u>	
1 to 2 months	2
2 to 4 months	5
4 to 6 months	2
6 months to 1 year	12
1 to 2 years	28
2 to 3 years	38
3 years or more	9
Don't know	+
Not ascertained	<u>4</u>
Total per cent	100%

Table A2.3-13Comments on Most Useful and Valuable Experience²
in Country of Training

Base	(460)
	<u>%</u>
<u>General comments</u>	
Everything was useful and valuable	2
Nothing was useful and valuable	2
<u>Program related comments</u>	
Studies in general	49
On-the-job-training	9
Observation tours	3
Meeting and working with professional counterparts	1
University attendance	+
High quality of instructors	+
Obtaining an academic degree	+
Other	1
<u>Comments on conditions seen</u>	
Way in which offices are organized	10
Advanced procedures and equipment	3
Good facilities for work or study	1
<u>Comments on people, customs</u>	
Greater knowledge of way of life	8
Characteristics of people	5
Meeting participants from other countries	1
<u>Others comments</u>	
Learning more English	2
Travel, visiting a foreign country	1
<u>Other non-program related comments</u>	
Don't know or don't remember	2
Not ascertained	<u>1</u>
Total per cent	100% ^①

+ Less than 0.5%

① Due to rounding

• Reported only for those who mentioned that length of program was not right

1/Q P-65: How long, do you think, it would have been suitable?

1/Q P-76: While you were in (country of training) what was the experience you had which was the most useful and the most valuable? (ask details).

Table A2.3-14Comments on Least Useful Experience in Country of Training¹

Base	(460)
	%
<u>Positive comments (nothing not useful)</u>	72
<u>Negative, program-related comments</u>	17
University or school attended	4
On-the-job-training	4
Visits to specific places	4
Entire program was not useful	2
Orientation program study of English language	1
Other	2
<u>Negative comments, non-program-related</u>	5
Not interested in customs, culture etc.	2
Social activities	1
Discriminatory attitudes towards nationality groups	1
Living conditions	1
Cultural activities	+
<u>Other non-program-related comments</u>	2
<u>Don't know or don't remember</u>	1
<u>Not ascertained</u>	3
Total per cent	100%

Table A2.3-15Reasons for Considering Experience as Least Useful¹

Base*	(127)
	%
<u>Reasons for least useful experience:</u>	
Conditions studied or seen too advanced	27
Program not related to needs	11
Programs were too short	6
Tour, program, courses, orientation etc. too repetitions	6
Some aspects of the tour, program, courses, orientation sessions etc. unnecessary	6
Tour, program, courses, orientation etc. poorly or not well organized	4
Tour, program, courses, orientation etc. too intensive, too concentrated	3
Too much theory, not enough practice	2
Conditions studied too elementary	2
Tour, program, course, orientation etc. too long	2
Tour, program, course, orientation etc. difficult because of language	2
Other concepts	3
Don't know or don't remember	3
Not ascertained	25
Total per cent	100% [@]

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

* Reported only for those who mentioned certain aspects of their experience being least useful or valuable

1/Q P-77: And what was the least useful, according to your experience? (ask details)

Section 4

Non-Technical Aspects of Training

Table A2.4-1Suggestions for Improvement of Orientation Sessions in USA¹

Base*	(313) %
<u>Suggestions for improvement of orientation sessions:</u>	
No improvement	53
Should be longer	8
Should include more information about country of training	6
Participants should be grouped by same background	5
Should be better organized	4
Should include more social activities	4
Should give more information about program	4
Participants should be given a chance to meet people in country of training	4
Should be shorter	3
Should be more lectures	3
Lectures should be shorter	2
Orientation schedule set at too fast a pace	2
Should be fewer lectures	1
Lectures should be longer	1
Should include less information about country of training	1
Should be conducted in participant's country or by someone familiar with participant's country	1
Should be conducted in participant's country before departure	1
The orientation should be less formal	+
Other comments	6
Don't know or don't remember	+
Not ascertained	4
Total per cent	113% [‡]

Table A2.4-2Reasons for Opinion on Private Home Visits²

Base**	(429) %
<u>Reasons for opinion on private home visits:</u>	
The home visits gave me a chance to observe and learn about the country of training	48
I like the hospitality and welcome received	25
The home visits gave me the opportunity to make friend	15
The home visits provided an opportunity to exchange ideas	11
I liked the atmosphere of the homes	8
The people were interested in my country and culture	5
The home visits were advantageous	3
I got experience in the language of the country of training	3
I could not accept all invitations extended	2
General positive comments	5
General negative comments	3
Qualified comments	2
Other comments	2
Don't know or don't remember	+
Not ascertained	2
Total per cent	134% [‡]

+ Less than 0.5%

* Reported only for those who attended orientation sessions in USA

** Reported only for those who were entertained in private homes

‡ Total adds to more than 100% because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-47: How do you think the orientation sessions could be improved in order to be more useful to those who will receive the grant in future?

2/Q P-83: Why did you feel so (about visiting private homes)?

Table A2.4-3

Suggested Types of Social Activities Which Should Be Less¹

Base*	(28)
	<u>%</u>
<u>Should be fewer activities in:</u>	
Social and recreation	29
Invitations to private homes	7
Culture	4
Other	14
Don't know or don't remember	4
Not ascertained	<u>43</u>
Total per cent	101% [#]

Table A2.4-4

Suggested Types of Social Activities Which Should Be More²

Base**	(105)
	<u>%</u>
<u>Should be more activities in:</u>	
Social and recreation	24
Meeting with professional colleagues	13
Invitations to private homes	11
Travel	9
Meeting between groups from different countries	9
Culture	6
I would have liked more free time	4
Other	11
Don't know or don't remember	5
Not ascertained	<u>26</u>
Total per cent	118% [#]

- * Reported only for those who mentioned that there were too many social activities
- ** Reported only for those who mentioned that there were not enough social activities
- # Total adds to more than 100% because some respondents gave more than one answer
- 1/Q P-85: What kinds of activities do you think should have been less?
- 2/Q P-86: What activities do you think should have been more?

Table A2.4-5

Satisfaction with Training Program¹
BY
Frequency of Meeting with Local People in Country of Training²

	Base	Frequency of meeting with local people				
		3 times a week or more	1 or 2 times a week	1 to 3 times a month	Once in a while	Don't know or don't remember
	(460) %	(333) %	(44) %	(32) %	(47) %	(4) %
<u>Satisfaction with training program:</u>						
Very satisfied	50	52	50	53	40	-
Moderately satisfied	40	38	45	38	47	50
Not satisfied at all	10	10	5	9	13	50
Not ascertained	+	+	-	-	-	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table A2.4-6

Attendance at Seminar in Communications³

Base	(460) %
Attended seminar in communication	22
Did not attend seminar in communication	72
Don't know	5
Total per cent	100% [@]

+ Less than 0.5%

① Due to rounding

1/Q P-144: In general, how satisfied were you with the training program, very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, not so satisfied, or not satisfied at all

2/Q P-154: In the country you spent the longest time, how often did you meet with the local people? (Question added by USOM/Thailand).

3/Q P-87: At the end of your program, did you ever attend the seminar in communication?

Table A2.4-7Most Liked Values of Seminar in Communications¹

Base*	(102) %
<u>Positive opinion:</u>	
I liked the exchange of ideas with people from other country	33
The most valuable things in the seminar were ideas and suggestions for adapting what had been learned for my own country	19
I liked learning how to communicate with other people	15
I liked everything	5
I liked teachers of the seminar	5
Non specific	8
I liked nothing	8
Other opinions	18
Don't know	2
Not ascertained	1
	<hr/>
Total per cent	114% [‡]

Table A2.4-8Things Least Liked About Seminar in Communications²

Base*	(102) %
<u>Negative opinion:</u>	
Nothing, I liked everything	72
I liked nothing	5
I felt that seminar was too superficial	3
I felt that seminar was too short	2
I felt that seminar was too intensive	1
I didn't like the location	2
Other	16
Not ascertained	7
	<hr/>
Total per cent	108% [‡]

* Reported only for those who attended seminar in communication
[‡] Total adds to more than 100% because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-89: What did you like most about the seminar?
 2/Q P-90: What did you like least about that seminar?

Table A2.4-9Place Where Seminar Was Held¹

Base*	(102) %
Michigan State University	32
Department of Agriculture	30
Other	35
Not ascertained	2
Total per cent	100% [@]

Table A2.4-10Use of Seminar Materials in Participant's Work²

Base*	(102) %
<u>Seminar materials were:</u>	
Used	69
Not used	30
Not ascertained	1
Total per cent	100%

Table A2.4-11Usefulness of Seminar Materials³

Base**	(71) %
<u>Usefulness of materials:</u>	
The ideas helped in dealing with people	30
Used the principles in teaching others	24
Used the idea in suggesting changes	24
Used the material in teaching others	1
Used the idea in writing	1
Non specific responses	25
Other	14
Not ascertained	7
Total per cent	126% [‡]

[@] Due to rounding

* Reported only for those who attended seminar in communication

** Reported only for those who used the materials or ideas from the seminar in their work

[‡] Total adds to more than 100% because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-91: Who arranged that seminar?

2/Q P-92: Did you use in your work some of the things or ideas obtained from the seminar?

3/Q P-93: What did you use and how?

Table A2.4-12Reasons for Non-use of Seminar Materials¹

Base*	(32) %
<u>Reasons for non-use of materials:</u>	
I haven't had the opportunity to use	31
There was nothing in the seminar that I could use	19
The ideas from the seminar cannot be used in the present job	13
Because of administrative problems	3
Other	25
Don't know	28
Not ascertained	<u>13</u>
Total per cent	132% [‡]

Table A2.4-13Membership in Professional Society of Countries Other Than USA²

Base	(460) %
Member of professional society	<u>34</u>
In Thailand	28
Country other than Thailand or USA	5
Not ascertained	1
Not a member of any professional society	68
Don't know or don't remember	+
Not ascertained	<u>+</u>
Total per cent	102% [‡]

+ Less than 0.5%

* Reported only for those who did not use the materials or ideas from the seminar in communication in their work

‡ Total adds to more than 100% because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-94: Why is that so?

2/Q P-151+152: I have asked you once before about being a member of a U.S. professional society; now I'd like to ask you if you are a member of a professional society of any country?

What country?

(Question added by USOM/Thailand).

Section 5

Administrative Practices and Procedures

Table A2.5-1

Technician's Pre-departure Contacts with Participants¹

	Kind of contact							
	Helped in selection	Helped in planning program	Previous work contacts	Advised about program	Coordinated program with host country	Coordinated with program employer	Corresponded	Other contacts
Base*	(a) (31) %	(b) (31) %	(c) (31) %	(d) (31) %	(e) (31) %	(f) (31) %	(g) (31) %	(h) (31) %
Yes	65	68	68	68	68	65	42	10
No	32	29	29	29	29	32	55	45
Not ascertained	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	45
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table A2.5-2

Kind of Pre-departure Information Needed about Place of Program²

Base**	(166)
	<u> </u>
Details about place of attendance	42
Background information about university	7
Information was not timely, received too late	7
Other	5
Don't know or don't remember	40
Not ascertained	<u> </u>
Total per cent	108% [‡]

* Reported only for technicians who had contacts with participant prior to departure

** Reported only for those who did not receive enough information about place of attendance

‡ Total adds to more than 100% because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q T1-11: In this question I would like to know what kind of contact you had with the participant prior to his/her departure for training. Please answer Yes or No to the following:

- A. Did you help select (READ NAME OF FIRST PARTICIPANT) for the training program?
- B. Did you help in planning his program?
- C. Did you have previous work contacts with him?
- D. Did you give him information or advice about his program?
- E. Did you coordinate his program with the host country?
- F. Did you coordinate his program with the employer?
- G. Did you correspond with him while he was away?
- H. Did you have any other pre-departure contacts?

2/Q P-37b: If "No": what kind of information you thought useful that should have been given but was not?

Table A2.5-3Participant's Evaluation of Pre-departure Information
about How to Use Restaurants¹

Base	(460) %
<u>Amount of information:</u>	
Enough	82
Not enough	18
Not ascertained	+
Total per cent	100%

Table A2.5-4Kind of Pre-departure Information Needed² about Restaurants
and Public Facilities²

Base*	(80) %
Location and use of restaurants	15
Information on etiquette	15
Types of food available	8
Information on tipping	4
Information on cost of living	1
Information on means of transportation	3
Other	10
Don't remember	48
Not ascertained	13
Total per cent	117% ³

+ Less than 0.5%

• Reported only for those who didn't receive enough information about restaurants and public facilities

≠ Total adds to more than 100% because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-40A: Prior to your departure -- apart from the information about the program --, did you have enough information regarding how to get along in (country of training)?
For instance:

Δ) Information regarding behavior (how to do) in restaurants and in public places

2/Q P-40a: If "No": what types of information do you think would have been useful which were not previously received?

Table A2.5-5

Participant's Evaluation of Pre-departure Information about Colloquial Speech and Idioms ¹	
Base	(460) %
<u>Amount of information:</u>	
Enough	80
Not enough	20
Not ascertained	<u>+</u>
Total per cent	100%

Table A2.5-6

Kind of Pre-departure Information Needed about Colloquial Speech and Idioms ²	
Base*	(91) %
Should have been more language training	12
Information about dialects, patois, slang etc.	12
Needed to know more about phrases words, idiom commonly used in restaurants	3
Needed to know more about phrases words, idioms commonly used in traveling	3
Needed to know more information (general)	10
Other	13
Don't remember	49
Not ascertained	<u>7</u>
Total per cent	109% [‡]

+ Less than 0.5%

* Reported only for those who didn't receive enough information about colloquial speech and idioms

‡ Total adds to more than 100% because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-40B: Prior to your departure -- apart from the information about the program --, did you have enough information regarding how to get along in (country of training)?
For instance:

B) Information regarding idioms and spoken language

2/Q P-40b: If "No": what types of information do you think would have been useful which were not previously received?

Table A2.5-7Participant's Evaluation of Pre-departure Information
about the Use of Money¹

Base	(460)
	<u>%</u>
<u>Amount of information:</u>	
Enough	79
Not enough	<u>21</u>
Total per cent	100%

Table A2.5-8Kind of Pre-departure Information Needed about the Use of Money²

Base*	(96)
	<u>%</u>
Should have had more information	18
Needed to know about price in general	12
Needed to know on exchange rates	7
Needed to see their money	2
Other	9
Don't know or don't remember	49
Not ascertained	<u>4</u>
Total per cent	101% [‡]

* Reported only for those who didn't receive enough information about the use of money

‡ Total adds to more than 100% because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-40D: Prior to your departure -- apart from the information about the program ---, did you have enough information regarding how to get along in (country of training)?
For instance:

D) Information regarding the use of currency, i.e. how should it be used, and the prices of articles

2/Q P-40d: If "No": what types of information do you think would have been useful which were not previously received?

Table A2.5-9Participant's Evaluation of Pre-departure Information
about Manners and Customs¹

Base	(460) %
<u>Amount of information:</u>	
Enough	82
Not enough	17
Not ascertained	+
Total per cent	100% [@]

Table A2.5-10Kind of Pre-departure Information² Needed
about Manners and Customs

Base*	(80) %
Needed more information	18
Needed information on etiquette in general	10
Needed information on customs	5
Needed information on discriminatory attitudes	4
Needed to know about behavior of people	1
Other	10
Don't know or don't remember	55
Not ascertained	4
Total per cent	107% ⁺

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

• Reported only for those who didn't receive enough information about manners and customs

≠ Total adds to more than 100% because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-40E: Prior to your departure -- apart from the information about the program --, did you have enough information regarding how to get along in (country of training)?
For instance:

E) Information regarding manners and customs in general

2/Q P-40e: If "No": what types of information do you think would have been useful which were not previously received?

Table A2.5-11

Participant's Evaluation of Pre-departure Information
about Study Details¹BY
Training Field of Activity²

	Base	Training field of activity					
		Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- lanous	Public Safety
	(460) %	(90) %	(75) %	(94) %	(114) %	(57) %	(30) %
<u>Amount of information:</u>							
Enough	45	43	53	32	50	49	40
Not enough	54	52	47	68	50	51	60
Not ascertained	1	4	-	-	-	-	-
Total per cent	100%	100% [@]	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

[@] Due to rounding1/Q P-37A: Prior to your departure for abroad, did you receive
sufficient information about the program that was
arranged for you?

Particularly in connection with:

A) Details of study

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.5-12

Kind of Pre-departure Information Needed
about Study Details¹BY
Training field of activity²

	Base*	Training field of activity					
		Agriculture and Natural resources	Industry & Mining and Transportation	Health and Sanitation	Education	Public Administration, Labor, Community Development, Miscellaneous	Public Safety
	(254) %	(51) %	(35) %	(64) %	(57) %	(29) %	(18) %
<u>Need of pre-departure information about study details:</u>							
Should have more information about program in its entirety	25	22	31	30	21	21	28
Needed to know about subject of the program	32	14	37	41	44	34	22
Needed to know about university requirement	9	2	6	13	16	7	6
Needed to know more information about level of program	3	6	3	-	5	-	-
Needed to know how to apply the training after return	+	-	-	-	2	-	-
Needed to know background information about the program	2	4	-	-	4	-	11
Information come too late	3	6	-	1	5	-	6
Other	2	4	-	-	-	7	11
Don't remember	31	35	23	30	26	45	39
Not ascertained	12	20	20	5	9	7	11
Total per cent	119% [‡]	113% [‡]	120% [‡]	120% [‡]	132% [‡]	121% [‡]	134% [‡]

+ Less than 0.5%

* Reported only for those who did not receive enough information about study details

‡ Total adds to more than 100% because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-37a: If "No": what kind of information you thought useful should have been given but was not?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.5-13

Participant's Evaluation of Pre-departure Information
about Place of Program¹
BY
Training Field of Activity²

	Training field of activity						
	Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety	
Base	(460)	(90)	(75)	(94)	(114)	(57)	(30)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<u>Amount of inform-</u>							
<u>ation:</u>							
Enough	64	64	65	49	72	74	57
Not enough	36	36	35	51	28	26	43
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

1/Q P-37B: Prior to your departure for abroad, did you receive sufficient information about the program that was arranged for you?
Particularly in connection with:

B) Details of places to attend

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.5-14

Kind of Pre-departure Information Needed about Place of Program¹
 BY
 Training Field of Activity²

	Base*	Training field of activity					
		Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety
	(166) %	(32) %	(26) %	(48) %	(32) %	(15) %	(13) %
Needed to know details about where would be going	42	44	58	38	47	20	31
Needed background information about the university, plants, factories, organization, etc.	7	3	8	8	6	7	8
Information was not timely, received too late	7	9	8	6	6	7	8
Other comments	5	-	-	10	6	13	-
Don't know or don't remember	40	34	38	38	38	47	62
Not ascertained	7	9	-	8	6	13	8
Total per cent	108% [‡]	100% [@]	112% [‡]	108% [‡]	109% [‡]	107% [‡]	117% [‡]

● Due to rounding

* Reported only for those who did not receive enough information about place of program

‡ Total adds to more than 100% because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-37b: If "No": what kind of information you thought useful should have been given but was not?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.5-15

Participant's Evaluation of Pre-departure Information
about Date of Departure
BY
Training Field of Activity

	Training field of activity						
	Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety	
Base	(460)	(90)	(75)	(94)	(114)	(57)	(30)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<u>Amount of inform- ation:</u>							
Enough	88	87	90	84	93	82	90
Not enough	12	13	10	16	7	18	10
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

1/Q P-37C: Prior to your departure for abroad, did you receive sufficient information about the program that was arranged for you? Particularly in connection with:
C: Scheduled time for departure

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.5-16

Kind of Pre-departure Information Needed about Date of Departure¹
 BY
 Training Field of Activity²,

	Training field of activity						
	Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety	
Base*	(55) %	(12) %	(7) %	(15) %	(8) %	(10) %	(3) %
<u>Kind of information needed:</u>							
Information given on departure date too uncertain	13	17	29	13	-	10	-
Needed to know about compliance with regulation	2	-	14	-	-	-	-
Information was not timely	45	42	57	40	38	60	33
Other comments	4	-	-	-	13	10	-
Don't know or don't remember	40	42	29	47	38	30	67
Not ascertained	2	-	-	-	13	-	-
Total per cent	106% [‡]	100% [@]	109% [‡]	100%	100% [@]	110% [‡]	100%

@ Due to rounding

* Reported only for those who did not receive enough information about the date of departure

‡ Total adds to more than 100% because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-37c: If "No" what kind of information you thought useful should have been given but was not?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.5-17

Participant's Evaluation of Pre-departure Information
about Length of Program¹
BY
Training Field of Activity²

	Training field of activity						
	Agriculture and Natural resources	Industry & Mining and Transportation	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety	
Base	(460)	(90)	(75)	(94)	(114)	(57)	(30)
<u>Amount of inform- ation:</u>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Enough	93	93	81	91	95	93	90
Not enough	7	5	19	9	5	7	10
Not ascertained	+	1	-	-	-	-	-
Total per cent	100%	100% [@]	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

1/Q P-37D: Prior to your departure for abroad, did you receive sufficient information about the program that was arranged for you?
Particularly in connection with:

D) Duration of program

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.5-18

Kind of Pre-departure Information Needed about Length of Program¹
BY
Training Field of Activity

	Base* (35) %	Training field of activity					
		Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health & Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety
	(35) %	(6) %	(7) %	(9) %	(6) %	(4) %	(3) %
<u>Kind of information needed:</u>							
Needed to know total length of the program	26	33	14	44	17	25	-
Needed to know length of time to be spent in each place	14	-	14	11	50	-	-
Information not timely	11	17	-	22	-	25	-
Other comments	6	-	14	-	-	25	-
Don't know or don't remember	37	17	47	33	33	25	67
Not ascertained	14	33	14	11	-	-	33
Total per cent	108% [‡]	100%	103% [‡]	121% [‡]	100%	100%	100%

* Reported only for those who did not receive enough information about the length of program

‡ Total adds to more than 100% because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-37d: If "No": what kind of information you thought useful should have been given but was not?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.5-19

Participant's Evaluation of Pre-departure¹ Information
about Other Aspects of Program¹
BY
Training Field of Activity²

	Base (460) %	Training field of activity					
		Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety
		(90) %	(75) %	(94) %	(114) %	(57) %	(30) %
<u>Amount of inform- ation needed:</u>							
Enough	61	59	69	55	67	56	50
Not enough	39	40	31	45	33	44	50
Not ascertained	+	1	-	-	-	-	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

1/Q P-37E: Prior to your departure for abroad, did you receive sufficient information about the program that was arranged for you? Particularly in connection with:

E) Whether the other details about the program which were given to you prior to your departure were sufficient?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.5-20

Kind of Pre-departure Information Needed
about Other Aspects of Program¹
BY
Training Field of Activity²

Base*	Training field of activity					
	Agriculture and Natural resources	Industry & Mining and Transportation	Health and Sanitation	Education	Public Administration, Labor, Community Development, Miscellaneous	Public Safety
(179) %	(37) %	(23) %	(43) %	(38) %	(23) %	(15) %
<u>Kind of information needed:</u>						
Needed more general information	26	27	30	33	18	27
Needed more information on administrative detail of program	22	22	22	19	34	13
Needed more information on subject-matter of program	18	5	17	16	24	27
Needed more information about manners and custom	3	-	-	9	5	-
Information was not timely	6	8	4	9	3	7
Other	3	-	4	-	5	7
Don't know or don't remember	40	43	48	33	32	43
Not ascertained	4	5	-	2	5	-
Total per cent	122% [‡]	110% [‡]	125% [‡]	121% [‡]	126% [‡]	128% [‡]

* Reported only for those who received not enough information about other aspects of the program

‡ Total adds to more than 100% because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q Q-37E: If "No": what kind of information you thought useful should have been given but was not?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.5-21

Pre-departure Information about Level of Program¹
 BY
 Training Field of Activity²

	Training field of activity						
	Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety	
Base	(460)	(90)	(75)	(94)	(114)	(57)	(30)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<u>Information was:</u>							
Received	27	30	27	18	32	28	20
Not received	73	70	73	82	67	72	80
Not ascertained	+	-	-	-	1	-	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

1/Q P-68: Prior to your departure were you ever informed about the level of your program, if it were difficult or easy?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.5-22Source of Ideas for Major Portion of Program¹

Base*	(210)
	<u>%</u>
<u>Major portion of program was:</u>	
My ideas	36
Someone else's ideas	16
Ideas from both sides	48
Not ascertained	<u>+</u>
Total per cent	100%

Table A2.5-23

Adequacy of Amount and Kind of Pre-departure Information Given
about How to Get Along in Country of Training²
BY
Orientation Classes at Home Country prior to Departure³

	AUA orientation classes			
	Yes	No	Don't know or don't remember	
Base	(460)	(297)	(161)	(2)
	%	%	%	%
<u>Number of "Yes"</u>				
All five	53	57	45	100
Less than five	47	43	55	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

* Reported for those who had opportunity to take part in the planning of program

1/Q P-34: Was the major portion of your program in accordance with your ideas or someone else's?

2/Q P-40: Prior to your departure -- apart from the information about the program --, did you have enough information regarding how to get along in (country of training)?

For instance:

Information regarding behavior (how to do) in restaurants and in public places

Information regarding idioms and spoken language

Information regarding the religious practices of the people in that country

Information regarding the use of currency, i.e. how should it be used, and the prices of articles

Information regarding manners and customs in general

2/Q P-147: Did you join the Orientation Classes at AUA Language Center prior to your trip abroad? (Question added by USOM/Thailand).

Table A2.5-24Opinion about Helpfulness of Degree¹

Base*	Received degree (130) %	Didn't receive degree (129) %
<u>Positive answer</u>	124	73
Gain more knowledge	43	13
Will mean more prestige, status	28	21
Will mean more money	17	13
Qualified to teach others	16	5
Leads to advancement in job	15	15
Other positive concepts	5	6
<u>Qualified answer</u>	5	3
Not specialized enough	2	-
Other qualified concepts	2	2
Not advanced enough	1	1
<u>Negative answer</u>	9	26
Other negative concept	4	6
Would not lead to advance- ment in job	2	11
Not relevant to work	2	3
Degree program too elementary	1	1
Would not lead to greater prestige	-	5
<u>Not ascertained</u>	-	12
Total per cent	138%*	114%*

Table A2.5-25Type of Degree Received from Program²

Base*	(259) %
Received degree	50
Master level	41
Bachelor level	6
Other	2
Not ascertained	1
Received certificate	12
Received nothing	38
Total per cent	100%

* Reported only for those who received attending university

Total adds to more than 100% because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-62+63: Do you think that a degree or diploma will be very useful to your work, or somewhat useful, or not at all useful?

Why is that so?

2/Q P-58+59: Did you receive a degree or a diploma?
What degree or diploma did you receive?

Table A2.5-26

Amount of Usefulness of Degree for Future Work¹

Base*	Received degree	Didn't receive degree
	(130) %	(129) %
<u>Degree for future career is:</u>		
Very useful	78	48
Somewhat useful	16	19
Not at all useful	6	22
Don't know	-	2
Not ascertained	-	9
Total per cent	100%	100%

Table A2.5-27

Position of Guidance Officer²

Base**	(435) %
<u>ICA</u>	54
<u>Government agency other than ICA or university</u>	41
At a university where training was received	15
Department of Health	9
Department of Agriculture	7
Bureau of Public Roads	1
Bureau of Census	1
Federal Aviation Agency	1
At a university other than training was received	1
All other government department	4
Don't know or don't remember	+
Not ascertained	2
<u>Labor union</u>	1
<u>Other organization</u>	3
Don't know or don't remember	1
Not ascertained	+
Total per cent	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

* Reported only for those who reported attending university

** Reported only for those who met someone for program discussion on arrival in country of training

1/Q P-60+62: Do you think that the degree or diploma which you received will be very useful for your work in future, or somewhat useful, or not at all useful? Do you think that a degree or diploma would have been very useful to your work, or somewhat useful, or not at all useful?

2/Q P-52+53: Can you remember where he worked? Although ICA sponsored all programs, the program manager might not be working for ICA; some might be working for other governmental departments, some at a university, and some might be working in private firms. The person who arranged your program, where was he working? What was the name of that place? (What department or division, what university, or what firm?)

Table A2.5-28

Source of Information for Those Not Met on Arrival ¹		
Base*		(25) %
<u>Source of information:</u>		
<u>By personal contact:</u>		68
USOM in home country	24	
USOM in country of training	20	
Government department	12	
University official	12	
<u>By non-personal contact:</u>		36
Letter or other written instructions	24	
ICA printed program	12	
<u>Other method</u>		12
<u>Not ascertained</u>		8
Total per cent		124% [‡]

Table A2.5-29

Completion of Program ²		
Base		(460) %
Completed program		95
Did not complete program		4
Arrangement of training program	2	
Recalled by home government	1	
Personal reasons	+	
Other reasons	1	
Total per cent		100% [@]

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

* Reported only for those who did not meet someone on arrival in country of training

‡ Total adds to more than 100% because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-54: Then how did you know where to go or what to do for your program?

