PN-AAS-395
ISN 39233

4.013
58
no.2
ay 1965

A REPORT ON PARTICIPANT FOLLOW-UP/ EVALUATION

CURRENT NO. 2

"Some Statistics and Comments with respect to Participant and USOM Technician (Follow-Up/ Evaluation) Questionnaire Reports completed between April 30, 1964 and May 1, 1965"

Training Division
United States Operations Mission, AID
Bangkok, Thailand
May, 1965

A.I.D.
Reference Center
Room 1656 NS

A REPORT ON
PARTICIPANT FOLLOW-UP/EVALUATION

"Some Statistics and Comments with respect to Participant and USOM Technician (Follow-Up/Evaluation) Questionnaire Reports completed between April 30, 1964 and May 1, 1965"

Training Division
United States Operations Mission, AID
Bangkok, Thailand
May, 1965

Table of Contents

		Pages
Background		1 - 2
The Report		2 - 3
Part I	(Trend Assessment & Recommendations)	4 - 9
	1. Selection of Participants	4 - 6
	2. Participant Pre-departure Orientation as to the substantive aspects of the training	6 - 7
	3. Post-training Contacts	7 - 9
Part II	(The "Current" picture; detailed report)	
	Forward	10
	Section 1. Follow-up/Evaluation Questionnaire No.1; Participant Selection	11 - 17
	Section 2. Follow-up/Evaluation Questionnaire No.2; Participant Pre-departure Report	18 - 39
	Section 3. Follow-up/Evaluation Questionnaire No.3; Participant Returned Report	40 - 70
	Section 4. Follow-up/Evaluation Questionnaire No.4; Participant Six (6) Month Report	71 - 85
	Section 5. Participant Follow-up/Evaluation; Technician Six (6) Month Report	86 - 96
Part III	(Post-training situation one year after the participants' return)	
	Forward	97
	Section 1. Follow-up/Evaluation Questionnaire No.5; Participant One Year Report	98 - 110
	Section 2. Participant Follow-up/Evaouation; Technician One Year Report	111 - 121

BACKGROUND

In May 1964, the Training Division prepared and submitted a report on Participant Follow-Up entitled "Statistical Highlights of Participant/USOM Technician Reports, and Some Comments in regard to Mission Follow-Up Activity." The May, 1964 report was the first assessment of the Mission's training program based on data which post dates that collected and analyzed in the Returned Participant Evaluation Survey (hereafter referred to as RPES) which was published in 1964 as Volume I of "An Evaluation Survey."

This report is the second such assessment and introduces data which has been collected over the past 12 months. The data presented were obtained by self-administered questionnaires completed by participants and USOM technicians. A word about the design and purpose of these questionnaires is in order.

The participant's questionnaires number from 1 to 4 and are designed to ascertain the following:

Participant Questionnaire 1 Selection	- Participants pre-AUA experience and knowledge of the joint Thai-American project sponsoring his training and the process by which he becomes a candidate for AID sponsored training. (completed when entering AUA)
Participant Questionnaire 2 Pre-Departure	- a. His AUA experience; attitude toward and satisfaction with both the language training and orientation programs at AUA. b. The extent and nature of his pre-departure program preparation as shown by contacts and discussions with both his Thai superiors and USOM project advisors. (completed immediately prior to departure for training)
Participant Questionnaire 3 Returned Participant Report	- His experience with and attitude toward both the technical and non-technical aspects of his training, and his expectations in regard to his immediate future. (completed immediately upon return to Thailand)
Participant Questionnaire 4	- Post-training experience and attitude in regard to the utilization of his training; his USOM contacts during the first six months after return. (completed approximately 6 months after the participant's return)
Technician's Questionnaire Six (6) Month Report	- The technician's questionnaire is designed to ascertain the technician's personal evaluation of the participant's utilization of training; technician post-training contacts with the participant, and related data. (completed approximately 6 months after the participant's return)

The questionnaires /1 listed above elicit data which relate to three specific time periods which comprise the total training process. These are:

I.	The pre-departure period	(Participant Questionnaires 1 & 2)
II.	The period while abroad	(Participant Questionnaire 3)
III.	The post-training period	(Participant Questionnaire 4, and Technician's Questionnaire)

The questionnaires described above are basically the same as those which supplied data for the May report in 1964, and they contain many of the same questions which appeared in the questionnaires used in the RPES. Thus, using the RPES data as "bench mark" information we can, with some minor reservations, make a valid assessment of what is happening to the conduct of the mission's participant training program through time. The reservations to be kept in mind when comparing the RPES data with that collected more recently are as follows.

Participants represented in the RPES were interviewed in October, November and December, 1960, and included a sample of those sent since the beginning of Mission operations and who had returned to Thailand prior to March 30, 1960. Hence, in the interview, many of them answered questions about events, and expressed attitudes about experiences which had occurred years earlier. Thus, the RPES data is perhaps more colored by memory bias than that collected by the "current" /2 questionnaires. As was noted earlier, "current" questionnaires are completed at a time when the subject of inquiry is fresh in the participant's mind.

One other difference is that in the RPES the data were elicited by a personal and separate interview with each of the reporting participants. Currently, all questionnaires are self-administered and, in some instances completed in a group situation.

THE REPORT

This report consists of three parts. With the reservations noted, we proceed in part I with a "trend" assessment of the conduct of the participant training program in Thailand. In doing so, three sets of data will be referred to as follows: RPES (data from the Returned Participant Evaluation Survey), "Current", No.1 (data from May Report 1964, "Current", No.2 (day collected over the past 12 months.)

There is no reference made to specific tables containing the data discussed in part I. Only selected findings are used in this assessment and the data used can be found in the RPES Reports, the May 1964 Report, and parts II and III of this report.

/1 The questionnaires are on file at AID/W, A/IT, IT/R, Evaluation and Follow-Up Section

/2 "Current" refers to the data appearing in the May 1964 report, and that collected over the past 12 months, and reported in part II of this report.

Part II of this report consists of the statistical tables compiled from questionnaires completed over the past 12 months ("Current", No.2) and is subdivided into 5 sections. Section 1, deals with the data from participant questionnaire 1 - Selection (P/1); Section 2, with questionnaire No.2 - Pre-departure (P/2); Section 3, with participant questionnaire No.3 - Returned Participant Report (P/3); Section 4, with participant questionnaire No.4 - Participant's Six (6) Month Report (P/4); and, Section 5, deals with the Technician's Six (6) Month Report (T/1). In each of the 5 sections of part II, preceding the tables, will be some observations and comments with respect to the data shown. The table containing the data on which comment is made will be referenced.

Part III of this report consists of two sections and introduces data from two questionnaires which gives a picture of the returnees' post-training situation one (1) year after their return. Section 1 of part III deals with questionnaire No.5 Participant's One (1) Year Report (P/5) and is identical to questionnaire No.4 Participant's Six (6) Month Report (P/4). Section 2 of part III deals with the Technician's One (1) Year Report (T/2) and is identical to the Technician's Six (6) Month Report (T/1). These questionnaires were initiated in May 1964 for the purpose of decerning any changes which might have occurred in the participants post-training situation through time. Many of the participants reporting in section 1, part III of this report are the same participants who reported in section 4, part II of the May 1964 report. Likewise, many of the participants reported on (by technicians) in section 2, part III of this report are the same participants reported on (by technicians) in section 5, part II of the May 1964 report. In commenting on the data in part III comparisons will be made between the reported situation of participants six (6) months after their return as opposed to one (1) year after their return.

It is emphasized that the comments and observations appearing in sections I, II and III are made solely to provide as clear and reliable picture as the data and our analytical procedures will permit. In respect to the latter it is recognized that the data has not been fully exploited. To do so would require machine data processing with cross tabulations involving both funds and time, neither of which are readily available. Nevertheless the report gives a reliable general picture as to where we stand with respect to effective implementation of each phase of the participant training program and stands alone as a guide for future operations.

The tables in parts II and III of the report provide a breakdown of the findings by USCM's Technical Divisions. In most instances the number of cases appearing for the various divisions are insufficient in number to consider the differences shown as truly significant.

However, certain tables do reflect what appears to be differences in the effective effort between divisions and these should be noted for appropriate action. Division chiefs and project managers are urged to review all tables in the report with the purpose of discussing with their staff members the major findings and the factors which may account for the situation, either favorable or unfavorable, shown by the tables.

PART I

The RPES provided data on each phase of the training process and the results of this study indicated both the strength and weakness of the program as it operated prior to March 30, 1960. /1 Though the overall picture of the training program in "prior years" /2 appeared good, the RPES showed "soft spots" in our operations with respect to participant selection, pre-departure orientation as to the substantive aspects of the training, and post-training participant/technician contacts. Participant and USOM Technician Questionnaires tabulated over the past two years (May 64, May 65) give a "Current" picture of our operations with respect to selection, orientation and post-training contacts. In the order mentioned, the following gives a comparison between the RPES data (prior years) and the "Current" data (May, 64; "Current", No.I), (May 65; "Current", No.2) for these three areas of operational activity.

1. Selection

(a) "prior years"

The data from the RPES showed that participants in the earlier years of USOM's operations viewed the selection process as inherently local and unilateral. If it existed, participants were unaware of any active role of USOM technicians in the selection process. In the RPES only about 7% of the 460 participants interviewed mentioned USOM personnel as participating in their selection while 83% reported having been selected by their Thai supervisor. None of these participants made reference to being selected by a joint Thai/American committee.

The RPES showed that less than half (46%) of the participants interviewed were aware that their work prior to selection was in any way related to a joint Thai/American project, a further indication of participants' limited knowledge concerning the USOM TA, and the relationship of their training to a USOM activity.

(b) "Current" No.1

The May, 1964 tabulations showed that of the 132 participants reporting 26% mentioned USOM personnel as participating in their selection, and 67% mentioned their Thai supervisor. About 9% of these participants credited their selection to the activity of a committee, a procedure which USOM Policy Order No.75 (September 1962) strongly recommended.

In addition, 67% of the participants reported their work at time of selection as being with a joint Thai/American project, and an equally high percent said that they had personally met the USOM TA assigned to their project prior to being selected for training.

/1 See Vol.I, THE REPORT, Chapter II, Highlights of Survey Findings, Thai Watana Panich press, 1964.

/2 Previous to March 30, 1960

(c) "Current" No.2

The May, 1965 tabulations show that of the 118 participants reporting 24% mentioned USOM personnel as participating in their selection, and 88% mentioned their Thai supervisor. Only four percent credited their selection to a committee activity.

However, 83% of these "Current" participants reported their work at the time they were selected was on a joint Thai/American project, and better than 60% had personally met the USOM TA assigned to the sponsoring project prior to their selection.

Comment and Recommendation

The foregoing indicates a significant improvement through time in the overall picture of how the selectees perceive the selection process and the relationship of their training to joint Thai/American project activity. This is particularly true of the latter. Whereas less than 46% of those included in the RPES knew that their pre-selection assignment was "project-related", 67% of those in the May, 1964 report said so, and 83% of those selected over the past 12 months said they were working on a project. The three sets of data show a distinct, favorable trend in the selectees identification with joint Thai/American activity, and this is a crucial step in enhancing the likelihood of effective post-training project impact which the training is programmed to achieve.

The data, however, do not show that there has been any improvement over the past year ("Current", No.1, Current, No.2) in the way the selectees perceive USOM's role in their selection. By and large they see the selection process as a Thai prerogative. Though they know they are working on a joint Thai/American project and that their training is related to a joint effort they do not identify Americans as playing an active or strong role in their selection.

Unfortunately, in too many instances the participants concept of his selection represents the true situation. As the data indicates only in a few instances has a joint Thai/American selection committee been formed to screen and approve candidates. Experience strongly indicates that in the absence of a committee the role of USOM project personal is frequently that of approving selections after they are made rather than actively participating in the procedure. This results in the naming of individuals as principal candidates who for one reason as another do not measure up to the criteria for selection which are set forth in USOM Order No.800.3, Sections 5 and 8.

There are apparent reasons for the failure of selection committees to develop and function at the project level. Probably the most obvious is the pressure of other work on USOM's Technical Advisors, particularly the increasing necessity for their spending so much time on travel up-country. USOM Technical Advisors are simply not available to work with their Thai counterparts to the extent desirable.

More and more of USOM's activity is concentrating in the Northeast, with less technician time spent in Bangkok. Thus technicians are often not in Bangkok when participant selections are being considered by the Thai. Moreover, though joint Thai/American activity is currently concentrated up-country, most of the selectees for training abroad continue to come from Bangkok. The May/65 report shows that of those currently departing, 60% were working in Bangkok at the time of selection.

In order to more effectively implement the selection process by strengthening the role of USOM it is herewith recommended that a permanent selection committee be appointed for each functional field in which participant training is programmed. On the American side this committee should be represented by the Chief of the Training Division and the Chief of the Technical Division concerned. On the Thai side there should be a representative from DTEC and the Thai Ministry or Agency concerned.

It is suggested that such a committee be established in implementing the FY-66 training program.

2. Participant Pre Departure Orientation as to the substantive aspects of the training.

(a) "Prior years"

The RPES data showed the pre-departure orientation of participants during the early years of the mission's operations as being, at best, a hit-or-miss proposition. As many as 35% of the participants interviewed claimed to have received no program information at all prior to their departure. Of those who reported receiving information, about half said that they were given information by their supervisor or others where employed, and a fifth said that they learned about their program from USOM personnel. More specifically, 73% reported that they had been told nothing about the level of the program they were undertaking, and only 5% said that they were told anything from any source about the use to be made of their training after their return.

(b) "Current" No.1

The data from the May 1964 tabulation ("Current", No.1) showed a marked improvement in efforts to prepare the participant for the program he was to undertake. Of the 175 reporting, 139 (about 80%) said that persons at their place of employment had discussed their training program with them. Six out of ten reported that their supervisors had specifically discussed their post-training assignment and plans for accomplishing the "multiplier effect" of their training abroad. An even greater number of these participants reported pre-departure discussions about their program with a USOM technical advisor. Of the 175 reporting, 153 (about 87%) reported discussing their programs with a TA or other USOM personnel and 75% said the level of their program had been discussed.

(c) "Current", No.2

The data from the May 1965 tabulations show that 70 percent of the participants departing during the preceding 12 months discussed their training program with someone at their place of employment (Thai Ministry or Agency). Of those reporting such a discussion 90% (60% of total reporting) said they had specifically discussed their post-training assignment and 70% discussed plans for accomplishing the "multiplier effect" of training after their return.

Of the 101 reporting during the last 12 months, 84 (about 84%) said they had discussed the program they were undertaking with their USOM Technical Advisor or other USOM personnel, and 70% said the level of their program had been discussed.

Comment and Recommendation

The foregoing clearly indicates an improvement through time in preparing the departing participant for the program to be undertaken abroad and his function on return.

However, "Current", No.1 and "Current", No.2 data indicate no improvement in this respect during the past year. In fact, the two sets of data show the overall effort (both Thai and American) in pre-departure orientation with respect to the substantive aspect of training to have "slipped" noticeably within the last year.

In regard to the picture shown, the reader is cautioned not to assume that 15 percent or more of the participants depart without having discussed their programs with anybody at USOM. This is not the case. The questionnaire eliciting the data is completed by the participant when he reports to the Training Division for a final pre-departure briefing. The completed questionnaire is used as a guide by the Training Officer in his discussion, and in many instances when the participant has reported having no discussion with the USOM TA this person is contacted and participates in the final breifing. Thus, in all cases there is between USOM and the participant a discussion of the training to be undertaken prior to the participant's departure.

The fact remains, however, that in too many cases Thai and American project personnel are not performing satisfactorily in pre-departure counseling with the participant. The Thai supervisor on the project and the American advisor both represent a "professional seniority" to the participant for which he has respect, and a desire for recognition. For this reason, and the fact that the participant represents a substantial project investment, there should be no instance where a participant reports to the Training Division (immediately prior to departure) that neither his Thai superior or the USOM project advisor has discussed his program with him.

It is recommended that division chiefs review with their various project managers their role in pre-departure participant orientation as it is set forth in USOM Order No.800.3, Section 7. The American project managers should in turn review with their Thai counterparts the role they should play in this phase of the training process.

3. Post-training Contacts

(a) "Prior years"

The RPES showed that in the earlier years of the mission's operations both the number of participants known by USOM TAs and the frequency of contact with those known were both relatively low. Only about two-thirds of the participants interviewed in the RPES reported having ever had any contact with USOM since their return. Slightly over half reported that their post-training work was on a joint Thai/American project.

At the time of the survey, USOM records showed that 77% of the participants interviewed in the RPES were presumably working in an activity to which a USOM TA was assigned. Yet, only 44% of the participants covered said there was a USOM TA available for consultation, and little more than half of these reported "frequent" contacts with USOM technicians.

The technicians interveined in the RPES substantially corroborated the picture given by the participants in respect to post-training contact. According to USOM records, there were 357 participants in the RPES sample from projects having one or more TAs aboard at the time of the survey. Of these, the TAs knew only 167 (about 47%) well enough to give a report. In 29% of these cases, the reporting TA was unable to comment on the extent to which training was utilized.

The RPES data also showed that of the 167 participants reported on by USOM TAs, only 28% had been contacted "frequently." The TAs reported an equal number as having been contacted no more than once or twice.

It might be assumed that the RPES picture of the percent of participants known by USOM TAs, and frequency of contact, was due to the fact that many of the participants comprising the RPES sample had departed and returned from training several years prior to conducting the RPES. Hence, the technicians aboard at the time of the study could not be expected to know those participants. The RPES data do not support such an assumption. The data show that the technicians reported knowing, and contacting, just as high a percent of the participants who departed (and returned) during 1957-1958 as they did those departing (and returning) in 1959-1960. In fact, of the participants in the RPES who had departed and returned during the Thailand assignment of the USOM Technical Advisors reporting, only 54% were reported by TAs as being known.

(b) "Current", No.1

The May, 1964 tabulations showed that 50% of the participants, 6 months after return, reported that a USOM technician was available to them for consultation and advise. Of these, more than one-third said that they had personally talked with the USOM Technical Advisor four (4) or more times since their return, and an additional 59% reported having had at least one personal contact.

When the participants reported the availability of a USOM TA, a very favorable relationship was indicated in that about 80% of those so reporting said that the USOM TA was either very or somewhat helpful to them in putting their training into practice in Thailand.

In the May, 1964 tabulations USOM technicians reported on 163 of the most recent returnees who had been back from training for 6 months. Ninety-four percent (94%) of these were reported as being employed by the sponsoring project and personal contacts had been made with 78%. About one-third of the 163 had been contacted four (4) or more times by a Technical Advisor during the first 6 months following their return. In the composite TA's report on these returnees a rating of the utilization of training was made for 123 of the 163, about 75%.

(c) "Current", No.2

The May 1965 tabulations (questionnaires completed over the past year) show that 72 of the 129 participants reporting (56%) said that a USOM technician (or contract representative) was available to them for consultation and advice. A larger number, (77%), said that they had personally talked with a USOM TA during the past 6 months and of these 41% reported four or more personal contacts, with about one-third averaging two (2) contacts per month. Of the 72 participants who said a USOM TA was available to them for consultation and advice 66 (91%) said the TA was "somewhat" or "very helpful" to them in putting their training into practice in Thailand.

In the May, 1965 tabulations USOM Technical Advisors reported on 119 of the most recent returnees who had been back from training 6 months. Of these, better than 90% were reported as working on the sponsoring project, with an assignment which was in line with the training received. The TAs reported having had at least one "prior" /1 personal contact with about 75 of these returnees, with 35% having been contacted 4 or more times during the preceding 6 months. In the composite TAs report on current returnees, an overall rating of the utilization of training was made for 95 of the 119, about 80%.

Comment and Recommendation

The foregoing clearly indicates that USOM TA knowledge of the returnees and personal post-training contact with them has improved significantly over the past two or three years, particularly during the past 12 months.

It is worthwhile to comment that the improvement in technician performance shown by the data from the May, 1964 tabulations and the May, 1965 tabulations has occurred even though a high percent of the participants covered by the latter returned to Thailand after the sponsoring project had phased out and no technician was aboard whose assignment concerned their activity. This was true for about 40% of the participants who reported, and for about 30 percent of those reported on by technicians. /2 These percentage are not additive. The 30% is included in the 40%. This situation largely explains the fact that only 56% of the participants reporting said a USOM TA (or contract representative) was available to them for consultation while the TA's reported a "prior" personal contact with about 75% of those on which they submitted the Six (6) Month (questionnaire) Report.

A further indication of increased TA interest and activity in post-training follow-up is the fact that of the 119 returnees reported on a utilization rating was made for 80%. This exceeds by 5% the number for which a "prior" contact was reported and is indicative of an effort to learn from others the post-training situation and participant performance in those cases where personal contacts cannot be arranged.

It is re-emphasized that the improvement in post-training participant and TA relationship has been pronounced. The Chiefs of the various Technical Divisions, project managers, and the individual Technical Advisors are to be congratulated.

The Training Division recently published a Provincial Index of returned participants. A copy of this Index has been forwarded to all USOM direct hire and contract personnel stationed up-country and it should prove very helpful in facilitating personal contacts.

It is recommended that Bangkok personnel, when planning up-country trips, call on the Training Division for a copy of this Index and that a special effort be made to include "some" personal calls on the returnees located in the areas visited.

/1 A contact prior to receiving the Technician Six (6) Month Report Questionnaire (T/

/2 As shown by USOM Training Division records.

PART II

Foreward

Part II consists of 5 sections, each comprised of comments and tables, in that order. The data presented are from participant questionnaires No.1 through No.4, (Selection, Pre-departure, Return, and Six (6) Month Report) and the Technician Six (6) Month Report (T/1). All questionnaires were completed between April 30, 1964 and May 1, 1965.

The question eliciting the shown data serve as the table heading, and all tables give a breakdown of the data by technical fields of training (equivalent to USOM's Divisions).

It is to be noted that each table includes only those participants for which the inquiry was applicable. For example, in section 1, table P/1-1, only 99 of the 118 participants reporting said they were "selected" for training as opposed to having "made application." Thus, the base is 99 for table P/1-3, which shows who the participant feels was involved in his selection. Other tables developed from "contingency" questions are likewise presented.

The "not answered" category appearing in a table indicates a participant failure to answer a question which was applicable, and represents perhaps a different frame of mind than an expressed "don't know," "undecided", "no opinion", or "no suggestion" response. Of course, in some instances a "no answer" simply indicates an honest oversight on the part of respondent; which is one weakness of the self-administered questionnaire in data collection.

There are many aspects of participant experiences, including attitudes, return-expectations, and job-realizations, on which one or more of the current questionnaires has shed some light. Only a few of these were specifically mentioned in Part I. In the sections which follow, comments are made about selected additional ones.

There are tables at the end of each section on which little or no comment is made. It is recommended that Chiefs of Technical Divisions and their project managers review each of the tables in Part II with the purpose of noting that which should be a matter of discussion among their own staffs, and between them and their Thai counterparts.

SECTION 1

Follow-up/Evaluation Questionnaire No.1; Participant Selection /1

Introduction

This section deals with tabulations of 118 P/1 questionnaires which were completed by participants /2 between April 30, 1964 and May 1, 1965. In most instances the questionnaire was completed when the participant reported to AUA for instruction in the English language. Due to an inadequacy in English at this point in time, the questionnaire used is in the Thai language. An English translation of the questions eliciting the data serves as the heading for the tables appearing at the end of the section.

P/1 is a questionnaire to be completed by all selectees for USOM sponsored trainir However, in actual operations this has not been accomplished. In practice only those selectees who enter AUA complete the questionnaire. Thus, those reporting are different from those who do not report in that they are undertaking programs which require proficiency in English and which are more likely to be academic and of a longer duration.

In the tables for this section the column headed "misc" includes four (4) participants in Public Works, three (3) in Social Development, two (2) from Special Projects, and one (1) in Education.

The questionnaire used over the past 12 months is identical to that used during the preceding 18 months. Hence, the findings discussed in this section may be compared to those shown in the May, 1964 report. Where such comparisons are considered noteworthy they will be made a part of the following comments.

Comments

As shown by tables P/1 - 5 and P/1 - 4 a large majority of the participants selected over the past 12 months are aware of the fact that their opportunity for traini relates to their work on a joint USOM/Thai Project, and that the training is being programmed to serve the needs of theproject. Seventy percent (70%) of those selected said they were working on a joint Thai/USOM project at the time of their selection, and almost 80% felt that the needs of the project was a very important consideration in their being given the training opportunity. Overall, this finding differs very little from that reported in the May, 1964 report for the participants who were selected during the 18 month period preceding that report. In the May/64 report the percentages were 66 and 85 respectively.

Most selectees for AID sponsored training continue to view the selection process as being pretty much a Thai unilateral action. Though an increasing percentage appreciate the fact that they are "selected" as opposed to "making application" the number who credit USOM personnel with having been a first source of knowledge about AID (USOM) training, or as having been active in their selection remains relatively small. As shown by tables P/1 - 1 through P/1 - 3 about 84% said they were selected for the training; 9% first learned of the training from USOM personnel, and 25% credited USOM personnel with having something to do with their selection. In the May, 1964 report these percentages were 79, 5, and 32.

/1 Referred to in this report as P/1

/2 Includes some who were selected as alternates to the principals.

The point of concern is that few selectees perceive their selection as a joint undertaking by Thai and American project personnel even though better than two-thirds of them identify with a project and know of USOM's Technical Advisor assigned to the project; tables P/1 - 5 and P/1 - 8. As commented in Part I, the TA is not participating systematically in the actual selection of participants. Some reasons for this and a recommendation for correction appears in part I of this report.

With respect to the selectees knowledge of the USOM TA, his personal contact with him and how he perceives the TA's role in the selection process, the picture has not improved over the past year. In the May, 64 report 83% of the participants were aware of the availability of a TA where they had been working. Table P/1 - 8 shows that only 67% of those selected over the past 12 months possessed this awareness. However, of the latter group a larger percentage had actually met the TA prior to selection. Table P/1 - 9 in this section shows 90% had met the TA, while the May, 1964 report showed approx. 80%. Likewise, a higher percentage of those selected over the past 12 months, who reported a TA available, said that the TA consulted and advised with them personally than did those covered in the May 1964 report.

As shown by table P/1 - 6 six out of ten of the participants reporting were worki in Bangkok at the time of selection, less than one-third were working up-country, and the remaining (about 12%) were spending time both in Bangkok and up-country. This distribution is rather surprising in view of the fact that more and more of USOM's total program is devoted to assistance to the northeast. As compared to the group reported in the May, 1964 report, approximately 12% more of the "current" /1 selectec are from Bangkok than was true in 1962 and 1963.

Table P1 - 12, does reflect slightly the change in program emphasis. Whereas 6 out of 10 report they were working in Bangkok when selected, on their return slightl less than 4 out of 10 expect to be in Bangkok. As the table shows, however, b d on their own expectations, the number of participants working (full time) up-country will not increase as a result of training, but the number who will work both in Bangkc and up-country will increase significantly.

Regardless of where assigned on their return, a large majority (76%) expect at the time of selection to return to the same kind of work they were doing prior to training; see table P/1 - 11.

It should be kept in mind that this section is based on participant informational levels, opinions and expectations as they exist at the time of selection. In almost all of the 118 cases the participant undergoes intensive language training at AUA after completing the questionnaire. In fact, many of them are now in AUA. Attention is directed particularly to the 17 and 12 percent who say they do not know the kind of work they will be doing on return (table P/1 - 11) or where they will be working (table P1/1 - 12). Thai/American project personnel should assure that these aspects of the post-training assignment be crystallized, and that appropriate discussions are held with these participants prior to their departure.

/1 The word "current" is used here and else where in this section to refer to participants who have completed P/1 during the past 12 months (April 30, 1964 - May 1, 1965)

Section 1: Referenced Tables

Q. 1. We are interested in some events and considerations in your being a candidate for training abroad -- Did you make application by yourself to go, or were you selected by someone else before you had made application?

Table P/1-1

	Response by Technical Field of Activity					
	AG	PH	PA	PS	Misc.*	Total
Made application	0	2	15	0	1	18
Was selected	51	9	21	9	9	99
Don't know	0	0	0	1	0	1
Participants reporting	51	11	36	10	10	118

*Misc. includes: Public Works 4, Education 1, Social Dev. 3, Special Project 2. This is the case for all subsequent tables in Section 1.

Q. 2. How did you first learn about ICA(AID)/USOM training programs in your field?

Table P/1-2

	Response by Technical Field of Activity					
	AG	PH	PA	PS	Misc.	Total
From supervisor	47	10	24	6	7	94
From colleagues	1	1	4	0	0	6
From USOM Personnel	3	0	3	3	2	11
Other Thai person	0	0	3	1	0	4
Other non-Thai person	0	0	2	0	1	3
Don't recall	0	0	0	0	0	0
Participants reporting	51	11	36	10	10	118

Q. 3. (If you were selected by someone; please answer this question) Who selected you? (If you feel two or more of the following took part in your selection, check the two which had the most to do with it. If only one made the selection, check that one only).

Table P/1-3

(Reports only those who said they were selected. Questions permitted as many as 2 mentions)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity					
	AG	PH	PA	PS	Misc.	Total
My supervisor	48	7	18	8	7	88
USOM personnel	13	5	1	2	3	24
Ministry or other Thai official	1	0	1	0	0	2
I won scholarship	0	0	7	0	1	8
Selected by a committee	1	0	0	1	2	4
Don't know	0	1	0	0	0	1
Total mentions	63	13	27	11	13	127
Participants reporting	51	9	21	9	9	99

Q. 4. To what extent do you feel the following were important in your being selected as a candidate for USOM training abroad? (Check one)

Table P/1-4

Selection Factors	Degree of Importance				Participants reporting
	Very Importance	Importance	Not Imp. at all	Don't Know	
Your personal ability	92	25	0	1	118
The needs of your job	94	23	1	0	118
Your personal contacts	23	62	26	7	118
Your language ability	102	13	2	1	118
Your professional and educational qualifications	81	33	2	2	118
The needs of a joint Thai/American project	93	23	0	2	118

Q. 5. Were you working with USOM or working on a joint USOM/Thai Government project at the time you were selected? (Check one)

Table P/1-5

	Response by Technical Field of Activity					
	AG	PH	PA	PS	Misc.	Total
Yes	34	11	27	6	5	83
No	8	0	8	4	4	24
Don't know	9	0	1	0	1	11
Participants reporting	51	11	36	10	10	118

Q. 6. Is the place where you have been working up-country or here in Bangkok?

Table P/1-6

	Response by Technical Field of Activity					
	AG	PH	PA	PS	Misc.	Total
Bangkok	22	4	30	7	7	70
Up-country	18	7	4	3	1	33
Both Bangkok and Up-country	11	0	2	0	2	15
Participants reporting	51	11	36	10	10	118

Q. 8. Has there been a USOM technical advisor available to give you and your supervisor and colleagues advice and assistance in the work you were doing?

Table P/1-8

	Response by Technical Field of Activity					
	AG	PH	PA	PS	Misc.	Total
One or more available; advises only with supervisor	21	7	12	2	1	43
One available, advises with supervisor, myself and colleagues	20	1	10	2	4	37
None available; or don't know	10	3	14	6	5	38
Participants reporting	51	11	36	10	10	118

Q. 9. Had you met this USOM technical advisor prior to learning you were going to be selected for training?

Table P/1-9

(Reports only those who said a USOM TA was available; 80 of the 118 candidates)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity					
	AG	PH	PA	PS	Misc.	Total
Yes	35	8	20	3	4	70
No	5	0	2	1	1	9
Don't recall or don't know	1	0	0	0	0	1
Participants reporting	41	8	22	4	5	80

Q. 11. If you go abroad for training, do you expect to return to do the same type of work you are doing now or do you expect your job to be different?

Table P/1-11

	Response by Technical Field of Activity					
	AG	PH	PA	PS	Misc.	Total
Same type of work	38	11	25	9	7	90
Different type of work	1	0	6	0	1	8
Don't know	12	0	5	1	2	20
Participants reporting	51	11	36	10	10	118

Q. 12. On your return, where do you expect to be assigned for work, in Bangkok or up-country, or both?

Table P/1-12

	Response by Technical Field of Activity					
	AG	PH	PA	PS	Misc.	Total
Bangkok	5	3	24	7	4	43
Up-country	23	7	-	1	2	33
Both Bangkok and Up-country	16	1	7	0	3	27
Don't know	7	0	5	2	1	15
Participants reporting	51	11	36	10	10	118

Section 2

Follow-Up/Evaluation Questionnaire No.2: Participants' Pre-departure Report /1

Introduction

This section deals with tabulation of 101 P/2 questionnaires completed between April 30, 1964 and May 1, 1965. The questionnaire is in English and is completed by participants immediately prior to their departure for training. Those excused from this exercise are those who do not have adequate proficiency in English to do so, and certain VIP's who are undertaking short period observation type programs. Generally speaking, all participants whose programs are 6 months or longer in duration complete P/2.

It should be kept in mind that whereas P/1, Section 1 deals primarily with participants selected and programmed under the FY-65 program, P/2, Section 2 reports primarily on those in the FY-64 program, with a few from FY-63 and only two (2) or three (3) from FY-65.

The P/2 in use over the past 12 months is, with a few exceptions, identical to the questionnaire tabulated and reported as P/2, Section 2, of the May 1964 report. Comparison may be made between the data in this section and that which appears in the May/64 report. This will be done, in some instances, in commenting on the tables appearing at the end of the section.