2/Q P-74+75: Did you complete your training program or did you return prior to completion?
Why was that so?

Table A2.5-30

Program Satisfaction of Participants Requesting Extension¹
BY
Participants Receiving Extension²

Base*	(131) %	Participants receiving extension		
		Received extension (58) %	Did not receive extension (72) %	Don't know or don't remember (1) %
<u>Program satisfaction of participants requesting extension:</u>				
Very satisfied	45	52	39	100
Somewhat satisfied	43	41	44	-
Not satisfied	12	7	17	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table A2.5-31

Opinion about Amount of Money Supplied by ICA³
BY
Age in Years at Time of Departure⁴

Base	(460) %	Age in years at time of departure							
		Under 25 (20) %	25-29 (95) %	30-34 (105) %	35-39 (85) %	40-44 (71) %	45-49 (48) %	50 & older (22) %	Not ascertained (14) %
<u>Amount of money was:</u>									
Too little	31	25	23	31	33	30	33	55	29
About right	68	75	74	69	67	70	67	41	71
More than needed	1	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not ascertained	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

* Reported only for those who requested an extension

1/Q P-144: In general, how satisfied were you with the training program, very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, not so satisfied, or not satisfied at all?

2/Q P-156: Did you get an extension?

3/Q P-78: What is your opinion about the money allotted to you by ICA for living cost and travel during your training program? Can you say that it was too little, just right, or more than needed?

4/Q P-page 1

Table A2.5-32

Kind of Work Done at Time of Interview¹
BY
Participants Claiming Project-connected Employment²

Base*	(297) %	Participant's employment		
		Project- connected (198) %	Not Project- connected (98) %	Not ascertained (1) %
<u>Kind of work done at time of interview:</u>				
Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	8	10	6	-
Mining and Quarrying	1	1	2	-
Manufacturing, Maintenance and repair	1	1	1	-
Engineering and Construction	4	6	2	-
Electricity, Gas, Water and Sanitary Services	1	1	-	-
Transport, Storage and Communication Services	4	3	5	-
Commerce, Banking and Insurance	3	4	6	-
Educational Services	33	32	35	-
Medical Services	10	11	7	-
Welfare, Community Development, Housing	2	1	3	-
Not employed	1	-	2	-
Other ⁺⁺	31	31	31	100
Total per cent	100% [@]	100% [@]	100% [@]	100%

Position at Time of Interview³
BY
Availability of USOM Technician to Participant⁴

Base*	(297) %	Availability of technician		
		Available (198) %	Not available (98) %	Not ascertained (1) %
<u>Position at time of interview:</u>				
Top and second-level policy makers	14	16	11	-
Subordinate management	47	46	51	100
Professional, Sub-professional and supervisory	38	39	38	-
Total per cent	100% [@]	100% [@]	100%	100%

@ Due to rounding

* Reported only for those who said they had contact with USOM

++ Includes: Legal, Community Services; Public Safety, Government Services n.o.s.

1/Item 7, Transmittal sheet

2/Q P-130: Since your return, have you ever worked in USOM or on a joint project of USOM and the government?

3/Q P-Transmittal sheet

4/Q P-131: Is there a USOM technician who is there to give you recommendation and advice?

Table A2.5-34

Date Returned from Training Program¹
 BY
 Availability of USOM Technician to Participant²

<u>Date returned from program:</u>	<u>Availability of technician</u>			
	<u>Available</u>	<u>Not available</u>	<u>Not ascer- tained</u>	
(297) %	(198) %	(98) %	(1) %	
<u>Year</u>				
1952 - 1954	14	15	12	-
1955 - 1956	27	29	24	-
1957 - 1958	31	31	29	100
1959 - 1960	28	25	35	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Reported only for those who said they had contact with USOM
 1/Q P-page 1
 2/Q P-131: Is there a USOM technician who is there to give you
 recommendation and advice?

Table A2.5-35

Date Left for Training Program¹
 BY
 Availability of USOM Technician to Participant²

Base*	<u>Availability of technician</u>			
	<u>Available</u>	<u>Not Available</u>	<u>Not ascer- tained</u>	<u>Not ascer- tained</u>
(297) %	(198) %	(98) %	(1) %	(1) %
<u>Date left for training:</u>				
<u>Year</u>				
1951-1954	29	30	29	-
1955-1956	27	29	24	-
1957-1958	36	31	39	100
1959-1960	8	8	8	-
Total per cent	100%	100% [Ⓔ]	100%	100%

Ⓔ Due to rounding

* Reported only for those who said they had contact with USOM

1/Q P-page 1

2/Q P-131: Is there a USOM technician who is there to give you recommendation and advice?

Table A2.5-36

Kinds of Problem for Which Help Was Requested from USOM¹
 BY
 Kind of Work Done at Time of Interview²

	Kind of work done at time of interview											
	Agricul- ture, Forestry & Fish- eries	Mining & Quar- rying	Manufac- turing, Mainten- ance & repair	Engi- neer- ing & Cons- truc- tion	Electri- city, Gas, Wa- ter & Sanita- ry Ser- vices	Trans- port, Stora- ge & Commu- nica- tion Ser- vices	Com- merce, Bank- ing & Insur- ance	Educa- tional Ser- vices	Medical Ser- vices	Welfare, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Housing	Other Govern- ment Services includ- ing Pub- lic Safe- ty	
Base*	(124)	(12)	(3)	(3)	(6)	-	(3)	(3)	(41)	(14)	(3)	(36)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<u>Kinds of problem for which help was requested from USOM</u>												
Requested equipment material	53	58	67	100	17	-	67	67	45	57	67	55
Financial assistance	26	33	-	-	50	-	33	67	22	21	33	26
Technical advice	25	50	33	-	-	-	-	33	26	29	33	19
Assistance from Technician in training staff	16	8	-	-	33	-	-	-	22	14	-	17
Requested training for others	13	8	-	-	-	-	-	33	17	14	33	11
Printed material	11	-	-	-	-	-	33	-	7	36	-	14
Requested additional training	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-
Audio-Visual aids	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	-
Other requests	11	-	33	-	33	-	-	-	10	14	-	14
Not ascertained	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	1	-
Total per cent	158% [‡]	157% [‡]	133% [‡]	100%	133% [‡]	-	133% [‡]	200% [‡]	158% [‡]	192% [‡]	167% [‡]	156% [‡]

+ Less than 0.5%

* Reported only for those who requested help from USOM and were employed.

‡ Total adds to more than 100% because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-134: What sort of assistance did you ask for? What type of assistance did you receive in this connection?

2/Q P-Transmittal sheet

Table A2.5-37

Kinds of Problem for Which Help Was Requested from USOM¹
 BY
 Training Field of Activity²

	Base*	Training field of activity					
		Agriculture and Natural resources	Industry & Mining and Transportation	Health and Sanitation	Education	Public Administration, Labor, Community Development, Miscellaneous	Public Safety
	(125) %	(33) %	(21) %	(30) %	(23) %	(9) %	(9) %
<u>Kinds of problem for which help was requested from USOM</u>							
Requested equipment material	53	48	71	53	30	56	78
Financial assistance	26	36	19	17	22	33	33
Technical advice	25	27	10	23	35	22	33
Assistance from technician in training staff	16	21	5	7	30	11	22
Requested training for others	13	6	5	20	17	11	22
Printed material	11	3	10	17	13	22	11
Requested additional training	+	-	-	3	-	-	-
Audio-Visual aids	+	-	-	3	-	-	-
Other requests	11	12	10	10	9	22	11
Not ascertained	3	3	-	-	13	-	-
Total per cent	158% [‡]	156% [‡]	130% [‡]	153% [‡]	169% [‡]	177% [‡]	210% [‡]

+ Less than 0.5%

* Reported only for those who requested help from USOM

‡ Total adds to more than 100% because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-134: What sort of assistance did you ask for?

What type of assistance did you receive in this connection?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.5-38

Help Requested from USOM¹
BY
Training Field of Activity²

	<u>Training field of acti</u>						
	Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Publi Safet	
Base	(460)	(90)	(75)	(94)	(114)	(57)	(30)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<u>Help requested</u> <u>from USOM:</u>							
Requested	27	37	28	32	20	16	30
Not requested	73	63	72	68	80	84	70
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table A2.5-39

Technician's Previous Acquaintance with Participant³

Base*	(56)
	%
Has heard of participant	54
Has never heard of participant	46
Total per cent	100%

* Reported only for participants who were sent abroad during the technicians tour of duty in Thailand

1/Q P-133: Since your return, have you ever requested any assistance from USOM or ICA?

2/Q P-page 1

3/Q T1-10: The date on this card indicates that (participant) left for training while you were in your present office. I would like to know whether you recall having heard of him/her before he/she left for training.

Table A2.5-40

Interference with Participant Contact Technician's Rating ¹

	Work load	Location of job	Participant's lack of ini- tiative	Participant has no time	Attitude of Super- visor, employer	Political problems	Language barrier	Participant's personality	Other
Base*	(167) %	(167) %	(167) %	(167) %	(167) %	(167) %	(167) %	(167) %	(167) %
Interfered	10	16	5	4	3	3	4	10	9
Didn't interfere	90	84	95	96	97	97	96	90	91
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Reported only for those whose technicians were interviewed and completed answer record form

1/Q T1-2: Many factors sometimes make it difficult to see participants as much as would be desirable. Have any of these factors interfered with your seeing these participants since their return from training?

1. First, your work load, or the number of participants you have to handle. Did this interfere with your seeing as much as would be desirable?
2. How about the location of this participant's job: Did this interfere?
3. Did the participant's lack of initiative in seeking help interfere?
4. Did his/her lack of time or overwork interfere?
5. Did the attitude of his supervisor or employer toward his/her seeing you interfere?
6. Did political problems interfere?
7. Did difficulty in conversing with participant because of language barrier interfere?
8. Did participant's personality interfere?
9. Did anything else interfere? (IF YES: PLEASE SPECIFY)
0. Nothing interfered with your seeing this participant as much as would be desirable.

Section 6

Relationship of Year of Departure and Training Field
of Activity to the Conduct of the Training Program

Table A2.6-1

Additional English Instruction on Arrival in Country of Training¹
 BY
 Date Left for Training²

	Base*	<u>Date left for training</u>			
		1951	1955	1957	1959
		to	to	to	to
	(406)	1954	1956	1958	1960
	%	(114)	(119)	(141)	(32)
		%	%	%	%
<u>Additional English instruction:</u>					
Taken	38	41	42	38	16
Not taken	62	59	58	62	84
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table A2.6-2

English Language Requirement of the Program³
 BY
 Date Left for Training²

	Base	<u>Date left for training</u>			
		1951	1955	1957	1959
		to	to	to	to
	(460)	1954	1956	1958	1960
	%	(132)	(131)	(159)	(38)
		%	%	%	%
<u>In program, knowledge of</u>					
<u>English was:</u>					
Required	88	86	91	89	84
Not required	12	14	9	11	16
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

- * Reported only for those whose program required English
- 1/Q P-96: After your arrival and before commencing your program, did you take any additional or extra lessons in English to prepare yourself?
- 2/Q P-page 1
- 3/Q P-95: Now I would like to know some things about English language training. Did your program require knowledge in English language?

Table A2.6-3

Sex of Participant¹
 BY
 Date Left for Training²

	<u>Date left for training</u>			
	<u>1951</u> to <u>1954</u>	<u>1955</u> to <u>1956</u>	<u>1957</u> to <u>1958</u>	<u>1959</u> to <u>1960</u>
Base	(460)	(132)	(131)	(159)
	%	%	%	%
<u>Sex of participant:</u>				
Male	72	70	65	75
Female	28	30	35	25
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table A2.6-4

Kind of Work Done at Time of Departure¹
 BY
 Training Field of Activity²

	Base* (457) %	Training field of activity					
		Agricul- ture and natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety
	(457) %	(89) %	(75) %	(92) %	(114) %	(57) %	(30) %
<u>Kind of work done at time of Departure</u>							
Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries	8	37	-	-	+	2	-
Mining and Quarrying	2	1	8	-	-	2	-
Manufacturing, maintenance and repair	2	3	5	-	-	2	-
Engineering and Construction	5	2	20	1	-	7	-
Electricity, Gas, Water and Sani- tary Services	1	-	5	1	-	-	-
Transport, Storage and Communica- tion Services	5	-	25	-	-	5	-
Commerce, Banking and Insurance	3	9	1	-	-	4	3
Educational Services	37	16	-	49	93	9	-
Medical Services	9	1	1	42	-	4	-
Welfare, Community Development, Housing	2	1	-	1	+	4	3
Other Government Services includ- ing Public Safety ⁺⁺	27	29	33	5	6	60	93
Total per cent	100% [@]	100% [@]	100% [@]	100% [@]	100% [@]	100% [@]	100% [@]

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

* Reported only for those who are employed

++ Includes: Legal, Community Services, Public Safety Government Service n.e.s.

1/Q P-5: Kind of work done at time of departure

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-5

Number of People Supervised¹
 BY
 Training Field of Activity²

	Training field of activity						
	Agriculture and Natural resources	Industry & Mining and Transportation	Health and Sanitation	Education	Public Administration, Labor, Community Development, Miscellaneous	Public Safety	
Base	(460)	(90)	(75)	(94)	(114)	(47)	(30)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<u>Number of people supervised:</u>							
1000 or more	2	1	4	2	2	-	-
20 - 99	26	26	31	19	22	35	33
1 - 19	23	34	24	19	13	32	13
None	34	26	27	44	39	25	43
Not ascertained	16	13	15	16	25	9	10
Total per cent	100% [@]	100%	100% [@]	100%	100% [@]	100% [@]	100% [@]

[@] Due to rounding

1/Q P-6: Number of people supervised in position held

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-6

University Degrees before ICA Training¹
 BY
 Training Field of Activity²

	Base*	Training field of activity					
		Agriculture and Natural resources	Industry & Mining and Transportation	Health and Sanitation	Education	Public Administration, Labor, Community Development, Miscellaneous	Public Safety
	(365) %	(66) %	(61) %	(73) %	(86) %	(52) %	(27) %
<u>Degrees before ICA training:</u>							
Received	92	92	95	95	93	90	85
Did not receive	7	8	5	4	6	8	15
Not ascertained	1	-	-	1	1	2	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Reported only for those who entered university before the program
 1/Q P-17: University degrees before ICA training
 2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-7

Importance of Personal Ability in Participant's Decision to
Go on Training Program¹
BY
Training Field of Activity²

	Base (460) %.	Training field of activity					
		Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety
		(90) %	(75) %	(94) %	(114) %	(57) %	(30) %
<u>Personal ability</u> <u>was:</u>							
Very important	87	84	88	87	88	84	93
Not so very important	9	12	9	5	8	14	3
Don't know	4	3	3	6	4	2	3
Not ascertained	+	-	-	1	-	-	-
Total per cent	100%	100% [@]	100%	100% [@]	100%	100%	100% [@]

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

1/Q P-36: To what degree of importance would you say that the following has in connection with your being selected to go abroad for the training program?

a) Your own ability

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-8

Importance of Job Requirements in Participant's Decision
to Go on Training Program¹
BY
Training Field of Activity²

	Base (460) %	Training field of activity					
		Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety
		(90) %	(75) %	(94) %	(114) %	(57) %	(30) %
<u>Job requirements</u> <u>were:</u>							
Very important	87	84	94	91	90	72	73
Not so very important	13	16	5	7	10	28	20
Don't know	+	-	-	-	-	-	7
Not ascertained	+	-	-	1	-	-	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100% [@]	100% [@]	100%	100%	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

1/Q P-36: To what degree of importance would you say that the following has in connection with your being selected to go abroad for the training program?

b) Job requirements

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-9

Importance of Personal Contacts in Participant's Decision
to Go on Training Program¹
BY
Training Field of Activity²

	Base (460) %	Training field of activity					
		Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety
		(90) %	(75) %	(94) %	(114) %	(57) %	(30) %
<u>Personal contacts</u> <u>were:</u>							
Very important	10	10	11	7	11	9	13
Not so very important	78	77	72	74	83	86	70
Don't know	12	13	17	17	6	5	17
Not ascertained	+	-	-	1	-	-	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100% [@]	100%	100%	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

1/Q P-36: To what degree of importance would you say that the following has in connection with your being selected to go abroad for the training program?

c) Your "arranging" contacts

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-10

Importance of Language Ability in Participant's Decision
to Go on Training Program¹
BY
Training Field of Activity²

	Base (460) %	Training field of activity					
		Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety
		(90) %	(75) %	(94) %	(114) %	(57) %	(30) %
<u>Language ability</u> <u>was:</u>							
Very important	80	78	76	80	84	79	90
Not so very important	17	19	21	17	13	21	10
Don't know	2	3	3	2	3	-	-
Not ascertained	+	-	-	1	-	-	-
Total per cent	100% [@]	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

1/Q P-36: To what degree of importance would you say that the following has in connection with your being selected to go abroad for the training program?

d) Language proficiency

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-11

**Importance of Professional and Educational Qualifications
in Participant's Decision to Go on Training Program¹
BY
Training Field of Activity²**

	Training field of activity						
	Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety	
Base	(460)	(90)	(75)	(94)	(114)	(57)	(30)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<u>Professional and educational qualifications were:</u>							
Very important	87	87	94	86	89	82	80
Not so very important	10	12	3	12	10	14	10
Don't know	2	1	3	1	2	4	10
Not ascertained	+	-	-	1	-	-	-
Total per cent	100% [@]	100%	100%	100%	100% [@]	100%	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

1/Q P-36: To what degree of importance would you say that the following has in connection with your being selected to go abroad for the training program?

e) Your professional and educational qualifications

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-12

Participant's Evaluation of Pre-departure Information
about How to Use Restaurants¹
BY
Training Field of Activity²

	Training field of activity						
	Agriculture and Natural resources	Industry & Mining and Transportation	Health and Sanitation	Education	Public Administration, Labor, Community Development, Miscellaneous	Public Safety	
Base	(460)	(90)	(75)	(94)	(114)	(57)	(30)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<u>Amount of information was:</u>							
Enough	82	82	89	78	82	79	83
Not enough	18	17	11	22	18	21	13
Not ascertained	+	1	-	-	-	-	3
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100% [@]

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

1/Q P-40a: Prior to your departure -- apart from the information about the program --, did you have enough information regarding how to get along in (country of training? For instance:

a) Information regarding behaviour (how to do) in restaurants and in public places

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-13

Participant's Evaluation of Pre-departure Information
about Colloquial Speech and Idioms¹
BY
Training Field of Activity²

	Training field of activity						
	Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety	Public Safety
Base	(460) %	(90) %	(75) %	(94) %	(114) %	(57) %	(30) %
<u>Amount of information was:</u>							
Enough	80	79	83	72	86	81	77
Not enough	20	21	17	28	14	18	23
Not ascertained	+	-	-	-	-	2	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100% [@]	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

1/Q P-40b: Prior to your departure -- apart from the information about the program --, did you have enough information regarding how to get along in (country of training)?

For instance:

b) Information regarding idioms and spoken language

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-14

Participant's Evaluation of Pre-departure Information
about Religious Practices¹
BY
Training Field of Activity²

	Training field of activity						
	Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health & Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety	
Base	(460)	(90)	(75)	(94)	(114)	(57)	(30)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<u>Amount of inform-</u>							
<u>ation was:</u>							
Enough	61	56	57	67	64	60	57
Not enough	39	43	43	32	36	40	40
Not ascertained	+	1	-	1	-	-	3
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

1/Q P-40c: Prior to your departure -- apart from the information about the program --, did you have enough information regarding how to get along in (country of training)?
For instance;

c) Information regarding the religious practices of the people in that country

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-15

Participant's Evaluation of Pre-departure Information
about Use of Money¹
BY
Training Field of Activity²

	Training field of activity						
	Agriculture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety	Public Safety
Base	(460) %	(90) %	(75) %	(94) %	(114) %	(57) %	(30) %
<u>Amount of information was:</u>							
Enough	79	81	81	74	81	81	73
Not enough	21	19	19	26	19	19	27
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

1/Q P-40d: Prior to your departure -- apart from the information about the program --, did you have enough information regarding how to get along in (country of training)?

For instance:

- d) Information regarding the use of currency, i.e. how should it be used, and the prices of articles

Table A2.6-16

Participant's Evaluation of Pre-departure Information
about Manners and Customs¹
BY
Training Field of Activity²

	Training field of activity						
	Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety	
Base	(460)	(90)	(75)	(94)	(114)	(57)	(30)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<u>Amount of inform-</u>							
<u>ation was:</u>							
Enough	82	84	83	78	85	77	90
Not enough	17	16	17	22	15	21	10
Not ascertained	+	-	-	-	-	2	-
Total per cent	100% [@]	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

1/Q P-40e: Prior to your departure -- apart from the information about the program --, did you have enough information regarding how to get along in (country of training)?

For instance:

a) Information regarding manners and customs in general

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-17

Orientation in Country of Training¹
 BY
 Training Field of Activity²

	Training field of activity						
	Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety	Public Safety
Ba	(460) %	(90) %	(75) %	(94) %	(114) %	(57) %	(30) %
<u>Orientation in coun- try of training</u>							
Joined	72	63	85	72	62	77	87
Did not join	28	38	15	28	38	23	13
Total per cent	100%	100% [@]	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

[@] Due to rounding

1/Q P-42: When you arrived in (country of training) did you join in any general orientation sessions which took longer than one day?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-18

Amount of Attention or Guidance Received¹
BY
Training Field of Activity²

	Training field of activity						
	Agriculture and Natural resources	Industry & Mining and Transportation	Health and Sanitation	Education	Public Administration, Labor, Community Development, Miscellaneous	Public Safety	
Base*	(435) %	(88) %	(70) %	(82) %	(112) %	(53) %	(30) %
<u>Amount of attention or guidance received:</u>							
Enough	89	90	90	90	89	87	83
Not enough	10	10	9	10	9	9	13
Don't know or don't remember	+	-	-	-	1	2	-
Not ascertained	1	-	1	-	1	2	3
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

* Reported only for those who met someone who discussed the program with them

1/Q P-51: Do you think that that person paid enough attention or gave sufficient recommendations to you during your training program?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-19

Office of Program Manager¹
 BY
 Training Field of Activity²

	Agriculture and Natural resources	Industry & Mining and Transportation	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety	
Base*	(435) %	(88) %	(70) %	(82) %	(112) %	(53) %	(30) %
<u>Program manager's office</u>							
ICA	54	48	76	60	41	57	53
Government agency other than ICA	24	33	14	30	19	21	27
University	17	13	4	4	39	17	7
Private organi- zation	+	1	-	-	-	-	-
Union	1	1	1	1	-	-	-
Other	2	2	3	2	-	2	10
Don't know or don't remember	1	1	1	2	1	-	3
Not ascertained	+	1	-	-	-	2	-
Total per cent	100% [@]	100%	100% [@]	100% [@]	100%	100% [@]	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

* Reported only for those who met someone who discussed the program with them

1/Q P-52: Can you remember where he worked? Although ICA sponsored all programs, the program manager might not be working for ICA; some might be working for other governmental departments, some at a university, and some might be working in private firms. The person who arranged your program, where was he working?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-20

Opinion about Length of Program¹
 BY
 Training Field of Activity²

	Training field of act						
	Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion		ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	
Base	(460)	(90)	(75)	(94)	(114)	(57)	(30)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<u>Length of program</u> <u>was:</u>							
Too long	6	10	8	2	2	9	7
Too short	49	44	45	63	57	30	37
Just right	45	45	46	35	41	61	57
Total per cent	100%	100% [@]	100% [@]	100%	100%	100%	100% [@]

[@] Due to rounding

1/Q P-64: Did you think that the length of your training program was too long, just right, or too short?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-21

Opinion about the Scope of Program¹
 BY
 Training Field of Activity²

	Base (460) %	Training field of activity					
		Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety
		(90) %	(75) %	(94) %	(114) %	(57) %	(30) %
<u>Scope of program</u>							
Too many things Would have liked more	17	24	21	5	18	21	17
All right as it was	31	23	33	33	33	26	40
Don't know or don't remember	50	47	45	61	47	53	43
	2	6	-	1	+	-	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100% [@]	100%	100% [@]	100%	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

1/Q P-66: Did you think that the items arranged to be done or to be seen for the training program were too many, or should have been more?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-22

Changes in the Program¹
 FY
 Training Field of Activity²

	Training field of activity						
	Agriculture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety	
Base	(460)	(90)	(75)	(94)	(114)	(57)	(30)
<u>Changes in the program</u>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
No change; followed program as origi- nally planned	85	88	88	88	78	86	80
Important changes made	15	12	12	11	22	14	20
Not ascertained	+	-	-	1	-	-	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

1/Q P-70: Did you follow the original program or did you make important changes after starting? This does not deal with changes in your traveling plan or stopovers while traveling, but changes in course of your study,

2/Q P-page

Table A2.6-23

Opinion about Amount of Money Supplied by ICA¹
 BY
 Training Field of Activity²

	Base (460) %	Training field of activity					
		Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety
<u>Amount of money was:</u>		(90) %	(75) %	(94) %	(114) %	(57) %	(30) %
Too little	31	27	36	37	15	39	53
Just right	68	73	63	63	83	60	47
More than needed	1	-	-	-	2	2	-
Not ascertained	+	-	1	-	-	-	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100% [@]	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

1/Q P-78: What is your opinion about the money allotted to you by ICA for living cost and travel during your training program? Can you say that it was too little, just right, or more than needed?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-24

Time for Personal Interests during Program¹
 BY
 Training Field of Activity²

	Training field of activity						
	Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety	
Base	(460)	(90)	(75)	(94)	(114)	(57)	(30)
<u>Time for personal interests was:</u>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Too much	2	1	4	-	4	-	3
Sufficient	60	52	64	64	54	72	67
Too little	37	46	32	36	42	28	30
Don't know or don't remember	+	1	-	-	-	-	-
Total per cent	100% [@]	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

1/Q P-80: According to the program arranged, do you think that the spare time for your personal interest was too much, sufficient, or too little?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-25

Opinion about Other Social Activities¹
 BY
 Training Field of Activity²

	Training field of activity						
	Agriculture and Natural resources	Industry & Mining and Transportation	Health and Sanitation	Education	Public Administration Labor, Community Development, Miscellaneous		
Base	(460)	(90)	(75)	(94)	(114)	(57)	(30)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<u>Social activities were:</u>							
Too many	5	4	1	7	5	4	3
Just right	73	77	71	67	76	75	63
Not enough	22	19	27	23	18	18	33
Not ascertained	1	-	1	2	1	4	-
Total per cent	100% [@]	100%	100%	100% [@]	100%	100% [@]	100% [@]

@ Due to rounding

1/Q P-84: Now speaking about other social activities, did you think that there were too many or too few of these which were arranged for you?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-26

Attendance at Seminar in Communications¹
 BY
 Training Field of Activity²

	Base (50) %	Training field of activity					
		Agriculture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety
		(90) %	(75) %	(94) %	(114) %	(57) %	(30) %
<u>Seminar in communi- cations was:</u>							
Attended	22	17	12	27	19	35	37
Not attended	72	80	79	66	76	63	57
Don't know or don't remember	5	3	10	7	4	2	7
Total per cent	100% [@]	100%	100% [@]	100%	100% [@]	100%	100% [@]

[@] Due to rounding

1/Q P-87: At the end of your program, did you ever attend the seminar
in communication ?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-27

Use of Seminar Materials in Participant's Work¹
 BY
 Training Field of Activity²

	Base*	Training field of activity					
		Agriculture and Natural resources	Industry & Mining and Transportation	Health and Sanitation	Education	Public Administration, Labor, Community Development, Miscellaneous	Public Safety
	(102) %	(15) %	(9) %	(25) %	(22) %	(20) %	(11) %
<u>Seminar materials were:</u>							
Used	69	60	67	68	73	80	55
Not used	30	40	33	32	23	20	45
Not ascertained	1	-	-	-	5	-	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100% [@]	100%	100%

@ Due to rounding

* Reported only for those who attended the seminar in communication

1/Q P-92: Did you use in your work some of the things or ideas obtained from the seminar?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-28