Comments

(a) AUA Language program; tables P/2 - 2 through P/2 - 12.

Pre-departure questionnaires completed during the past 12 months indicate that those who attended AUA have, in general, a very favorable opinion of the language instruction they received there. Three out of four reported a "lot" of improvement in their English while at AUA, with 63% saying that the improvement was at a faster rate than they had expected. No one reported no improvement while at AUA and only 4 (about 6%) said their progress was slower than theyhad expected it to be. (See tables P/2 - 5 and P/2 - 6). Further indication of a favorable AUA experience is shown in table P/2 - 9. All but one of the participants report this experience as "moderately" or "highly" satisfactory.

As compared to that shown in the May, 1964 report the foregoing indicates an improvement at AUA. It is believed this is the true situation and more will be said about this later.

As shown by table P/2 - 2, of the 101 participants completing P/2 only 63 received English instruction at AUA. This represents a significant percentage (about 23%) drop from the May report in 1964 and is explained by the fact that a higher percent of those departing in the last 12 months had the required level of English proficiency when selected,and, as in the case of a number of Public Health participants some received their language training in the provinces prior to reporting to AUA for testing. It will be noted in table P/2 - 3 that the number of weeks at AUA varied

---

/1 Referred to in this report as P/2

significantly by functional field of training. The 18 participants in Agriculture averaged 34 weeks at AUA. Those in Public Administration and Public Safety averaged 13 to 15 weeks less. The overall average was some 26 weeks which is 3 weeks longer than the average for the group covered by the May, 1964 report.

It is worthwhile to comment at this point that over the past three years (ever since the Training Division has made such a computation) the number of weeks required to prepare participants in English proficiency has steadily increased.

Tables P/2 - 4 and P/2 - 4(a) show an operational problem which has been known for sometime, and about which corrective steps have already been taken. For the past few years it has been noted that relatively large number of participants were called forward prior to having completed their scheduled program at AUA. When this occurs it is always the conversational part (the last 6 weeks) of their program which is omitted, or cut short. Only about three fourths of those departing in the last 12 months completed this part of their programs. Yet, seven (7) out of ten (10) of those who have suggestions for improving the language training (table P/2 - 10) say that "more conversation" is needed.

USOM and AUA have taken two steps to correct this situation just described. First of all, with a better response from the Thai ministries we were able to get a much higher percent of the FY-65 candidates into AUA at an earlier point in time./1 As a result many of these participants have already completed their AUA program (including the 6 weeks conversation) and are now awaiting their call forward (C.F.) in August.

Secondly, AUA has changed their intensive language course to introduce conversational English at an earlier point in their overall program. Whereas conversational English was delayed until the last 6 weeks, it is now being introduced in the second or third six weeks of training, depending on the overall length of the individuals scheduled program. This change is considered to be extremely significant in improving the participants language training. It not only alleviates the problem of a C.F. prior to the completion of an individual program, it is strengthening AUA's overall program in the area which has received the most participant criticism.

Table P/2 - 7 & 8 requires a speicial note of explanation. As shown, the data is misleading. In the tabulation of the data it was noted that in the majority of cases the period indicated as the one in which most progress was made was the last six weeksof training, or "Conversational English." This observation serves to strengthen the findings noted earlier, and has led to a slight change in the P/2 Questionnaire which will permit a more meaningful tabulation of this inquiry in future reports.

Though the data show a high degree of accomplishment, and personal satisfaction with AUA language training, the fact remains that a large number of Thai participants depart feeling that their English is inadequate for the undertaking they face. Better than four (4) out of ten (10) feel that additional lessons in English is needed. (Table P/2 & 1). An overwhelming percent (table P/2 - 12) of these feel this additional instruction should be given after their arrival in the country of training (USA).

/1 A high percent entered AUA in October, 1964

There is, however, evidence that the percentage of departees who feel their English is adequate is increasing. The 58% shown in table P/2 - 11 in this report is 10% greater than that shown in table P/2 - 11 in the May, 1964 report.

In summarization, the data appearing in tables P/2 - 2 through P2/12 show clearl that, from the participants' view point, AUA is doing a very good job.

More important, a comparison of the data in this section with that developed a year ago (see tables P/2 - 2 through P2 - 12, May, 1964 report) shows that an increasing number of USOM participants speak favorably of the AUA language program, and depart feeling more adequately prepared to face the language problem when they reach the USA.

(b) AUA Orientation program; Tables P/2 - 13 through P/2 - 15(d).

The data (Tables P/2 - 13 through P/2 - 15(d) show a similar picture for AUA's orientation program to prepare the participant for life in the USA. As compared to comparable tables in the May 1964 report the "current" /1 data show a significant improvement. For example, the number of participants who view the AUA orientation program as very satisfactory increased by about 10%. With the exception of "Religion an religious practices" nearly all of the participants report having received adequate information on the topics about which inquiry was made, and the number who report adequate coverage on this subject has increased by about 10% during the past 12 month

The only way in which this aspect of participant pre-departure preparation has suffered is that, relatively speaking, a decreasing number of departees participate in the AUA orientation program. Only 50% of those departing during the past 12 month did so. This compares to 80% of those who were covered in the May, 1964 report. Thi picture deserves a word of explanation.

Of those who did not attend AUA orientation 57% did not do so because they had been to the USA before, or they were going to third countries. Theoretically these participants would not have benefitted from such attendance. However, 43% of those not attending did not do so because they did not have time due to an early call forward, or for some other reason. This number accounts for about 22% of all participants who departed, and is a matter of concern. As mentioned earlier in commenting on the conversational English course, this problem can only be solved by assuring tha candidiates enter AUA at an earlier date. This arrangement was made for many of the participants in the FY-65 program. Every effort must be made to assure that we do so with respect to the FY-66, and future programs.

Table P/2 - 15(e) is a new table in that it did not appear in the May 1964 repor The table is included to give AUA some insight as to areas in which the participants feel an improvement might be made. It is significant that less than half of those attending the orientation program had any suggestion to make, and one-third of these mentioned nothing specific. Interestingly, "Religion and religious practices" is not specifically mentioned here even though it is the one subject matter area which the greatest number felt to be inadequately covered.

/1 The word "current" is used here and elsewhere in this section to identify data collected over the past 12 months.

(c) The Thai role in pre-departure orientation as to the substantive aspects of training; tables P/2 - 18 through P/2 - 21.

Seven (7) out of ten (10) of the participants departing in the past 12 months reported that someone (Thai) at their place of employment had discussed their program with them, (Table P/2 - 18). This compares with better than eight (8) out of ten (10) who so reported in the May, 1964 report. A recommendation to correct this indicated lessening of effort has been made in part I of this report and no further comment is required here.

As shown by table P/2 - 19, the participants immediate supervisor, or other Thai official are the ones who most often discuss the training program with the participant. However, "former (USOM) participants" are playing a significant role in these discussions. This is considered a very favorable procedure in that such persons can give from first hand experience information and advice on the problems the participant will face when he reaches the USA. However, discussions with former participants does not suffice to displace the need for a discussion between the participant and his superiors. In fact, the picture shown by table P/2 - 19 probably explains the following tables (P/2 - 20(a), (b), (c), etc.) which show a failure to cover, in all cases, some important areas of the post-training situation. The participants superior, who is in a position to make decisions and follow through, should be the one to discuss the post training job assignment, and what it will involve.

(d) USOM's Role in pre-departure orientation as to the substantive aspects of training; tables P/2 - 22 through P/2 - 26

The data (tables P/2 - 22, P/2 - 23 & 24) show that though 94% of the participants know the USOM TA on the project sponsoring their training, only about 84% report (at the time they complete P/2) /1 that the TA, or other USOM officer, had discussed their program with them. This is some 3% less than that shown in table P/2 - 23 in the May 1964 report. This difference alone is relatively insignificant, but tables P/2 - 25(a) through P2 - 25(g) indicate that the discussions held with participants departing during the past 12 months were not as complete and comprehensive as those held with the participants covered in the May, 1964 report. With respect to each of the program areas shown by these tables, the number reporting coverage has decreased. Though the percentage change in most instances is relatively small it's one-direction consistency establishes the fact that TA performance in respect to this aspect of pre-departure preparation has deteriorated.

Attention was directed to this situation and a recommendation made in the comments appearing in part 1 of this report. No further comment is required here.

Perhaps specific comment should be made with respect to table P/2 - 25(d). The inquiry here concerns what obviously should be a must in pre-departure participant/TA discussions. Yet, only 65% of the "current" participants report coverage as compared to 86% who did so in the May, 1964 report. It is hoped that this apparent reduction is not real, and there is reason to believe that it probably is not. Unfortunately, the question used referenced "block 17" in the PIO/P instead of "block 19" which now contains the description of the training. This change has been made in the questionnaire now in use.

/1 As reported in part I this is a day or so prior to departure, when they report to the Training Division for final briefing.

Tables P/2 - 25(f) presents a picture similar to that presented in the May, 1964 report. Though a high percent of the participants reporting are scheduled for academic training in the USA, relatively few are being alerted by their TA of their opportunity to join an American professional society or association while they are abroad. The TA undoubtedly knows of the affilation which would be most beneficial for the professional growth of the participant, and this aspect of the training opportunity should certainly be covered in pre-departure discussion.

(e) The participant's overall attitude toward his program; table P/2 - 29

The picture shown with respect to the frequency and nature of the TA/participant pre-departure discussions perhaps accounts for the finding in Tables P/2 - 29. The response here speaks somewhat less favorable of our efforts over the past 12 months than that shown for the participants covered by the May 1964 report. Six percent less of the "current" participants report being well satisfied with the training they are undertaking, and this difference is accounted for by the significantly higher percentage who report that they do not feel they know enough about their program to say. This percentage increased from 6%, May, 1964 to 15% for the "current" group.

This finding may appear to contradict what was noted in table P/2 - 31, but this is not necessarily true. It should be kept in mind that in the latter emphasis is on the participant's acceptance of the conditions of training, while the former concerns his satisfaction with the training program to be completed. Table P/2 - 30 is a new table and the response shown does not, it is thought, reflect accurately the number of participants who can name the project sponsoring the training. Many of those who did not mention the project reported that they were being sent abroad under "AID sponsorship," or under "A.I.D. projects." The self-administered questionnaire does not lend itself to the follow-up "probes" required to clarify such general, non-specific responses.

Section 2 - Referenced Tables

Q. 2. In preparation for this particular training program, did you have English language training at AUA?

Table P/2-2

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD*	Total
Yes	18	6	13	13	6	7	63
No	5	14	2	6	5	6	38
Participants reporting	23	20	15	19	11	13	101

*Includes 1 Public Works and 2 Social Development participants.

Q. 3. For how many weeks did you attend AUA?

Table P/2-3

(Reports only those attending AUA Language classes)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD*	Total
6 weeks	2	1	0	2	1	1	7
12 weeks	0	0	1	1	1	0	3
18 weeks	0	1	1	3	2	3	10
24 weeks	3	0	1	3	0	0	7
30 weeks	7	3	5	3	2	3	23
36 weeks	3	1	3	1	0	0	8
42 weeks	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
48 weeks	1	0	2	0	0	0	3
54 weeks	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number attending AUA	18	6	13	13	6	7	63
Average number of weeks attended	34	25	31	21	19	21	26

Q. 4. Did you complete the 6-week Conversation Course?

Table P/2-4

(Reports only those who attended AUA language classes)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Yes	16	4	13	6	4	4	47
No	2	2	0	7	2	3	16
Number attending AUA	18	6	13	13	6	7	63

Q. 4(a) (If "No" to Q. 4) Why not?

Table P/2-4(a)

(Reports only those not completing Conversation Course)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Time factor (passed ALIGU tests & was called forward prior to completing Conversation Course)	2	2	0	6	2	3	15
Other (non-specific reason)	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Participants reporting	2	2	0	7	2	3	16

Q. 5. While at AUA, do you think your English language proficiency improved a lot, improved somewhat, or improved only a little?

Table P/2-5

(Reports only those attending AUA language classes)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD*	Total
Improved a lot	12	2	13	9	5	7	48
Improved somewhat	6	2	0	3	1	0	12
Improved only a little	0	2	0	1	0	0	3
Don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Participants reporting	18	6	13	13	6	7	63

*Includes 1 Public Works and 2 Social Development participants.

Q. 6. What about your rate of progress at AUA in improving your language proficiency? Was the rate at which your English improved more than you expected, less than you expected, or, about what you expected it would be?

Table P/2-6
(Reports only those attending AUA language classes)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
More than expected	15	2	11	7	2	3	40
Less than expected	0	2	0	2	0	0	4
About as expected	3	2	2	3	2	4	16
Don't know	0	0	0	1	2	0	3
Participants reporting	18	6	13	13	6	7	63

Q. 7. When you were attending AUA classes was there some particular time period during which you think you made the fastest progress in understanding Engoish? (If "Yes") In which period did you make the greatest improvement?

Table P/2-7 & 8

(Reports only those attending AUA language classes)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Only in AUA 6 weeks	2	1	0	2	1	1	7
First 6 weeks	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Second 6 weeks	2	1	3	1	1	1	9
Third 6 weeks	2	0	1	4	3	3	13
Fourth 6 weeks	3	0	6	3	1	0	13
Fifth 6 weeks	7	3	3	3	0	1	17
No particular period	1	1	0	0	0	1	3
Participants reporting	18	6	13	13	6	7	63

Q. 9. Overall, how do you view your English language training experience at AUA: Was it highly satisfactory, only moderately satisfactory, or not satisfactory at all? (Check one)

Table P/2-9
(Reports only those attending AUA language classes)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Highly satisfactory	5	0	6	5	3	4	23
Moderately satisfactory	13	6	7	8	2	3	39
Not satisfactory	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Undecided	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Participants reporting	18	6	13	13	6	7	63

Q. 10. What suggestions do you have, if any, which you think might improve the English courses at AUA?

Table P/2-10
(Reports only those attending AUA language classes)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
More conversation	10	3	4	3	0	4	24
More grammer	1	0	1	1	0	0	3
Use audio visual aids	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Suggestion (Non-specific)	1	0	1	1	0	1	4
Improve teaching staff	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
No suggestion	6	3	7	5	6	2	29
Participants reporting	18	6	13	13	6	7	63

Q. 11. Do you think your English is now adequate for the training program you are undertaking, or do you feel a need for additional lessons in English? (Check one)

Table P/2-11

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Adequate	12	14	5	12	7	9	59
Not adequate - need additional lessons	11	6	10	6	3	4	40
Undecided	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
Participants reporting	23	20	15	19	11	13	101

Q. 12. (If you believe you need additional lessons in English, answer this question) If time would permit your taking additional English lessons, where do you think they should be taken: here in Bangkok before you depart, or after you arrive in the U.S.A.?

Table P/2-12
(Reports only those who at time of departure felt the need for additional English instruction; including the undecided)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
In Bangkok	0	1	0	1	0	1	3
After arrival in U.S.A.	11	5	10	4	4	2	36
Don't know	0	0	0	2	0	1	3
Participants reporting	11	6	10	7	4	4	42

Q. 13. Did you attend the Orientation program (one hour a day for 6 weeks) at AUA which is given for Thais going to the United States under AID sponsorship? (Check one)

Table P/2-13

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Yes	17	5	13	8	3	4	50
No, I have been in the U.S.A. before	2	0	1	7	4	1	15
No, my program is for 3rd country	1	11	0	0	0	2	14
No, (time factor - CF prior to completing course	3	2	0	3	3	3	14
No, (no reason given)	0	2	1	1	1	3	8
Participants reporting	23	20	15	19	11	13	101

Q. 14. In general, the AUA Orientation program is to give participants adequate information on how to get along in the U.S.A., and some key insights into the American way of life, American institutions, cultural values, attitudes, and the like; with the foregoing in mind how would you rate the Orientation sessions which you attended? (Check one)

Table P/2-14

(Reports only those who attended AUA Orientation)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	[illegible]	PS	SD	Total
Very satisfactory	12	1	11	1	2	1	28
Moderately satisfactory	5	3	2	7	1	3	21
Not satisfactory	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Participants reporting	17	5	13	8	3	4	50

Q. 15. Specifically, in those (AUA Orientation) sessions did you get enough information on the following:

a. How to use restaurants and public facilities in the U.S.A.?

Table P/2-15a

(Reports only those who attended AUA Orientation)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Yes	15	5	13	6	3	4	46
No	2	0	0	2	0	0	4
Participants reporting	17	5	13	8	3	4	50

Q. 15b. Religion and religious practices in the U.S.A.?

Table P/2-15b

(Reports only those who attended AUA Orientation)

Enough information	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Yes	14	3	11	5	2	4	39
No	3	2	2	3	1	0	11
Participants reporting	17	5	13	8	3	4	50

Q. 15c. American money and its use?

Table P/2-15c

(Reports only those who attended AUA Orientation)

Enough information	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Yes	17	5	13	8	3	4	50
No	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Participants reporting	17	5	13	8	3	4	50

Q. 15d. American manners and customs in general?

Table P/2-15d

(Reports only those who attended AUA Orientation)

Enough information	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Yes	17	5	11	8	3	4	48
No	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No answer	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Participants reporting	17	5	13	8	3	4	50

Q. 15c. In addition to the foregoing (Q. 15a through d) is there something which you would have liked to have known about which you did not get information on?

Q. 16. Do you have suggestions for improving AUA Orientation sessions?

Table P/2-15c & 16

(Reports only those who attended AUA Orientation)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Show more (modern) films	2	0	3	1	0	0	6
More information on the geography, history of the U.S.A.	0	2	0	0	1	0	3
More information on customs	0	0	2	1	2	0	5
How to study	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
More information in general (Non specific)	3	0	2	1	0	1	7
No suggestion	12	3	6	5	0	3	29
Participants reporting	17	5	13	8	3	4	50

Now, will you please answer the following questions about the Technical Training Program which you are undertaking. First of all ---

Q. 17. While you are away what will your status be with the Thai organization sponsoring the training? Will you be --- (Check one)

Table P/2-17

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
On leave of absence without pay	0	0	0	1	1	2	4
On leave of absence with pay	13	10	8	12	5	5	53
On TR. assignment with full pay with the (official) responsibility that such an assignment requires.	5	10	6	6	3	5	35
Don't know	5	0	1	0	2	1	9
Participants reporting	23	20	15	19	11	13	101

Q. 18. Has anyone at your place of employment (or your school) given you information, that is, actually talked with you about the training program which you are going abroad to complete?

Table P/2-18

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Yes	17	18	10	12	5	9	71
No	5	2	5	7	5	4	28
Don't know or no answer	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
Participants reporting	23	20	15	19	11	13	101

Q. 19. (If "Yes" to Q. 18 above, please answer this question) Who talked with you about your program? Was it your immediate supervisor, a Thai official other than your immediate supervisor, or some other person? (If more than one person discussed your program with you, you may check two or more of the following)

Table P/2-19

(Reports only those who said program information was received at place of employment)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
My immediate supervisor	10	12	7	8	3	8	48
Other Thai official	8	11	7	6	4	5	41
University official (professor, faculty advisor, etc.)	1	3	0	0	1	2	7
A former participant who is my colleague or friend	9	7	7	4	2	3	32
Total mentions	28	33	21	18	10	18	128
Participants reporting	17	18	10	12	5	9	71

Q. 20. (If "yes" to Q. 18 answer this question) In discussing your program with your immediate supervisor or other Thai official did you discuss the following? (Check "Yes" or "No" for each item)

a. The relationship of your training program to specific problems with which the Thai Government is concerned.

Table P/2-20a

(Reports only those who said program information was received at place of employment)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Yes	15	17	10	10	5	6	63
No	2	1	0	2	0	3	8
Participants reporting	17	18	10	12	5	9	71

Q. 20b. The type of assignment you will have on return -- where you will be assigned, what your job function will be, etc.

Table P/2-20b

(Reports only those who said program information was received at place of employment)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Yes	16	17	9	10	3	9	64
No	1	1	1	2	2	0	7
Participants reporting	17	18	10	12	5	9	71

Q. 20c. The extent to which you will be expected to pass on to others what you acquire in your training experience.

Table P/2-20c

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Yes	14	10	8	6	5	8	51
No	3	8	2	5	0	1	19
Don't know or no answer	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Participants reporting	17	18	10	12	5	9	71

Q. 20d. The length of your program -- that is, when you are expected to return.

Table P/2-20d

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Yes	15	17	9	11	3	9	64
No	2	1	1	1	2	0	7
Participants reporting	17	18	10	12	5	9	71

Q. 20e. Was anything said about the conditions under which your stay abroad might be extended.

Table P/2-20e

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Yes	11	5	7	2	3	5	33
No	6	13	3	10	2	4	38
Participants reporting	17	18	10	12	5	9	71

Q. 21. Altogether, about how much time in the last 3 months have you spent discussing your training abroad with a person or persons at your place of employment? (Check one of the following)

Table P/2-21

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Less than one hour	0	4	0	0	0	1	5
One hour, but less than two hours	3	5	0	1	0	1	10
Two hours, but less than three hours	3	1	1	1	0	0	6
Three hours, but less than four hours	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
Four hours, but less than five hours	2	1	0	1	1	0	5
Five hours, but less than six hours	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Six hours, but less than seven hours	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Seven hours, but less than eight hours	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Eight hours or more	6	5	2	4	2	4	23
I don't remember	2	2	7	4	2	2	19
Participants reporting	17	18	10	12	5	9	71

Q. 22. Who is your USOM Technical Advisor?

Table P/2-22

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Knew the TA and identified him by name	22	20	15	18	10	12	97
Did not know of TA	1	0	0	1	1	1	4
Participants reporting	23	20	15	19	11	13	101

Q. 23. Have you discussed your training program with your USOM TA or anyone at USOM?

Q. 24. With whom did you hold this discussion?

Table P/2-23 & 23

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Yes; discussed program with TA	20	14	11	16	8	12	81
Yes; discussed program with other USOM official	0	2	0	1	0	0	3
No; program not discussed with USOM official	3	4	4	2	3	1	17
Participants reporting	23	20	15	19	11	13	101

Q. 25. (If "Yes" to Q. 23, answer this question) Did this person discuss the following? (Check "Yes" or "No" for each of the following)

a. How your training was related to a joint Thai/American Project.

Table P/2-25a

(Reports only those who said their program was discussed with the USOM TA, or other USOM official)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Yes	17	16	11	14	7	7	72
No	3	0	0	3	1	5	12
Participants reporting	20	16	11	17	8	12	84

Q. 25b. The goals of the project, and how your training is to contribute to accomplishing project goals.

Table P/2-25b

(Reports only those who said their program was discussed with the USOM TA, or other USOM official)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
YES	18	15	11	12	7	10	73
No	2	1	0	5	1	2	11
Participants reporting	20	16	11	17	8	12	84

Q. 25c. Did this person discuss the level of your training program?

Table P/2-25c

(Reports only those who said their program was discussed with the USOM TA, or other USOM official)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Yes	18	14	11	10	7	10	70
No	2	2	0	7	1	2	14
Participants reporting	20	16	11	17	8	12	84

Q. 25d. Did he review with you block 17 of the PIO/P which is the description of the training you are to receive?

Table P/2-25d

(Reports only those who said their program was discussed with the USOM TA, or other USOM official)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Yes	15	10	4	12	6	10	57
No	5	6	7	5	2	2	27
Participants reporting	20	16	11	17	8	12	84

Q. 25e. Did he discuss plans for you to pass along the skills and knowledge you acquire in training to others working on the project?

Table P/2-25e

(Reports only those who said their program was discussed with the USOM TA, or other USOM official)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Yes	15	12	11	11	7	10	66
No	5	4	0	6	1	2	18
Participants reporting	20	16	11	17	8	12	84

Q. 25f. The conditions under which your training program might be extended?

Table P/2-25f

(Reports only those who said their program was discussed with the USOM TA, or other USOM official)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Yes	13	4	8	6	3	6	40
No	7	12	3	11	5	6	44
Participants reporting	20	16	11	17	8	12	84

Q. 25g Your eligibility to join a U.S. Professional association in your technical field (at relatively little cost to you)

Table P/2-25g

(Reports only those who said their program was discussed with the USOM TA, or other USOM official)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Yes	11	6	5	4	1	5	32
No	8	0	6	13	7	5	39
Question not applicable - 3rd country training	1	10	0	0	0	2	13
Participants reporting	20	16	11	17	8	12	84

Q. 26. Altogether about how much time have you spent discussing your training abroad with your USOM technical advisor, or other USOM official? (Please check one of the following)

Table P/2-26

(Reports only those who said their program was discussed with the USOM TA, or other USOM official)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Less than one hour	2	1	1	2	0	3	9
One hour, but less than two hours	7	5	3	1	1	0	17
Two hours, but less than three hours	3	0	0	2	2	2	9
Three hours, but less than four hours	1	3	0	1	0	4	9
Four hours, but less than five hours	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Five hours, but less than six hours	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Six hours, but less than seven hours	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Seven hours, but less than eight hours	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
Eight hours or more	6	4	3	5	3	0	21
I don't remember	0	2	4	4	2	1	13
Participants reporting	20	16	11	17	8	12	84

Q. 27. Did you have any part in planning the training program you are undertaking? (Check one)

Table P/2-27

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Yes	9	10	2	11	6	7	45
No	14	10	10	7	5	6	52
Don't know	0	0	3	1	0	0	4
Participants reporting	23	20	15	19	11	13	101

Q. 28. Insofar as you know did your immediate Thai supervisor have any share in planning your training program? (Check one)

Table D/2-28

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Yes	11	11	10	13	3	8	56
No	8	8	2	6	5	4	33
Don't know	4	1	3	0	3	1	12
Participants reporting	23	20	15	19	11	13	101

Q. 29. When all is considered how do you now feel about the training program you are going abroad to complete? (Check one)

Table D/2-29

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Well satisfied	19	15	12	17	8	11	82
Not very well satisfied	0	1	0	0	2	1	4
I really don't know - I do not feel I have enough info to say	4	4	3	2	1	1	15
Participants reporting	23	20	15	19	11	13	101

Q. 30. What is the name of the joint Thai/USOM project under which you are being sent abroad for training?

Table P/2-30

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Participant knew and correctly identified the sponsoring project	16	18	12	14	8	10	78
Participant did not identify sponsoring project	7	2	3	5	3	3	23
Participants reporting	23	20	15	19	11	13	101

Q. 31. The purpose and nature of your AID training is spelled out in Blocks 16, 17 and 18 of the PIO/P. You should at this time have a complete understanding of both the training objective and the conditions under which the training is undertaken. Please check one of the following.

Table P/2-31

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
I understand the nature and amount of training and accept the conditions under which the training is granted	23	20	15	18	7	13	96
Understand the training but reluctant to accept conditions	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
I do not understand the nature and/or amount of training	0	0	0	1	3	0	4
Participants reporting	23	20	15	19	11	13	101

SECTION 3

Evaluation
Follow-Up Questionnaire No.3: Participant's Return Report [1]

Introduction

This section deals with the results of 154 P/3 questionnaires completed between April 30, 1964 and May 1, 1965. According to Training Office records the 154 questionnaires represent all but a few of the participants who returned during the reporting period who had completed programs of 6 months or longer in duration. The participants who reported all completed programs 6 months or longer in duration, and 143 received training in the U.S.A.

P/3 is a self administered questionnaire which is completed when the participant reports to the Training Division, and the completed questionnaire is used as a guide by the Training Officer in the debriefing interview.

In May 1964 the P/3 questionnaire was revised by adding what now appears as questions 8, a, b & c; 23 a & b; and question 24. Most of the 154 returnees reporting over the past 12 months completed the revised questionnaire. However, Tables reporting the results of the aforementioned questions have a reduced base and they will be foot-noted accordingly.

Aside from the additions mentioned, theP/3 completed by those returning over the past year affords the same tables as were presented in the May, 1964 report. Where comparisons can be appropriately made between the current findings and those reported a year ago, they will be made a part of the comments which follow.

Comments

(a) Facts about the training program completed; tables P/3 - 3 through P/3 - 11

On their return approximately 73% of the participants were able to name the USOM TA who was their advisor at the time of departure. However, less than a third were able to name the TA currently assigned to the sponsoring project; (Tables P/3 - 3 & 4) The latter was true even though 90% had reported to their ministry prior to completing P/3, and about 78% (see table P/3 - 12 (a) & (b)) reported in P/3 that they knew the post-training position they were to fill. The relatively high percent of those reporting that they did not know who their USOM advisor would be, stems largely from the fact that for a sizeable number of the returnees, there was no USOM advisor aboard. The sponsoring project had phased out and the TA's either transferred to other projects, other missions, or returned to the U.S.A. For example, of the 62 returnees in Education no more than one-third returned to an active project with a USOM TA aboard. However, based on the data and the debriefing interview in the Training Division, it appears that the absence or presence of a USOM TA is not being discussed with the returnee when he reports to his ministry. Perhaps USOM project managers should request their counterparts to include in their discussion with returnees the status of the project, and the identity of the American personnel involved, if any.

Three fourths of the participants reporting completed programs which were primarily academic and 85% of these received an academic degree. In almost all cases (only 3 exceptions) the degree received was at the graduate level. In pursuing the degree objective about two-thirds of the participants required an extension in time, and in 7 cases out of 10 the extension was partly or completely financed by AID. In most instances (74%) the extension received was for a period of less than 12 months; (See tables P/3 - 6 through 7 (b)).

[1] Referred to in this report as P/3

The foregoing differs very little from the picture shown by the May, 1964 report. A look at comparable tables does indicate that fewer of the participants returning over the past 12 months received an extension, and that the average length of the extensions granted was somewhat shorter.

In all inquiries in the past, 40% or more of the Thai participants reporting have felt that the training program completed was too short. In the May 1964 report and in this report (See table P/3 - 18) the percentage is 41% and 42% respectively, and the RPES data show 49%.

The RPES report pointed out that though the participants attitude toward the length of his program (feeling it was "too long", "too short", or "about right") had little or no relationship to the actual length of the program completed, there was a positive relationship between his attitude toward the length of his program and his degree of satisfaction with the overall training experience.

Because of the foregoing, new questions were introduced in the P/3 questionnaire used over the past 12 months to give some insight as to why so large a number report their programs as too short.

The results of the new questions are shown in tables P/3 - 8(a), (b) and (c). About half of the participants reporting (only 130 were asked this question) said they would have liked to have stayed longer in the country of training. In more than half of the cases those desiring to stay longer would have liked less than 12 months additional time. It does not appear that the desire to remain longer in any way relates to whether the participant accomplished the original training objective of receiving an academic degree. In fact, those receiving a degree are slightly more likely to report desiring additional time than those whose programs were non-academic, or who for other reasons received no degree. A significant finding is the reason for desiring more time abroad. As shown by Table P/3 - 8 c, of those who gave a reason better than half wished to broaden their training experience by getting OJT (practical experience. Most of these were participants in the field of Education who did not gain an academic degree.

This picture substantiates a finding reported in the RPES report and calls attention to the following recommendation which was made in Chapter III, page 42 & 43, of the RPES report: "when a degree program is planned, adequate time should be provided and an arrangement made for subject-matter related practical experience upon completion of the academic work." Table P/3 - 8c would indicate that this consideration is needed most urgently for those participants in the field of Education.

About 80% of the returnees report on returning that they had a clear understanding of their post-training assignment prior to their departure. Interestingly, this is a considerably larger number than the number departing during the past 12 months who said their post-training assignment was discussed with someone (Thai) at their place of employment. (See Section 2, tables P/2 - 18 and P/2 - 20 b). Also, as shown by table P/3 - 12 (a) & (b), it is some 6% more than report that they presently (at the time of completing P/3) know what their return assignment will be. Since 90% of those reporting had already reported to their ministry it would appear that (for some reasons) the return interview at the ministry had introduced an assignment consideration unknown to the participant prior to his departure for training.

(b) Present plans and expectations; tables P/3 - 12(a) through P/3 - 15.

As previously noted, about 74% of the returnees feel they know what their post-training assignment will be. Of these, almost all report that the assignment is what they expected to get on return; table P/3 - 12(a) & (b).

Regardless of whether they knew the assignment they were to receive, three out of four expect to now have more responsibility than they had had prior to their training, and about half expect to receive a higher salary. The latter is a considerably lower percentage than was shown for participants covered by the May, 1964 report.

It is worthwhile to note that the number who obtained an academic degree is significantly higher than the number who expect an increase in salary; tables P/3 - 6(b) and P/3 - 13(b). However, the opposite is true with respect to participant expectations in regard to the responsibility they will have, Table P/3 - 13(a).

An observation made in the May, 1964 report is worth repeating here. Programming a participant for an advanced degree does not necessarily give assurance that he will be promoted to a position of higher authority, more salary, etc., on his return, and, hence, be in a better position to effectively use the knowledge and skills acquired. Tables P/3 - 13(a)and 13(b)show that many of the participants themselves do not expect this development on their return, and as will be noted in tables P4 - 3a and 3b, Section 4, such a promotion has not occurred within 6 months after return.

As shown by table P/3 - 14a, better than 80% of the participants return with something specifically in mind which they want to put into use in Thailand. In the majorit of cases the returnee has in mind utilizing his training experience in improving, reorganizing, or changing existing methods, procedures, etc. However, almost one third return with ideas for introducing or developing something "new" in improving Thai social or economic conditions.