Length of Time since Return¹
 BY
 Training Field of Activity²

	Training field of activity						
	Agriculture and Natural resources	Industry & Mining and Transportation	Health and Sanitation	Education	Public Administration, Labor, Community Development, Miscellaneous	Public Safety	
Base	(460)	(90)	(75)	(94)	(114)	(57)	(30)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<u>Length of time since return</u>							
6 months to 1 year	5	10	3	2	4	4	3
1 to 2 years	25	23	15	5	34	42	37
2 to 3 years	18	19	16	11	17	30	17
3 to 4 years	13	10	21	12	16	11	7
4 to 5 years	11	10	17	16	11	2	7
5 to 6 years	12	9	9	16	12	4	23
6 to 7 years	5	3	7	9	3	4	-
7 years or more	13	16	12	30	4	2	7
Not ascertained	+	-	-	-	-	2	-
Total per cent	100% [@]	100%	100%	100% [@]	100% [@]	100% [@]	100% [@]

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

1/Q P-100: How long has it been since you returned?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-29

Job Changes between Departure and Return¹
 BY
 Training Field of Activity²

	Base	Training field of activity					
		Agriculture and Natural resources	Industry & Mining and Transportation	Health and Sanitation	Education	Public Administration, Labor, Community Development, Miscellaneous	Public Safety
	(460) %	(90) %	(75) %	(94) %	(114) %	(57) %	(30) %
<u>Job at departure and return:</u>							
Same	77	79	76	79	76	72	73
Different	23	21	24	21	24	26	27
Not ascertained	+	-	-	-	-	2	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

1/Q P-108: Talking about the first job you had after your return from the training program, was it the same as the one you had prior to your departure?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-30

Helpfulness of Supervisor in Utilizing Training
BY
Training Field of Activity²

Base*	(457) %	portation			ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous		
		(89) %	(75) %	(92) %	(114) %	(57) %	(30) %
<u>Helpfulness of supervisor:</u>							
Considerably helpful	50	38	48	53	61	54	40
Somewhat helpful	31	44	25	32	26	26	37
Not helpful at all	14	11	20	15	9	11	20
Indifferent, not ever interested	3	4	7	-	3	7	-
Has no supervisor	1	3	-	-	-	-	-
Not ascertained	1	-	-	-	1	2	3
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Reported only for those who were employed

1/Q P-121: Now, talking about the supervisor of your present job. How much does he help you to apply the knowledge acquired usefully? Can you say that he helps you considerably, some, or does not help at all?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-31

Means of Conveyance¹
BY
Training Field of Activity²

	Base*	Training field of activity					
		Agriculture and Natural resources	Industry & Mining and Transportation	Health and Sanitation	Education	Public Administration, Labor, Community Development, Miscellaneous	Public Safety
	(435) %	(82) %	(68) %	(94) %	(112) %	(51) %	(28) %
<u>Means of conveyance</u>							
Gave formal training programs, lectures	78	73	59	85	92	59	64
Informal discussions	67	59	65	74	68	59	54
Wrote articles, other publication	49	46	37	58	53	37	43
On-the-job teaching and training	8	6	7	3	7	4	7
Consultant to organizations	1	-	4	1	-	-	-
Organized or re-organized industry or system	1	1	-	-	2	2	4
Orientation for persons going abroad	+	-	-	1	-	-	-
Other	3	1	3	5	3	2	-
Not ascertained	+	-	1	-	-	-	-
Total per cent	207% [‡]	186% [‡]	176% [‡]	227% [‡]	225% [‡]	163% [‡]	172% [‡]

* Reported only for those who had transmitted knowledge

‡ Total adds to more than 100% because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-126: By what means have you done this?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-32

Plans for Future Use of Training¹
 BY
 Training Field of Activity²

	Training field of activity						
	Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety	
Base	(460)	(90)	(75)	(94)	(114)	(57)	(30)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<u>Plans for future use of training</u>							
Have plans	75	75	71	81	71	81	67
Have no plans	25	24	29	19	28	19	33
Not ascertained	+	1	-	-	1	-	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

1/Q P-127: Have you any plans to make your knowledge from the program useful but have not had the opportunity to do it?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-33

Membership in U.S. Professional Society¹
 BY
 Training Field of Activity²

	<u>Training field of activity</u>						
	Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Publ Admi- stration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	(57)	(30)
Base	(460)	(90)	(75)	(94)	(114)	%	%
<u>Membership in US professional society</u>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Joined	34	23	16	42	46	37	30
Did not join	66	77	84	58	54	63	70
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

1/Q P-135: Have you ever joined any US professional society during or after your training program?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-34

Current Membership in a U.S. Professional Society¹
 BY
 Training Field of Activity²

	Training field of activity						
	Agriculture and Natural resources	Industry & Mining and Transportation	Health and Sanitation	Education	Public Administration, Labor, Community Development, Miscellaneous	Public Safety	
Base	(460) %	(90) %	(75) %	(94) %	(114) %	(57) %	(30) %
<u>Current membership in US professional society</u>							
Yes	25	23	9	35	24	30	27
No	73	72	88	64	73	68	70
Not ascertained	3	4	3	1	3	2	3
Total per cent	100% [@]	100% [@]	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

[@] Due to rounding

1/Q P-136: Are you currently a member of any US professional society?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-35

Receipt of U.S. Professional Publications¹
 BY
 Training Field of Activity²

	<u>Training field of activity</u>						
	Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety	
Base	(460)	(90)	(75)	(94)	(114)	(57)	(30)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<u>Receipt of US professional publications</u>							
Receive	60	56	48	73	60	63	57
Do not receive	39	43	52	27	40	35	43
Not ascertained	1	1	-	-	-	2	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

¹/Q P-137: Do you receive some US professional publications?
²/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-36

Major Difficulties Encountered in Using or Transmitting
Training-acquired Skills and Knowledge¹
BY
Training Field of Activity²

	Training field of activity						
	Agriculture and Natural resources	Industry & Mining and Transportation	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety	
Base	(460) %	(90) %	(75) %	(94) %	(114) %	(57) %	(30) %
<u>Major difficulties in transmitting knowledge</u>							
No difficulties	43	34	37	38	50	53	47
Lack of money	15	13	12	23	14	11	20
Lack of equipment	23	21	19	38	21	12	20
Government not amenable to application	2	3	3	-	3	2	3
Difficulties related to other people	24	24	29	29	14	28	27
Difficulties related to participant's job	13	14	19	15	5	14	10
Difficulties related to other reasons	6	9	4	5	6	-	13
Don't know	+	2	1	-	-	-	-
Not ascertained	+	1	-	-	+	2	-
Total per cent	126% [‡]	121% [‡]	124% [‡]	148% [‡]	113% [‡]	122% [‡]	140% [‡]

+ Less than 0.5%

‡ Total adds to more than 100% because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-142: Generally speaking, what do you think are the main obstructions in using or in passing on to other people the knowledge obtained from the training program?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-37

Number of Outstanding Activities Reported¹
 BY
 Training Field of Activity²

	Training field of activity						
	Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Devo- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Pu Sa	
Base	(460)	(90)	(75)	(94)	(114)	(57)	(30)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<u>Number of outstand- ing activities reported</u>							
None	46	50	44	43	45	47	40
One	27	31	28	26	24	26	33
Two or more	23	16	21	29	24	25	27
Not ascertained	4	3	7	3	6	2	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100% [Ⓐ]	100% [Ⓐ]	100%	100%

Ⓐ Due to rounding

1/Q P-143: After your return from the training program, do you think you have ever done one or two pieces of work which were notably outstanding?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-38

Discussion with Participants about Things Learned¹
 BY
 Training Field of Activity²

	Training field of activity						
	Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety	Public Safety
Base*	(440)	(88)	(72)	(90)	(111)	(54)	(25)
<u>Discussion with participants</u>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Discussed	87	92	89	84	86	85	80
Did not discuss	12	6	8	13	14	15	20
Don't know	1	1	3	2	-	-	-
Not ascertained	+	1	-	-	-	-	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100% [@]	100%	100%	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

* Reported only for those whose supervisors were interviewed

1/Q S1-8: Since (participant's) return did you ever ask him about
 the things he had learned?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-39

Discussion with Participants about Non-program Experience¹
 BY
 Training Field of Activity²

	Training field of activity						
	Agriculture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety	
Base*	(440)	(88)	(72)	(90)	(111)	(54)	(25)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<u>Discussion with participants about non- program experience</u>							
Discussed	73	83	74	66	69	78	68
Did not discuss	25	14	24	32	29	20	28
Don't know	1	1	1	2	-	2	4
Not ascertained	1	2	1	-	2	-	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Reported only for those whose supervisors were interviewed
 1/Q S1-9: And have you ever talked with him about other things he had acquired — not connected with his study or training? For example, things about social, experiences of strange customs and traditions, or about the people of that country?

Table A2.6-40

Length of Time Supervisor Has Known Participant¹
BY
Training Field of Activity²

	Training field of activity						
	Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety	Public Safety
Base*	(440) %	(88) %	(72) %	(90) %	(111) %	(54) %	(25) %
<u>Length of time known parti- cipant</u>							
Less than 5 years	23	13	24	14	41	22	16
6 to 10 years	28	31	29	23	25	30	32
11 to 20 years	31	38	35	29	23	31	40
More than 20 years	17	18	11	33	9	11	12
Don't know	1	1	.1	-	1	4	-
Not ascertained	+	-	-	-	1	2	-
Total per cent	100%	100% [@]	100%	100% [@]	100%	100%	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

* Reported only for those whose supervisors were interviewed

1/Q S1-10: How long have you known (participant)?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-41

Means of Transmitting Knowledge Gained on ICA
Program to Other People¹
BY
Training Field of Activity²

	Training field of activity						
	Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety	
Base*	(403)	(78)	(65)	(85)	(109)	(43)	(23)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<u>Means of transmis- sion</u>							
Formal teaching	75	72	51	86	101	53	74
Informal discussion	13	9	20	11	14	19	4
Wrote publication	14	21	15	13	8	9	26
Reports given in meeting	1	5	-	2	-	-	-
Demonstrations of techniques	6	19	6	2	3	5	-
Introduction of new methods	13	1	32	4	11	33	13
Supervision, guidance	19	28	25	12	15	23	26
Other	4	3	2	4	7	-	8
Don't know or don't remember	1	-	-	2	-	-	-
Not ascertained	1	-	-	1	-	5	-
Total per cent	147% [‡]	158% [‡]	151% [‡]	137% [‡]	159% [‡]	147% [‡]	151% [‡]

* Reported only for those whose supervisor was interviewed and mentioned that participants had transmitted knowledge gained to others

‡ Total adds to more than 100% because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q S1-13: How did he do it? (Passed on how)

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-42

Interference with Participant Contact: Technician's Rating¹
 BY
 Training Field of Activity²

	Training field of activity						
	Agriculture and Natural resources	Industry & Mining and Transportation	Health and Sanitation	Education	Public Administration, Labor, Community Development, Miscellaneous	Public Safety	
Base*	(167)	(52)	(14)	(29)	(31)	(30)	(11)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<u>Interference with contact</u>							
Nothing interfered	59	56	71	62	77	43	45
Interference ³	41	44	29	38	23	57	55
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Reported only for those whose technician was interviewed and completed answer record form

1/Q T1-2(O): Many factors sometimes make it difficult to see participants as much as would be desirable. Have any of these factors interfered with your seeing these participants since their return from training?

2/Q P-page 1

3/ See Appendix 2 Table A2.5-40 (page 81) for distribution of type of interference

Table A2.6-43

Contribution of Training to Participant's Job Performance¹
 BY
 Training Field of Activity²

	Training field of activity						
	Agriculture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety	
Base*	(167)	(52)	(14)	(29)	(31)	(30)	(11)
<u>Contribution of training to participant's job performance</u>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Major	62	75	64	62	65	43	45
Minor	25	21	36	28	13	37	18
No importance	2	2	-	-	3	7	-
Reduced useful- ness	1	-	-	3	3	-	-
Don't know	10	2	-	7	16	13	36
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100% [@]

@ Due to rounding

* Reported only for those whose technician was interviewed and completed answer record form

1/Q T1-5: Next, I would like you to rate the contribution that each participant's training program has made to his ability to perform his present job well.

How about (first participant)? Would you say that his/her training made a major contribution or a minor contribution to his ability to do his work, or would you say it was of no importance, or perhaps that it actually reduced his/her usefulness?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-44

Technician's Utilization Score
BY
Training Field of Activity¹

	<u>Training field of activity</u>						
	Agriculture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety	
Base*	(167) %	(52) %	(14) %	(29) %	(31) %	(30) %	(11) %
<u>Technician's utilization score</u>							
High (75-100)	52	71	57	38	65	23	36
Low (0-74)	19	19	21	21	19	13	27
No total score	29	10	21	41	16	63	36
Total per cent	100%	100%	100% [@]	100%	100%	100% [@]	100% [@]

[@] Due to rounding

* Reported only for those whose technician was interviewed and completed answer record form

1/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-45

Technician's Rating of Participant's Job Importance
to Country Economy¹
BY
Training Field of Activity²

	Training field of activity						
	Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety	Public Safety
Base*	(167) %	(52) %	(14) %	(29) %	(31) %	(30) %	(11) %
<u>Technician's rating</u> <u>of job importance:</u>							
High	43	50	64	55	32	20	36
Fairly high	16	25	36	10	16	3	18
Average	30	21	-	10	45	53	36
Low	5	2	-	17	-	7	9
Don't know	6	2	-	7	6	17	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100% [@]	100% [@]	100%	100% [@]

[@] Due to rounding

* Reported only for those whose technician was interviewed and completed answer record form

1/Q T1-9A: In comparison with the jobs of other participants whom you know, how would you rate the importance of job to the overall economic development of this country? Would you say his/her job is of high importance, average, or low importance?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-46

Technician's Rating of Participant's Job Ability¹
BY
Training Field of Activity²

	Training field of activity						
	Agriculture and Natural resources	Industry & Mining and Transportation	Health and Sanitation	Education	Public Administration, Labor, Community Development, Miscellaneous	Public Safety	
Base*	(167)	(52)	(14)	(29)	(31)	(30)	(11)
<u>Technician's rating of job ability</u>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
High	35	27	57	59	45	13	18
Fairly high	31	23	21	21	42	40	55
Average	20	31	21	10	6	27	9
Low	4	8	-	3	-	3	9
Don't know	10	12	-	7	6	17	9
Total per cent	100%	100% [@]	100% [@]	100%	100% [@]	100%	100%

[@] Due to rounding

* Reported only for those whose technician was interviewed and completed answer record form

1/Q T1-9B: And how do you rate his/her ability to do his/her job without any outside help? Would you rate it high, fairly high, average, or low?

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-47

Orientation Classes at Home Country prior to Departure¹
 BY
 Training Field of Activity²

	<u>Training field of activity</u>						
	Agriculture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety	Public Safety
Base	(460) %	(90) %	(75) %	(94) %	(114) %	(57) %	(30) %
<u>Orientation classes at home country</u>							
Yes	65	66	71	47	77	60	63
No	35	33	29	53	22	40	37
Don't know	+	1	-	-	1	-	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

1/Q P-147: Did you join the orientation classes at AUA language center prior to your trip abroad? (Question added by USOM/Thailand)

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-48

Membership in Professional Society
of Countries Other Than USA¹
BY
Training Field of Activity²

	Training field of activity						
	Agriculture and Natural resources	Industry & Mining and Transportation	Health and Sanitation	Education	Public Administration, Labor, Community Development, Miscellaneous	Public Safety	
Base Membership in professional society	(460) %	(90) %	(75) %	(94) %	(114) %	(57) %	(30) %
Yes	32	27	31	40	37	25	13
No	68	73	69	57	62	74	87
Don't know	+	-	-	1	1	2	-
Not ascertained	+	-	-	1	-	-	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100% [@]	100%	100% [@]	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

1/Q P-151: I have asked you once before about being a member of a US professional society; now I'd like to ask you if you are a member of a professional society of any country?
(Question added by USOM/Thailand).

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-49

Frequency of Meeting with Local People
in Country of Training¹
BY
Training Field of Activity²

	Base (460) %	Training field of activity					
		Agricul- ture and Natural resources	Indus- try & Mining and Trans- porta- tion	Health and Sa- nita- tion	Educa- tion	Public Adminis- tration, Labor, Communi- ty Deve- lopment, Miscel- laneous	Public Safety
		(90) %	(75) %	(94) %	(114) %	(57) %	(30) %
<u>Frequency of meeting the local people</u>							
Three times a week or more	72	74	71	74	73	67	73
Once or twice a week	10	4	11	13	12	9	3
One to three times a month	7	10	9	5	5	5	7
Once in a while	10	11	8	7	9	16	13
Don't know or don't remember	+	-	1	-	-	4	3
Total per cent	100% [@]	100% [@]	100%	100% [@]	100% [@]	100% [@]	100% [@]

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

1/Q P-154: In the country you spent the longest time, how often did you meet with the local people? Can you roughly say, about 3 times a week or more often, once or twice a week, once to three times a month, or once in a while?
(Question added by USOM/Thailand)

2/Q P-page 1

Table A2.6-50

Opinion about the Scope of Program¹
BY
Age in Years at Time of Departure²

Base	(460) %	Age in years at time of departure							Not older ascertained (14) %
		Under 25	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50 or older	
		(20) %	(95) %	(105) %	(85) %	(71) %	(48) %	(22) %	
<u>Scope of program</u>									
Too many things Would have liked more	17	10	16	17	22	14	19	23	21
All right as it was	31	35	35	36	27	31	23	32	8
Don't know or don't remember	50	50	47	47	48	54	58	41	71
	2	5	2	-	3	1	-	4	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table A2.6-51

Attitude Toward Level of Program³
BY
Age in Years at Time of Departure²

Base	(460) %	Age in years at time of departure							Not older ascertained (14) %
		Under 25	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50 or older	
		(20) %	(95) %	(105) %	(85) %	(71) %	(48) %	(22) %	
<u>Level of program</u>									
About right	80	70	78	79	82	79	79	85	93
Too simple	7	15	6	8	9	6	8	15	-
Too advanced	11	10	13	13	8	14	8	-	-
Don't know or don't remember	2	-	3	-	-	1	4	-	7
Not ascertained	+	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100% [@]	100%	100% [@]	100%	100%

+ Less than 0.5%

@ Due to rounding

1/Q P-66: Did you think that the items arranged to be done or to be seen for the training program were too many, or should have been more?

2/Q P-7: Age in years of participants at time of departure

3/Q P-67: How would you rate the program that was arranged for you? Considering the background and experience which you had at that time, would you say in general that it was too easy for you, just right, or too difficult?

Table A2.6-52

Participant's Opinion about Other Social Activities¹
 BY
 Age in Years at Time of Departure²

	Age in years at time of departure								
	Under 25	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50 or older	Not ascertained	
Base	(460)	(20)	(95)	(105)	(85)	(71)	(48)	(22)	(14)
<u>Opinion about other social activities</u>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Enough	73	80	73	68	74	77	77	64	64
Too many	5	-	9	4	2	1	2	5	15
Not enough	22	20	17	27	21	22	17	31	21
Not ascertained	1	-	1	1	2	-	4	-	-
Total per cent	100% [@]	100%	100%	100%	100% [@]	100%	100%	100%	100%

[@] Due to rounding

1/Q P-84: Now speaking about other social activities, did you think that there were too many or too few of these which were arranged for you?

2/Q P-7: Age in years of participants at time of departure

Appendix 3

Tabulations of Responses from Up-country Participants

APPENDIX 3

TABULATIONS OF RESPONSES FROM UP-COUNTRY PARTICIPANTS

Introduction

As has been pointed out in the body of the report, the responses from up-country participants do not constitute an adequate and precise sample of those returned participants who were working up-country at the time of the survey. Since locations for interviews were chosen with an eye to concentrations of returned participants, there is probably a strong bias toward those trained in the Education and Public Health Divisions. These Divisions have had a strong part in the development of hospitals and teacher training centers in Cholburi and Chiangmai Provinces, two of the three provinces selected for study.

The main purpose for including this "group" of up-country participants in the survey was to determine the presence or absence of differentiating characteristics which might make more rigorous sampling procedures outside the capital city area advisable on future studies.

The reader should beware of trying to make percentage comparisons between the data presented in the other parts of this report, and that included in this appendix. The figures in the tables which follow do, however, indicate that there may well be differences between those who were selected from and return to work up-country, and those who are mostly metropolitan. Some of the possible difference which may exist are described briefly below.

Participant Characteristics

- Those interviewed up-country tended to be younger than the Bangkok sample; the median age of the 52 interviewed was 32 as compared to a median of 35.5 in Bangkok.
- Forty-five of the 52 had had university training as compared to 79% of the Bangkok sample, and 40 of the 52 had college degrees. About half the Bangkok participants held college degrees prior to training.

Selection

- Forty-six of the 52 said their supervisors had participated in their selection, and only 3 of 14 supervisors were dissatisfied with the selection process; in Bangkok, 86% of the participants said that their supervisors had played some role in their selection, but 36% said they were not satisfied with the selection process.
- Attitudes and responses of participants about pre-departure information and activities appear to follow about the same pattern as those of their Bangkok colleagues. However, up-country supervisors in a significantly large amount would like a larger share in the planning of participant's programs.
- A smaller proportion of the up-country participants surveyed were satisfied with their orientation at AUA than were the Bangkok sample, but they were far less specific about what they felt needed improvement.

English Language

- It appears that considerably more of those participants from up-country areas have difficulty with English and feel the need for more English language training both before departure and after arrival in the country of training, than do their Bangkok counterparts. Forty out of the 52 in the group said they felt they needed additional instruction after they arrived in the country of training, and 30 of them took extra language training.

Activities in Country of Training

- Three-fifths of this group studied abroad for one year or more, and fewer of them were on short programs than were those surveyed in Bangkok. Nevertheless, a higher proportion of the rural group thought that their program was too short.
- Ten of the 52 said the money ICA supplied was insufficient; two-thirds of the main sample were satisfied with the amount they received.
- Indications are that more variety of program and activities would be appreciated abroad by those coming from outside Bangkok, although they had about the same amount of social contacts and community activities as those in the primary sample.

Post-Training Experiences

- Twenty-one of the 52 had changed jobs between their return and time of interview, most to a better job.
- Thirty-four of the 52 said they would not have had so good a job without USOM training; 46% of the Bangkok sample replied thus.
- Forty-two of the group felt that the training program was the most important thing that ever happened to them; 71% in Bangkok were this enthusiastic.
- While it might be expected that those up-country would have less contact with USOM than the two-thirds who report this in Bangkok, still over half the up-country group said they had had some contact with USOM since their return.
- While it is difficult to determine any indications about relative proportions of participants having contact with Technicians, about half of those who do report contact, report "frequent" contacts.
- Those interviewed tended to show a much greater variety in the ways in which they put their training into practice. Thirty-three of the group mentioned at least two "outstanding" ways in which they had used their training, and a much larger proportion of this group said they had transmitted training through informal discussion and writing, than did those in the city.
- Of the 46 whose supervisors were interviewed, the supervisors said they had discussed with the participants what they had learned during their programs. This appears to be much more prevalent than in the metropolitan area.

Conclusions

A study of the results in this appendix compared with comparable data in the body of the report indicates that an earnest effort to obtain a sufficient valid sample of up-country participants on any future evaluation surveys is not only warranted but strongly advisable.

Table A3-1

Type of Participant Questionnaire Form Coded

Participated in a single program only	50
Participated in more than one program	<u>2</u>
Total	52

Table A3-2Training Field of Activity¹

Agriculture & Natural Resources	9
Transportation	3
Health & Sanitation	14
Education	25
Public Safety	<u>1</u>
Total	52

Table A3-3Participant Sponsorship¹

Regular ICA	46
University contract	<u>6</u>
Total	52

Table A3-4English Grade Score¹

	<u>Written</u>	<u>Oral</u>
50 - 59%	-	2
70 - 79%	1	-
90 - 100%	1	-
Not available	<u>50</u>	<u>50</u>
Total	52	52

Table A3-5Date Left for Training Program¹

<u>Year</u>	
1951-1954	14
1955-1956	18
1957-1958	18
1959-1960	<u>2</u>
Total	52

Table A3-6Date Returned from Training Program¹

<u>Year</u>	
1952-1954	7
1955-1956	17
1957-1958	12
1959-1960	<u>16</u>
Total	52

Table A3-7Date of Interview²

<u>Year</u>	<u>Month</u>	
1960		1
1961	November	1
	January	1
	February	4
	March	25
	April	13
	May	1
	September	6
	October	1
	Total	

1/Q P-page 1

2/Transmittal sheet: Date of interview

Table A3-8

Level of Position at Time of Departure for Training¹
and at Time of Interview²

<u>Level of position</u>	<u>Departure</u>	<u>Interview</u>
Top and second-level policy makers	5	8
Subordinate management	20	19
Professional, sub-professional and supervisory	27	25
Not ascertained	<u>+</u>	<u>-</u>
• Total	52	52

Table A3-9

Kind of Work Done at Time of Departure for Training¹
and at Time of Interview²

<u>Kind of work done</u>	<u>Departure</u>	<u>Interview</u>
Agriculture, forestry and fisheries	5	5
Mining and quarrying	-	-
Manufacturing, maintenance and repair	-	1
Engineering and construction	1	1
Electricity, gas, water and sanitary services	-	-
Transport, storage and communication services	2	2
Commerce, banking and insurance	1	1
Educational services	25	26
Medical services	12	12
Welfare, community development, housing	1	1
Other government services including public safety	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>
Total	52	52

1/Q P-5: Kind of work done (at time of departure)

2/ Transmittal sheet: Present position

Table A3-10Area of Residence at Time of Departure¹

Capital city area	5
Provincial city area	38
Outside country	<u>9</u>
Total	52

Table A3-11Occupation or Type of Employer at Time of Departure²

Government	52
------------	----

Table A3-12Total Time in Field of Specialization at Time of Departure³

10 years or more	11
5 to just under 10 years	13
Less than 5 years	<u>28</u>
Total	52

Table A3-13Number of People Supervised at Time of Departure⁴

None	16
1 - 19	11
20 - 499	14
500 or more	3
Not ascertained	<u>8</u>
Total	52

- 1/Q P-1: Area of residence at time of departure
2/Q P-2: Occupation or type of employer at time of departure
3/Q P-4: Total time in field of specialization at time of departure
4/Q P-6: Number of people supervised at time of departure

Table A3-14Age at Time of Departure for Training¹

<u>Age in years</u>		
	Under 25	-
	25 - 29	19
	30 - 34	18
	35 - 39	6
	40 - 44	5
	45 - 49	2
	50 and older	1
	Not ascertained	<u>1</u>
Total		52
	Median	32 years

Table A3-15Sex of Participant²

	Male	37
	Female	<u>15</u>
Total		52

Table A3-16Total Years of Education at Time of Departure³

<u>Total years of education</u>		
	Less than 13	4
	13 - 16	17
	17 or more	28
	Not ascertained	<u>3</u>
Total		52
	Median	17 years

1/Q P-7: Age at time of departure

2/Q P-8: Sex of participant

3/Q P-9: Total years of education at time of departure

Table A3-17Marital Status at Time of Departure¹

Married	36
Not married	<u>16</u>
Total	52

Table A3-18Attendance at University prior to ICA Training²

Attended university	45
Did not attend university	<u>7</u>
Total	52

Table A3-19Attendance at Special School³

Attended special school	10
Did not attend special school	<u>42</u>
Total	52

Table A3-20Type of Special School Attended⁴

Teacher training school	3
Agriculture school	2
Trade and technical schools	1
Nursing school	1
Secretarial school	1
Special language school	1
Not ascertained	<u>1</u>
Total	10*

- * Reported only for those who attended special school
- 1/Q P-10: Marital status at time of departure
- 2/Q P-13: Attendance at university prior to ICA training
- 3/Q P-11: Attendance at special school
- 4/Q P-12: Type of special school attended

Table A3-21Location of University Attended prior to ICA Training¹

University in Thailand	44
University outside Thailand	1
Did not attend university	<u>7</u>
Total	52

Table A3-22Location of University Attended prior to ICA Training²

Philippines	1*
-------------	----

Table A3-23Major Field of Study in University prior to ICA Training³

Agriculture	11
Arts	9
Education	5
Engineering	2
Fine Arts	1
Medicine, dentistry, public health	9
Law, commerce, political science	5
Science	3
Did not attend university	<u>7</u>
Total	52

Table A3-24University Degrees before ICA Training⁴

Received degree	40
Did not receive degree	5
Did not attend university	<u>7</u>
Total	52

* Reported only of one participant who attended university outside Thailand before ICA training program

- 1/Q P-14+15: Location of university attended prior to ICA training
 2/Q P-15: Location of university attended prior to ICA training
 3/Q P-16: Major field of study in university prior to ICA training
 4/Q P-17: University degrees before ICA training

Table A3-25Type of Degree at Time of Departure¹Type of degree obtained

Below bachelor	1
Bachelor	27
Law	3
Medical	8
Doctor of veterinary medicine	1
Did not attend university or attended university but did not receive degree	<u>12</u>
Total	52

Table A3-26

Name of Ministry Sponsoring Participant

Ministry of Education	26
Ministry of Public Health	12
Ministry of Agriculture	7
Ministry of Communications	3
Ministry of Interior	1
All other agencies not included above	<u>3</u>
Total	52

Table A3-27Method of Initiation of the Training Program²

Own application	4
Was selected or invited	<u>48</u>
Total	52

¹/Q P-18: Type of degree at time of departure

²/Q P-20: Try to think back in connection with the arrangements for going abroad for the ICA training program. Did you apply yourself or were you selected or were you invited to go?