If the investment benefits of training can be measured by the percent of participants who return with definite, constructive ideas to bring about change, it was certainly a wise investment to have sent those who returned during the past 12 months.

Though participants, in large numbers, return with specific training-inspired changes which they hope to make, many of them expect something less than complete acceptance of what they would like to try by either their superiors in the Thai Government, or their USOM advisors. As noted in tables P/3 - 14 (a) and (b) only about 4 out of 10 feel their superiors and the USOM advisor will give complete support. An additional one-third anticipate almost complete support. The remaining expect only partial support, or do not feel they can express an opinion. About 15% of the participants returning during the past 12 months expressed "no opinion" with respect to support from USOM. This relatively high percentage is perhaps related to the fact that so many of the participants returned to projects which had been phased out. A specific check disclosed that those who were returning to an active project, and who had already talked with the USOM TA, were more likely to expect complete support from USOM.

The majority of participants made a specific suggestion as to how the USOM TA could be of assistance to them, and the type of assistance most frequently mentioned was "technical support." (See tables P/3 - 15(a) and (b))

(c) Reflections on training experience abroad; Tables P/3 - 16 through P/3 - 7.

Most of the participants (93%) found their programs either completely (51%), or partially (42%) arranged when they arrived in the country of training. Eighty-seven percent report that the program actually completed was in line with what they and their ministry had requested. These data (tables P/3 - 16 & 17(a)) indicate that returnees over the past 12 months had a little better programming experience than did the group covered by the May, 1964 report.

Table P/3 - 17b show the complaints made by those participants who said their programs were only partially, or not at all in line with that requested. Though this number is relatively small, it represents a problem requiring AID/W corrective action.

Tables P/3 - 18 and 19 show that a substantial number of participants feel their program was too short, and an even higher number would have liked to have seen, or participated in, more different things. As noted earlier (table P/3 - 8(a), (b) and (c)) many of these participants would have liked to have had some (or more) OJT experience while they were abroad.

In general, participants found their programs at the right level for their background and experience, (Table P/3 - 20). However, those who did not find this to be true were more likely (better than 2 to 1) to report that their program was too advanced. The percent who so report has remained consistent through time (between 10 and 13 percent; RPES, May 1964 report, and "current" data) and, according to the RPES Report, represents a group which will be relatively low utilizers of their training.

Three-fourths of the participants (table P3/ - 21) report having received information about the level of their program prior to departure. This is a substantial increase over the number reporting so in the May, 1964 report.

Those who were not told of the level of their programs prior to departure (Table P/3 - 22), in general, feel such information would have been helpful. However, as compared to returnees covered by the May, 1964 report a higher percent of the "current" group question the value of having advanced knowledge on this point.

Of the 130 participants reporting (Table P/3 - 23(a)) about half were very satisfied with the programs they had completed. Almost as many said they were somewhat satisfied.

Those who were less than very satisfied report in Table P/3 - 23(b) their reasons. The reasons given are significant and pinpoint problem areas for AID/W attention. As a further guide to AID/W it is here reported that "spontaneous" comment by the participants indicates that, in general, those who reported their programs as either poorly planned, or poorly conducted, are the ones who complained of the "attitude and actions" of the people in the country of training. Moreover, some of those who expressed this complaint, specifically wrote in the fact that they had in mind AID officials. In general, complaints against AID officials fall into two areas, both of which indicate, from the participants' viewpoint, an improper attitude. One complaint is that AID officials are not considerate when arranging travel (adjusting per diem rates when ones travel status changes, permitting stopovers etc.,) which relates to the personal welfare and convenience of the individual. The other, and a more serious complaint, is best expressed by the following quotation from a returnee's remarks.

/1 The word "current" here and elsewhere in this section is used to refer to those completing P/3 during the past 12 months.

"They [AID officials] make us feel like beggars [who are] always requesting something, not like representatives of a country who were invited to receive a grant to visit and learn something from the USA."

Table P/3 - 23b gives data related to that shown in P/3 - 30. It is significant to note that some of those who indicated a "less favorable" opinion in P/3 - 30 specifically wrote in; "because of the attitude of AID officials." More significantly, in two instances participant's checking a "more favorable" opinion added the comment; "not if you include AID officials."

For AID/W information, the participants who offered, spontaneously, the foregoing quotes were in the field of Education, Public Administration and Public Works. None of the participants referenced in the foregoing were trained in a 3rd country.

Though experience in the USA has unfavorably colored the attitude of a few, two-thirds of the 130 reporting (Table P/3 - 24) said that it was the:"most important thing that ever happened to me." This picture is slightly less favorable than that shown by the RPES report, in which 71% of the participants so reported.

Of the 154 participants reporting during the past 12 months 85% had received English language instruction in preparation for their training (Table P/3 - 25) and almost half of these felt on their return that they should have had some additional instruction.

Of those who felt additional instruction was needed, about one third believed 6 weeks or less would have been sufficient and an additional one third thought they needed from 7 to 12 weeks; Table P/3 - 26(b).

Table P/3 - 26(c) shows that a majority of these participants feel that the additional instruction should have been arranged in the country of training (USA), with about one-third indicating that more AUA instruction here in Thailand would have solved their problem.

The picture with respect to the returnees reflection on the problem with language remains quite stable. Almost an identical finding was shown in the May, 1964 report.

English definitely continues to be a major problem of Thai participants. Table P/3 - 27 shows that the number who report a language difficulty is considerably higher than the number who felt they should have had additional instruction, and that the major problem is in being understood by others. The increased emphasis at AUA on conversational English (discussed in Section 2) should serve to alleviate this problem.

(d) <u>Some Non-technical aspects of the training experience; Tables P/3 - 28 through P/3 - 32.</u>

Table P/3 - 28 shows the degree of participant satisfaction with travel and housing arrangements and the rate of per diem paid. It will be noted that only 20% (1 out of 5) of the returnees report the per diem rate received as <u>very satisfactory</u>, and that an equal number say that it was <u>unsatisfactory</u>. As compared to the May, 1964 report, the percentage of those <u>dissatisfied</u> has doubled. This probably reflects the fact that per diem rates have been adjusted downward during the past year for participants who were in academic residency. Slightly better than half of those reporting found the per diem rates to be <u>fairly</u> satisfactory.

Forty percent found housing to be very satisfactory, and 50% found the transportation arrangement to be so. However, whereas less than 3% reported housing as unsatisfactory, 10% were dissatisfied with the travel arrangements. Overall, the picture with respect to participant satisfaction with housing and travel has not changed noticeably since the May, 1964 report.

As was true in the May, 1964 report, 40% of the "current" participants found their "non-professional" contacts completely satisfactory. The only difference between the picture shown by table P/3 - 29 and the same table in the May, 1964 report is that 5 of the "current" participants either said these contacts were not at all satisfactory, or did not answer the question. There is little doubt but what the participants who left the question unanswered did so because they chose not to give what they felt would be viewed as an unfavorable response.

It is worthwhile to note that in the May, 1964 report there were no participants out of the 152 reporting who failed to express an opinion in either Tables P/3 - 28, 29 or 30. For "current" participants, in Table P/3 - 28; five (5) did not express an opinion on either housing or per diem, and three (3) expressed no opinion on transportation. In table P/3 - 29, three (3) expressed no opinion as to their satisfaction with their "non-professional" contacts, and in P/3 - 30 five (5) did not indicate whether their opinion of the USA had changed as a result of their stay there These cases, it is believed, can all safely be assigned to the "least favorable" response category.

Table P/3 - 30 shows about 52% of the returnees report that their opinion of the people and the country of training is more favorable as a result of their stay there. An additional 36% report no change in their opinion, and the remaining 12% either specifically report their opinion as less favorable, or fail to answer the question. Regardless of how one chooses to treat those who did not express an opinion, a comparison of table P/3 - 30 in the May, 1964 report with "current" data reveals that the number of returnees who report that they have a less favorable opinion of the American people and the U.S.A. has increased significantly.

There were seven (7) of the 152 participants covered in the May, 1964 report who said they had a less favorable opinion of the USA as a result of their stay there as compared to twelve (12) of the 154 reporting back during the past 12 months. Assuming the five (5) of the latter group who did not answer the question to have also been negatively impressed, the comparison is really 7 of 152 to 17 of 154. Taking into account the fact that a "courtesy bias" is no doubt present in the response pattern, the number of participants who actually returned with a less favorable opinion of the American people and the USA probably approaches 25%.

The comments of a few of the returnees certainly indicates the existence of "courtesy bias." As reported earlier, one participant who checked "opinion now more favorable" added the remark "not if you include AID officials. In another instance, a participant checked "opinion now less favorable", and added the comment, "but I want you to know I'm thankful for the training I received."

For an explanation of what accounts for participants returning from the U.S.A. with an attitude toward the people and the country which is less favorable, you are directed to the comments made in this section with respect to Table P/3 - 23b. Additional insight into the situation is given by the one or two participants who reported a personal involvement with "racial" discrimination, but such incidents, it is believed account for only a minor part of the problem.

One factor operating in the picture is that some of the Thais depart with an unrealistic concept of America and Americans. To quote a recent returnee; "when I went I thought America was a happy country, with people who were wealthy. I found there are many problems there, problems which they can't solve, and there are a lot of poor people." This participant suffered general disillusionment. He reported no personal unfavorable incident; nor did he report dissatisfaction with his program, or with the official attitude encountered. He reported, however, his opinion of the USA was less favorable as a result of his stay there.

A few participants return bitter toward their training experience and the U.S.A. primarily because they failed to complete successfully the training programmed. In most of these cases an advanced academic degree was the training objective and the participants were not qualified to complete the graduate study programmed. These participants usually rationalize their failure as being the fault of something other than their own deficiency; they were sent to the wrong university, or the treatment they received from their AID or campus advisor was not good. Such rationalization is initially, no doubt, consciously developed to save face with colleagues, superiors, and friends. But, through time the participant ceases to be aware of his self-created defense mechanism and truly views the situation as a failure of others. These cases are relatively few, but their occurence is of serious concern and emphasize the need for more careful participant selection and realistic programming.

It is stressed here, as it was in the May, 1964 report, that USOM's self-administered questionnaire is indeed a rather superficial "probe" into the participants' experiences abroad, and resulting opinions and attitude. This is particularly true with respect to delving into the reasons which underlie the "negative" attitudes revealed by the questionnaire.

USOM again recommends that AID/W develop and include in its de-briefing procedures a "depth" interview to ascertain the frequency and nature of participant experiences while in the U.S.A. which are largely responsible for the "negative" attitudes noted on their return.

Approx 57% of the participants who went to the U.S.A. reported that they were advised by their AID project manager of their eligibility to join a professional society; Table P/3 - 31. As shown by table P/3 - 32 almost half of those going to the U.S.A. joined a professional society while they were there. Comparable tables in the May, 1964 report show that a higher percentage of the "current" returnees are receiving the project manager's attention on this matter, but a slightly smaller number are actually joining an association. The data give no explanation for this development.

Table P/3 - 32 shows the position of the returnees in the Thai Civil Service. It will be noted that only 9 of the 154 participants returning during the past 12 months were above the level of a second grade civil servant. A high percentage (about 7 out of 10) were second grade officials, which represents the middle position in the civil service hierarchy.

Table P/3 - 32 raises the question of whether we are devoting the proper percentage of our training effort to better preparing those who are already in positions of higher authority and responsibility. Granting that many of those represented in Table P/3 - 32 will eventually be in such positions, the fact remains that they are several years away from being in the position of responsibility and authority required for their training to be fully effective in bringing about change.

It is worthwhile to note in this report that "current" returnees, as a group, largely represent a lower echelon of Thai Government officials than did those who returned in earlier years; prior to 1960. The PRES report, Volume I, page 53, Table 4.1 - 3 shows 47% of those participants to have been either top and second-level policymakers, or subordinate management at the time of their selection. Less than 10% of those represented in Table P/3 - 32 would appear to fall in these categories.

Section 3: Referenced Tables [1]

Q. 3. (Who was your) USOM Advisor on departure (for training)?

Table P/3-3

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Named an advisor	8	25	11	44	19	5	112
Said don't know	3	2	4	16	8	1	34
Not answer	1	1	1	2	2	1	8
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	154

Q. 4. (Who is your) USOM advisor on return (from training)?

Table P/3-4

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Named advisor	5	9	8	11	13	1	47
Said don't know	7	18	7	40	12	4	88
No answer	0	1	1	11	4	2	19
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	154

[1] Tables in this section relate to Activity No.4, USOM's Policy Order No.800.4,

Q. 6. Indicate the one kind of activity listed below which best describe your training.

Table P/3-6(a)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Observation tour(s)	2	4	2	1	0	0	9
On-the-job training	2	13	3	0	11	0	29
Academic study	8	11	11	61	18	7	116
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	154

Table P/3-6(b)

(Reports only those whose programs were academic)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Graduate study, degree received	6	6	6	56	15	6	95
Graduate study, no degree	1	3	2	4	1	0	11
Undergraduate study, degree received	0	2	0	1	0	0	3
Undergraduate study, no degree	1	0	3	0	2	1	7
Participants reporting	8	11	11	61	18	7	116

Q. 7a. Did you receive a time extension to complete your training?

Table P/3-7a

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Yes	6	11	7	35	12	3	74*
No	6	17	8	26	17	4	78
Not answered	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	154

*Approximately 65% of those with academic programs report receiving an extension.

Q. 7b. (If "Yes") For how many months was the time extended?____ Months

Table P/3-7b

(Reports only those who said they received an extension)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Less than 6 months	2	7	1	21	2	1	34
6 months, but less than 12 months	1	4	1	9	6	2	23
12 months, but less than 18 months	0	0	2	2	4	0	8
18 months but less than 24 months	1	0	2	0	0	0	3
24 months or more	2	0	1	3	0	0	6
Participants reporting	6	11	7	35	12	3	74

Q. 7c. How was the extension financed?

Table P/3-7c

(Reports only those who said they received and extension)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
AID(USOM) financed	3	6	2	27	11	3	52
Independently financed	0	5	5	8	1	0	19
Both AID & Independently financed	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Participants reporting	6	11	7	35	12	3	74

Q. 8a. After you completed your program did you have any desire to stay longer in the country where you were trained or were you eager to return to Thailand?

Table P/3-8(a)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Would have liked to have stayed longer	1	8	7	39	10	2	67
Was eager to return to Thailand	7	12	7	17	7	4	54
Question not asked, or not answered	4	8	2	6	12	1	33*
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29*	7	154

*The questionnaire completed by 24 of these participants did not contain this

Q. 8b. (If you would have liked to have stayed longer please answer this question) How much longer would you have liked to have stayed?

Table P/3-8(b)

(Reports only those who would have liked to have stayed (abroad) longer)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Less than 6 months	0	0	1	13	2	0	16
6 months, but less than 12	0	1	1	14	5	2	23
12 months, but less than 18	0	2	3	6	2	0	13
18 months, but less than 24	1	4	0	1	0	0	6
24 months or more	0	1	0	3	1	0	5
Not answered	0	0	2	2	0	0	4
Participants reporting	1	8	7	39	10	2	67

Q. 8c. What would you have done during this additional stay?

Table P/3-8(c)

(Reports only those who would have liked to have stayed (abroad) longer)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Get (more) practical training	0	2	0	24	5	1	32
Get more academic training and/or to obtain a degree	1	5	4	5	5	0	20
To obtain another (second) degree	0	1	0	4	0	0	5
Not answered	0	0	3	6	0	1	10
Participants reporting	1	8	7	39	10	2	67

Q. 9. Before returning to Bangkok, did you prepare and leave a final written report on your training with AID/W, or institution where trained?

Table P/3-9

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Yes	7	25	13	47	23	7	122
No	5	3	2	15	5	0	30
Not answered	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	154

Q. 10a. Since your return have you reported to your USOM Technical Advisor?

Table P/3-10(a)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Yes	7	15	5	19	11	4	[illegible]
No	5	13	10	42	[illegible]	3	[illegible]
Not answered	0	0	1	1	0	0	[illegible]
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	[illegible]

Q. 10b. Since your return have you reported to your Ministry (or supervisor in agency of employment)?

Table P/3-10(b)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Yes	12	25	16	55	26	6	140
No	0	3	0	7	3	1	14
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	154

Q. 11. At the time you departed for training did you have a clear understanding with your Ministry or supervisor about the position you were expected to fill on your return?

Table P/3-11

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	SD	PA	SD	Total
Yes	10	19	15	48	24	7	123
No	2	9	1	14	5	0	31
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	154

Present Plans and Expectations:

Q. 12a. At this time do you understand specifically the position within your Ministry or agency that you are to now fill?

Q. 12b. (If "Yes") Will this be the position you expected to get on your return from training?

Table P/3-12(a) & (b)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Yes; and it is the position I expected	9	21	14	46	21	3	114
Yes; but it is not the position expected	1	1	0	2	1	1	6
No	2	6	2	12	7	2	31
Not answered	0	0	0	2	0	1	3
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	154

Q. 13. As you now understand the work you will be doing, will you now have --

(a) The same responsibility, less responsibility, or more responsibility than you had before your training?

Table P/3-13(a)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
The same responsibility as you had before your training	6	11	4	16	5	1	43
Less responsibility than you had before your training	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
More responsibility than you had before your training	6	14	11	46	22	6	105
Not answered	0	3	1	0	2	0	[illegible]
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	154

(b) The same salary, a lower salary, or a higher salary than you had before your training?

Table P/3-13(b)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
The same salary as you had before your training	9	14	8	15	13	2	61
A lower salary than you had before your training	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A higher salary than you had before your training	3	9	6	46	12	4	80
Not answered	0	5	2	1	4	1	13
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	154

Q. 14a. In your training you undoubtedly learned a number of things, new ideas, techniques, etc., which you would like to put into practice in Thailand, what is the one most important thing you hope to accomplish now that you have returned?

Table P/3-14(a)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
To improve, reorganize or change existing methods, procedures, or techniques (includes training)	6	9	5	34	19	6	79
To introduce, develop or construct something new or different to that which exists	5	11	6	20	5	0	47
Non-specific mention	1	5	3	8	5	1	23
Not answered	0	3	2	0	0	0	5
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	154

Q. 14b. Please check the degree of acceptance and implementation which you anticipate on the part of your Ministry or agency supervisor in accomplishing this? (Check one)

Table P/3-14(b)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Complete acceptance and cooperation	8	11	10	29	7	3	68
Almost complete acceptance and Cooperation	3	12	4	17	12	2	51
Partial acceptance and cooperation	1	1	0	13	8	2	25
Little or no acceptance and coop.	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
No opinion, Don't know or no answer	0	3	2	2	2	0	9
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	154

Q. 14c. Please check the degree of acceptance and implementation which you anticipate on the part of the USOM Technical Advisor in accomplishing this.

Table P/3-14(c)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Complete acceptance and cooperation	8	11	9	25	10	3	66
Almost complete acceptance and coop.	3	8	3	21	13	0	48
Partial acceptance and cooperation	1	3	2	5	3	2	16
Little or no acceptance and cooperation	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
No opinion; don't know or no answer	0	5	2	10	3	2	22
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	154

Q. 15. In the work which you will now be doing, in what way can the USOM Technical Advisor best be of help to you, or can he be of any help?

Table P/3-15(a)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Made specific suggestion(s)	7	10	6	41	19	3	86
Made no suggestion	5	18	10	21	10	4	68
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	154

Table P/3-15(b)

(Reports only those who made suggestions, Q. 15; multiple mentions permitted)

Can help by:	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
Helping me gain supervisor approval for "new" ideas	0	0	0	4	2	0	6
Giving technical support, advise, consultation and training	3	7	4	21	12	3	50
Providing materials and/or funds	7	4	4	21	5	0	41
Total mentions	10	11	8	46	19	3	97
Participants reporting	7	10	6	41	19	3	96

Reflections on Training Experience

Q. 16. When you arrived in the country of training, was your training program arranged in complete detail, in partial detail, or not set up at all? (Check one)

Table P/3-16

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Program in complete detail	9	8	11	36	11	4	79
Program in partial detail	3	18	5	22	16	1	65
Program not set up at all	0	1	0	4	1	2	8
Don't know	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	154

Q. 17a. Now how about the program which you actually completed, to what degree was your training program in line with what was requested by you, and your Ministry, before you went abroad. (Check one)

Table P/3-17(a)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Completely	5	7	8	26	12	4	62
Almost completely	6	19	7	26	13	1	72
Partially	1	2	1	9	3	2	18
Not at all	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	154

Q. 17b. (If "partially" or "not at all" checked) In terms of what was requested, in what way was your training program different?

Table P/3-17(b)

(Reports only those who said program actually completed was only partially, or not all, what had been requested: question permitted multiple mentions)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Did not get the degree (or academic course0 desired	0	0	0	3	2	0	5
Did not get the practical training requested in PIO/P	0	1	0	2	1	0	4
Training not consistent with PIO/P-- (Non-specific)	1	0	1	5	0	2	9
No answer	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
Total mentions	0	1	1	10	3	0	20
Participants reporting	1	2	1	10	4	2	20

Q. 18. How was the length of your program -- do you think it was too long, about right, or too short? (Check one)

Table P/3-18

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Too long	1	1	0	0	1	0	3
About right	9	15	10	29	19	4	86
Too short	2	12	6	33	9	3	65
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	154

Q. 19. Do you think the planned part of your training required you to do or see too many different things, or would you have preferred more different things? (Check one)

Table P/3-19

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Too many things	0	2	0	5	1	1	9
Would have liked more	4	11	7	36	14	2	74
All right as it was	8	13	9	20	14	4	68
Don't know	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
Not answered	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	154

Q. 20. And how did you find the level of your program? Judging from your background and experience at the time, do you think the program was generally on too simple a level for you, was it about right, or was it too advanced? (Check one)

Table P/3-20

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Too simple a level	0	5	0	3	0	0	8
About right	12	19	14	48	27	6	126
Too advanced	0	3	2	11	2	1	19
Don't know	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	154

Q. 21. Had you been told anything about the level of your program before you left home?

Table P/3-21

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Yes	9	14	14	43	17	4	101
No	3	14	2	19	12	3	53
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	154

Q. 22. Would it have been helpful or not helpful if you had been told something about the level of your program before you departed?

Table P/3-22

(Reports only those who said the level of their their program had not been described)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Helpful	2	9	2	15	8	3	39
Not helpful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Don't know	1	4	0	2	4	0	11
Not answered	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Participants reporting	3	14	2	19	12	3	53

Q. 23a. In general, how satisfied are you with the training program you completed?

Table P/3-23(a)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Very satisfied	5	12	9	25	9	4	64
Somewhat satisfied	3	10	6	28	9	3	59
Not so satisfied	1	1	0	3	1	0	6
Not satisfied at all	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Not asked	3	5	1	5	10	0	24*
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	154

*The questionnaire completed by the (24) participants did not contain this question.

Q. 23b. Which of the following accounts for your not being very satisfied?

Table P/3-23(b)

(Reports only those who said they were less than very satisfied; question permitted multiple mentions)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Reasons related to the program:							
I did not get the kind of training (academic course) which I personally would have liked to have had	1	3	3	7	0	2	16
I do not think that my program was well planned and/or well conducted --(Non specific)	0	8	2	14	5	1	30
Did not get practical (OJT) training	0	2	0	5	2	0	9
The program was scheduled in the wring place or country training should have have been in	0	0	0	4	0	0	4
Non-program reasons:							
I was personally handicapped in completing the program due to sickness, accident, etc.	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
I was not adequately prepared in English to undertake the program when I did	0	1	0	3	0	0	4
The people (their attitude and actions) in the country of training made my stay there unpleasant	2	2	0	4	3	0	11
Problems in personal adjustment	1	0	2	3	2	0	8
Total mentions	4	16	7	40	12	0	84
Participants reporting	4	11	6	32	10	3	66

Q. 24. Some Thais who have gone abroad for training under joint USOM/ Thai Government sponsorship have returned feeling that their training experience was the most important thing that had ever happened to them; some say that their program was actually a waste of time, and others feel that their training experience was neither so good or so bad--but was somewhere in between. What is your personal opinion about your training experience? (Check one)

Table P/3-24

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
The most important thing that ever happened to me	6	11	12	43	10	5	87
Pretty much a waste of time	0	1	1	1	0	1	4
Somewhere in between	3	9	2	13	6	1	34
Not answered	3	7	1	5	13	0	29*
Participants reporting	12	29*	16	62	29*	7	154

*The questionnaire completed by 24 of these participants did not contain this question.

Q. 25. Now, a few questions about English language training. In preparation for your program abroad, did you receive English language training?

Table P/3-25

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Yes	9	25	15	53	23	7	132
No	3	3	1	9	5	0	21
No answer	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	154

Q. 26c. When should this additional English language instruction have been given, before you left Thailand, or after you arrived in the country of training?

Table P/3-26(c)

(Reports only those who said they needed additional language instruction)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Should have had more English instruction:							
Before leaving Thailand	2	4	1	10	2	1	20
After arriving in U.S.A.	2	4	2	17	9	1	35
Either place; makes no difference	1	0	1	1	1	0	4
Some training both places	0	0	0	3	0	0	3
Participants reporting	5	8	4	31	12	2	62

Q. 27. If you had any difficulty at all with your English during the program, was this mainly in making yourself understood, in understanding others, or both? (Check one)

Table P/3-27

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
No difficulty at all	5	13	5	14	15	4	56
Difficulty in being understood	5	8	2	14	4	2	35
Difficulty in understanding others	1	2	5	6	3	1	18
Both	0	2	3	26	4	0	35
Not answered	1	3	1	2	3	0	10
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	154

Q. 26a. In your opinion should you have had more instruction in English than you did have before starting your training program?

Table P/3-26(a)

(Reports only those who said they received language instruction in preparation for training)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Yes	5	8	4	31	12	2	62
No	4	14	8	19	9	4	58
Undecided or Don't Know	0	3	3	3	2	1	12
Participants reporting	9	25	15	53	23	7	132

Q. 26b. How much more English instruction do you feel you should have had?

Table P/3-26(b)

(Reports only those who said they needed additional English instruction)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
6 weeks or less	1	3	0	8	5	1	18
7 to 12 weeks	2	2	2	7	6	1	20
13 to 18 weeks	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
19 to 24 weeks	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
25 to 30 weeks	0	1	0	3	0	0	4
More than 30 weeks	0	0	0	4	0	0	4
No time specified	2	2	1	7	1	0	13
Participants reporting	5	8	4	31	12	2	62

Q. 28. Aside from the substantive aspects of your training, were the mechanics of your program in the country of training satisfactory? (Check beneath each of the subject headings appearing below whether or not the arrangement was very satisfactory, fairly satisfactory, or unsatisfactory.)*

Table P/3-28

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
1. Housing							
Very satisfactory	6	10	7	20	15	5	63
Fairly satisfactory	6	17	9	37	11	2	82
Unsatisfactory	0	0	0	3	1	0	4
Not answered	0	1	0	2	2	0	5
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	154
2. Per Diem							
Very satisfactory	5	7	5	3	9	3	32
Fairly satisfactory	6	16	8	41	12	2	85
Unsatisfactory	1	4	3	16	6	2	32
Not answered	0	1	0	2	2	0	5
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	154
3. Transportation							
Very satisfactory	8	16	8	24	11	5	72
Fairly satisfactory	3	8	8	29	13	2	63
Unsatisfactory	1	3	0	7	5	0	16
Not answered	0	1	0	2	0	0	3
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	154

*153 of the participants were trained in the U.S.

Q. 29. Aside from professional contacts, to what degree were your contacts with people in the country of training satisfactory? (If training was in more than one country, consider the one in which most time was spent) (Check one)

Table P/3-29

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Completely	7	10	7	18	17	5	64
Almost completely	3	10	6	31	8	2	60
Partially	2	5	3	12	3	0	25
Not at all	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
Not answered	0	2	0	0	1	0	3
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	154

Q. 30. Has your opinion of the people in the country of training changed as a result of your stay there? (If training was in more than one country, consider the one in which most time was spent) (Check one)

Table P/3-30

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
No - opinion same	6	18	7	15	6	4	56
Yes - opinion now less favorable	2	4	2	3	1	0	12
Yes - opinion now more favorable	4	6	7	41	20	3	81
Not answered	0	0	0	3	2	0	5
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	154

C. 31. Were you reminded by your project advisor in the U.S.A. of your chance to join a professional society while you were there?

Table P/3-31

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Yes	10	8	8	37	16	5	82
No	2	19	6	12	11	1	51
Did not go to U.S.A.	0	0	0	10	0	1	11
Don't remember	0	0	1	3	1	0	5
Not answered	0	1	1	0	1	0	3
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	154

C. 32. While in the United States did you join (hold membership in) any professional association, or organization?

Table P/3-32

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Yes	7	5	3	36	16	3	70
No	5	23	13	16	11	3	71
Did not go to the U.S.A.	0	0	0	10	0	1	11
Not answered	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	154

Participants report their Thai Civil Service Grade and Level at time of their return.

Table P/3-32

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Special Grade:							
Level - 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
First Grade:							
Level - 1	1	1	2	1	3	0	8
2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Second Grade:							
Level - 1	3	5	5	18	5	0	36
2	3	6	6	26	10	1	52
3	3	3	2	7	3	0	18
Third Grade:							
Level - 1	0	1	0	2	1	1	5
2	2	7	1	2	5	4	21
Fourth Grade:							
Level - 1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Special	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No answer	0	5	0	5	2	0	12
Participants reporting	12	28	16	62	29	7	154

SECTION 4

Evaluation
Follow-Up/Questionnaire No. 4, Participant's Six(6) Month Report /1

Introduction

This section deals with 129 P/4 questionnaires completed between April 30, 1964 and May 1, 1965. The 129 questionnaires received represents a response rate of approximately 95%. Training Office records show that about 135 questionnaires were due during the 12 month period. Questionnaire P/4 is mailed to participants who completed programs of 6 months or longer in duration approximately 6 months after their return to Thailand. All of the participants reporting in this section had all or a part of their training in the U.S.A., and most of them completed academic programs in which they received an advanced degree.

A consideration to be kept in mind with respect to the participants reporting is that a fairly large number were trained and are now working in activity areas where there is no longer an American TA aboard. The sponsoring project has been phased out. This situation is particularly true of those who are in the field of Education. Due to this situation the wording of Q2(a) in the P/4 used was found to be inadequate. About one-third of the participants assigned to projects which had phased out answered the question "no". In developing table P4/2a, therefore, these responses were edited to reflect the true situation as could be ascertained from the USOM Technicians Six(6) Month Report and other Training Office records. Q2a in the P/4 now in use has been reworded to read: "Is your present work related to what has been or is currently a joint Thai/American project?"

The P/4 in use over the past 12 months is, with a few exceptions, identical to the P/4 questionnaire tabulated and reported in section 4 of the May, 1964 report. A comparison of the data in the tables at the end of this section and that appearing in the May/1964 report will be a part of the following comments. Many of the participants reporting in this section are the same participants who completed questionnaire P/3 prior to April 30, 1964. Their post-training expectations on return are represented in the tables appearing in Section 3 of the May/64 report. Therefore, a comparison between their reported status 6 months after their return and that which they had expected on their return will in some instances be both interesting and meaningful.

Comment

As shown by table P/4 - 2a, 124 of the 129 reporting (about 96%) are in an assignment related to what is (or was) a joint Thai/American project. The few who are not represent either cases in which there has been a mutual Thai/American agreement for reassignment, or ones which are now under discussion. Such cases notwithstanding table P/4 - 2a indicates a very favorable situation with respect to Thai participants returning to the sponsoring project.

Table P/4 - 3a shows 60% of the participants to have a higher level of authority 6 months after their return than they had prior to their training. This picture for "current" /2 participants appears to be more favorable than that shown for the group

---

/1 Referred to in this report as P/4

/2 The word "current" here and elsewhere in this section is used to refer to those completing P/4 during the past 12 months.

covered by the May 1964 report; only 52% of that group so reported. However, Section 3, Table P/3 - 13a, shows that about 70% of the participants on return expect to have positions of greater authority. The same was true for the group covered by the May, 1964 report, which, as was mentioned earlier, contained many of those who are here reporting on their status 6 months after their return.

In Table P/4 - 3b, about forty-six percent of the "current" group report receiving a higher salary 6 month after their return than they had prior to training. This compares to 53% of the group covered by the May 1964 report.

More significantly, the May/64 report (Section 3) showed that 60% of the participants returning during the period when the "current" group did expected to get salaries higher than what they were receiving prior to their training.

"Current" returnees, however, are not so optimistic. As noted by table P/3 - 13(b), section 3 of this report, only 51% expect a higher salary.

The data leaves little doubt that participant job expectations on return are not in all cases being realized. At least, they are not within the first 6 months after they get back. (See Part III for the picture one year after return).

About 60% of the participants reporting said they were in the position they expected to get on their return, and the same number said they would have had a better position, or about the same position if they had not gone abroad for training; tables P/4 - 4 and P/4 - 5.

These tables show about the same pictures as did comparable tables in the May, 1964 report. In both instances the percent of participants who say 6 months after their return that they have the position they expected to get is considerably lower than the number who report on their return that they know the assignment they are to have, and that it is what they expected.

Thus, it would appear that a number of participants are not getting the assignment which they had been given reason to believe they would have. This, plus the report of 60% that they have no better position than they would have had if they had not received the training, indicates that a more serious concern is needed with respect to participant post-training assignment.