Table A3-28Source of Knowledge about ICA Training Program¹

Supervisor	2
Colleague	1
USOM	1
Friend	<u>1</u>
Total	5*#

Table A3-29Selector of Participant²

Supervisor	46
USOM personnel	7
University	3
Ministry	1
Won scholarship	1
Other	<u>1</u>
Total	59#

Table A3-30Source of Information Received about Program³Participant stated that he:

<u>Received information</u>		30
From ministry only	18	
From employer only	11	
From both employer and ministry	1	
<u>Did not receive information</u>		<u>22</u>
Total		52

* Reported only for those who made application themselves

Total adds to more than the number of respondents because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-21: How did you learn of the training program project of ICA right from the beginning?

2/Q P-22: Who selected you?

3/Q P-23, 26: While your program was being arranged, was there someone in your office or at your educational institution who gave you some sort of information? Did the ministry which sponsored you give you any information about your program?

Table A3-31Source of Information at Place of Employment or School¹

<u>Source</u>	
Supervisor	16
ICA/USOM personnel	7
Colleague or friend	4
University official, advisor or professor	3
Former participant	2
Ministry or other government official	1
Other	<u>1</u>
Total	34*#

Table A3-32Kind of Information Received from Employer or School about Program²

<u>Kind of information received about program</u>	
Subject-matter aspects of training	18
Administrative aspects of program	12
Training program in general	10
Cultural, social, and economic life of country of training	10
Climate in the country of training	3
Administrative role of own government, financial contribution to be made etc.	<u>3</u>
Total	56*#

* Reported only for those who received information from employer or school

Total adds to more than 30 because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-24: Who gave you that information?

2/Q P-25: What did you learn about your program from this person?

Table A3-33Kind of Information Received from Ministry about Program¹Kind of information received about program

Subject-matter aspects of training	13
Administrative aspects of program	6
Training program in general	5
Cultural, social and economic life of country of training	3
Participant's post training job	1
Administrative role of own government, financial contribution to be made etc.	1
Not ascertained	<u>3</u>
Total	32* [#]

Table A3-34Pre-departure Work or Connection with USOM Project²

Participants were employed by USOM or on joint project		24
Full-time	21	
Part-time	2	
Occasionally	1	
Participants were not employed by USOM or on joint project		28
Had contact with USOM	5	
Did not have contact with USOM	22	
Not ascertained	1	<u> </u>
Total		52

* Reported only for those who received information from ministry
 # Total adds to more than 18 because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-27: What kind of information about your program did you receive from the ministry?

2/Q P-28+29+30: At the time when you were selected to go abroad, were you working with USOM or working on a joint project of USOM and the Thai Government?

Was it permanent, part time, or just occasionally?

Prior to your being selected to go, did you ever work in connection with any one of the USOM projects?

Table A3-35Satisfaction with Training Program at Time of Departure¹

Very satisfied with program	24
Not very well satisfied with program	13
Don't know or don't remember	<u>15</u>
Total	52

Table A3-36Participant's Participation in Program Planning²

Participated in program planning	19
Did not participate in program planning	32
Don't know or don't remember	<u>1</u>
Total	52

Table A3-37Extent of Participant's Participation in Program Planning³

Enough participation in program planning	16
Not enough participation in program planning	<u>3</u>
Total	19*

Table A3-38Major Author of Program⁴Major portion of program

My ideas	10
Ideas from both sides	<u>9</u>
Total	19*

- * Reported only for those who had opportunity to take part in their program planning
- 1/Q P-31: Prior to your departure for abroad, how satisfied were you with your program?
- 2/Q P-32: Did you have any share in the planning of your training program?
- 3/Q P-33: Did you have as much participation as you had wanted to?
- 4/Q P-34: Was the major portion of your program in accordance with your ideas or someone else's?

Table A3-39

Possibility of Program Improvement through Shared Planning
by Participant¹

<u>Shared planning would:</u>	
Have improved program	29
Not have improved program	2
Not have made any difference	<u>1</u>
Total	32*

Table A3-40

Importance of Selected Factors Affecting Decision to
Go on Training Program²

<u>Degree of importance</u>	<u>Factors affecting decision</u>				
	Personal ability (a)	The needs of the job (b)	Personal contacts (c)	Language ability (d)	Professional and educa- tional qua- lification (e)
Very important	46	49	9	43	45
Not very important	6	3	41	8	6
Don't know	-	-	2	1	1
Total	52	52	52	52	52

* Reported only for those who had did not participate in program planning

- 1/Q P-35: Were you to take part in some of the planning, would it have made your program better than what it was?
- 2/Q P-36: To what degree of importance would you say that the following have in connection with your being selected to go abroad for the training program?
- Your own ability
 - Job requirements
 - Your "arranging" contacts
 - Language proficiency
 - Your professional and educational qualifications

Table A3-41Adequacy of Pre-departure Information on Program¹

	Pre-departure information				
	Study details	Place of program	Date of departure	Length of program	Other aspects of program
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
Given enough information	19	32	45	48	21
Not given enough information	33	20	7	4	31
Total	52	52	52	52	52

Table A3-42Kind of Pre-departure Information Needed about Study Details²Kind of information needed

More about the subjects	15
More about training program in its entirety	11
More about university requirements	5
Other	1
Don't know or don't remember	8
Not ascertained	7
Total	47*#

* Reported only for those who did not receive enough information about study details

Total adds to more than 33 because some respondents gave more than one answer

- 1/Q P-37: Prior to your departure for abroad, did you receive sufficient information about the program that was arranged for you? Particularly in connection with:
- Details of study
 - Details of places to attend
 - Scheduled time for departure
 - Duration of program
 - Whether the other details about the program which were given to you prior to your departure were sufficient?
- 2/Q P-37a: If "No": what kind of information you thought useful should have been given but was not?

Table A3-43Kind of Pre-departure Information Needed about Place of Program¹Kind of information needed

Details about where would be going	7
Background information about the university	2
Other	1
Don't know or don't remember	7
Not ascertained	<u>5</u>
Total	22* 7

Table A3-44Kind of Pre-departure Information Needed about Date of Departure²Kind of information needed

Information not timely, received too late	2
Exact departure date	1
Not ascertained	<u>4</u>
Total	7**

Table A3-45Kind of Pre-departure Information Needed about Length of Program³Kind of information needed

Length of time to be spent in each place	2
Total length of program	1
Other	1
Not ascertained	<u>2</u>
Total	6*** 7

- * Reported only for those who did not receive enough information about place of program
- ** Reported only for those who did not receive enough information about date of departure
- *** Reported only for those who did not receive enough information the length of program
- ~~7~~ Total adds to more than the number of respondents because some respondents gave more than one answer
- 1/Q P-37b: If "No": what kind of information you though useful should have been given but was not?
- 2/Q P-37c: If "No": what kind of information you though useful should have been given but was not?
- 3/Q P-37d: If "No": what kind of information you though useful should have been given but was not?

Table A3-46Kind of Pre-departure Information Needed about Other Aspects of Program¹Kind of information needed

Information on subject-matter	8
More information in general	7
Administrative details	5
Manners and customs in country of training	3
Information was not timely, received too late	2
Don't know or don't remember	3
Not ascertained	<u>10</u>
Total	38*

Table A3-47Adequacy of Pre-departure Information on Program²Number of questions answered "Yes"

All five	10
Four	13
Three	12
Two	11
One	5
All five "No"	<u>1</u>
Total	52

* Reported only for those who did not receive enough information about other aspects of program

* Total adds to more than 31 because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-37e: If "No": what kind of information you thought useful should have been given but was not?

2/Q P-37: Prior to your departure for abroad, did you receive sufficient information about the program that was arranged for you? Particularly in connection with:

- a) Details of study
- b) Details of places to attend
- c) Scheduled time for departure
- d) Duration of program
- e) Whether the other details about the program which were given to you prior to your departure were sufficient?

Table A3-48

Country of Training¹

	<u>Primary country</u>	<u>Second country</u>	<u>Third country</u>
U.S.A.	47	-	-
France	-	4	-
Italy	-	-	4
Hongkong	-	1	-
China (Taiwan)	3	1	-
Japan	-	2	2
Philippines	2	2	1
Total	52	10	7

Table A3-49

Amount of Time Spent in Training¹

<u>Amount of time</u>	<u>Total time</u>	<u>Primary country</u>	<u>Second country</u>	<u>Third country</u>
Less than 1 month	1	1	5	2
1 to 6 months	6	6	4	4
6 months to 1 year	6	8	-	-
1 to 2 years	35	33	-	-
2 to 3 years	2	2	-	-
More than 3 years	2	2	-	-
Not ascertained	-	-	1	1
Total	52	52	10	7

1/Q P-38+39: In going abroad for your training program, did you go to one country or many for your study?

Please tell me the names of countries where you went to study or where you went for working experience in the order of attendance. Where did you receive your first training and how long did it take you?

Table A3-50

Adequacy of Pre-departure Information on How to Get Along
in Country of Training¹

	Type of pre-departure information				
	How to use restaurants and public facilities (a)	Colloquial speech and idiom (b)	Religious practices (c)	Use of money (d)	Customs and manners (e)
<u>Adequacy of information</u>					
Enough	39	41	30	37	41
Not enough	13	11	22	15	11
Total	52	52	52	52	52

Table A3-51

Kind of Pre-departure Information Needed about Restaurants
and Public Facilities²

Kind of information needed

Types of food available	1
Tipping	1
Etiquette	1
Other	2
Don't know	6
Not ascertained	4
Total	15*

* Reported only for those who did not receive enough information about restaurants and public facilities

* Total adds to more than 13 because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-40: Prior to your departure, -- apart from the information about the program --, did you have enough information regarding how to get along in (country of training)?

For instance:

- a) Information regarding behaviour (how to do) in restaurants and in public places
- b) Information regarding idioms and spoken language
- c) Information regarding the religious practices of the people in that country
- d) Information regarding the use of currency, how should it be used, and the prices of articles
- e) Information regarding manners and customs in general

2/Q P-40a: If "No": what types of information do you think would have been useful which were not previously received?

Table A3-52

Kind of Pre-departure Information Needed
about Colloquial Speech and Idioms¹

Kind of information needed

More about phrases, words, idioms commonly used in restaurants, etc.	2
More about phrases, words, idioms commonly used in traveling	2
More training in language	1
More information about the numbers and kinds of language actually used	1
Other	2
Don't know	4
Not ascertained	<u>1</u>
Total	13*#

Table A3-53

Kind of Pre-departure Information Needed
about Religious Practices in Country of Training²

Information needed about religious practices

Should have had more information about the number of kinds of religions	6
Should have had more information about how to behave	1
Other	2
Don't know or don't remember	12
Not ascertained	<u>1</u>
Total	22**

* Reported only for those who did not receive enough information about colloquial speech and idioms

** Reported only for those who did not receive enough information about religious practices of country of training prior to departure

Total adds to more than 11 because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-40b: If "No": what types of information do you think would have been useful which were not previously received?

2/Q P-40c: If "No": what types of information do you think would have been useful which were not previously received?

Table A3-54

Kind of Pre-departure Information Needed about the Use of
Money¹

<u>Kind of information needed</u>	
More information in general	4
Prices in general	3
Other	1
Don't know	6
Not ascertained	<u>1</u>
Total	15*

Table A3-55

Kind of Pre-departure Information Needed
about Manners and Customs²

<u>Kind of information needed</u>	
Etiquette in general	6
Behavior of people	2
What to do when participants are guests	2
Don't know or don't remember	<u>4</u>
Total	14**

* Reported only for those who did not receive enough information about the use of money

** Reported only for those who did not receive enough information about manners and customs

1/Q P-40d: If "No": what types of information do you think would have been useful which were not previously received?

2/Q P-40e: If "No": what types of information do you think would have been useful which were not previously received?

Table A3-56

Adequacy of Pre-departure Information on How to Get Along
in Country of Training¹

Number of questions answered "Yes"

All five	21
Four	15
Three	4
Two	4
One	3
All five "No"	<u>5</u>
Total	52

Table A3-57

Additional Information Desired before Departure²

Type of additional information wanted

Program		10
Content	6	
Scheduling	3	
Background information	1	
Customs and conditions		8
Transportation		6
Housing		1
Restaurants and food		1
Earlier information		1
Other comments		6
No additional information wanted		<u>28</u>
Total		61 [#]

[#] Total adds to more than 52 because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-40: Prior to your departure -- apart from the information about the program --, did you have enough information regarding how to get along in (country of training)?
For instance:

- a) Information regarding behaviour (how to do) in restaurants and in public places
- b) Information regarding idioms and spoken language
- c) Information regarding the religious practices of the people in that country
- d) Information regarding the use of currency, i.e. how should it be used, and the prices of articles
- e) Information regarding manners and customs in general

2/Q P-41: Are there still some other points on which you would have liked to be better informed and were not, prior to your departure? If so, what are they?

Table A3-58Orientation in Country of Training¹

Joined orientation sessions	40
Did not join orientation sessions	<u>12</u>
Total	52

Table A3-59Place of Orientation in Country of Training²

Washington International Center	27
School or university in U.S.A., n.e.s. ⁺⁺	5
American University	3
Outside U.S.A.	2
Department of government agency	2
Don't know or don't remember	<u>1</u>
Total	40*

Table A3-60Newsletters Received from Orientation Sessions³

Received newsletters	25
Did not receive newsletters	<u>13</u>
Total	38**

++ Not elsewhere specified

* Reported only for those who attended orientation in country of training

** Reported only for those who attended orientation in U.S.A.
1/Q P-42: When you arrived in (country of training) did you join in any general orientation sessions which took longer than one day?

2/QPP-43+44: What city was that?

What was the name of the location where the orientation sessions were arranged

3/Q P-45: Did you receive any newsletters?

Table A3-61Value of Orientation Sessions in U.S.A.¹Orientation sessions

Valuable	35
Prefer time on rest of program	<u>3</u>
Total	38*

Table A3-62Suggestions for Improvement of Orientation Sessions in U.S.A.²Suggestions for improvement

No improvement	14
The orientation should include more information about the country of training	4
The entire orientation should be longer	3
The orientation should include more social activities	2
There should be fewer lectures	2
Participants should be grouped by same background	1
I don't think the orientation was well organized	1
Should have been given more information about program	1
The lectures should be shorter	1
Other comments	10
Don't know or don't remember	3
Not ascertained	<u>2</u>
Total	44* 7

* Reported only for those who attended orientation sessions in U.S.A.

≠ Total adds to more than 38 because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-46: Do you think that the time spent in the orientation sessions was useful, or do you think it would have been better to spend it on other parts of the training program?

2/Q P-47: How do you think the orientation sessions could be improved in order to be more useful to those who will receive the grant in future?

Table A3-63

Extent of Program Arrangement after Arrival in Country
of Training¹

Arranged program:

In complete detail	33
In partial detail	15
Program not set up at all	<u>4</u>
Total	52

Table A3-64

Program Guidance on Arrival in Country of Training²

Met someone on arrival for program guidance	52
--	----

Table A3-65

Source of Program Guidance on Arrival in Country of Training³

Source of program guidance

<u>Project manager</u>	46
<u>Someone else</u>	5
ICA official or government official	2
University official	1
Director or coordinator of program	1
Some other person	1
<u>Not ascertained</u>	<u>1</u>
Total	52

- 1/Q P-48: When you arrived in (country of training) did they arrange the program for you in complete detail or just partly, or did they not prepare anything at all?
- 2/Q P-49: When you arrived, did you meet anyone there who waited to discuss your program?
- 3/Q P-50: Was he your program manager or program specialist, or someone else?

Table A3-66Amount of Attention or Guidance Received¹

Received enough attention	44
Did not receive enough attention	7
Don't know or don't remember	<u>1</u>
Total	52

Table A3-67Position of Guidance Officer²

<u>ICA</u>		25
<u>Other government agency, or university</u>		24
Department of Health	10	
Department of Agriculture	6	
Government agency, n.e.s. ++	1	
University where training was received	5	
Other University	2	
<u>Labor union</u>		1
Don't know or don't remember		<u>2</u>
Total		52

Table A3-68Number of Universities Attended in the Program³

One university	32
Two universities	5
Three universities	<u>1</u>
Total	38*

* Reported only for those who attended university on the program

++ Not elsewhere specified

1/Q P-51: Do you think that that person paid enough attention or gave sufficient recommendations to you during your training program?

2/Q P-52+53: Can you remember where he worked? Although ICA sponsored all programs, the program manager might not be working for ICA; some might be working for other governmental departments, some at a university, and some might be working in private firms. The person who arranged your program, where was he working?

What was the name of that place? (What department or division, what university, or what firm?)

3/Q P-57: Which universities did you attend? And how long did you spend at each place?

Table A3-69Length of Time Spent in University in the Program¹Length of time in university

Under 2 weeks	1
2 to 6 months	5
6 months to 1 year	15
1 to 2 years	15
3 years or more	<u>2</u>
Total	38*

Table A3-70Name of University Attended in the Program¹Name of university

Ball State Teachers College; Muncie	1
Eastern Michigan University; Ypsilanti	2
Indiana, University of; Bloomington	7
Kansas State Teachers College; Emporia	1
Kansas State University; Manhattan	2
Louisiana State University; Baton Rouge	2
Maryland, University of; Baltimore	1
Michigan, University of; Ann Arbor	4
Michigan, University of; Kalamazoo	1
Mississippi State University; State College	1
Ohio State University; Columbus	3
Oklahoma State University of Agriculture and Applied Science; Stillwater	1
Purdue University; Lafayette	1
Syracuse University; Syracuse	1
Wayne State University; Detroit	2
West Georgia College; Carrollton	1
Women's College of University of North Carolina; Greensboro	4
Not ascertained	<u>3</u>
Total	38*

* Reported only for those who attended university on the program
1/Q P-57: Which universities did you attend? And how long did
you spend at each place?

Table A3-71Opinion about Helpfulness of Degree¹

<u>Helpfulness of degree</u>	<u>Received degree</u>	<u>Did not receive degree</u>
Positive comments	34	6
To gain more knowledge	10	2
Leads to better job	8	1
Means more money	5	2
Means more prestige	5	1
Qualifies to teach others	5	-
Other	1	-
Qualified comments	1	-
Negative comments	1	2
Not ascertained	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>
Total	39*#	13*#

Table A3-72Opinion about the Length of Program²

Length of program was too short	32
Length of program was about right	<u>20</u>
Total	52

* Reported only for those who attended university on the program
 # Combined total adds to more than 38 because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-61+63: Why is that so? [A degree was (would have been) helpful]

2/Q P-64: Did you think that the length of your training program was too long, just right, or too short?

Table A3-73Type of Training Program¹Type of training

Observation tours	14
On-the-job training	8
Attendance at university	38
Special group not at university	<u>12</u>
Total	72 [#]

Table A3-74Length of Time on Each Type of Training Program¹

<u>Length of time on each type of training</u>	<u>Observation tours</u>	<u>On-the-job training</u>	<u>Attendance at a university</u>	<u>Special group not at university</u>
Less than 1 month	1	1	1	1
1 to 6 months	9	3	2	7
6 months to 1 year	3	4	16	3
One year or more	<u>1</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>1</u>
Total	14*	8*	38*	12*

* Reported only for those who had taken on each type which characterizes their training

Total adds to more than 52 because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-55a-d: Now I would like to ask about your training program. Usually there are many types of training program for those who went. Can you please tell me what type was your training program? There are the Observation Tours which normally take from 3 to 8 weeks, On-the-job-training where participants will have experience from working, Attendance at a University, and Program arranged specially for groups of participants not at a university and not Observation Tours.

How many weeks, or months (did you spend in each)?

Table A3-75

Type of University Attendance ¹	
Attended university as a regular student	26
Attended university as a special student	<u>13</u>
Total	39* [‡]

Table A3-76

Length of Time Spent in University ¹		
<u>Length of time in university</u>	<u>Regular student</u>	<u>Special student</u>
Less than 1 month	-	-
1 to 6 months	1	3
6 months to 1 year	9	7
1 to 2 years	11	3
2 to 3 years	3	-
3 years or more	<u>2</u>	<u>-</u>
Total	26* [‡]	13* [‡]

Table A3-77

Type of Degree or Diploma Received from Program ²		
<u>Type of degree or diploma received from program</u>		
<u>Degree</u>		28
Bachelor level	4	
Master level	24	
<u>Certificate</u>		1
<u>Did not receive degree or certificate</u>		<u>9</u>
Total		38*

* Reported only for those who attended university on the program

‡ Combined total adds to more than 38 because one respondent attended university both as a regular student and a special student

1/Q P-56: When you attended the university or school, did you enter as a regular student, a special student (observer, auditor or a special program) OR as a member or a group program?

If "Yes": spent how many weeks or how many months?

2/Q P-58+59: Did you receive a degree or a diploma?

What degree or diploma did you receive?

Table A3-78Amount of Usefulness of Degree for Future Work¹

<u>Amount of usefulness of degree</u>	<u>Received degree</u>	<u>Did not receive degree</u>
Very useful	25	4
Somewhat useful	2	3
Not at all useful	1	1
Not ascertained	-	2
Total	28*	10*

Table A3-79Opinion about Suitable Length of Program²

<u>Suitable length of program</u>	
2 to 4 months	1
6 months to 1 years	3
1 to 2 years	7
2 to 3 years	15
3 years or more	4
Don't know	2
Total	32**

Table A3-80Opinion about the Scope of Program³

<u>Scope of program</u>	
Too many things	6
Would have liked more	23
All right as it was	21
Don't know	1
Not ascertained	1
Total	52

* Reported only for those who attended university on the program

** Reported only for those who mentioned that the program was too short

1/Q P-60+62: Do you think that the degree or diploma which you received will be very useful for your work in future, or somewhat useful, or not at all useful?

Do you think that a degree or diploma will be very useful to your work, or somewhat useful, or not at all useful?

2/Q P-65: How long, do you think it would have been suitable?

3/Q P-66: Did you think that the items arranged to be done or to be seen for the training program were too many, or should have been more?

Table A3-81Attitude toward Level of Program¹The program was

Too easy	4
About right	44
Too difficult	<u>4</u>
Total	52

Table A3-82Pre-departure Information about Level of Program²

Informed about level of program	12
Not informed about level of program	<u>40</u>
Total	52

Table A3-83Desirability of prior Information about Level of Program³Prior information would have been

Useful	37
Not useful	2
Not ascertained	<u>1</u>
Total	40*

* Reported only for those who had not receive information about the level of program

1/Q P-67: How would you rate the program that was arranged for you?

2/Q P-68: Prior to your departure were you ever informed about the level of your program, if it were difficult or easy?

3/Q P-69: Do you think it would have been useful if you had been previously informed?

Table A3-84Changes in the Program¹

<u>No change</u>		45.
<u>Important changes made</u>		7
By request of participant	4	
Required by circumstances	1	
Not ascertained	2	
		<hr/>
Total		52

Table A3-85Nature of Changes of the Program²

<u>Nature of changes made</u>		
Changed the subjects studied		3
Changed location of training		2
Included more academic study		1
Changed program in general		1
		<hr/>
Total		7*

Table A3-86Necessity of Program Change³Participant believed change was necessary because:

It was more suitable to needs		3
A degree could be obtained		2
It was more interesting		1
Not ascertained		1
		<hr/>
Total		7*

* Reported only for those whose programs were changed

1/Q P-70+71: Did you follow the original program or did you make important changes after starting? This does not deal with changes in your traveling plan or stopovers while traveling, but changes in course of your study. What were the changes?

2/Q P-71: What were the changes?

3/Q P-72+73: Did you think that these changes were necessary? Why did you think so?

Table A3-87Completion of Program¹

Completed program		46
Did not complete program		6
Program arrangement	5	
Personal reasons	1	
Total		<u>52</u>

Table A3-88Comments on Most Useful and Valuable Experience
in Country of Training²Type of comments

Program-related comments		31
Specific subjects studied	24	
Observation tour	3	
On-the-job training	2	
Meeting and working with profession counterparts	1	
Other	1	
People and customs		11
Greater knowledge of way of life	6	
Characteristics of people	4	
Meeting participants	1	
Conditions seen (organized office)		5
General comments (everything useful)		3
Learning more English		<u>2</u>
Total		52

1/Q P-74+75: Did you complete your training program or did you return prior to completion?

Why was that so?

2/Q P-76: While you were in (country of training) what was the experience you had which was the most useful and the most valuable?

Table A3-89Comments on Least Useful Experience in Country of Training¹

<u>Type of comments</u>	
<u>Positive comments</u> (nothing not useful)	37
<u>Negative, program-related comments</u>	7
University attended	2
The entire program was not useful	1
Visits to specific places	1
On-the-job training	1
Study of English	1
Other	1
<u>Non-program-related comments</u>	2
<u>Don't know</u>	1
<u>Not ascertained</u>	5
Total	52

Table A3-90Reasons for Considering Experience as Least Useful¹

<u>Reasons for least useful experience</u>	
Conditions studied or seen too advanced	3
Program not related to needs	2
Program too elementary	1
Program poorly planned or not well organized	1
Don't know	1
Not ascertained	7
Total	15*

Table A3-91Opinion about Amount of Money Supplied by ICA²

<u>Amount of money was:</u>	
Too little	10
About right	42
Total	52

* Reported only for those who mentioned the least useful part of their experience

1/Q P-77: And what was the least useful, according to your experience?

2/Q P-78: What is your opinion about the money allotted to you by ICA for living cost and travel during your training program? Can you say that it was too little, just right, or more than needed?

Table A3-92

Reasons for Amount of Money Being Too Small ¹	
Cost of living was too high	5
The hotel and/or travel expenses were too high	2
I had extra expenses due to the nature of training	1
General statements	<u>2</u>
Total	10*

Table A3-93

Time for Personal Interests During Program ²	
<u>Time for personal interests was:</u>	
Too much	1
Enough	32
Too little	<u>19</u>
Total	52

Table A3-94

Invitation to Private Homes ¹	
Invited to private homes	49
Not invited to private homes	<u>3</u>
Total	52

* Reported only for those who said too little money was supplied by ICA

1/Q P-79: Why do you think so?

2/Q P-80: According to the program arranged, do you think that the spare time for your personal interest was too much, sufficient, or too little?

3/Q P-81: Were you ever invited to private homes during your program?

Table A3-95Opinion about Visits to Private Homes¹

Liked visits to private homes very much	38
Rather liked the visit to private homes	<u>11</u>
Total	49*

Table A3-96Reasons for Opinion on Private Home Visits²Reasons for opinion given on private home visits

The home visits gave me a chance to observe and learn about the country of training	31
I liked the hospitality and welcome received	12
I liked the atmosphere of the home visit	10
The people were interested in my country and culture	6
The home visits gave me the opportunity to make friends	3
The home visits provided an opportunity to exchange ideas	3
I got experience in the language of the country of training	1
General positive comments	1
Qualified comments	1
Not ascertained	<u>1</u>
Total	69*

Table A3-97Opinion about Other Social Activities³Other social activities were:

Too many	4
About enough	38
Not enough	<u>10</u>
Total	52

* Reported only for those who were entertained in private home
 † Total adds to more than 49 because some respondents gave more than one answer

- 1/Q P-82: How did you feel about visiting these homes? Did you like it very much, did you rather like it, or did you not like it?
 2/Q P-83: Why did you feel so (about visiting private homes)?
 3/Q P-84: Now speaking about other social activities, did you think that there were too many or too few of these which were arranged for you?

Table A3-98Suggested Types of Social Activities Which Should Be Less¹

I would have liked fewer social and recreational activities	2
Other activities	1
Not ascertained	<u>1</u>
Total	4*

Table A3-99Suggested Types of Social Activities Which Should Be More²Participant would have liked more:

Meeting with professional colleagues	5
Cultural activities	3
Social and recreational activities	2
Travels	1
Meetings between groups from different countries	1
Free time	1
Don't know or don't remember	<u>1</u>
Total	14**≠

Table A3-100Attendance at Seminar in Communications³

Attended seminar	10
Did not attend seminar	41
Don't know	<u>1</u>
Total	52

- * Reported only for those who mentioned that there were too many social activities
- ** Reported only for those who mentioned that there were not enough social activities
- ≠ Total adds to more than 10 because some respondents gave more than one answer
- 1/Q P-85: What kinds of activities do you think should have been less?
- 2/Q P-86: What activities do you think should have been more?
- 3/Q P-87: At the end of your program, did you ever attend the seminar in communications?