Table P/4 - 6 shows that 6 months after their return all but 14 of the 129 feel that their training should have, in some respects, been different. The 129 participants made 240 mentions on this point and most of these fell into four (4) categories. They report they should have had "more specialization", "more practical training", "a longer program", and "more academic work." These account for 209 of the mentions. This picture is not to be interpreted to mean that the program completed was completel unsatisfactory and not in line with their needs. As discussed in Section 3, most of the participants return pretty much satisfied with the program completed and report that it was in line with the program requested by their ministry (Tables P/3 - 16 and 17(a)).

Furthermore, in this section, Tables P/4 - 17, it will be noted that only 27 of these participants mention their program, or the way it was conducted, as a limiting factor in their utilization of training.

Table P/4 - 6 merely substantiates the fact that, true to Thai tradition, USOM participants want to stay abroad as long as possible and get as much knowledge as possible. If they get a M.S. degree they would like to stay for a Ph.D; or at least to get further specialization in their major field.

Actually, Table P/4 - 6 indicates the "additional" things they wish they had accomplished. The number who indicate that they should have had "practical" experience is significant. This further substantiates the finding in Section 3, table P/3 - 23(b

The data in tables P/4 - 7 and P/4 - 8 show a picture which is similar to that shown in the May, 1964 report. Six (6) months after their return, approximately 60% of the participants report using 50% or more of their training in their work. Moreover, almost all have plans for using some ideas, skills, etc., which they have not yet been able to do. It does appear that fewer of the "current" returnees are using all, or almost all of their training in their assignments. Only 24 of 129 "current" participants so report as compared to 33 of 129 covered in the May, 1964 report. This perhaps explains the opposite shift in Table P/4 - 8. Ninety-four percent of the "current" participants say they intend to use something which they have not yet been able to, as compared to 86% of those covered in the May/64 report.

Almost all of the participants report that they have made suggestions for change since their return (Table P/4 - 9), and two-thirds say that they have found those to whom suggestions were made either moderately or very interested; table P/4 - 10.

Tables P/4 - 9 and 10 show the same picture as comparable tables did in the May/6 report.

Tables P/4 - 11 shows that the percent of participants who (6 months after return felt that they had transmitted to others 50% or more of their training to be significantly less than the percent who reported in Table P/4 - 7 that they were using their training to such an extent. A quite similar picture was shown in the May/64 report, the primary difference being that fewer of the "current" participants report transmitting all or almost all of their training.

Table P/4 - 12 shows that participants use a number of ways in which the "multiplier" effect of training is realized. The most popular procedure is "on-the-job instruction or suggestions", but a large number report transmission of their training in more formal situations, such as "staff meetings", "formal training courses", etc.

In Section 3 (tables P/3 - 14(a)) it was found that participants return with specific ideas, techniques, etc., which they want to try. Tables P/4 - 7 through P/4 - 12 gives a picture of the extent to which they feel (6 months later) that they are succeeding, and some insight into the effort made to do so.

The percent of participants who on return expected complete or almost complete acceptance an cooperation from their superiors in putting their training to use (table P/3 - 14b, section 3) is 13% greater than the percent who actually found their superio moderately or very interested in their suggestions for change (table P/4 - 10), and the percent who found their superiors somewhat or very helpful to them in fully utilizing their training. This is further evidence that participants undergo considerable frustration in attempting to realize their personal post-training objectives. The problem appears to be a combination of the assignment they receive, and the attitude of those with whom they work. Comment on the former was made earlier in this section; see discussion of tables P/4 - 4 and P/4 - 5.

Tables P/4 - 14 through P/4 - 16 indicate that, generally speaking, the presence and assistance of a USOM TA is not likely to solve the problems participants have in realizing their objectives. Only 55% (table P/4 - 14) of the participants who have been back 6 months report that a USOM TA is available to them for consultation and advice. In view of the fact that many of them returned after the sponsoring project had phased out, this percentage pretty well describes the situation. Interestingly, a higher (60%) percent report (table P/4 - 15) having had a personal contact with a USOM TA during the past 6 months. This is indicative of the USOM effort to increase personal contacts with returnees even though they are in activities for which there is no longer a technician aboard.

As shown by table P/4 - 16, about half of the 129 participants reporting feel the USOM TA is somewhat or very helpful to participants in putting their training into practice. When one considers the number of cases in which there is no TA aboard to give such assistance table P/4 - 16 speaks more favorably of the TA than table P/4 - 13 does for the participants immediate (Thai) supervisor.

Table P/4 - 17 presents the factors which the participants report as tending to limit their utilization of training. As shown by the footnote, there were only nine (9) participants who said there were no limiting factors. The remaining 120 mention one or more limitations, and almost 60% of the total mentions relate to the participants assignment and the "human" element in his work situation.

As shown by table P/4 - 18 - 19, 73 of the 129 participants joined a professional society while they were in the U.S.A. in training, and all but nine (9) of these are still members of the association joined. Of course, these participants have only been back 6 months. The percent who will renew their membership when it expires is unknown. About 45% of the participants (table P/4 - 20) report membership in a Thai professional association. Most of this membership, however, is accounted for by those in Education who report membership in the Thai Teachers Association.

Section 4; referenced tables /A

Q. 2(a) Is your present assignment related to joint Thai/American project activity?

Table P/4-2a

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Yes	13	25	12	45	22	7	124
No	0	0	1	0	2	0	3
Don't know	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
Participants Reporting	13	25	14	46	24	7	129

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant

Q.3 As compared to the position you held before you went abroad for training, does your present assignment have--
(a) an equivalent level of responsibility, lower level of responsibility, or higher level of responsibility ?

Table P/4 - 3a

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Equivalent	4	13	8	12	6	2	45
Lower	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Higher	8	11	6	31	17	5	78
No Answer	1	1	0	1	1	0	4
Participants Reporting	13	25	14	46	24	7	129

/A Tables P/4-14-P/4-16 in this section relate to activity No.5, USOM's Policy Order No.800.4. Participant Follow-Up.

(b) An equivalent salary, lower salary, or higher salary?

Table P/4 - 3b

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Equivalent	6	14	9	17	11	1	58
Lower	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
Higher	7	9	3	26	10	5	60
No Answer	0	2	1	3	2	1	9
Participants Reporting	13	25	14	46	24	6	129

/1 Includes One (1) Public Safety participant.

Q.4 Is your present assignment what you expected to get on your return from training abroad?

Table P/4 - 4

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Yes	8	13	11	24	14	6	76
No	3	5	0	11	5	0	24
Had no expectations; Return assignment not discussed prior to departure for training	2	7	3	11	5	1	29
Participant Reporting	13	25	14	46	24	7	129

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety Participant

Q. 5. Suppose that you had not gone abroad for training, do you think that you would now have about the same kind of position, a better position, or one not so good? (Check one)

Table P/4 - 5

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
About the same	5	13	8	21	9	2	58
Better	2	3	2	5	5	1	18
Not as good	2	6	3	9	7	3	30
Don't know	4	3	1	11	3	1	23
Participants Reporting	13	25	14	46	24	7	129

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant

Q. 6. As you see it now, when you were on your training program should you have had: (Check one or more as appropriate)

Table P/4 - 6

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
The same program as you did	2	1	2	3	2	3	14
More specialization	2	8	5	30	11	4	60
Less specialization	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
More practical experience (on-the-job training or observation)	2	15	4	20	12	3	56
Less practical training (on-the-job training or observation)	0	3	1	1	0	0	5
A longer program.	4	9	3	20	11	2	49
A shorter program.	0	4	0	2	2	0	8
More academic work.	7	6	6	13	7	4	43
Less academic work.	0	1	1	2	1	0	5
Total mentions	17	47	22	93	45	16	240
Participants Reporting	13	25	14	46	24	7	129

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant.

Q. 7. Thinking of your present assignment and your own work situation, to what extent are you able to use the knowledge, skills, techniques, etc., which you acquired in training: (Check one)

Table P/4 - 7

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Practically none of it.	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
Only a little of it (less than 25%)	2	4	3	4	2	0	15
Some of it (25-50%)	6	9	2	16	2	2	37
Quite a bit of it (50-75%)	1	10	9	18	10	2	50
Almost everything, or all of it (75-100%)	4	1	0	6	10	3	24
No Answer	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Participants Reporting	13	25	14	46	24	7	129

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant.

Q. 8. Do you have any plans for using some ideas, skills or knowledge, etc., acquired in training which as yet you have not been able to carry out?

Table P/4 - 8

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Yes	12	24	14	44	23	5	122
No	1	1	0	2	1	2	7
Participants Reporting	13	25	14	46	24	7	129

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant.

Q. 9. Since your return, have you suggested any changes based on your training experience? (Check one)

Table P/4 - 9

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Yes; many of them	6	4	5	11	8	5	39
Yes; several	2	7	4	14	6	1	34
Yes; one or a few	4	12	5	21	7	1	50
No; none made	1	2	0	0	3	0	6
Participants Reporting	13	25	14	46	24	7	129

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant

Q. 10. What degree of interest has been shown by those to whom you made suggestions for changes? (Check one)

Table P/4 - 10
(Reports only those who had suggested changes)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Very interested.	2	4	4	6	5	2	23
Moderately interested.	4	10	5	28	13	3	63
Slightly interested.	3	6	1	9	1	1	21
Not interested at all.	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
Don't know or can't say	3	2	4	2	2	1	14
Participants Reporting	12	23	14	46	21	7	123

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant.

Q. 11. About how much of the skills, ideas, techniques, or knowledge which you acquired in training have you been able to transmit to others since you returned? (Check one)

Table P/4 - 11

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Practically none	0	2	0	3	1	0	6
Only a little (less than 25%)	2	6	4	10	6	1	29
Some (25 - 50%)	7	8	3	20	5	3	46
Quite a bit (50 - 75%)	4	6	7	12	9	2	40
Almost everything; all of it (75 - 100%)	0	3	0	1	3	1	8
Participants Reporting	13	25	14	46	24	7	129

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant

Q. 12. Which of the following ways have you gone about passing on to others things you learned: (Check all that are applicable)

Table P/4 - 12

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Through staff meetings	5	9	8	31	11	5	69
OJT instruction or suggestions	10	17	9	27	16	6	85
By formal regular training courses	6	2	4	9	7	3	31
By formal occasional training courses	2	3	5	15	5	4	34
Giving special lectures.	7	6	4	18	6	3	44
Writing special articles.	4	6	5	11	6	4	36
Informal Conversation	0	0	2	8	1	1	12
Demonstrations	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Total mentions	34	43	37	121	52	26	313
Participants Reporting	13	25	14	46	24	7	129

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant

Q. 13. Does your present supervisor, (your immediate superior) help you in utilizing the training your received? (Check one)

Table P/4 - 13

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Neither helpful nor unhelpful	0	0	3	2	3	0	8
Somewhat helpful	8	11	7	18	7	3	54
Very helpful	3	6	2	4	10	3	28
Not helpful	1	4	0	3	3	1	12
I have no supervisor	1	4	2	18	1	0	26
No Answer	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Participants Reporting	13	25	14	46	24	7	129

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant

Q. 14. Since your return, has there been a USOM technician, or USOM Contract representative available to you for consultation or advice?

Table P/4 - 14

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Yes	6	15	8	20	17	6	72
No	6	8	5	21	5	0	45
Don't know	1	2	1	5	2	1	12
Participants Reporting	13	25	14	46	24	7	129

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant.

Q. 15. In the past six months about how many times have you personally talked with a USOM (or Contract) technician? (Check one)

Table P/4 - 15

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Have had no contact.	7	10	7	20	7	1	52
One to three times, but less than four	2	13	3	22	6	0	46
Four to six times, but less than seven	3	1	0	0	3	0	7
Seven times or more.	1	1	4	4	8	6	24
Participants Reporting	13	25	14	46	24	7	129

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant.

Q. 16. In your opinion how helpful is the USOM (or Contract) technician in giving returned participants like yourself assistance in putting what was learned abroad into practice in Thailand? (Check one)

Table P/4 - 16

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Neither helpful nor unhelpful	0	2	0	3	1	0	6
Somewhat helpful	4	10	5	13	3	3	38
Very helpful	2	2	1	8	12	3	28
Not helpful	0	0	0	2	2	0	4
Don't know - can't say—have had no contact with USOM technicians	7	11	8	20	6	1	53
Participants Reporting	13	25	14	46	24	7	129

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant

Q. 17. There are many factors which may prevent full utilization of the training received. Which of the following do you believe are limiting factors in your work now? (Check all that are applicable)

Table F/4 - 17

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Training I received was not in line with current job needs - (my program was not at the proper level to meet job requirements).	3	3	1	4	3	0	13
Training I received was not well done. (Instruction and/or program was carried out poorly.	0	4	3	4	1	2	14
Current assignment is at level which does not require full use of training	2	9	5	9	7	1	33
In the current situation I lack the materials, equipment, etc. to full utilize my training.	9	11	6	28	7	2	63
In the current situation I lack the assistance of other trained personnel, making full utilization of training impossible	7	6	3	22	6	3	47
In general, the organizational structure within which I function makes full utilization of my training very difficult.	4	2	5	15	6	2	34
The attitude of my supervisor makes full utilization of my training rather difficult.	0	2	2	7	5	1	17
Total Mentions	25	37	25	89	35	11	221
No limiting factors	0	3	0	0	5	1	9
Participants Reporting	13	25	14	46	24	7	129

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant.

Q. 18. While you were in the United States for training did you join (hold membership) in a professional society or organization?

Q. 19. (If "Yes" to Q. 18 above, please enter below the name(s) of the professional association(s) or organization(s) which you joined, and check whether or not you have continued your membership.

Table P/4 - 18 - 19

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Yes; and I'm still a member	8	8	9	20	16	5	66
Yes; but I'm no longer a member	2	0	0	5	2	0	9
No; did not join	3	17	5	21	6	2	54
Participants Reporting	13	25	14	46	24	7	129

Q. 20. Please list the name(s) of Thai professional association, or organizations to which you belong now?

Table P/4 - 20

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Listed one Thai association	2	10	9	28	4	0	53
Listed two Thai associations	0	0	2	1	0	0	3
Listed three Thai associations	0	0	1	2	0	0	3
Listed none	11	15	2	15	20	7	70
Participants Reporting	13	25	14	46	24	7	129

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant.

Q. 21. Please indicate your current Thai civil service grade and level.

Table P/4 - 21

		Response by Technical Field of Activity						
		AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Special Grade	Level 1	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
	Level 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Level 3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
First Grade	Level 1	1	1	4	1	5	0	12
	Level 2	0	1	1	2	1	0	5
Second Grade	Level 1	2	3	0	11	4	1	21
	Level 2	8	7	5	21	9	4	54
	Level 3	2	0	1	6	2	0	11
Third Grade	Level 1	0	4	1	0	0	0	5
	Level 2	0	3	2	3	1	1	10
Fourth Grade	Level 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Level 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Level 3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	(Special	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Answer		0	3	0	2	2	1	8
Participants Reporting		13	25	14	46	24	7	129

/1 Includes One (1) Public Safety participant.

SECTION 5

Evaluation; Participant Follow-Up, Technician's Six (6) Month Report /1

Introduction

This section deals with 119 T/1 questionnaires completed by USOM Technical Advisors between April 30, 1964 and May 1, 1965. The 119 questionnaires represent an 88% coverage in getting a Technician (Six-month) Report on the total number of returnees for which such a report was due during the 12 month period.

It is worthwhile to report here that a sizeable number of returnees on which a Technician's Six (6) month Report was requested were working in activity areas where there was no longer an active joint Thai/American project. Hence, there were no USOM Technicians aboard who, by the nature of their assignments, would have continuing contacts with this group. For this reason, the 88% coverage is considered to be good.

As noted in describing the "battery" of follow-up questionnaires in use (Part I of this report), the Participant's Six (6) Month Report (P/4) and the Technician's Six (6) Month Report (T/1) both provide information concerning the returnees utilization of training. The former gives the returnees own appraisal of his assignment and the extent to which the training is being used and transmitted to others, while the latter gives the TA's personal appraisal of the post-training situation. The two questionnaires are forwarded to the participant and the TA at the same point in time, approximately 6 months after the participants return. However, they are not completed and returned at the same time. Generally speaking the TA report lags behind the participant's report from a period of six weeks to two months. Hence, there were questionnaires completed by participants (P/4) used in developing the tables in Section 4 for which there was no TA report (T/1) included in developing tables for this section, and vise versa.

Of the 129 questionnaires used in developing tables in Section 4, however, 93 (about 72%) were completed by returnees who are covered in this section with the Techincian's Six (6) Month Report. Therefore, having a "matched report" (both a P/4 and T/1 questionnaires) on 93 of the 119 participants covered in section 5 permits some meaningful comparisons between data from the two sources. Such comparisons will be made part/of the following comments.