Table A3-101Most Liked Values of Seminar in Communications¹

I liked learning how to communicate with other people	3
The most valuable things in the seminar were ideas and suggestion for adapting what had been learned for own country	2
Non specific	2
I liked the exchange of ideas with people from other country	1
I liked teachers of the seminar	1
I liked nothing	1
Other opinions	1
Not ascertained	1
	<hr/>
Total	12* #

Table A3-102Things Least Liked about Seminar in Communication²

Nothing, I liked everything	5
I liked nothing	1
Other opinion	1
Not ascertained	3
	<hr/>
Total	10*

Table A3-103Place Where Seminar Was Held³

Michigan State University	3
Department of Agriculture	3
Other	4
	<hr/>
Total	10*

* Reported only for those who attended the seminar in communications
Total adds to more than 10 because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-89: What did you like most about the seminar?

2/Q P-90: What did you like least about that seminar?

3/Q P-91: Who arranged that seminar?

Table A3-104Use of Seminar Materials in Participants' Work¹

Used seminar materials	10*
------------------------	-----

Table A3-105Usefulness of Seminar Materials²Usefulness of materials or ideas

The ideas helped in dealing with people	2
The principles were used in teaching others	2
The idea was used in suggesting changes	1
Non-specific responses	3
Other	<u>4</u>
Total	12**

Table A3-106English Language Requirement of the Program³

Program required English	47
Program did not require English	<u>5</u>
Total	52

* Reported only for those who attended the seminar in communications

** Reported only for those who used materials or ideas from the seminar in their work

† Total adds to more than 10 because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-92: Did you use in your work some of the things or ideas obtained from the seminar?

2/Q P-93: What did you use and how?

3/Q P-95: Now I would like to know some things about English language training. Did your program require knowledge in English language?

Table A3-107Additional English Instruction on Arrival in Country of Training¹

Took additional or extra lessons	26
Did not take additional or extra lessons	20
Not ascertained	<u>1</u>
Total	47*

Table A3-108Adequacy of Additional English Instruction Taken²

More instruction would have been useful	24
More instruction would not have been useful	<u>2</u>
Total	26**

Table A3-109Desirability of Additional English Instruction In
Country of Training³

Additional instruction would have been useful	14
Additional instruction would not have been useful	<u>6</u>
Total	20***

* Reported only for those whose program required English language

** Reported only for those who received additional English instruction

*** Reported only for those who did not receive additional English instruction

1/Q P-96: After your arrival and before commencing your program, did you take any additional or extra lessons in English to prepare yourself?

2/Q P-97: Do you think that more additional or extra lessons in English would be useful to you during the program?

3/Q P-98: Do you think that if you had had some English lessons, they would have been useful during your program?

Table A3-110Type of English Language Difficulty¹

No difficulty	10
Difficulty in being understood	8
Difficulty in understanding others	5
Both	23
Not ascertained	<u>1</u>
Total	47*

Table A3-111Length of Time since Participants' Return²Length of time since return

Six months to one year	3
One to two years	10
Two to three years	10
Three to four years	5
Four to five years	8
Five to six years	5
Six to seven years	5
Seven years or more	<u>6</u>
Total	52

Table A3-112Job Changes between Departure and Return³

Same job	35
Different jobs	<u>17</u>
Total	52

- * Reported only for those whose program required English language
- 1/Q P-99: If you had had difficulties with your English during the program, was it more so in making yourself understood, or was it to understand other people, or both?
- 2/Q P-100: How long has it been since you returned?
- 3/Q P-108: Talking about the first job you had after you return from the Training Program, was it the same as one you had prior to your departure?

Table A3-113Job Expectancy on Return¹

Returned to expected job	11
Returned to job not expected	5
Don't know or don't remember	<u>1</u>
Total	17*

Table A3-114Difference between Position at Departure
and
First Position after Return from Training²Type of difference

I got better job: more salary, more responsibility, more important work, more prestige or status	1
I changed from one part of the government to another part	1
Other difference not included in the above categories	<u>3</u>
Total	5**

Table A3-115Number of People Supervised on First Job on Return³

None	5
1 - 19	6
20 - 999	4
1000 or more	1
Not ascertained	<u>1</u>
Total	17*

* Reported only for those whose first job after return was different from the job at departure

** Reported only for those whose job was different and who did not expect it at departure

1/Q P-109: Was this the job you expected to have when you returned?

2/Q P-110: What was the difference between this job and the one you had previously?

3/Q P-111: How many people did you supervise in that job?

Table A3-116Employment Status at Time of Interview¹

Employed	52
----------	----

Table A3-117Job Changes between Return and Time of Interview²

Same job	31
Different jobs	<u>21</u>
Total	52

Table A3-118Difference between Participant's Present Position
and
the Position to Which He First Returned³

My present job is better than the first job after return; more salary, more responsibility, more important work, more prestige or status	15
I changed from one part of the government to another part	3
I changed to a different job in the same general field	1
My present job is not in the field I was trained in	1
I changed from a government position to private business, industry, or professional practice	<u>1</u>
Total	21*

* Reported only for those whose present position is different from the first one after return

1/Q P-113: Are you working at present?

2/Q P-114: Is your present position the same as that when you first returned?

3/Q P-115: What is the difference between your present position and one you had when you first returned?

Table A3-119Number of People Supervised on Present Job¹

None	4
1 - 19	6
20 - 499	10
500 or more	<u>1</u>
Total	21*

Table A3-120Type of Present Employment²

Government	20
Private business	<u>1</u>
Total	21**

Table A3-121Kind of Position Expected without ICA Training³Position without training

About the same	8
Better	5
Not as good	34
Don't know	<u>5</u>
Total	52

* Reported only for those whose present position is different from the first one after return

** Reported only for those whose first job after return was different from the job at departure

1/Q P-116: How many people do you supervise on this job?

2/Q P-117: What type of job is it?

3/Q P-118: Supposing you had not gone for the training program, do you think you would be working in the same position as you have now, or in a better one, or not as good?

Table A3-122

Using Skills or Knowledge from ICA Training Program
in Current Job¹

<u>Amount of training-acquired knowledge used in job</u>	
Practically none	3
A little	4
Some	11
Quite a lot	23
Nearly all or all	<u>11</u>
Total	52

Table A3-123

Helpfulness of Supervisor in Utilizing Training²

<u>Supervisor's helpfulness in utilizing training</u>	
Very helpful	24
Somewhat helpful	22
Not helpful	5
Indifferent, not over interested	<u>1</u>
Total	52

- 1/Q P-119+120: Now talking about knowledge and other things acquired from the training program. There are many participants who had said that not much of what they had learned had been applied to his work. How about you yourself? Could you use some of what you have learned from the program in the work that you do at present? Could you say about how much is used?
- 2/Q P-121: Now, talking about the supervisor of your present job. How much does he help you to apply the knowledge acquired usefully? Can you say that he helps you considerably, some, or does not help at all?

Table A3-124Whether Participant's Colleagues Had Gone Abroad¹

Supervisor trained abroad	28
Other colleagues trained abroad	13
No colleague trained abroad	<u>11</u>
Total	52

Table A3-125Conveying of ICA Training Program to Other People²Amount of conveyance of training to others

Practically none	1
A little	2
Some	11
A lot	32
Almost all, or all	<u>6</u>
Total	52

Table A3-126Number of Ways Used for Transmitting Knowledge Gained
from Program³Number of ways used in transmission

One	18
Two	16
Three	15
Four	<u>2</u>
Total	51*

* Reported only for those who had transmitted training-acquired knowledge to other people

1/Q P-122+123: Is there anyone working with you who had been abroad?
Is he your supervisor?

2/Q P-124+125: Talking about passing on what you have learned from
abroad to others, have you ever passed on anything of
what you have learned to others?
How much have you passed on to others the knowledge
obtained?

3/Q P-126: By what means have you done this?

Table A3-127Means of Transmitting Knowledge Gained from Program¹Means of transmission

Formal training program	42
Informal discussion	35
Writing articles	22
On-the-job teaching	3
Other	<u>1</u>
Total	103*#

Table A3-128Plans for Future Use of Training²

Have plans for future use	35
Have no plans for future use	<u>17</u>
Total	52

Table A3-129

Total Utilization Score

90 or higher	7
74-89	34
Under 74	<u>11</u>
Total	52

* Reported only for those who had transmitted training-acquired knowledge to other people

Total adds to more than 51 because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-126: By what means have you done this?

2/Q P-127: Have you any plans to make your knowledge from the program useful but have not had the opportunity to do so?

Table A3-130Kinds of Plan for Future Use of Training¹

<u>Definite plans</u>	39
To change procedures, reorganize an organization or section of an organization, introduce new procedures, change curriculum, change or recommend changes in laws	10
To institute a new organization or service	7
To teach others, lecture, demonstrate	5
To write a book, manual, article, pamphlet, report	4
To conduct research or survey or census	4
To introduce, purchase, or install new equipment	2
To construct something:- dam, bridge, building, irrigation system, etc.	2
Other definite plans	5
<u>Plans to be carried out if certain conditions are met</u> (if money and equipment are available)	3
<u>Not ascertained</u>	<u>1</u>
Total	43* 4

Table A3-131

Participant's Contact with USOM since Return

Contacted USOM since return	28
Had not contacted USOM since return	<u>24</u>
Total	52

* Reported only for those who have plans for future use of training

~~4~~ Total adds to more than 35 because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-128: Can you tell me something about those plan?

2/Q P-129: Since your return, have you made any contact with USOM?

Table A3-132Participants Claiming Project-connected Employment¹

Project-connected employment	15
Non-project-connected employment	<u>13</u>
Total	28*

Table A3-133Availability of USOM Technician to Participant²

USOM technician available	28
No USOM technician available	23
Don't know	<u>1</u>
Total	52

Table A3-134Frequency of Contact with USOM Technicians³

Frequent contacts with technician	12
Occasional contacts with technician	15
Never met technician	<u>1</u>
Total	28**

* Reported only for those who said they had contact with USOM

** Reported only for those who have USOM technicians available

1/Q P-130: Since your return, have you ever worked in USOM or on a joint project of USOM and the (Thai) government?

2/Q P-131: Is there a USOM technician who is there to give you recommendation and advice?

3/Q P-132: Do you always keep in touch with him, or occasionally, or you never see him at all?

Table A3-135Help Requested from USOM¹

Requested help from USOM	17
Did not request help from USOM	<u>35</u>
Total	52

Table A3-136Kinds Help Requested from USOM²

<u>Kinds of request</u>	<u>First mentioned</u>	<u>Second mentioned</u>	<u>Third mentioned</u>
Requested equipment, material	8	5	1
Technical advice	4	2	2
Assistance from USOM in training staff	1	3	2
Financial assistance	1	1	-
Printed material	1	-	-
Requested additional training program	1	-	-
Other	1	-	-
Total	17*	11*	5*

Table A3-137Help Received from USOM²

	<u>First mentioned</u>	<u>Second mentioned</u>	<u>Third mentioned</u>
Help received	13	5	3
Help partially received	1	-	1
Help not received	2	5	1
Not ascertained	1	1	-
Total	17*	11*	5*

- * Reported only for those who requested help from USOM
- 1/Q P- 133: Since your return, have you ever requested any assistance from USOM or ICA?
- 2/Q P- 134: What sort of assistance did you ask for?
(Can you tell me some of it?)

Table A3-138Membership in U.S. Professional Societies¹

Joined U.S. society	22
Did not join U.S. society	<u>30</u>
Total	52

Table A3-139Current Membership in a U.S. Professional Society²

Now a member	16
Not a member	34
Not ascertained	<u>2</u>
Total	52

Table A3-140Receipt of U.S. Professional Publications³

Receive publications	26
Do not receive publications	25
Not ascertained	<u>1</u>
Total	52

Table A3-141Usefulness of Professional Publications⁴Usefulness of publications

Very useful	20
Somewhat useful	4
Only a little useful	<u>2</u>
Total	26

- * Reported only for those who receive U.S. professional publications
- 1/Q P-135: Have you ever joined any U.S. professional society during or after your training program?
- 2/Q P-136: Are you currently a member of any U.S. professional society?
- 3/Q P-137: Do you receive some U.S. professional publications?
- 4/Q P-138: How useful are these publications to you?

Table A3-142How Program Could Have Been Improved¹

<u>Type of change recommended</u>		
<u>Change in Program Arrangement</u>		45
More information in advance	12	
More emphasis on the language	9	
Participant's participation in planning	8	
Better planning, more guidance	7	
More planning for utilization	3	
Training in different place	3	
Members of study groups should have the same background	2	
More help on living expenses	1	
<u>Change in Emphasis of Training Program</u>		32
Longer, or more general training	18	
Program more specifically related to job, personal, or country needs	7	
More specialized or concentrated program	5	
More leisurely, more free time	2	
<u>Change in Type of Training Program</u>		25
More observation	11	
More practical work	8	
Would have liked a degree	3	
Less academic training	3	
<u>No changes</u>		5
<u>Other negative comments</u>		2
<u>Not ascertained</u>		<u>1</u>
Total		110 [‡]

[‡] Total adds to more than 52 because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-139+140+141: Now supposing you were to begin your program all over again, what in general do you think must be corrected in order that the program would be much more useful to you?
Why do you think that it has to be corrected so?
Have you additional comments or suggestions to make in connection with your program?

Table A3-143

Major Difficulties Encountered in Using or Transmitting
Training-acquired Skills and Knowledge¹

<u>Positive Comment</u>		9
No difficulties	9	
<u>Difficulties Related to Resources or Conditions of Country</u>		29
Lack of equipment, machinery, facilities, material, books	16	
Lack of money	9	
Government and general organization of the country are not amendable to application of things learned on training program	3	
Lack of transportation	1	
<u>Difficulties Related to Other People</u>		20
Lack of trained staff	6	
Government, ministers, heads of department, "bosses" do not want to accept new ideas, do not cooperate	5	
Lack of educational preparation among people with whom I would deal or work	4	
Colleagues, employees, the general public do not want to accept new ideas	3	
Lack of help from supervisor; supervisor does not know enough; misunderstanding on the part of supervisor	2	
<u>Difficulties Related to Participant's Job</u>		8
I lack the time to use or teach what I learned	4	
The job I am in is not related to the field I was trained in; am in a job different from the one I was trained for	2	
I am not in a position of sufficient authority to apply or teach what I learned	2	
<u>Difficulties Related to the Training Program</u>		1
<u>All other difficulties not included in the above categories</u>		4
Total		71 [‡]

[‡] Total adds to more than 52 because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-142: Generally speaking, what do you think are the main obstructions in using or in passing on to other people the knowledge obtained from the training program?

Table A3-144

First Dimension for Outstanding Activities
Degree of Initiative Displayed¹

	<u>First activity</u>	<u>Second activity</u>
The participant stated or implied that the planning, organizing, operations, changes, etc., which characterize the activity reported <u>were initiated by himself</u>	6	3
The participant stated or implied that the planning, organizing, operations, etc., which characterize the activity reported were <u>initiated by others, or jointly by the participant and others, or he functioned as a consultant or advisor to the initiating individual or group</u>	15	6
The information given concerning the reported activity did not permit a determination of the degree of the initiative displayed by the participant	<u>10</u>	<u>8</u>
Total	31*	17*

* Reported only for those who mentioned having accomplished outstanding activities

1/Q P-143: After your return from the training program, do you think you have ever done one or two pieces of work which were notably outstanding?

Table A3-145

Second Dimension for Outstanding Activities
Nature of Activity¹

	<u>First activity</u>	<u>Second activity</u>
Changed or improved procedures, reorganized an organization, introduced new procedures, changed curriculum, changed or recommended changes in laws	10	6
Taught others, lectured, demonstrated	5	2
Instituted a new organization or service or school curriculum	4	1
Made formal plans for future development (presumably the plans had not been put into effect at the time of interview, but would be in the future)	4	2
Performed regular occupation, farming, practiced medicine, performed occupation in a superior way, took on additional responsibi- lities, etc.	4	1
Conducted research, survey, or census	1	-
Wrote a book, manual, article, pamphlet, report	1	1
Introduced, purchased, or installed new equipment	1	1
All other types of activity not included in the above categories	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
Total	31*	17*

* Reported only for those who mentioned having accomplished outstanding activities

1/Q P-143: After your return from the training program, do you think you have over done one or two pieces of work which were notably outstanding?

Table A3-146

Third Dimension for Outstanding Activities
Field of Economic Endeavor¹

	<u>First activity</u>	<u>Second activity</u>
Education	16	9
Health and sanitation	6	3
Agriculture and natural resources, including any branch of agriculture, land and water resources, agricul- tural extension, home economics, rural youth, forestry, and fisheries	4	2
Community development, social welfare, and housing	2	-
Industry and mining, including any phase of industry, power, communica- tions engineering, construction, and marketing	1	1
Transportation, including highways, railways, ship operations, air transport, ports, harbors, waterways, and urban transit	1	1
Labor	1	-
All other fields, including mass communi- cations, atomic energy, and others	<u>-</u>	<u>1</u>
Total	31*	17*

* Reported only for those who mentioned having accomplished outstanding activities

1/Q P-143: After your return from the training program, do you think you have ever done one or two pieces of work which were notably outstanding?

Table A3-147

Fourth Dimension of Outstanding Activities
Use of Training¹

	<u>First activity</u>	<u>Second activity</u>
Training used	31	15
Training not used	-	1
Not ascertained	<u>-</u>	<u>1</u>
Total	31*	17*

Table A3-148

Satisfaction with Program²

Satisfaction with program

Very satisfied	26
Moderately satisfied	21
Not too satisfied	<u>5</u>
Total	52

Table A3-149

Opinion about Program³

Program was:

The most important thing	42
A waste of time	1
Somewhere in between	<u>9</u>
Total	52

* Reported only for those who mentioned having accomplished outstanding activities

1/Q P-143: After your return from the training program, do you think you have ever done one or two pieces of work which were notably outstanding?

2/Q P-144: In general, how satisfied were you with the training program?

3/Q P-145: Some of those who received the scholarship and have returned have the idea that the training program was the most important thing they had done; some think that it was a pure waste of time; and some compromisingly say that it was somewhere in between. What is your opinion about it?

Table A3-150

Reasons for Importance of Program¹Importance of Program

<u>Specific, Impersonal Gain</u>		22
I am able to work more effectively in my field, make greater contribution by applying and transmitting the acquired knowledge, ideas, etc.	14	
I acquired knowledge and ideas and observed systems, methods which were new and applicable in solving problems in my country	8	
<u>Non-specific, Personal Gain</u>		23
It was educational; gave me experience	14	
Training gave me broader insight; now I see matters from different angle	9	
<u>Non-specific, Impersonal Gain</u>		14
It gave me a chance to know a country with highly developed technology and her people, developed mutual understanding, international viewpoint	7	
It was useful to my employer or country	4	
It gave me a chance to compare home situations with the situations abroad	3	
<u>Specific, Personal Gain</u>		10
I improved my position; have a better job; it gave me chance for advancement, increased prestige, status, etc.	6	
It gave me self-confidence, courage, confirmed my convictions, etc.	4	
Total		69*#

Table A3-151

Reason for Negative Comment on Program¹

Training was at too low a level 1**

- * Reported only for those who mentioned the program was important
 - ** Reported only for one participant who said that the program was a waste of time
 - # Total adds to more than 42 because some respondents gave more than one answer
- 1/Q P-146: Why do you feel like that?

Table A3-152Orientation Classes at Home Country prior to Departure¹

Joined orientation classes	41
Did not join orientation classes	<u>11</u>
Total	52

Table A3-153Participant's Suggestions for Improvement
of AUA Orientation Program²

<u>Suggestions for improvement of orientation program</u>		-
No improvement needed		6
Needed improvements		31
More practice in English	10	
More information about American life	4	
More social activities	4	
Less informal	2	
More information about living arrangement	2	
Better organized	1	
Should be longer	1	
Less formal	1	
English lecturers should speak more slowly	1	
Should be conducted by Thai people	1	
Should improve examination procedure	1	
Other	3	
Don't know		3
Not ascertained		<u>4</u>
Total		44*#

* Reported only for those who attended AUA orientation program
Total adds more than 41 because some respondents gave more than one answer

- 1/Q P-147: Did you join the orientation classes at AUA Language Center prior to your trip abroad?
(Question added by USOM Thailand)
- 2/Q P-148: Do you think that the AUA orientation program could be improved -- from your experience on your last trip abroad -- to be more useful to you? How?
(Question added by USOM Thailand)

Table A3-154Need for Additional English Instruction in Country of Training¹

Needed additional instructions	40
Did not need additional instructions	<u>12</u>
Total	52

Table A3-155Place of Additional English Instruction in Country of Training²

American University, Michigan University, or other U.S. Government-connected specialized language school	17
Classes in university	10
Private tutoring	1
Other places	2
Had no lessons	9
Not ascertained	<u>1</u>
Total	40*

Table A3-156Membership in Professional Society of Countries Other than USA³

Member of professional society		11
In Thailand	10	
Country other than Thailand our USA	1	
Not a member of any professional society		<u>41</u>
Total		52

- * Reported only for those who felt the necessity to improve English by additional instruction in the country of training
- 1/Q P-149: When you arrived in the foreign country, did you feel the necessity to improve your English by additional instructions? (Question added by USOM Thailand)
- 2/Q P-150: Where did you have these lessons? (Question added by USOM Thailand)
- 3/Q P-151+152: I have asked you once before about being a member of a U.S. professional society; now I'd like to ask you if you are a member of a professional society of any country?
What country?
(Questions added by USOM Thailand)

Table A3-157Receipt of Professional Journals from Other Countries¹

Receiving journals	15
Not receiving journals	32
Not ascertained	<u>5</u>
Total	52

Table A3-158Frequency of Meeting with Local People in Country of Training²Frequency of meeting with local people

Three times a week or more	36
Once or twice a week	5
Once or three times a month	5
Once in a while	5
Not ascertained	<u>1</u>
Total	52

Table A3-159Request for Extension³

Requested an extension	14	
Did not request an extension	37	
Not ascertained	<u>1</u>	
Total	Total	52

1/Q P-153: Are you still receiving professional journals from other countries (excluding US)?
(Question added by USOM Thailand)

2/Q P-154: In the country you spent the longest time, how often did you meet with the local people? (Whether in their homes or yours, or at social gatherings). Can you roughly say, about 3 times a week or more often, once or twice a week, once or three times a month, or once in a while?

Three times a week or more often

Once or twice week

Once to three times a month

Once in a while

(Question added by USOM Thailand)

Table A3-160Participants Receiving Extension¹

Received extension	6
Did not receive extension	36
Not ascertained	<u>1</u>
Total	43*

Table A3-161Difficulties in Thai-American Understanding²

<u>No difficulty</u>		12
<u>Difficulties connected with differences in the two cultures</u>		16
The cultures (traditions, ways of behaving) are different	12	
Thais do not understand American culture and traditions	2	
Americans do not make friends as easily as Thais	1	
The values of the two cultures are different: different aspirations, goals, belief in what is important	1	
<u>Language difficulties</u>		10
Language difficulties	9	
Thais have difficulty in understanding "American" English	1	
<u>Difficulties connected with living conditions</u>		5
Difficulty with food	2	
Difficulty with transportation	2	
General and non-specific comments about differences in living conditions	1	
<u>Difficulties because of personal attitudes of Americans</u>		4
Americans "look down" on foreigners	4	
<u>Difficulties connected with differences in social customs; social life</u>		2
<u>Difficulties connected with differences in educational level</u>		1
<u>Other difficulties</u>		3
<u>Not ascertained</u>		<u>6</u>
Total		59 [#]

* Due to misunderstanding of field techniques, this question was not asked of 9 participants

Total adds to more than 52 because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q P-156: Did you get an extension? (Question added by USOM Thailand)

2/Q P-157: Do you think there may be some things which your Thai friends would find very difficult to understand in connection with the U.S. or Americans? (Question added by USOM Thailand)

Table A3-162Supervisor's Name Given by Participant¹

Supervisor's name was given	52
-----------------------------	----

Table A3-163

Supervisor Questionnaires Completed

Supervisor questionnaires completed	46
Supervisor questionnaires not completed	<u>6</u>
Total	52

Table A3-164Work Relation of Supervisor to Participant
at Time of Departure²

Participant worked for present supervisor	16
Participant did not work for present supervisor	14
Interviewed supervisor was not in that department at participant's departure	<u>16</u>
Total	46*

Table A3-165Proportion of Supervisors Encouraging Participant's Selection³Supervisor:

Encouraged participant's selection	14
Did not encourage participant's selection	<u>2</u>
Total	16**

* Reported only for those whose supervisors were interviewed

** Reported only for supervisors who were working with participants at time of departure

1/Q P-last page

2/Q S1-1: When (participant) was leaving to go abroad, was he working for you here?

3/Q S1-2: Did you encourage his (participant's) being given the scholarship?

Table A3-166Supervisor's Familiarity with Participant's Program¹

Familiar with program	4
Not familiar with program	<u>26</u>
Total	30*

Table A3-167Initiator of Training Program²Initiated by:

Someone in the organization	10
USOM	7
Participant	1
Ministry	<u>2</u>
Total	20**

Table A3-168Supervisor's Participation in Program Planning³Supervisor:

Participated in program planning	8
Did not participate in program planning	<u>12</u>
Total	20**

* Reported only for supervisors who were not working with participants at time of departure

** Reported only for supervisors who were working with participants or who were familiar with participant's program at time of selection

1/Q S1-3: Prior to (participant's) departure, did you know something about his training program?

2/Q S1-4: Who originated (participant's) training program; was it he himself or someone in here or someone in another office?

3/Q S1-5: Did you help to prepare (participant's) program?

Table A3-169Kind of Participation in Planning by Supervisor¹Kind of help given by supervisor in preparing program

Suggested subject	5
Suggested country	1
Other	<u>3</u>
Total	9*#

Table A3-170Employer's Pre-departure Potential for Utilization of Training²

Had a project which could utilize training	19
Don't know or don't remember	<u>1</u>
Total	20**

Table A3-171Discussions with Participants about Things Learned³Supervisor:

Discussed about things learned	38
Did not discuss about things learned	<u>8</u>
Total	46***

- * Reported only for supervisors who participated in program planning
- ** Reported only for supervisors who were working with participants or who were familiar with participants program at time of departure
- *** Reported only for those whose supervisors were interviewed
- 1/Q S1-6: What were the things you helped to prepare?
- 2/Q S1-7: Prior to (participant's) going abroad, did this office have any project which could utilize his training?
- 3/Q S1-8: Since (participant's) return did you ever ask him about the things he had learned?

Table A3-172

Supervisor's Discussion with Participants
about Non-program Experience¹

Supervisor:

Discussed non-program experience	34
Did not discuss non-program experience	11
Don't know or don't remember	1
Total	46*

Table A3-173

Length of Time Supervisor Has Known Participant²

Length of time supervisor has known participant

Less than one year	4
One to five years	18
Six to ten years	10
Eleven to twenty years	8
More than twenty years	5
Don't remember	1
Total	46*

Table A3-174

Amount of Time Spent Per Week by Supervisor with Participant
with Participant Per Week³

Amount of time per week with participant

16 hours or more	13
8 - 15 hours	6
4 - 7 hours	13
Less than 4 hours	14
Total	46*

- * Reported only for those whose supervisors were interviewed
- 1/Q S1-9: And have you ever talked with him about other things he had acquired -- not connected with his study or training? For example, things about social, experience of strange customs and traditions, or about the people of that country?
- 2/Q S1-10: How long have you known (participant)?
- 3/Q S1-11: About how many hours per week do you meet or talk with (participant)?

Table A3-175

Participant's Transmission of Knowledge Gained on ICA Program:
Supervisor's Report¹

Participant

Transmitted knowledge	43
Don't know	<u>3</u>
Total	46*

Table A3-176

Means of Transmitting Knowledge Gained on ICA Program to Other Peop
Supervisor's Report²

Means of transmission

Formal teaching, lectures, seminars, training sessions; radio or television broadcasts; made or showed films or slides	38
Supervision, guidance, or direction of other workers, subordinates, employees	1
Wrote articles, books, manuals, other publications; translated publications	1
Informal discussions on job, conversations	5
Other	2
Not ascertained	<u>1</u>
Total	48**

Table A3-177

Value of Participant's Program: Supervisor's Rating³

Worth cost and difficulty	43
Don't know or don't remember	<u>3</u>
Total	46*

* Reported only for those whose supervisors were interviewed

** Reported only for those whose supervisors reported having transmitted program to other people

‡ Total adds to more than 43 because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q S1-12: Has (participant) passed on to other people in this office what he has acquired from the training program?

2/Q S1-13: How did he do it?

3/Q S1-14: Do you think that (participant's) training program was worth the money spent and difficulties encountered in your work or not?

Table A3-178Suitability of Training Program to Participant's Office¹Suitability of training program

<u>Positive comments</u>		41
Strong positive comments not further specified	15	
Participant is applying training in his work	14	
Weak positive comments not further specified	8	
Participant is conveying training to others	2	
Participant has introduced new methods, techniques, equipment etc.	1	
Other positive comments	1	
<u>Didn't know participant, or program, etc.</u>		3
<u>Not ascertained</u>		<u>2</u>
Total		46

* Reported only for those whose supervisors were interviewed
 1/Q S1-15: How much is the participants' training program suitable to the type of work of your section?

Table A3-179Supervisor's Suggestions for Improving the Program¹

<u>Suggestions for program improvement</u>		
<u>Changes related to content of program</u>		8
Program should include more practical training, more on-the-job experience	6	
Program should permit participant to get an academic degree	1	
Content of program should be more specific	1	
<u>General comments</u>		4
No changes suggested: no further comments	4	
<u>Changes related to program planning</u>		13
Supervisor should have more important role in planning program	9	
Program should be planned to meet needs of participant, his employer, his country	1	
Other comments relating to planning of program	3	
<u>Changes related to length of program</u>		2
Training should be longer	2	
<u>Other (concepts not included in above categories)</u>		3
<u>Don't know, can't evaluate program, don't know enough about program or participant, etc.</u>	7	
<u>Not ascertained</u>		12
Total		49* 4

* Reported only for those whose supervisors were interviewed

~~4~~ Total adds to more than 46 because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q S1-16: Supposing you were to send another person for the training program like (participant's) what corrections, in your opinion, should be made?

Table A3-180

Importance of Training Program to Participant's Work Abilities:
Supervisor's Rating¹

Program's degree of importance to participant's abilities

Most important	7
Very important	37
Not useful	1
Don't know, or don't remember	<u>1</u>
Total	46*

Table A3-181

Supervisor's Utilization Score

81 or higher	39
No total score	<u>7</u>
Total	46*

Table A3-182

Supervisor's Rating of Procedures by Which Participants
Were Selected²

Participant's selection was:

Satisfactory	9
Unsatisfactory	3
Can't rate	<u>2</u>
Total	14**

* Reported only for those whose supervisors were interviewed

** Reported only for supervisors interviewed

1/Q S1-17: Regarding the work abilities of participants at present; how important do you think was the fact that he had been on the training program?

2/Q S2-1A: For this section, I would like to have your suggestions regarding the ICA training program in general. I am going to read the headings to you and would like to have your opinion about each as to whether it is good or not.

A) Consideration in selecting people to send

Table A3-183Supervisor's Reasons for Dissatisfaction with Selection Process¹Reasons for dissatisfaction with selection process

<u>Criteria for Selection</u>		2
Selection should be appropriate to the requirements of participant's job, supervisor, employer, or needs of country	1	
Participant's knowledge of English is too important	1	
<u>Who Should Select Participants?</u>		1
A participant should be selected by his supervisor, or another superior at his place of employment	1	<u> </u>
Total		3*

Table A3-184Supervisor's Rating of Program Subject Matter²Program subject matter was:

Satisfactory	7
Unsatisfactory	2
Can't rate	<u>5</u>
Total	14**

* Reported only for supervisors interviewed and who mentioned that the selection was unsatisfactory

** Reported only for supervisors interviewed

1/Q S2-1A: And if you should find any which is not good, please also tell me what makes you feel so?

A) Consideration in selecting people to send

2/Q S2-1B: For this section, I would like to have your suggestions regarding the ICA training program in general. I am going to read the headings to you and would like to have your opinion about each as to whether it is good or not.

B) Subjects arranged under the training program

Table A3-185

Supervisor's Reasons for Dissatisfaction
with Program Subject Matter¹

Dissatisfied because subject matter was not appropriate to needs	1	
Other	1	
Total		2*

Table A3-186

Supervisor's Rating of Level of Program²

Level of program was:

Satisfactory	5	
Unsatisfactory	1	
Can't rate	8	
Total		14**

Table A3-187

Supervisor's Reasons for Dissatisfaction with Level of Program³

Other comment relating to level of program (not included in code book categories)		1***
---	--	------

- * Reported only for supervisors interviewed and who mentioned that the subject matter of the program was unsatisfactory
- ** Reported only for supervisors interviewed
- *** Reported only for one supervisor who mentioned that the level of program was unsatisfactory
- 1/Q S2-1B: And if you should find any which is not good, please also tell me what makes you feel so?
- B) Subjects arranged under the training program
- 2/Q S2-1C: For this section, I would like to have your suggestions regarding the ICA training program in general. I am going to read the headings to you and would like to have your opinion about each as to whether it is good or not.
- C) Level of program -- difficult or easy

Table A3-188Supervisor's Rating of Length of Program¹Length of program was:

Satisfactory	6
Unsatisfactory	5
Can't rate	<u>3</u>
Total	14*

Table A3-189

Supervisor's Reasons for Dissatisfaction with Length of Program

Program too short, not further specified	4
Program too long	<u>1</u>
Total	5**

Table A3-190Supervisor's Rating of Country of Training³Country of training was:

Satisfactory	7
Unsatisfactory	5
Can't rate	<u>2</u>
Total	14*

* Reported only for supervisors interviewed

** Reported only for supervisors who mentioned that the length of program was unsatisfactory

1/Q S2-1D: For this section, I would like to have your suggestions regarding the ICA training program in general. I am going to read the headings to you and would like to have your opinion on each as to whether it is good or not.

D) Duration of program

2/Q S2-1D: And if you should find any which is not good, please also tell me what makes you feel so?

D) Duration of program

3/Q S2-1E: For this section, I would like to have your suggestions regarding the ICA training program in general. I am going to read the headings to you and would like to have your opinion about each as to whether it is good or not.

E) Country visited for the program

Table A3-191

Supervisor's Reasons for Dissatisfaction
with Country of Training¹

Training should include visits to more countries	2
Some or all of training should be in Europe (including England)	1
Some or all of training should be in Asian countries (including Japan and Philippines)	1
Some or all of training should be in the United States (not including Puerto Rico)	<u>1</u>
Total	5*

Table A3-192

Supervisor's Rating of Practical Experience Provided in Program²

Practical experience was:

Satisfactory	5
Unsatisfactory	4
Can't rate	<u>5</u>
Total	14**

Table A3-193

Supervisor's Reason for Dissatisfaction
with Practical Experience Provided in Program³

Practical experience not sufficient; more is needed; not enough time in program allotted to practical experience	4***
--	------

-
- * Reported only for supervisors who mentioned that the country of training was unsatisfactory
 - ** Reported only for supervisors interviewed
 - *** Reported only for supervisors who mentioned that the practical experience provided in program was unsatisfactory
 - 1/Q S2-1E: And if you should find any which is not good, please also tell me what makes you feel so?
E) Country visited for the program
 - 2/Q S2-1F: For this section, I would like to have your suggestions regarding the ICA training program in general. I am going to read the headings to you and would like to have your opinion about each as to whether it is good or not.
F) Work training under the program
 - 3/Q S2-1F: And if you should find any which is not good, please also tell me what makes you feel so?
F) Work training under the program

Table A3-194

Supervisor's Suggestions for Changes in Other Aspects
of Training Program¹

<u>Favorable comment only</u>	1
<u>Selection of Participants</u>	4
Participants should be experienced people	2
Language should be less important factor in selection	1
More people in specific field should be trained	1
<u>Training Program</u>	11
Program should be longer	3
More practical training	2
Program should be planned to meet specific needs	1
More places to visit during training	1
Fewer places to visit during training	1
Participants should receive higher per diem	1
More theoretical training	1
Time should be spent in one place	1
<u>Post Training</u>	2
Participant should be placed in jobs were training can be used	2
<u>Other comments</u>	3
<u>Not ascertained</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	23* [#]

* Reported only for supervisors interviewed

Total adds to more than 14 because some respondents gave more than one answer

1/Q S2-2: Is there anything further about the training program on which you can give you opinions?

Table A3-195Proportion of Supervisors Who Had Been ICA Participants¹

Had received ICA training	8
Had not received ICA training	<u>6</u>
Total	14*

Table A3-196Assigned Participants Known to Technicians²

Participants known to technician	24
Participants not known to technician	<u>23</u>
Total	47**

* Reported only for supervisors interviewed

** Reported only for those whose technicians were interviewed

1/Q S2-3: Have you yourself ever received ICA scholarship?

2/Q T1-1: First, I am going to read the names of some participants. I would like you to tell me whether you are familiar enough with their work and training program to give me some information and ratings about them

Table A3-197

Interference with Participant Contact: Technician's Rating¹

	Work load	Location of job	Partici- pant's lack of initia- tive	Partici- pant has no time	Attitude of Super- visor, employer	Political problems	Language barrier	Participant's personality	Other
Interfered	11	14	-	3	-	-	-	-	-
Did not interfere	13	10	24	21	24	24	24	24	24
Total	24*	24*	24*	24*	24*	24*	24*	24*	24*

* Reported only for those whose technician was interviewed and remembered participant well enough to rate him
1/Q T1-2: Many factors sometimes make it difficult to see participants as much as would be desirable. Have any
of these factors interfered with your seeing these participants since their return from training?

1. First, your work load, or the number of participants you have to handle. Did this interfere with your seeing as much as would be desirable?
2. How about the location of this participant's job: Did this interfere?
3. Did the participant's lack of initiative in seeking help interfere?
4. Did he/her lack of time or overwork interfere?
5. Did the attitude of his supervisor or employer toward his/her seeing you interfere?
6. Did political problems interfere?
7. Did difficulty in conversing with participant because of language barrier interfere?
8. Did participant's personality interfere?
9. Did anything else interfere? (IF YES: PLEASE SPECIFY)
0. Nothing interfered with your seeing this participant as much as would be desirable.

Table A3-198Technician's Contact with Participant¹Technician's contact with participant

Occasional	11
Frequent	9
Regular	<u>4</u>
Total	24*

Table A3-199Contribution of Training to Participant's Job Performance
Technician's Rating²

Major contribution	17
Minor contribution	6
No importance	<u>1</u>
Total	24*

* Reported only for those whose technician was interviewed and knew participant

- 1/Q T1-3: Here I am interested in how much contact you have had with each of these participants since his return, aside from contact of a strictly social type
- 2/Q T1-5: Next, I would like you to rate the contribution that each participant's training program has made to his ability to perform his present job well. How about? Would you say that his/her training made a major contribution or a minor contribution to his ability to do his work, or would you say it was of no importance, or perhaps that it actually reduced his/her usefulness?

Table A3-200Technician's Rating of Participant's Personality Attributes¹

	<u>Education qualifica- tion</u>	<u>Intelli- gence</u>	<u>Languago knowledge</u>	<u>Attitude toward training</u>	<u>Attitude toward job</u>
Adequate	20	19	16	18	17
Indequat	2	3	6	2	5
Can't ra	2	2	2	4	2
Total	24*	24*	24*	24*	24*

* Reported only for those whose technician was interviewed and knew participant

1/Q T1-6: In order that a training program be successful, participants must have certain personality attributes so that they may benefit from the training and later be able to apply it in their jobs. I'd like you to rate each of the participants in these attributes as they may have affected the success of his training. Please feel free to comment on any of the responses you give.

How about:

- A. Have his/her educational qualifications been adequate or inadequate? Or can't you rate this?
- B. How about the intelligence of Mr./Miss/Mrs. _____? Has he/she shown it to be adequate or inadequate?
- C. Was his/her knowledge of the language in which training was given adequate or inadequate?
- D. How about his/her attitude toward his/her training program?
- E. And how about the attitude toward the present job?

Table A3-201

Technician Rating of Factors Related
To Suitability of Participants Training¹

	Pre-de- parture prepara- tion	Type of program	Subject- matter coverage	Level of program	Length of program	Country of Training	Appropriate materials
Satis- factory	9	23	21	20	19	22	20
Unsatis- factory	1	1	1	1	2	-	2
Can't rate	14	-	2	3	3	2	2
Total	24*	24*	24*	24*	24*	24*	24*

* Reported only for those whose technician was interviewed and knew participant

1/Q T1-7: A training program must also be suitable for the participant and for the work he will be doing. Here I would like you to rate the following aspects of the participant's program. Could you tell me whether they did or did not satisfy the needs of the participant's PIO/P?

- A. For example, would you rate the preparations of before his/her departure as satisfactory? Or can't you rate this?
- B. How about the type of program he/she took part in -- was it satisfactory or unsatisfactory for his/her needs?
- C. Was the subject-matter coverage satisfactory or unsatisfactory?
- D. How was the level of his/her training program?
- E. The length of the program?
- F. The country of training?
- G. The practicality of experience provided? Was he trained in the use of appropriate materials, equipment, and techniques?

Table A3-202Technician's Reasons for Dissatisfaction with Program¹

A	<u>Pre-departure preparation</u> Participant had insufficient knowledge of language	1
B	<u>Type of program</u> Program too academic	1
C	<u>Subject-matter coverage</u> Subject-matter too narrow	1
D	<u>Level of program</u> Program too advanced	1
E	<u>Length of program</u> Program too short	2
F	<u>Country of training</u>	-
G	<u>Appropriate material</u> Techniques not appropriate to needs	2
Total		8*

Table A3-203Technician's Satisfaction with Supervisor's Utilization
of Participant's Training²

Satisfied with supervisor's utilization	21
Dissatisfied with supervisor's utilization	3
Total	24**

* Reported only for those whose technician mentioned that the program was unsatisfactory

** Reported only for those whose technician was interviewed and knew participant

1/Q T1-7: In what way do you feel that it was unsatisfactory

2/Q T1-8A: Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the utilization of (participant's) training by his/her present supervisor

Table A3-204

Technician's Satisfaction with Utilization of Participant's
Training by Department or Ministry¹

Satisfied with Department or Ministry's utilization	22
Dissatisfied with Department of Ministry's utilization	<u>2</u>
Total	24*

Table A3-205

Technician's Satisfaction with Participant's Utilization
of Training²

Satisfied with participant's utilization	18
Dissatisfied with participant's utilization	<u>6</u>
Total	24*

Table A3-206

Total Utilization Score: Technician's Rating

75 or higher	16
18 - 74	7
Under 18	<u>1</u>
Total	24*

* Reported only for those whose technician was interviewed and knew participant

1/Q T1-8B: Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the utilization of his/her training by the department or ministry for whom he/she works?

2/Q T1-8C: Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with what the participant himself/herself has done to make for good utilization of the training?

Table A3-207

Technician's Rating of Importance of Participant's
Job to Home Country¹

<u>Technician's rating</u>	<u>Participant's job import- ance to coun- try economy</u>	<u>Participant's job ability</u>
High	9	10
Fairly high	7	6
Average	7	5
Low	1	3
Total	24*	24*

Table A3-208

Technician's Previous Acquaintance with Participant²

Had heard of participant	3
Never heard of participant	2
Not ascertained	9
Participant left for training before Technician's arrival in Thailand	10
Total	24*

* Reported only for those whose technician was interviewed and knew participant

- 1/Q T1-9: Now I would like you to compare some aspects of each participant's work with the work of other participants in this country with whom you are familiar.
- A. In comparison with the jobs of other participants whom you know, how would you rate the importance of job to the over-all economic development of this country? Would you say his/her job is of high importance, average, or low importance?
- B. And how do you rate his/her ability to do his/her job without any outside help? Would you rate it high, fairly high, average, or low?
- 2/Q T1-10: The date on this card indicates that (participant's) left for training while you were in your present office. I would like to know whether you recall having heard of him/her before he/she left for training.

Table A3-209

Technician's Pre-departure Contacts with Participants¹

	Helped in se- lect- ion	Helped in plann- ing	Previous work contacts	Advised about program	Coordi- nated program with host country	Coordi- nated program with employ- er	Corres- ponded	Other con- tacts
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)
Yes	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
No	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Total	3*	3*	3*	3*	3*	3*	3*	3*

* Reported only for technicians who had contacts with participant prior to departure

- 1/Q T1-11: In this question I would like to know what kind of contact you had with the participant prior to his/hor departure for training. Please answer Yes or No to the following:
- A. Did you help select for the training program?
 - B. Did you help in planning his program?
 - C. Did you have previous work contacts with him?
 - D. Did you give him information or advice about his program?
 - E. Did you coordinate his program with the host country?
 - F. Did you coordinate his program with the employer?
 - G. Did you correspond with him while he was away?
 - H. Did you have any other pre-departure contacts?

228-

Appendix 4

Construction of Utilization Scores

APPENDIX 4

DEVELOPMENT OF TRAINING UTILIZATION SCORES IN THE EVALUATION SURVEY OF ICA PARTICIPANT TRAINING by Forrest Clements¹

In the evaluation survey of ICA participant training now going on in various countries over the world, several questionnaires are used. Two of these are for the personal interview with participants themselves. Form A applies to the great majority of participants and is used for those who had a training program directly connected to their field of activity. Form B differs only slightly from Form A but is for use with those participants whose training was not directly connected with their field of activity². There is a short supplemental questionnaire to be used in addition to either Form A or Form B for those returned participants who had more than one ICA training program, but this need not concern us here. There is also a questionnaire for use in interviewing a participant's supervisor about the participant plus a further questionnaire for interviewing U. S. technicians about those returned participants whom they know or with whose work and career they are familiar.

When considering various analytical approaches to be made in dealing with the raw data yielded by the interviews, it became apparent that a classification of participants according to utilization of training would be very desirable. If participants could in some way be scored on the utilization they have made of their training, they could be grouped into "high" utilizers, "low" utilizers and, of course, a middle group not so clearly cut as the two extremes.

However, the questionnaires had not been originally designed to satisfy such an objective although they did contain certain questions which it was felt might possibly be used for this purpose. Utilization was conceived in two main ways. One was the use to which the participant had put his training in his job performance and matters connected with his economic activity. The other had to do with the participant's function as a "multiplier" in disseminating or transmitting to others what he had learned during the training experience. These were not regarded as separate but as two aspects of the central concept of utilization.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE SCORING SYSTEM

Selection of Questions.

A panel of 17 judges was selected from among different ICA training divisions, training officers and survey specialists. They were instructed in the concept of training utilization described above and asked to make a question-by-question review of the several questionnaires. The purpose of this review was to choose those questions which a judge felt had some diagnostic value in measuring or indicating utilization or lack of utilization of training by a participant. These questions were called "separators" because of their possible function in separating participants into groups of "high", "middle" and "low" utilizers. The judges worked independently and submitted their choices of questions from each of the four types of questionnaire.

¹ Chief Evaluation Office ITD, A. I. D. Washington.
² Only Form A was used in Thailand.

When the results were tabulated, it was found that in the participant interviewing questionnaires a total of 52 different questions had been chosen by at least one of the 17 judges. However, only four question units in Form A and five in Form B had anything like a majority vote. In Form A, two of the question units were chosen by all 17 judges, one was selected by 11 judges and one by 10 members of the panel. No other questions in Form A had as many as half the votes. Of the five question units in Form B receiving the highest number of votes, two were selected by all 17 judges, one by 13, one by 11 and one by 10 judges. No others were chosen by as many as half the panel.

In the questionnaire for supervisors, there were fourteen different questions chosen by at least one judge but only four stood out. One was selected by all 17 members of the panel, one by 16, one by 13 and the other by 12 of the judges. The next highest question received only 6 votes.

Nineteen of the questions in the technician's questionnaire were chosen by at least one judge, but there were only four which were outstanding. Of these, one received 15 votes, two got 14 votes and the other was picked by 13 of the 17 judges. None of the others was chosen by more than half the panel members.

Weighting the Questions.

While all or most of the judges agreed that the selected questions had some virtue as criteria for separating participants into "high" and "low" utilizer groups, it was obvious that some were better measures than others. In other words, the questions were not of equal significance. The problem, therefore, became one of developing weights for the different questions.

Three methods were tried as solutions to this problem. These were the use of a rating scale, the method of paired comparisons and the method of rank order.

Rating Scale.

Each of the various questions was printed on separate pieces of paper with a rating scale underneath the question. The scale was a continuous line with five descriptive terms at different parts of the line as shown. Judges were asked to consider the questions in each questionnaire independently. They were instructed to regard each question within a questionnaire separately and not to make comparisons between questions. They were told that what was sought was an absolute rather than a relative judgment. Each question was to be judged independently as to how good a criterion it might be to separate participants into "high" and "low" utilizers of training. The judges were told to make a check directly over a descriptive term or anywhere between terms.

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
-----------	-----------	------	------	------

The order of the terms from left to right was varied between questions and between judges in order to neutralize any tendency of a judge to consistently follow an ascending or descending order. Judges were also warned to be alert against any unconscious tendency to make their judgments cluster toward the middle of the scale. In general, the whole procedure was based on that described in Guilford's "Psychometric Methods"¹.

¹ Guilford, J. P. Psychometric Methods, Chapter IX, pp. 263-281, McGraw-Hill, N. Y., 1936.

Guilford, J. P. Psychometric Methods, Second Edition, Chapter 11, pp. 236-301, McGraw-Hill, N. Y., 1954.

When the checked scales had been returned from the judges, numerical values were assigned to the ratings based on a 10-point scale. Since every question had previously been judged to have some merit, a value of the term was assigned to the point on the line directly above the middle of the term "poor". In the same way, "fair" had a value of 4, "good" rated 6, "very good" was 8 and "excellent" was 10. A check mark at intermediate points on the line was given an intermediate value but no finer discriminations than half a point were attempted. In this way, the checked positions on the rating scale line were converted into numerical values and there were 17 such judgments for each question. These values were then averaged for each question which thus received a mean score value.

The total error (T. E.) for each judge was then calculated as well as his systematic error (S. E.). The T. E. for a judge is the average deviation of his ratings on all questions from the mean score value of each question. Thus, for each question judged, the mean score value of that question is subtracted from the score value given by that individual judge. The difference or deviation may be either plus or minus depending on whether the judge's score value was larger or smaller than the mean score value. These deviations are summed without reference to their algebraic signs and this sum is divided by the number of questions judged. To get the S. E. , the deviations are again summed but this time with due attention to the algebraic signs. The summed value may thus be either plus or minus. It is divided by the number of questions judged to get the S. E. or systematic error of that judge. This is a measure of a judge's tendency to overrate or underrate. If his S. E. is positive, he is inclined to overrate and his original ratings are reduced by the amount of his S. E. is negative, he is prone to underrate and his ratings need to be increased by the amount of his S. E.

In the participant questionnaires, the questions chosen as measures of utilization were:

- Q. 101 (Both Forms A and B)
- Q. 119-120 as a unit (Both Forms A and B)
- Q. 121-122 as a unit (Form B)
- Q. 124-125 as a unit in Form A which are the same as 126-127 in Form B.
- Q. 127 in Form A which is 132 in Form B.

Since judges may be interested in their own T. E. and S. E. values on this question group, they are given below with the names of the judges abbreviated so each can recognize himself or herself but only rarely any other judge.

The average total error (T. E.) for the whole group was 1.76 points, the lowest T. E. being only .78 and the highest 2.42 points.

Nine of the judges had negative systematic errors meaning that they tended to rate lower than the group as a whole, the average negative S. E. being 1.09 points. Eight judges had positive S. E. values indicating ratings above the group average and the average positive S. E. was 1.13 points.

<u>Judges</u>	<u>T. E.</u>	<u>S. E.</u>
Mos.	1.40	- .02
Cl.	1.22	- .82
Mon.	1.36	+ .28
Wal.	2.02	- .82
O'B.	1.30	-1.22
De.	2.42	+ .78
Wak.	.78	+ .38
Sil.	2.22	+1.58
Ji.	1.54	-1.02
Do.	2.34	+1.98
Wi.	1.70	+1.58
Ve.	1.88	- .92
Jo.	1.84	-1.56
Wh.	2.14	+1.38
Ho.	2.42	-2.42
St.	1.34	-1.02
Lo.	2.04	+1.08

The final adjusted mean ratings for the questions in the participant questionnaires are as follows:

<u>Question</u>	<u>Mean Rating</u>
Q. 101 A and B	4.4
Q. 119-120 A and B	8.3
Q. 121-122 B	6.9
Q. 124-125 A; 126-127 B	8.7
Q. 127 A; 132 B	5.8

Thus, for Form A of the participant questionnaire, the questions would grade from most valuable to least valuable measures of utilization in the following order:

<u>Question</u>	<u>Mean Rating</u>
Q. 124-125 as a unit	8.7
Q. 119-120 as a unit	8.3
Q. 127	5.8
C. 101	4.4

The difference between the Q. 124-125 unit and Q. 119-120 is small and we may regard these questions as about equal and also of greatest weight. Q. 127 comes next and 101 is unquestionably of lowest weight.

In Form B the rating order would be:

<u>Question</u>	<u>Mean Rating</u>
Q. 126-127 as a unit	8.7
Q. 119-120 as a unit	8.3
Q. 121-122 as a unit	6.9
C. 132	5.8
Q. 101	4.4

It would have been possible to go ahead and calculate relative point values for these questions on, say, a 100-point scale. However, there are other and perhaps better methods for arriving at relative weights and the calculation was deferred until these methods could be tried. Meanwhile, the rating method may be regarded as having established the approximate relative order of the questions from highest to lowest weight.

Supervisor Questionnaire.

Questions 12, 14, 15, and 17 were those chosen by the judges. Mean score values have been calculated for these in the way described above. The questions are listed below in descending values;

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Mean Rating</u>
Q. 12	8.1
Q. 17	7.2
Q. 15	7.0
Q. 14	6.2

The difference between 17 and 15 is small and they might easily change order or be thought of as having equal weight. Moreover, the scale differences over-all are small and the rating method has not successfully discriminated among the questions. About all we could assume here is that Q. 14 is probably to be regarded as having the lowest weight.

Technician Questionnaire.

Question 5, 8A, 8B and 8C were chosen by the panel of judges. They are listed below with their mean ratings in descending order.

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Mean Rating</u>
Q. 5	8.3
A. 8C	7.5
Q. 8B	6.7
Q. 8A	6.6

These are small differences. Especially, 8B and 8A may be thought of as having the same value and as having the lowest weights. Q. 5 is probably the most valuable measure.

The rating scale method described above has given us some insight into the probable relative virtue of the different questions in the four questionnaires. But there are more rigid methods which we can use not only to test the relative order of the questions but also to get a better measure of scale differences. These will now be described, beginning with the method of paired comparisons.

Method of Paired Comparisons.

In this method, the questions which had been previously selected by the judges from each of the four questionnaires were printed separately on pieces of paper which were the same size. Each question had its proper number for identification.

As the name implies, in this method the stimuli (questions) are presented to each judge in pairs. For each pair, he is asked to decide which question of the two he regards as a "best" criterion for separating "high" and "low" utilizers of training. The number of pairings is n times n minus one, divided by two. Thus, from Form A of the Participant Questionnaire and from the Supervisor's and Technician's Questionnaires there were four questions respectively giving 6 pairings in each group. (Four times 3, divided by 2). From Form B of the Participant Questionnaire there were five questions which had 10 pairings. The order of the pairings was randomized among the judges and no systematic pairings were used. For example, in the Supervisor Questionnaire the selected questions were numbers 12, 14, 15 and 17. These would pair as follows:

12 - 14
 12 - 15
 12 - 17
 14 - 15
 14 - 17
 15 - 17

However, this is a systematic comparison and would not be used for this reason. Instead, randomized sequences were presented, one of which is given below:

12 - 14
 15 - 17
 12 - 15
 14 - 17
 12 - 17
 14 - 15

Thus, each judge made 6 judgments for each of the 4-question groups and 10 judgments for the 5-question group of Form B.

Each judgment was recorded and a table drawn up showing the number of times each question was preferred over each of the others by the panel of judges. There were 16 judges in the panel. These raw frequencies of the number of judges who chose one question over another were converted into proportions. These proportions were summed for each question and the average proportion calculated. The deviate for each average proportion was looked up in the usual table of "Deviate and Ordinates for Areas under the Normal Curve"²

This not only provided a definite sequence of importance of the questions as judged by the judges but, more important, gave a measure of the relative differences between them so they could be assigned proper relative weights. The actual scale values and the weights will be given later after the discussion of the ranking method.

Method of Ranking.

In this method, the questions in each group were again submitted to each judge. Each was printed on a separate piece of paper. For each group, the judge spread all the pieces of paper out before him and compared the questions. He then selected that question which seemed best to him. He studied the remaining questions and chose the one which seemed to have the least significance and put it aside. From the remainder he then selected the next best and so on until he had the questions ranked in order from the one he considered best, next best and on down to worst or least significant. He was then asked to study the layout and make any changes he desired in the order of ranking. If he felt that two questions were of equal rank he could so indicate. When his final decision was made, the results were recorded as numerical scores giving the highest score to the highest ranked question and the lowest to the question regarded as least significant. In the 4-question group, the "best" question got a value of 4 and the worst 1; in the 5-question group the values ran from 5 to 1.

These scores were then summed for each question for the whole panel of 16 judges. From these raw data, relative differences in terms of deviates were worked out for each question using Guilford's procedure.³

² Guilford, J. P. op. cit., Second Edition, Chapter 7, pp. 159-160 and p. 170.

³ Guilford, J. P. op. cit.

As in the case of paired comparisons, this method not only placed the questions in a sequence of importance but gave a measure of their relative distances from each other.

Since these relative differences arrived at by both the paired comparison and rank order methods are both in the same terms, e. g., z-value deviates for areas under the normal curve (area from $z=zero$), they can be directly compared. Moreover, since they are in terms of the same units, they can be averaged to obtain a composite Z value based on a combination of the two methods. This has been done with the data here described.

Obtaining the Z Values.

As an illustration, the final utilization scores will be worked out here for Questions 101, 119-120, 124-125, and 127 in Participant Form A. Only the main figures will be given for the questions in Form B and in the Supervisor and Technician questionnaires.

Paired Comparison--Form A.

Number of Times Questions in the Columns at the Top Were Preferred Over Those in the Rows at the Left.

	<u>Q. 101</u>	<u>Q. 119-120</u>	<u>Q. 124-125</u>	<u>Q. 127</u>
Q. 101		16	16	12
Q. 119-120	0		4	1
Q. 124-125	0	12		0
Q. 127	4	15	16	

These raw frequencies are converted into proportions. Thus, 4 judges out of the 16 preferred Q. 101 to Q. 127 and this proportion is .250 while 16 out of 16 judges preferred Q. 119-120 to Q. 101 and the proportion is 1.000 as given in the next table.

Proportion of Times Questions in the Columns at the Top Were Preferred Over Those in the Rows at the Left.

	<u>Q. 101</u>	<u>Q. 119-120</u>	<u>Q. 124-125</u>	<u>Q. 127</u>
Q. 101	.500	1.000	1.000	.750
Q. 119-120	.000	.500	.250	.062
Q. 124-125	.000	.750	.500	.000
Q. 127	.250	.938	1.000	.500
Sum of P	.750	3.188	2.750	1.312
Mean of P	.187	.797	.687	.328

In the above table, when a question is compared with itself, it is assumed that the proportion of choices would be half and half among the judges so the proportion .500 is entered in the appropriate spaces. The columns are summed and the sum divided by the number of questions (4 in this case) to get the average proportion of the judges preferring each question over any other. These values are given in the row "Mean of P" where P is a proportion.

The questions are now re-arranged in order of their mean proportions with the highest Mean of P at the left.

	<u>Q. 119-120</u>	<u>Q. 124-125</u>	<u>Q. 127</u>	<u>Q. 101</u>
Mean of P	.797	.687	.328	.187
z value	.831	.487	-.445	-.890

The Mean of P (M_p) values are looked up in a "Table of Deviates for Areas Under the Normal Curve" of which Table C in the Appendix in Guilford's Psychometric Methods, Second Edition, is an example.⁴ Since only half the area under the normal curve is involved in such tables, .500 must be subtracted from M_p to get the value for the "area from z equals zero." If M_p is greater than .500 this value will be positive; if it is less than .500 the value is negative and carries a minus sign.

In the example, M_p for Q. 119-120 is .797 from which .500 is subtracted to leave .297 as a remainder. Looking up .297 in "area from z equals zero" in the table of deviates we find that the z value is .831.

In the cases of Q. 127, M_p is .328 which, when .500 is subtracted from it leaves minus .172 as a remainder. Looking up this value in the table of deviates gives a z value of minus .445.

When the z values are found we would proceed to calculate the relative point score values for the questions. However, we have also had the judges go through the Method of Rank Order for the same questions. We will now find the z values for the questions by this method.

The rank values assigned to each question by each of the 16 judges are tabulated and summed. These sums for the questions in Form A are given in the next table.

	<u>Q. 101</u>	<u>Q. 119-120</u>	<u>Q. 124-125</u>	<u>Q. 127</u>
Sum of rank values	20	60	51	29
Sum of rank values minus .5 N	12	52	43	21
Sum of rank values minus .5N divided by Nn	.187	.812	.672	.328
z value	-.889	.885	.445	-.445

N is 16, the number of judges, and n is the number of question units, 4 in this case. Thus, the total number of comparisons implied for each question is N times n or 64.

Working through Q. 101, the total rank value assigned by all 16 judges was 20. This, minus .5N or half the number of judges is 12. This number divided by Nn or 64 is .187 which is comparable with M_p in the paired comparison method.⁵ .187 minus .500 is minus .313 which, in the table of deviates referred to before, has a z value of minus .889 for Q. 101.

Since the questions are now aligned along the same scale of z values for both the paired comparison method and the method of rank order we can legitimately add the z values from the two methods and obtain an average z based on both methods.

	<u>Q. 119-120</u>	<u>Q. 124-125</u>	<u>Q. 127</u>	<u>Q. 101</u>
z by paired comparison	.831	.487	-.445	-.890
z by rank order	.885	.445	-.445	-.889
Zverage z value	.858	.466	-.445	-.8895

⁴ Guilford, J. P. op. cit.

⁵ The rationale of this formula is discussed in Guilford, J. P. op. cit. Second Edition, p. 186-188.

At this point, ordinary psychological scaling procedure as described by Guilford in references previously cited would convert these z values into scale positions relative to a zero point. Thus, the question with the largest negative z value would be assigned to the .000 or starting point position on the scale. This would be Q. 101 in the above table. The scale distance between minus .889 and minus .445 is .444 so Q. 127 would fall at this point on the scale. Similarly the question unit 124-125 would be 1.355 scale units above the zero point of Q. 101 and Q. 119-120 would be 1.747 units above zero. One can think of the questions as stations along a railway with the zero point question as the starting point of the line. The units of the scale are measures of distance from the zero starting point. Thus, one can quickly see how far each stations. On a railway these distances would be measured in miles or kilometers. On a psychological scale they are measured in terms of scale units. In the example, Q. 119-120 is 1.747 scale units from Q. 101; Q. 124-125 is 1.355 units from Q. 101 and so on.

But merely having the questions on such a scale with known relative distances between them is not enough for our purposes and we must go a step farther. All of the questions chosen by the judges were regarded as having some diagnostic value as indicators of utilization. It would be a distortion, then, to assign a zero scale position to any question. We want to score the respondents according to the answers given to the questions so that they come out with something like a grade in an academic course. The method by which this can be done and which is now described, applies to all scaling problems where the assignment of a zero position to any variable would defeat the purpose of the scaling.

Translating z values into point scores.

First, we want to get the differences between the z values. These z values may be thought of as extending along a scale both above and below zero. We are interested in the differences along this scale. Thus, the difference between .858 and .466 or .392.

The difference between Q. 124-125 and Q. 127, however, is the difference between .466 and minus .445 which is .466 above zero and .445 below zero or a total difference distance of .911.

The difference between Q. 127 and Q. 101 is that between .445 below zero and .889 below zero or .444. These differences do not carry any algebraic sign.

The questions, then, line up as follows:

	<u>z value differences</u>
Q. 119-120 and Q. 124-125 difference	.392
Q. 124-125 and Q. 127 difference	.911
Q. 127 and Q. 101 difference	.444

We can now get rid of the decimals and since the differences are in terms of thousandths, we simply multiply them by 1000 and convert them to whole numbers.

We now assign an arbitrary value to Q. 119-120 which may be any number larger than the sum of the differences. Since the sum of the differences is 1747, we will assign an arbitrary value of 2000 to Q. 119-120. The difference between Q. 119-120 and Q. 124-125 is 392, so Q. 124-125 will have a value of 2000 minus 392 or 1608.

The difference between Q. 124-125 and Q. 127 is 911, so 1608 minus 911 equals 697 as the value for Q. 127. The difference between Q. 127 and Q. 101 is 444 so 697 minus 444 equals 253 as the value for Q. 101.

In tabular form they read as follows:

Q. 119-120	2000
Q. 124-125	1608
Q. 127	697
Q. 101	<u>253</u>
	4558

These values for each question are now converted into ratios which each question is of the total value for the whole group or battery of questions. For convenience, the ratios are then converted into whole numbers on a 100 point scale.

The ratio for Q. 119-120 is 2000 divided by 4558 or .44 which becomes 44 when multiplied by 100. Thus:

	<u>Ratio</u>	<u>Score points</u>
Q. 119-120	.44	44
Q. 124-125	.35	35
Q. 127	.15	15
Q. 101	.06	<u>6</u>
Total points		100

It was originally desired to obtain relative score values for these questions on a simple, familiar scale. The scale used here is a 100 point scale and the point values are analogous to simple percentages. They may also be thought of as academic scores on a 100 point scale.

The specific questions and the utilization score values are given below:

Q. 101 Since you've been back from that program, have there been any periods when you were not employed?

	<u>Score points</u>
Yes, never had a job since return	0
Yes, gives periods	0
No	6

Q. 119 Thinking now of the skills, techniques of knowledge that participants learn during their training programs -- a good many participants tell us that they are not actually using much of what they learned in their usual work. How about you personally? In your current job, have you ever been able to use any of the skills or knowledge that you learned on the program we have been discussing?

	<u>Score points</u>
Yes	20
No	0

Q. 120 Would you say you have used practically none, only a little, some, quite a bit, or almost everything?

	<u>Score points</u>
Practically none	0
Only a little	6
Some	12
Quite a bit	18
Almost everything; everything	24

Questions 119 and 120 were treated as a unit by the judges and we have seen that this unit turned out to have a total score value of 44 points on a 100 point scale. Q. 119, which measures whether a participant has or has not used any of his training on his job is given a score value of 20 points for a "yes" answer. Q. 120 which measures the amount of use he has made is given 24 score points if the answer is "almost everything, everything." For lesser utilization, the participant may score 18 points for "quite a bit", 12 points for "some", 6 points for "only a little" and zero for "practically none."

Q. 124 Now I would like to ask about whether or not you have conveyed to other people the things you learned on that program? Have you ever been able to convey any of what you learned in the program to other people?

	<u>Score points</u>
Yes	15
No	0

Q. 125 About how much of that training have you been able to transmit to other people -- practically none, only a little, some, quite a bit, or almost everything?

	<u>Score points</u>
Practically none	0
Only a little	5
Some	10
Quite a bit	15
Almost everything; everything	20

Questions 124 and 125 are similar to Q. 119 and Q. 120 except that they refer to dissemination of training rather than on-the-job use. They, too, were treated as a unit by the judges and have a combination weight of 35 score points on the 100 point scale. Q. 124 is given a score value of 15 points for a "yes" answer or zero for a "no" answer. Q. 125 can have score values ranging from zero for a "practically none" answer, 5 for "only a little", 10 for "some", 15 for "quite a bit" to 20 points for "almost everything, everything."

Q. 127 Do you have any plans for using that training which you have not as yet been able to carry out?

	<u>Score points</u>
Yes	15
No	0

A perfect score on all six questions would be 100 points while utter failure would score zero. A participant may have a score anywhere between these two extremes, depending on the amount of utilization he says he has made of his training.

Note that a participant must have recorded answers for all six questions to achieve a valid total score. If any of the six are not answered or have been omitted, that participant must not be included in the distribution of total scores.

For convenience, the participants who have answers to all six questions on Form A will be classified in four groups according to the total scores they receive as follows:

<u>Utilization</u>	<u>Score Range</u>
High	75 or more points
Upper middle	50-74 points
Lower middle	26-49 points
Low	25 or fewer points

Form B - Participant Questionnaire.

There are five units of questions in Form B which were selected by the judges. In paired comparisons, the judges' preferences are given in the following table:

<u>Times Questions At Top Were Preferred Over Those At Left</u>					
	<u>Q. 101</u>	<u>Q. 119-120</u>	<u>Q. 121-122</u>	<u>Q. 126-127</u>	<u>Q. 132</u>
Q. 101		16	15	16	11
Q. 119-120			3	6	1
Q. 121-122	1	14		13	5
Q. 126-127		10	3		1
Q. 132	4	15	11	15	

The z values in paired comparisons, worked out as has been described in connection with Form A, are as follows:

Q. 119-120	.799
Q. 126-127	.598
Q. 121-122	.000
Q. 132	-.454
Q. 101	-.908

In the method of rank order, these questions have the following data:

	<u>Sum of rank values</u>	<u>Sum of rank values minus .5N divided by Nn. Nn equals 80</u>	<u>z value</u>
Q. 119-120	72	.800	.842
Q. 126-127	66	.725	.598
Q. 121-122	48	.500	.000
Q. 132	35	.338	-.418
Q. 101	21	.163	-.982

The average z values obtained by the two methods are:

Q. 119-120	.820
Q. 126-127	.598
Q. 121-122	.000
Q. 132	-.436
Q. 101	-.945

Differences between questions in terms of z values.

(Q. 119-120) - (126-127)	.222 or 222
(Q. 126-127) - (121-122)	.598 or 598
(Q. 121-122) - (132)	.436 or 436
Q. 132-101	.509 or 509

Arbitrary value of 2000 to Q. 119-120, then:

Q. 119-120 will be	2000
Q. 126-127 will be	1778
Q. 121-122 will be	1180
Q. 132 will be	744
Q. 101 will be	235
	<u>5937 total</u>

On a 100 point scale, the questions would have score values:

	<u>Score points</u>
Q. 119-120	34
Q. 126-127	30
Q. 121-122	20
Q. 132	12
Q. 101	4
	<u>100 total</u>

Except for Q. 121-122, these are the same questions used in Form A although 126-127 are 124-125 in Form A and Q. 132 is 127 in Form A. Questions 121-122 do not appear in Form A. Actually, their inclusion makes a better battery of questions and it is unfortunate they were not used in Form A which is the Form which will be used for the large majority of participants since Form B is for special cases.

However, there is nothing sacred about a 100 point scale, desirable though it may be on the grounds of simplicity. Since Form A will be used for probably more than 90 per cent of participants, it has been felt that the scoring system used there should prevail. That is, the same questions in the two Forms ought to have the same point values. Otherwise, the "change of pace" might confuse coders working on the two Forms. If, therefore, we retain the point values of questions in Form A which are identical in Form B, we will have a total score greater than 100 points. However, we must keep the weight of Q. 121-122 relative to the other weights approximately the same in the more than 100 point scale as it is in the point scale calculated above. This would give Q. 121-122 an average weight relative to the other questions of 27 points but since we need an even number we will assign it 28 points.

Thus, the scale for the utilization questions in Form B will range from zero to 128 points as follows:

	<u>Score points</u>
Q. 101	6
Q. 119-120	44
Q. 121-122	28
Q. 126-127	35
Q. 132	<u>15</u>
	128 total

The specific questions on Form B with their score points are given below.

Q. 101 Since you've been back from that program, have there been any periods when you were not employed?

	<u>Score points</u>
Yes, never had a job since return	0
Yes, gives periods	0
No	6

Q. 119 Thinking now of the skills, techniques or knowledge that participants learn during their training programs -- a good many participants tell us that they are not actually using much of what they learned in their usual work. How about you personally? In your current job, have you ever been able to use any of the skills or knowledge that you learned on the program we have been discussing?

	<u>Score points</u>
Yes	20
No	0
Don't know	0

Q. 120 Would you say you have used practically none, only a little, some, quite a bit, or almost everything?

	<u>Score points</u>
Practically none	0
Only a little	6
Some	12
Quite a bit	18
Almost everything; everything	24

Q. 121 How about outside your current job? Have you ever been able to use any of the skills or knowledge that you learned on that program?

	<u>Score points</u>
Yes	12
No	0
Don't know	0

Q. 122 Would you say you have used practically none, only a little, some, quite a bit, or almost everything?

	<u>Score points</u>
Practically none	0
Only a little	4
Some	8
Quite a bit	12
Almost everything; everything	16

Q. 126 Now I'd like to ask about whether or not you have conveyed to other people the things you learned on that program. Have you been able to convey any of what you learned in the program to other people?

	<u>Score points</u>
Yes	15
No	0
Don't know	0

Q. 127 About how much of this training have you been able to transmit to other people -- practically none, only a little, some, quite a bit, or almost everything?

	<u>Score points</u>
Practically none	0
Only a little	5
Some	10
Quite a bit	15
Almost everything; everything	20

Q. 132 Do you have any plans for using this training which you have not as yet been able to carry out?

	<u>Score points</u>
Yes	15
No	0

A participant must have answers on all eight questions before his total score can be counted. If any of the questions have not been answered, that participant must not be included in the distribution of total scores. Participants with answers to all eight questions will be grouped in four classes according to the total scores they receive as follows:

<u>Utilization</u>	<u>Score Range</u>
High	95 points or more
Upper middle	64 to 94 points
Lower middle	33 to 63 points
Low	32 or fewer points

Supervisor Questionnaire - Part I

There are four questions in Supervisor Questionnaire Part I which were selected by the judges as bearing on utilization of training.

In paired comparisons, the judges preferences among the four questions are given below:

<u>Times Questions At Top Were Preferred Over Those At Left</u>				
	<u>Q. 12</u>	<u>Q. 14</u>	<u>Q. 15</u>	<u>Q. 17</u>
Q. 12		4	8	11
Q. 14	12		12	12
Q. 15	8	4		9
Q. 17	5	4	7	
Total	25	12	27	32

The z values for the questions are:

Q. 17	.319
Q. 12	.038
Q. 15	-.040
Q. 14	-.490

In the method of rank order, the questions have the following data:

	<u>Q. 17</u>	<u>Q. 12</u>	<u>Q. 15</u>	<u>Q. 14</u>
Sum of rank values	39	26	46	50
Sum of rank values minus .5N divided by Nn (64)	.656	.484	.594	.281
z values	.402	-.040	.238	-.580

The average z values obtained by the two methods are:

Q. 17	.360
Q. 15	.009
Q. 12	-.001
Q. 14	-.533

Differences between the questions in terms of z values.

Q. 17 - Q. 15	.261 or 261
Q. 15 - Q. 12	.100 or 100
Q. 12 - Q. 14	.532 or 532

Giving an arbitrary value of 1000 to Q. 17, then:

Q. 17	will be	1000
Q. 15	will be	739
Q. 12	will be	639
Q. 14	will be	107
		<u>2485</u> total

On a 100 point scale the questions will have the following utilization score values:

Q. 17	40 points
Q. 15	30 points
Q. 12	26 points
Q. 14	<u>4 points</u>
	100 total points

The questions are to be scored as follows:

Q. 12 Has any of the information (participant) acquired on his program been conveyed to other people in this organization?

	<u>Score points</u>
Yes	26
No	0

Q. 14 Do you think that this training program was worth the cost and difficulty it caused your organization, or was it not worth it?

	<u>Score points</u>
Worth cost and difficulty	4
Not worth cost and difficulty	0

Q. 15 "How suitable was (participant's) training for his usefulness to your organization?"

Although this is an open-end question, it needs to be coded on a scale of usefulness. The coders must read the replies and then form judgments as to what position on the scale best fits any individual answer. The question has a maximum relative value of 30 points and a minimum of zero.

The answers are to be rated on a 3-point scale as described.

If all the comments express concepts or ideas which indicate the training was suitable, the utilization score is to be counted as 30 points.

If the comments are mixed in meaning indicating that some of the training was suitable but some was not suitable, the score is 15 points.

If all the comments indicate the supervisor feels the training was not suitable, the score is zero for the question.

Q. 17 As a qualification for his present job, how important was (participant's) training program -- essential, very important, helpful but not very important, not useful, or would he have been better off without it?

	<u>Score points</u>
Essential	40
Very important	30
Helpful but not very important	10
Not useful	5
Better off without it	0

Total Point Score

It is obvious that these total point scores will not conform to a normal frequency distribution. Therefore, it is not proper to group them into categories of approximate quartiles as was done in the participant's questionnaire. An arbitrary judgment has been made as follows:

High utilizers	81 points or more
Medium utilizers	20 to 80 points
Low utilizers	19 points or less

Technician Questionnaire - Part I.

Part I of the technician questionnaire contains four questions which were agreed upon by a majority of the judges as having significance in measuring utilization.

In paired comparisons, the preferences of the judges among the four questions are given in the table.

	Q. 5	Q. 8A	Q. 8B	Q. 8C
Q. 5		1	2	6
Q. 8A	15		9	12
Q. 8B	14	7		13
Q. 8C	10	4	3	
Total	39	12	14	31

The z values for the questions are:

Q. 5	.625
Q. 8A	-.462
Q. 8B	-.404
Q. 8C	.277

In the method of rank order the questions have the following data:

	<u>Q. 5</u>	<u>Q. 8A</u>	<u>Q. 8B</u>	<u>Q. 8C</u>
Sum of rank values	58	27	28	47
Sum of rank values minus .5N divided by Nn (64)	.781	.297	.312	.610
z values	.776	-.533	-.490	.279

The average z values obtained by the two methods are:

Q. 5	.700
Q. 8A	-.497
Q. 8B	-.447
Q. 8C	.278

Differences between the questions in terms of average z values.

Q. 5 - Q. 8C	.422 or 422
Q. 8C - Q. 8B	.869 or 869
Q. 8B - Q. 8A	.050 or 50

Giving an arbitrary value of 1500 to Q. 5, then:

Q. 5	will be	1500
Q. 8C	will be	1078
Q. 8B	will be	209
Q. 8A	will be	159
		<u>2946</u> total

On a 100 point scale, these questions will have the following utilization score values:

	<u>Score points</u>
Q. 5	51
Q. 8C	37
Q. 8B	7
Q. 8A	5
	<u>100</u> total

The questions are to be scored as follows:

- Q. 5 Would you say that this (participant's) training made a major contribution or a minor contribution to his ability to do his work, or would you say it was of no importance or perhaps that it actually reduced his usefulness?

	<u>Score points</u>
Major contribution	51
Minor contribution	25
No importance	5
Reduced usefulness	0

- Q. 8C Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with what this participant has done to make good utilization of his training?

	<u>Score points</u>
Satisfied	37
Dissatisfied	0

- Q. 8B Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the utilization of (this participant's) training by the Department or Ministry where he works?

	<u>Score points</u>
Satisfied	7
Dissatisfied	0

Q. 8A Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the utilization of (this participant's) training by his present supervisor?

	<u>Score points</u>
Satisfied	5
Dissatisfied	0

Total Point Score.

An arbitrary judgment based on the possible distribution of total point scores for the four questions has been made for the purpose of classifying the participants into groups of high, medium, and low utilizers according to the ratings of the technicians.

High utilizers	75 points or more
Medium utilizers	18 to 74 points
Low utilizers	17 points or fewer

The purpose here has been to describe how the utilization questions were selected and the process by which the point scores were developed. The procedure is applicable to many problems where relative weighting or scaling of responses to stimuli is involved.

247-

Appendix 5

Questionnaires

APPENDIX 5**QUESTIONNAIRES**

NOTE: All questionnaires used in this survey were supplied by ICA/Washington in English. The original questionnaires for participants and supervisors were translated into Thai as described in Appendix 1. The versions of those questionnaires appearing in this appendix are re-translations to English of the Thai version.

WORDS UNDERLINED in these questionnaires were not translated to Thai, and appeared in English in the Thai version used.

PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE
Back Translation

Notes for Interviewer

After self-introduction and producing identity card to the interviewee, it is essential to explain the objectives of this interview, for example:

"The TTEC and USOM are trying to find a way, in joint cooperation, to improve the scholarship project. According to this project, there are many people of our country who had the opportunity to go abroad for training and to further their education in various fields in the USA as well as in other countries as agreed between the Thai Government and the U. S. Since you were one of those who received the scholarship, I would like to pose some questions regarding your training program, as well as your own experiences and suggestions.

All the suggestions of those who had the experience themselves like you will be useful in improving this project for the benefit of future participants who will have the opportunities to go abroad for studies and training. Our next procedure will be to request interviews with supervisors of those who received the scholarship, and USOM technicians connected with this project so as to have their opinions in order to improve this scholarship award project.

Kindly give frank answers and please do not hesitate to state your dissatisfaction in connection with the training program. All the opinions from you will be treated by us as most confidential. Your name will have no connection with your answers whatsoever. All the responses obtained from this interview will be analysed and compiled into a great number of figures for statistical data only. Therefore, no one can ever know whose these various opinions are."

Country _____

Interview No. _____

Field of Activity _____

Time Begun _____

PIO/P _____

English Grade Score

Written Oral

Participant Sponsorship

- 1 Regular ICA
- 2 University Contract

Current Residence

- 1 Capital city area
- 2 Provincial city area
- 3 Rural place, village, town

Date Left for Training Program

Month Year

Date Returned fr. Training Program

Month Year

SURVEY of RETURNED PARTICIPANTS
Information about Participant AT TIME of DEPARTURE for Training

ADDRESS:TownProvince

1. Area of Residence
 - 1 Capital city area
 - 2 Provincial city area
 - 3 Rural place, village, town
 - 4 Outside of country
2. Employer

OCCUPATION

3. Type of Employer
 - 1 Government
 - 2 Private business
 - 3 Profession
 - 4 Trade union
 - 5 Student
 - 6 Other (specify)
4. Total Time in Field of Specialization
 - 1 None
 - 2 Less than 1 year
 - 3 One to just under 2 years
 - 4 Two to just under 5 years
 - 5 Five to just under 10 years
 - 6 Ten years or more
5. Kind of Work Done
6. Number of People Supervised

PERSONAL DATA

7. Date of Birth:

Day	Month	Year
8. Sex
 - 1 Male
 - 2 Female
9. Total Years of Education
10. Marital Status
 - 1 Married
 - 2 Not married (single, widowed, divorced)
11. Special School
 - 1 Attended
 - 2 Not attended
12. Type of Special School

13. University
 1 Attended
 2 Not attended
14. Name of University
15. Location of University
16. Major Field of Study
17. Degree
 1 Received degree
 2 Did not receive degree
18. Type of Degree
19. Name of Ministry Sponsoring Training Program

C. PREPARATION for GOING ABROAD

At this stage I am interested in some of the things which happened to you prior to your departure for the training program.

20. Try to think back in connection with the arrangements for going abroad for the ICA training program. Did you apply yourself or were you selected or were you invited to go?
 Own application
 Selected or invited (Q22)
 Don't know (Q23)
21. How did you learn of the training program project of ICA right from the beginning?
 From supervisor
 From educational institution
 From people in ICA/USOM
 From friend
 From other (specify)
 Don't know
22. Who selected you?
 Supervisor
 Other (specify)
 Don't know
23. While your program was being arranged, was there someone in your office or at your educational institution who gave you some sort of information?
 Yes
 No (Q26)
 Don't know (Q26)
24. Who gave you that information?
 Supervisor
 Other (specify and state position)
 Don't know

25. What did you learn about your program from this person?
(Ask in detail.)
26. Did the ministry which sponsored you give you any information about your program?
Yes
No (Q28)
Attached to ministry (Q28)
Don't know (Q28)
27. What kind of information about your program did you receive from the ministry? (In what connection was the information?)
28. At the time when you were selected to go abroad, were you working with USOM or working on a joint project of USOM and the Thai Government?
Yes (Q29)
No (Q30)
Don't know (Q30)
29. If "Yes": Was it permanent, part time, or just occasionally?
Permanent
Part time
Occasionally
30. If "No" or "Don't know": Prior to your being selected to go, did you ever work in connection with any one of the USOM projects?
Yes
No
Don't know
31. Prior to your departure for abroad, how satisfied were you with your program?
Very satisfied
Not yet very well satisfied
Did not know anything well enough
32. Did you have any share in the planning of your training program?
Yes (Q33)
No (Q35)
Don't know (Q36)
33. If "Yes": Did you have as much participation as you had wanted to?
Yes
No
34. Was the major portion of your program in accordance with your ideas or someone else's?
My ideas
Someone else's ideas
Ideas from both sides

40. Prior to your departure -- apart from the information about the the program -- did you have enough information regarding how to get along in (country underlined in Q39)? For instance:
Information regarding behavior (how to do) in restaurants and in public places
Information regarding idioms and spoken language
Information regarding the religious practices of the people in that country
Information regarding the use of currency, i. e., how should it be used, and the prices of articles
Information regarding manners and customs in general
 Yes
 No
 If "No": What types of information do you think would have been useful which were not previously received?
41. Are there still some other points on which you would have liked to be better informed but were not prior to departure? If so, what are they?

D. WHILE STAYING ABROAD

For this second stage I would like to know about the various experiences you had abroad.

42. When you arrived in (country underlined in Q39), did you join in any general orientation sessions which took longer than one day?
 Yes
 No (Q48)
 Don't know (Q48)
43. What city was that?
 USA (state city and state)
 Outside USA (state city and go to Q48)
44. What was the name of the location where the orientation sessions were arranged?
Washington International Center
 Other (specify name)
 Don't know
45. Did you receive any newsletters?
 Yes
 No
46. Do you think that the time spent on the orientation sessions was useful, or do you think it would have been better to spend it on other parts of the training program?
 Useful
 Should spend time for other parts of program
47. How do you think the orientation sessions could be improved in order to be more useful to those who will receive the grant in future? (What would you recommend?)

56. When you attended the university or school, did you enter as a regular student, a special student (observer, auditor or a special program) OR as a member of a group program?
 Yes No
 As a regular student
 As a special student
 As a member of a group program
 If "Yes": Spent how many weeks or how many months?
57. Which universities did you attend? And how long did you spend at each place?
 (Write name of university and length of time spent at each university in the following boxes.)

	Length of Time Spent
Name of University	
58. Did you receive a degree or a diploma?
 Yes (Q59)
 No (Q62)
59. If "Yes": What degree or diploma did you receive?
60. Do you think that the degree or diploma which you received will be very useful for your work in future, or somewhat useful, or not at all useful?
 Very useful
 Somewhat useful
 Not at all useful
 Don't know (Q64)
61. Why is that so?
62. If "No" to Q58: Do you think that a degree or diploma will be very useful to your work, or somewhat useful, or not at all useful?
 Very useful
 Somewhat useful
 Not at all useful
 Don't know (Q64)
63. Why is that so?
64. Did you think that the length of your training program was too long, just right, or too short?
 Too long
 Just right (Q66)
 Too short
65. How long, do you think, would have been suitable?
66. Did you think that the items arranged to be done or to be seen for the training program were too many, or should have been more?
 Too many items
 Could have been more
 Quite sufficient
 Don't know

67. How would you rate the program that was arranged for you? Considering the background and experience which you had at that time, would you say in general that it was too easy for you, just right, or too difficult?
 Too easy
 Just right
 Too difficult
 Don't know
68. Prior to your departure were you ever informed about the level of your program, if it were difficult or easy?
 Yes
 No
69. Do you think it would have been useful if you had been previously informed?
 Yes
 No
 Not interested
70. Did you follow the original program or did you make important changes after starting? This does not deal with changes in your traveling plan or stop-overs while traveling, but changes in course of your study?
Followed original program or minor changes (Q74)
 Important changes
71. What were the changes?
72. Did you think that these changes were necessary?
 Yes
 No
 Don't know (Q74)
73. Why did you think so?
74. Did you complete your training program or did you return prior to completion?
 Completed (Q76)
 Did not complete
75. Why was that so?
76. While you were in (country underlined in Q39), what was the experience you had which was the most useful and the most valuable? (Ask details)
77. And what was the least useful, according to your experience? (Ask details)
78. What is your opinion about the money allotted to you by ICA for living cost and travel during your training program? Can you say that it was too little, just right, or more than needed?
 Too little
 Just right (Q80)
 More than needed
79. Why do you think so?

80. According to the program arranged, do you think that the spare time for your personal interests was too much, sufficient, or too little?
 Too much
 Sufficient
 Too little
81. Were you ever invited to private homes during your program?
 Yes
 No (Q84)
82. How did you feel about visiting these homes? Did you like it very much, did you rather like it, or did you not like it?
 Liked very much
 Rather liked
 Did not like
83. Why did you feel so?
84. Now speaking about other social activities, did you think that there were too many or too few of these which were arranged for you? (Such as arranged by program advisors, by various organizations, or church group.)
 Too many
 Just right (Q87)
 Too few (Q86)
85. What kinds of activities do you think should have been less? (Go to Q87)
86. What activities do you think should have been more?
87. At the end of your program, did you ever attend the seminar in communications?
 Yes
 No (Q95)
 Don't know (Q95)
88. In which country was this seminar in communications held?
 In USA
 Other (specify)
89. What did you like most about the seminar?
90. What did you like least about that seminar?
91. Who arranged that seminar?
Michigan State University
 Other (specify)
92. Did you use in your work some of the things or ideas obtained from the seminar?
 Yes (Q93)
 No (Q94)
93. If "Yes": What did you use and how?
94. If "No": Why is that so?

95. Now I would like to know some things about English language training. Did your program require knowledge in English language?
 Yes
 No (Q100)
96. After your arrival and before commencing your program, did you take any additional or extra lessons in English to prepare yourself?
 Yes (Q97)
 No (Q98)
97. If "Yes": Do you think that more additional or extra lessons in English would be useful to you during the program?
 Yes
 No
98. If "No": Do you think that if you had had some English lessons, they would have been useful during your program?
 Yes
 No
99. If you had had difficulties with your English during the program, was it more so in making yourself understood, or was it to understand other people, or both?
 No difficulty at all
 Difficult to make other people understand
 Difficult to understand other people
 Both

E. AFTER RETURN

Now I am going to ask about your experience after having returned from the program referred to above.

100. How long has it been since you returned?
 5 months to almost a year
 1 year to almost 2 years
 2 years to almost 3 years
 3 years to almost 4 years
 4 years to almost 5 years
 5 years to almost 6 years
 6 years to almost 7 years
 7 years or longer
101. Since you returned from that program, have you ever been unemployed at any period?
 Unemployed ever since (Q102)
 Unemployed periodically (Q104)
 Never unemployed (Q108)
102. If "Unemployed ever since": Do you think that your unemployment was consequential to your going abroad for the training program?
 Yes
 No
 Don't know

103. Why do you think so? (Go to Q122)
104. If "Unemployed periodically": How long was each period of your unemployment?
 First unemployment
 Second unemployment
 Third unemployment
105. How long ago was it for each period of unemployment?
 First unemployment
 Second unemployment
 Third unemployment
106. Do you think that your unemployment was consequential to your going abroad for the training program?
 Yes
 No
 Don't know
107. Why did you think so?
108. Talking about the first job you had after your return from the training program, was it the same as the one you had prior to your departure?
 Same (Q113)
 Not same
109. Was this the job you expected to have when you returned?
 Yes (Q111)
 No
 Don't know
110. What was the difference between this job and the one you had previously?
111. How many people did you supervise in that job?
112. What type of job was it? Government, private business, trade union, profession, or other categories, or were you a student?
 Government
 Private business
 Profession
 Trade union
 Student
 Other (specify)
113. Are you working at present?
 Yes
 No (Q125)
114. Is your present position the same as that when you first returned?
 Yes (Q118)
 No
115. What is the difference between your present position and the one you had when you first returned?
116. How many people do you supervise on this job?

117. What type of job is it? Government, private business, profession, trade union, or other categories, or are you a student?
 Government
 Private business
 Profession
 Trade union
 Student
 Other (specify)
118. Supposing you had not gone for the training program, do you think you would be working in the same position as you have?
 Same position
 Better position
 Not as good
 Not sure
119. Now talking about knowledge and other things acquired from the training program. There are many of the participants who had said that not much of what they had learned had been applied to their work. How about you yourself? Could you use some of what you have learned from the program in the work that you do at present?
 Yes
 No (Q121)
 Don't know (Q121)
120. In saying that you can, could you say about how much is used? Practically none, a little, some, quite a lot, nearly all or all?
 Practically none
 A little
 Some
 Quite a lot
 Nearly all or all
121. Now, talking about the supervisor of your present job. How much does he help you to apply the knowledge acquired usefully? Can you say that he helps you considerably, some, or does not help at all?
 Helps considerably
 Some
 Does not help at all
 Indifferent, not ever interested
 No supervisor
122. Is there anyone working with you who had been abroad?
 Yes
 No (Q124)
123. Is he your supervisor?
 Yes
 No
124. Talking about passing on what you have learned from abroad to others, have you ever passed on anything of what you have learned to others?
 Yes
 No (Q127)
 Don't know (Q127)

125. How much have you passed on to others the knowledge obtained?
Practically none, a little, some, a lot, almost all or all?
Practically none
A little
Some
A lot
Almost all or all
126. By what means have you done this? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
By formal training program or lecture
By informal discussion
Writing articles or theses
Other (specify)
127. Have you any plans to make your knowledge from the program
useful but have not had the opportunity to do so?
Yes
No (Q129)
128. Can you tell me about these plans?
129. Since your return, have you made any contact with USOM?
Yes
No (Q131)
130. Since your return, have you ever worked in USOM or on a
joint project of USOM and the government?
Yes
No
131. Is there a USOM technician who is there to give you recom-
mendation and advice?
Yes
No (Q133)
Don't know (Q133)
132. Do you always keep in touch with him, or occasionally, or do
you never see him at all?
Always keep in touch
Occasionally
Never see him at all
133. Since your return, have you ever requested any assistance
from USOM or ICA?
Yes
No (Q135)
134. What sort of assistance did you ask for? (Can you tell me
some of it?)
(Write details of requests below and for each request ask
further:)
What type of assistance did you receive in this connection?
(Write details in right hand column.)
Request Assistance Received
135. Have you ever joined any U. S. professional society during
or after your training program?
Yes
No

136. Are you currently a member of any U. S. professional society?
 Yes
 No
137. Do you receive some U. S. professional publications?
 Yes
 No (Q139)
138. How useful are these publications to you?
139. Now supposing you were to begin your program all over again, what in general do you think must be corrected in order that the program would be much more useful to you?
140. Why do you think that it has to be corrected so?
141. Have you additional comments or suggestions to make in connection with your program?
142. Generally speaking, what do you think are the main obstructions in using or in passing on to other people the knowledge obtained from the training program?
143. After your return from the training program, do you think you have ever done one or two pieces of work which were notably outstanding? (Will you kindly relate.)
 (And after each piece of work is mentioned, ask:) Did you use some of what had been acquired from the training program in this piece of outstanding work?
 First Work
 Second Work
 Things from training program and applied to this work
144. In general, how satisfied were you with the training program, very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, not so satisfied, or not satisfied at all?
 Very satisfied
 Somewhat satisfied
 Not so satisfied
 Not satisfied at all
145. Some of those who received the scholarship and have returned have the idea that the training program was the most important thing they had done; some think that it was a pure waste of time; and some compromisingly say it was somewhere in between. What is your opinion about it?
 The most important thing
 Pure waste of time
Somewhere in between
146. Why do you feel like that?

(The following questions, added by USOM/Thailand, were incorporated as an integral part of the questionnaire:)

147. Did you join the orientation classes at AUA Language Center prior to your trip abroad?
 Yes
 No (Q149)
 Don't know (Q149)

148. Do you think that the AUA Orientation Program could be improved -- from your experience on your last trip abroad -- to be more useful to you? How?
149. When you arrived in the foreign country, did you feel the necessity to improve your English by additional instructions?
 Yes
 No (Q151)
 Don't know (Q151)
150. Where did you have these lessons?
American University Language Center
Own University
 Other (specify)
151. I have asked you once before about being a member of a U. S. professional society; now I'd like to ask you if you are a member of a professional society of any country?
 Yes
 No (Q153)
 Don't know (Q153)
152. Professional society of what country?
 Thailand
 Other which is not Thailand or USA
153. Are you still receiving professional journals from other countries (excluding the U. S.)?
 Yes
 No
 Don't know
154. In the country you spent the longest time, how often did you meet with the local people? (Whether in their homes or yours, or at social gatherings.) Can you roughly say, about 3 times a week or more often, once or twice a week, once or three times a month, or once in a while?
 Three times a week or more often
 Once or twice a week
 Once to three times a month
 Once in a while
155. Did you, yourself, request an extension of your program?
 Yes
 No
 Don't know
156. Did you get an extension?
 Yes
 No
157. Do you think there may be some things which your Thai friends would find very difficult to understand in connection with the U. S. or Americans?

(Thank the respondent for his close cooperation and say something similar to the following:)

Thank you very much. These are all the questions I have. The interview was rather long. I have to thank you once again for sparing the time. I hope that your opinions will be very useful in improving this project. Have you any queries regarding our survey?

If you still have additional ideas which you would like me to present to USOM or anywhere else, please note them down on this paper together with your name and address. I shall take it back with me. (Hand Follow-up sheet.) This sheet of paper will be separated; it will not be attached to the interviewing papers where your name will not be present. I am not able to say how much they would follow your suggestions but I can assure you that this sheet of paper will be delivered to the person who is truly responsible.

Lastly, I have said in the beginning that we would be interviewing the supervisors of the participants in order to have some opinions on the project also, in particular, your direct supervisor. But it will bear no relation to your opinions given in this interview whatsoever, and your supervisor will not have an opportunity to know your opinions on this sheet. Please give me the name of your direct supervisor together with his office address.

Name of Immediate Supervisor

Office address

Mark if no supervisor

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS for Participants Who Received More Than One ICA Scholarship

I have asked you in great detail about your last ICA Program and would now like to ask a little bit more about the previous times you went on the ICA Program.

1. Apart from this last program, how many more times have you been abroad for the ICA training program?

For the First Program:

2. Referring to the first time you went on the ICA program, can you tell me briefly what that program was about?
3. After you had returned from the first program, did you have the same position as before or did you have a different one?
Same position (Q6)
Different position
4. How was it different from the old one?
5. How many people did you supervise on that job?
6. Could you make use of the knowledge acquired after your return that time?
Used
Never used
Don't know

7. The knowledge that was used, can you roughly say whether it was practically unused, a little, some, quite a lot, nearly all or all?

Practically unused
 Used a little
 Used some
 Used quite a lot
 Used nearly all or all

For Second Program:

8. Now for the second program, I would like to know why you were able to go once again? (Ask in detail)
9. Can you tell me briefly in what connection was this second program?
10. After your return from the second program, did you have the same position as before or was it a different one?
 Same position (Q13)
 Different position
11. How was it different from the previous one?
12. How many people did you supervise on that job?
13. Could you make use of the knowledge acquired when you returned at that time?
 Used
 Never used
 Don't know
14. The knowledge that was used, can you roughly say whether it was practically unused, a little, some, quite a lot, nearly all or all?
 Practically unused
 Used a little
 Used some
 Used quite a lot
 Used nearly all or all

For Third Program:

15. Now about the third program, I would like to know why you were able to go for the third time? (Ask in detail)
16. Will you please briefly describe what this third program was about?
17. After your return from the third program, did you work in the same position as before or was it a different one?
 Same position (Q20)
 Different position
18. How was it different from the previous one?
19. How many people did you supervise on that job?

20. Were you able to use some of the knowledge acquired to your work when you returned at that time?

- Used
- Never used
- Don't know

21. That knowledge that was applied, can you roughly say whether it was practically unused, a little, some, quite a lot, nearly all or all?

- Practically unused
- Used a little
- Used some
- Used quite a lot
- Used nearly all or all

For All Participants Who Went More Than Once for the Program:

22. Referring to all the programs including the program on which was the intensive interviewing, can you more or less say which program, in general, was particularly more interesting than the others?

- Yes
- No (Q24)
- Don't know (Q24)

23. Why do you feel so?

24. Can you possibly say which program was the most useful in your opinion?

- Yes
- No (Q26)
- Don't know (Q26)

25. Why do you feel so?

26. Since you had previously been once on the program, did this help to make your last program more fully effective or less?

- More
- Less
- Don't know (Q28)

27. Why do you feel so?

28. Was there any one program which you think was rather unnecessary and for which there was no need to go? (Ask in detail)

29. Which do you think is more useful to Thailand: to send only a few people and let each one go many times, or to send a lot of people and allow for only one trip each?

- Few people but many times each
- A lot of people and once each
- Don't know (close off)

30. Why do you think so?

SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE - PART I
Back Translation

Introduction

The Thai Government and USOM are jointly making a survey for the purpose of finding a way to improve the Training Program. The Training Program is the sending of people of our country to the United States of America and other countries for work experience or for further studies in the various technical fields, in accordance with the project planned jointly between Thailand and the U. S.

This survey is conducted in many countries by interviewing the supervisors of participants under the stated program. I would like to know some things about your subordinate and would like also your opinions which will be useful in the improvement of the Training Program to make it more beneficial to future participants.

I would like to know about (name of participant) who had been abroad on the Training Program from ___ to ___. Please be assured that your answers will be treated as confidential and your name will never be referred to.

1. When (participant) was leaving to go abroad, was he working for you here?
 Yes (Q2)
 No (Q3)
 No, I wasn't here then (Q3)
2. If "Yes": Did you encourage his being given the scholarship?
 Yes
 No
 Don't know
3. If "No": Prior to (participant's) departure, did you know something about his training program?
 Yes
 No (Q8)
4. Who originated (participant's) training program? Was it he himself or someone in here or someone in another office?
 Participant himself
 Someone in this office
 Someone in another office (please specify name of office)
5. Did you help to prepare (participant's) program?
 Yes
 No (Q7)
6. What were the things you helped to prepare?
7. Prior to (participant's) going abroad, did this office have any project which could utilize his training?
 Yes
 No
 Don't know

8. Since (participant's) return did you ever ask him about the things he had learned?
 Yes
 No
 Don't know
9. And have you ever talked with him about other things he had acquired -- not connected with his study or training? For example, things about social, experiences of strange customs and traditions, or about the people of that country?
 Yes
 No
 Don't know
10. How long have you known (participant)?
11. About how many hours per week do you meet or talk with (participant)?
 16 hours or more
 8 to 15 hours
 4 to 7 hours
 Less than 4 hours
12. Has (participant) passed on to other people in this office what he has acquired from the training program?
 Yes
 No (Q14)
 Don't know (Q14)
13. How did he do it? (Passed on how?)
14. Do you think that the (participant's) training program was worth the money spent and the difficulties encountered in your work or not?
 Yes
 No
 Don't know
15. How much is the (participant's) training program suitable to the type of work of your section (division, department or ministry)? (If not suitable, ask in detail.)
16. Supposing you were to send another person for the training program like (participant's), what corrections, in your opinion, should be made?
17. Regarding the work abilities of (participant) at present, how important do you think was the fact that he had been on the training program? Most important, very important, helpful but not so important, not useful, or would it have been better that he had not gone for the training?
 Most important
 Very important
 Helpful but not so important
 Not useful
 Better not to have gone for training

SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE - PART II
Back Translation

(For this second part, interview each supervisor once only):

1. For this section, I would like to have your suggestions regarding the ICA training program in general. I am going to read the headings to you and would like to have your opinion about each as to whether it is good or not. And if you should find any which is not good, please also tell me what makes you feel so?

- (a) Consideration in selecting people to send
- (b) Subjects arranged under the training program
- (c) Level of program -- difficult or easy
- (d) Duration of program
- (e) Country visited for the program
- (f) Work training under the program

Good already

Not yet good

Cannot judge

Not yet good because:

2. Is there anything further about the training program about which you can give your opinions?
3. Have you yourself ever received ICA scholarship?
Yes
No

TECHNICIAN QUESTIONNAIRE - PART I

A. Introductory Remarks

Perhaps you would like to follow along while I read. (HAND TECHNICIAN A COPY OF INTRODUCTION.) USOM and the host government are working together on a world-wide study for the purposes of improving the Participant Training Program. Participants who have been back in this country for six months or more are being interviewed for this study. Certain information regarding their training can only be gained from the technicians responsible for their field.

Because it is often the case that we have to ask a technician for information on so many former participants, considerable attention has been given to devising a procedure for gaining the information needed from technicians in the least burdensome way.

We are interested only in improving the training program. The information we are developing is not to be used to affect the career of any individual. The names of all our cases and all our informants are separated from the questionnaire records as soon as the interview is completed, so that the information will be kept anonymous and confidential.

(ASK:) Do you have any questions so far?

Here I have a participant's card. (HAND TECHNICIAN A BLANK ANSWER FORM.) Notice that there are answer blocks on both sides of it. Now, if you will look at the "tear-stub" on the right side (front) of the card, you will notice information which will aid in identifying the participant where only the name would be insufficient. This information has been taken from our regular files to speed the interview along. The perforation along the left side of the study makes for easy separation of the answer section and identifying data when the interview is complete. The separation will be done before I leave this office, assuring the desired anonymity.

(ASK:) Do you have any questions on the "tear-stub?"

Perhaps you will not be able to answer all questions about all participants, but I would like you to give me whatever information you can about each person.

(PROCEED WITH QUESTIONNAIRE.)

B. DETERMINATION of PARTICIPANTS KNOWN to TECHNICIAN

1. First, I am going to read the names of some participants. I would like you to tell me whether you are familiar enough with their work and training program to give me some information and ratings about them.

(READ THE NAMES, ONE BY ONE, ON ALL THE CARDS TO BE USED FOR THIS TECHNICIAN.)

(IF THE TECHNICIAN INDICATES THAT HE IS NOT CERTAIN ABOUT THE NAME OF A PARTICIPANT, HAND HIM THE CARD SAYING:)

Perhaps the additional information given on the "tear-stub" will help you identify this individual.

(IF THE TECHNICIAN STILL FEELS HE DOES NOT KNOW THE PARTICIPANT, ASK:)

Do you know of any other technicians in this country who might be familiar with this participant?

(PUT ASIDE THE CARDS OF CASES WITH WHICH THE TECHNICIAN IS UNFAMILIAR, NO FURTHER QUESTIONS ARE TO BE ASKED ABOUT THEM.)

C. FOR ALL PARTICIPANTS KNOWN TO TECHNICIAN

2. Many factors sometimes make it difficult to see participants as much as would be desirable. Have any of these factors (HAND TECHNICIAN CARD NO. 2) interfered with your seeing these participants since their return from training?
1. First, your work load, or the number of participants you have to handle. Did this interfere with your seeing (READ NAME OF FIRST PARTICIPANT) as much as would be desirable?
 2. How about the location of this participant's job: Did this interfere?
 3. Did the participant's lack of initiative in seeking help interfere?
 4. Did his/her lack of time or overwork interfere?
 5. Did the attitude of his supervisor or employer toward his/her seeing you interfere?
 6. Did political problems interfere?
 7. Did difficulty in conversing with participant because of language barrier interfere?
 8. Did participant's personality interfere?
 9. Did anything else interfere? (IF YES: PLEASE SPECIFY)
 0. Nothing interfered with your seeing this participant as much as would be desirable.

(FOLLOW SAME PROCEDURE FOR ALL PARTICIPANTS TECHNICIAN KNOWS, THEN GO TO QUESTION 3.)

3. Here I am interested in how much contact you have had with each of these participants since his return, aside from contact of a strictly social type.
Would you say that you had been in contact with (READ NAME OF FIRST PARTICIPANT) once or twice, occasionally, frequently, or regularly? (HAND TECHNICIAN CARD NO. 3)

(ASK QUESTION 3 FOR ALL PARTICIPANTS AND GO TO QUESTION 4.)

4. Next, I would like you to tell me where these participants work and their job titles or a brief description of their duties.
Can you tell me where (READ NAME OF FIRST PARTICIPANT) works and what job he/she has?

(ASK QUESTION 4 ABOUT ALL PARTICIPANTS, THEN GO TO QUESTION 5.)

Next, I would like you to rate the contribution that each participant's training program has made to his ability to perform his present job well.

How about (READ NAME OF FIRST PARTICIPANT)? Would you say that his/her training made (HAND TECHNICIAN CARD NO. 5) a major contribution or a minor contribution to his ability to do his work, or would you say it was of no importance, or perhaps that it actually reduced his/her usefulness?

(ASK ABOUT ALL PARTICIPANTS, THEN GO TO QUESTION 6.)

In order that a training program be successful, participants must have certain personality attributes so that they may benefit from the training and later be able to apply it in their jobs. I'd like you to rate each of the participants in these attributes (HAND TECHNICIAN CARD NO. 6) as they may have affected the success of his training. Please feel free to comment on any of the responses you give.

How about (READ NAME OF FIRST PARTICIPANT):

- A. Have his/her educational qualifications been adequate or inadequate? Or can't you rate this?
- B. How about the intelligence of Mr./Miss/Mrs. ___? Has he/she shown it to be adequate or inadequate?
- C. Was his/her knowledge of the language in which training was given adequate or inadequate?
- D. How about his/her attitude toward his/her training program?
- E. And how about the attitude toward the present job?

(ASK A-E FOR EACH PARTICIPANT BEFORE GOING ON TO NEXT PARTICIPANT, THEN GO TO QUESTION 7.)

A training program must also be suitable for the participant and for the work he will be doing. Here I would like you to rate the following aspects (HAND TECHNICIAN CARD NO. 7) of the participant's program. Could you tell me whether they did or did not satisfy the needs of the participant's PIC/P?

- A. For example, would you rate the preparations of (READ NAME OF FIRST PARTICIPANT) before his/her departure as satisfactory? Or can't you rate this?

(FOR ALL PARTS OF THIS QUESTION TO WHICH REPLY IS "UNSATISFACTORY," ASK:) In what way do you feel that it was unsatisfactory?

- B. How about the type of program he/she took part in -- was it satisfactory or unsatisfactory for his/her needs?
- C. Was the subject-matter coverage satisfactory or unsatisfactory?
- D. How was the level of his/her training program?
- E. The length of the program?
- F. The country of training?
- G. The practicality of experience provided? Was he trained in the use of appropriate materials, equipment, and techniques?

(ASK A-G FOR EACH PARTICIPANT SEPARATELY, THEN GO TO QUESTION 8.)

8. In general, would you say you are satisfied or dissatisfied with what the following have done to make for good utilization of the participant's training? (HAND TECHNICIAN CARD NO. 8.)
- A. Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the utilization of (READ NAME OF FIRST PARTICIPANT) training by his/her present supervisor?
- (FOR ALL PARTS OF THIS QUESTION TO WHICH REPLY IS "DISSATISFIED", ASK:) In what way do you feel it was unsatisfactory?
- B. Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the utilization of his/her training by the Department or Ministry for whom he/she works?
- C. Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with what the participant himself/herself has done to make for good utilization of the training?
9. Now I would like you to compare some aspects of each participant's work with the work of other participants in this country with whom you are familiar. (HAND TECHNICIAN CARD NO. 9)
- A. In comparison with the jobs of other participants whom you know, how would you rate the importance of (READ NAME OF FIRST PARTICIPANT) job to the over-all economic development of this country? Would you say his/her job is of high importance, average, or low importance?
- B. And how do you rate his/her ability to do his/her job without any outside help? Would you rate it high, fairly high, average, or low?

(ASK ENTIRE QUESTION FOR EACH PARTICIPANT, THEN GO TO QUESTION 10 FOR ALL NOTCHED CARDS. IF THERE ARE NO NOTCHED CARDS, SKIP TO QUESTION 12.)

D. FOR PARTICIPANTS WHO WERE TRAINED after TECHNICIAN ARRIVED

(ASK QUESTION 10 FOR ONLY THOSE PARTICIPANTS WHOSE CARDS HAVE BEEN CLIPPED -- OTHER CARDS ARE COMPLETE AND MAY BE PUT ASIDE)

10. The data on this card indicates that (READ NAME OF FIRST PARTICIPANT) left for training while you were in your present office. I would like to know whether you recall having heard of him/her before he/she left for training.

(END INTERVIEW HERE FOR THOSE PARTICIPANTS TECHNICIAN HAD NEVER HEARD OF OR CANNOT REMEMBER BY PUTTING THOSE CARDS WITH THOSE JUST COMPLETED ON QUESTION 9.)

(ASK QUESTION 11 ONLY IF TECHNICIAN HAD HEARD OF ANY OF THE PARTICIPANTS PRIOR TO DEPARTURE FOR THEIR TRAINING. IF THERE ARE NO PARTICIPANTS REMAINING, SKIP TO PART II OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE.)

11. In this question I would like to know what kind of contact you had with the participant prior to his/her departure for training. Please answer Yes or No to the following: (HAND TECHNICIAN CARD NO. 11.)
- A. Did you help select (READ NAME OF FIRST PARTICIPANT) for the training program?
 - B. Did you help in planning his program?
 - C. Did you have previous work contacts with him?
 - D. Did you give him information or advice about his program?
 - E. Did you coordinate his program with the host country?
 - F. Did you coordinate his program with the employer?
 - G. Did you correspond with him while he was away?
 - H. Did you have any other pre-departure contacts? (IF YES: PLEASE SPECIFY)

(ASK A-H FOR EACH PARTICIPANT REMAINING.)

(TEAR OFF STUBS FROM ALL COMPLETED INTERVIEW CARDS IN THE PRESENCE OF THE TECHNICIAN. DON'T FORGET ANY CARDS PUT ASIDE AFTER QUESTIONS 9 and 10.)

TECHNICIAN QUESTIONNAIRE -- PART II

1. Now I have a few questions on the program in general. For this question I would like to have your opinions about the effectiveness of the Participant Training Program in your field. Do you have some strong feelings about either its strong or weak points that you would care to talk about?
2. In what ways are you satisfied with what USCM has done in this country to make for good utilization of the participant's training?
3. In what ways are you dissatisfied with what USOM has done in this country to make for good utilization of the participant's training?
4. Are there any techniques or methods of follow-up that you think are particularly good to use?
5. In what ways could the host government and the U. S. derive greater benefits from the training program?