Comments

(a) Post Training Assignment (Six months after return)

A primary objective of the Technicians Six (6) Month Report is to ascertain the relationship of the returnees post-training assignment to the training programmed and completed, and to the sponsoring project. The post-training assignment given to the participant is, of course, crucial in achieving full utilization of the training programmed.

The data in section 4, and this section, show clearly that the assignment of participants on their return are in general conducive to achieving the maximum benefits from training. Participants are returning to their sponsoring project, and they are given assignments in line with, or which require their training.

/1 Referred to in this report as T/1

In section 4, table P/4-2a, shows that 124 of the 129 participants have an assignment 6 months after their return which is related to the sponsoring project. Table T/1-2a in this section shows 115 of the 119 reported on by USOM TA's to be in project-related positions, and table T/1-1 indicates that in 106 of the 119 cases the participants project-related assignment is in line with the training received.

The few cases noted where a "proper" post-training assignment has not been realized most often represent instances where a lag in organizational or administrative decisions have held up the desired project implementation. Thus, in one sense, the factors which tend to delay or block desired post-training assignments are the very ones which originally trigger the need for a training "input" into the project.

(b) Post Training TA and Participant Contacts

In table T/1-3 USOM TA's report that about 75% of the 119 returnees on which they submitted the Six (6) Month Report had been personally contacted prior to completing the T/1. This percentage is considerably greater than the participants who reported having personally talked with a TA during the 6 months preceding their completion of P/4, see table P/4-15, section 4.

A tabulation of the "matched reports" shows that in 66 of the 93 cases the TA and the participant basically agree with respect to their post training contacts, and that in the cases of disagreement the discrepancy is not always one-directional. The following table shows this picture by field of training.

P/4 & T/1 Questionnaires	Post-training TA/Participant Contact						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	TOTAL
Basically /2 Agree	5	12	7	24	11	7	66
Disagree: P/4 reported personal contact, T/1 did not	0	0	0	8	0	0	8
T/1 reported personal contact, P/4 did not	6	1	4	6	2	0	19
Total "Matched Report"	11	13	11	38	13	7	93

In looking at the foregoing table it should be recalled that a high percent of the participants in Education were working in activities where the project had phased out and there was no TA aboard. The eight (8) participants who reported a personal contact with a TA obviously were not referring to a TA assigned to their activity.

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety Participant

/2 Both reported prior personal contact and basically agreed on the frequency of such contacts

As was shown by the RPES data and by the May/64 report, the "current"/1 picture indicates a number of post-training TA and participants contacts occur when mutual knowledge of the identity of the persons involved is absent. A look at Tables T/1 - 3 and P/4 - 15, section 4 reveals however, that where there is contact between those who know one anothers identity there is general agreement as to the frequency with which contacts are made. Thirty-six percent of the participants said they had talked with the TA one to three times during the first six months after their return; five percent reported four to six contacts, and nineteen percent reported, seven or more contacts. The TA's report 41%, 9%, and 26% respectively.

Table T/4 gives (by frequency of mention) the reasons which the TA's report as limiting their personal contacts with returnees. It appears the major factors limiting contacts are the location of the returnee, the TA's work-load, and the fact that there is no TA working in the activity in which the returnee was trained. It should be noted that in more than half of the cases (62 in 119) the TA's reported that nothing interferred with their making personal contacts.

Division Chiefs and project managers will perhaps want to compare the response pattern in Table T/4 with that in Table T/3. Such an analysis will be helpful in fully realizing the problems faced in implementing the mission's policy with respect to participant follow-up contacts.

In USOM Order No.800.4 (participant follow-up) the mission recognizes a particular need for follow-up on returnees completing a program of 6 months or longer in duration. Personal contacts with these participants for a minimum of one year following their return is an accepted responsibility, regardless of the status of the project which sponsored the training.

(c) <u>The TA's appraisal of the post-training situation; tables T/1 - 5 through T/1 - 10.</u>

As shown by Table T/1 - 5 USOM technicians feel that in the majority of cases the training has made a major contribution to the participant's ability to do his job. Also, they feel (table T/1 - 6a) that the training represents an effective use of project funds.

Tables T/1 - 7 and T/1 - 8 show that in a high percent of the cases the TA's are satisfied with the effort and action of both the participant and his employing agency to maximumize utilization of training.

Tables T/1 - 9 (a) (b) and (c) give a similar picture with respect to the TA's appraisal of the extent to which participants are utilizing training. Of those they are able to rate, about 80% are reported as having achieved "high" or "full" utilization of their training on the job. Almost as many are reported to be doing equally well in transmitting their training to others. With respect to utilization, a look at Tables P/4 - 7 and P/4 - 11, section 4, shows that the TA's rate the participants' considerably higher than do the participants themselves. As shown by table P/4 - 11, Section 4 and T/1 9(b), this is particularly true with respect to the transmission of training to others.

/1 The word "current" is used here and elsewhere in this section in referring to questionnaires completed during the past 12 months.

The TA's only rated 17 of the participants (for which they made a rating) as achieving less than "high" utilization when both "use on the job" and "transmission to others" was combined; table T/1 - 9c. Table T/1 - 10 indicates what the TA's believe to be the problem in these cases. Here, as was the case when participants reported on their problems in achieving full utilization (table P/4 - 17, section 4), the "human element" stands out as a major bottle-neck. Hence, a major obstacle to participant's achieving higher utilization of their training is an inherent part of the situation which requires the training "input." Namely, inadequately developed human resources.

Section 5, Referenced Tables /4

Table T/1 - 0

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Academic; Degree obtained	11	2	9	41	8	7	78
Academic; Degree not obtained	2	0	4	3	1	0	10
Non-Academic	2	14	5	1	7	2	31
Participants Reported	15	16	18	45	16	9	119

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant

Q. 1. Is the participant's assignment in line with the training received?

Table T/1 - 1

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Yes	11	14	16	42	14	9	106
No	2	2	2	2	2	0	10
Don't know	2	0	0	1	0	0	3
Participants Reporting	15	16	18	45	16	9	119

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant

/4 Tables T/1 - 1, T/1 - 2, and T/1 - 3 - 10 in this section relate to activities No.4 and 5 respectively, USOM's Policy Order No.800.4, Participant Follow-Up.

2. (a) Is the participant currently employed in the project which sponsored the training or in a project related activity for which the training was programmed?

Table T/1 - 2(a)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Yes	15	16	17	44	14	9	115
No	0	0	1/2	0	2/3	0	3
Don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not Answered	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Participants Reporting	15	16	18	45	16	9	119

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant.

/2 The PH returnee who is not now assigned to the project was transferred by mutual agreement between USOM and RTG personnel. The participant is working in the field in which training was received.

/3 These participants were trained under personnel and management improvement project and will be so assigned when the positions for which they were trained are established.

3. In the past six months about how many times have you personally talked with the participant prior to receiving this inquiry? (Check one)

Table T/1 - 3

Frequency of Contact	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Never contacted	1	4	4	19	1	1	30
One to three, but less than four	8	8	6	21	5	0	48
Four to six, but less than seven	1	2	1	3	1	1	9
Seven or more	5	2	7	2	9	7	32
Participants Reporting	15	16	18	45	16	9	119

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant.

4. There may be many factors which make it difficult for you to see participants as often as would be desirable. Please check the following which would apply in respect to your seeing this particular participant.

Table T/1 - 4

(Question permitted multiple mentions)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
My workload, the number of participants I have to handle interferes with my seeing this participant as often as would be desirable.	2	4	0	5	0	0	11
The particular job location of this participant is a serious limitation in seeing him as often as would be desirable.	1	4	1	12	1	2	21
The attitude and interest of the participant - lack of initiative in seeking help makes contacts relatively non-productive.	1	0	0	1	0	1	3
The attitude of his (her) supervisor toward such contacts make them relative unlesirable.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difficulty in conversing with the participant because of language barrier make contacts relatively non-productive.	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Nothing interfered; the participant has been seen as often as would be desirable.	7	9	14	13	12	6	62
At present there is no TA assigned to the activity in which this participant was trained.	4	0	3	15	3	1	26
Total Mentions	15	18	18	46	16	10	124
Participants Reporting	15	16	18	45	16	9	119

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant.

5. How do you rate the contribution that this participant's training has made to his ability to perform his present job well? (Check one)

Table T/1 - 5

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Made a major contribution	10	8	13	28	11	8	78
Made a minor contribution	0	4	2	8	1	1	16
Made no contribution	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
Don't know can't rate	5	4	2	9	2	0	22
Not Answered	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Participants Reporting	15	16	18	45	16	9	119

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant.

6. (a) This participant's training represents a project input which was programmed 12 months ago or longer. Project requirements, and priorities in implementing project objectives undergo continuous review and frequently change. In light of the situation as you view it today, would you say this particular training investment represents an effective use of project funds? (Check one)

Table T/1 - 6(a)

(Only 75 participants were reported on; questionnaire for 44 did not contain this question)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Yes, completely	4	6	7	10	12	4	43
Yes, almost completely	0	1	4	8	0	2	16
Yes, partially	1	0	0	1	1	1	4
No, poor investment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Don't know, can't rate	3	3	2	3	1	1	12
Participants Reporting	8	10	13	22	14	8	75

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant.

7. In general would you say you are satisfied or dissatisfied with actions and effort of the department or ministry to insure the maximum utilization of the participant's training.

Table T/1 - 7

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD/1	Total
1. Satisfied.	10	10	15	38	14	7	94
2. Dissatisfied.	1	4	1	6	1	2	15
9. Don't know, can't rate.	4	1	2	1	1	0	9
Not Answered	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Participants Reported	15	16	18	45	16	9	119

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant.

8. Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the participant'w own action and effort to fully utilize his training?

Table T/1 - 8

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
1. Satisfied.	9	11	14	32	15	8	89
2. Dissatisfied.	2	0	1	3	0	1	7
9. Don't know, can't rate.	4	5	3	10	1	0	23
Participants Reporting	15	16	18	45	16	9	119

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant.

9. What about the participant's actual utilization of his training; his success in putting what he learned into practice and transmitting his training to others. (Give the appropriate number from the rating code for each part a, b and c.)

a. Direct utilization on the job.

Table T/1 - 9(a)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Uses all or almost all; Full utilization - 75-100%	6	6	9	21	11	5	58
Uses quite a bit; High utilization 50 - 75%	3	3	5	9	1	2	23
Uses some; 25 - 50%	1	3	0	4	1	1	10
Uses little or none; less than 25%	1	1	2	2	0	0	6
Don't know, can't rate	4	3	2	9	3	1	22
Participants Reporting	15	16	18	45	16	9	119

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant.

b. Transmission to others

Table T/9 (b)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Uses all or almost all; Full utilization - 75 - 100%	5	4	4	12	10	1	36
Uses quite a bit; high utilization - 50-75%	5	5	6	15	1	4	36
Uses some; 25 - 50%	0	2	4	3	1	2	12
Uses little or none; less than 25%	1	2	1	3	0	1	8
Don't know, can't rate	4	3	3	12	4	1	27
Participants Reporting	15	16	18	45	16	9	119

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant.

c. Overall rating (considering both on-the-job use and transmission)

Table T/1 9(c)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Uses all or almost all; Full utilization - 75 - 100%	7	6	6	18	10	2	49
Uses quite a bit; high utilization - 50 - 75%	3	2	7	11	1	5	29
Uses some; 25 - 50%	0	4	0	4	1	0	9
Uses little or none; less than 25%	1	1	3	2	0	1	8
Dont know, can't rate	4	3	2	10	4	1	24
Participants Reporting	15	16	18	45	16	9	119

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant.

Q. 10. If overall rating on utilization (table T/9 (c) is lower than "high" (less than 50%) indicate below the major factors preventing greater utilization.

Table T/1 - 10

(Reports only those whose utilization rating, overall, was only some, little or none; question permitted multiple mentions)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	PW	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Improper selection and/or personal characteristics: (Too old, too immature, inadequately qualified(technically) for the training program, does not try hard enough is not adaptable, has personality difficul	1	1	1	1	0	1	5
Deficiencies in training. (Training not geared to job needs—too high a level, too low a level. Training not well done, program too short, program too long).	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
The "human element" where employed: (participant blocked by supervisor, by co-workers, etc.; lacks assistance of other trained personnel, organizational set-up and/or administrative hierarchy limits utilization—attitude of supervisors. Assignment does not require(full)utilization of training).	0	3	1	6	1	1	12
Total Mentions	1	4	3	7	1	2	18
Not Answered	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Participants Reporting	3	5	1	6	1	1	17

PART III

Forward

Part III consists of two sections, each comprised of comments and tables, in that order.

Sections 4 and 5, part II, reported the viewpoints of the participants and USOM Technicians respectively as to the post-training situation of participants' after having been back from training for a period of six (6) months. This part of the report presents identical information for participants who have been back for a period of one year.

The reader is to bear in mind that the participants reported in part II of this report are not the ones reported here in part III. Generally speaking, however, the participants covered in this part of the report are those who were dealt with in sections 4 part II of the May, 1964 report. Some comparisons, therefore, will be made between the data here and that shown in the May/64 report.

SECTION 1

Evaluation
Follow-up/Questionnaire No.5; Participants' One Year Report /1

Introduction

This section deals with 110 P/5 questionnaires completed between April 30, 1964 and May 1, 1965. The P/5 questionnaire is sent to participants one year after their return and the 110 represents better than an 85% response rate for the time period concerned. All but six (6) of the 110 participants reporting had at least a part of their training in the USA, and in most instances the training resulted in an academic degree.

As previously stated, the purpose of the one-year participant and technician reports is to ascertain whether the returnees' job situation and their working relationships (with both their superiors and USOM) changes through time. For the sake of brevity, therefore, comments with respect to the data in this section will largely be confined to those tables which reflect a change in the situation as reported in the May/64 report.

Comments

All but one (1) of the 110 participants reporting were working in activities which relate to a joint Thai/American project (table P/5 - 2(a)).

The data show that through time a higher percentage of Thai returnees move into positions with more authority, responsibility, and higher salaries, than they had prior to their training. Six months after their return only 55% (May/64 report) reported such a change in their positions as compared to 69% who reported so at the end of one year (Tables P/5 - 3(a) & (b)).

The two sets of data also show that the longer the participants are back the less likely they are to be in the positions they expected to get on their return. The percentages are 54 and 62 respectively (tables P/5 - 4 this section and P/4 - 4, May/64 report).

Tables P/5 - 7 through P/5 - 12 relate to utilization of traning and the relationships between the participant and his superiors. A comparison of the data in the May/64 report, section 4, with "current" /2 data shows that the additional 6 months on the job has resulted in practically no change with respect to either utilization, or the relationships between the participants and their supervisors.

Tables P/5 - 14 through P/16, relates to the participants relationship with USOM Technical Advisors. The "current" data show 50% of the participants reporting the availability of a TA for consultation, and 2% less reporting one or more personal contacts during the past 6 months. (tables P/6 - 14 and 15).

Sixty-three percent of the participants completing the one year report view USOM's TA as being either somewhat or very helpful to returnees in putting their training into practice (tables P/5 - 16).

/1 Hereafter referred to as P/5

/2 "Current" refers to the participants one year report.

Unfortunately, with respect to the role of the technician in the post-training situation, the data in the May/64 report cannot be compared with "current" data. The percentages in the May/64 report were somewhat lower both with respect to the availability of USOM, TAs, and personal contacts with them, but the differences shown results from a change in the query used rather than from an actual change in the situation. Whereas the query currently used reads "USOM (or contract) technicians" it formerly read "USOM Technicians." It was noted in the May/64 report that participants do not always consider a "Contract" advisor as being a "USOM" advisor.

Table P/5 - 17 shows the factors which participants', one year after their return, identify as "bottlenecks" in achieving full utilization of their training. A comparison of the picture here with that given 6 months earlier (May/64 report, Section 4, table P/4 - 17) reveals some interesting aspects of the post-training situation.

The frequency with which "bottlenecks" are mentioned, and their nature, changes through time. A higher percentage of participants mention "bottle-necks" at the end of a year than do at the end of 6 months, and, on an average, they mention more of them.

Interestingly, after a year they are less likely to report the quality of the the training received as a limiting factor, but more likely to mention that the training was not what they needed for the positions they fill. The latter, of cours, is consistent with the finding reported earlier that after one year they are less liekly to be in positions they expected to get on their return. With respect to utilization "bottle neck", the biggest change through time relates to the "human" factor in the job situation. Whereas one year after their return 4 participants in 10 mentioned the "organizational structure in which they function", or "the attitude of superiors" as limiting factors in utilizing their training, only 1 in 4 did so after they were back for a period of 6 months.

About the same percentage mention lack of "materials" and "equipment" as limiti utilization of training at the end of 6 months as do after being back a year.

In the participants one year report almost half of the 110 participants reporte joining a US professional society while they were abroad and 85% of these have continued their membership (table P/5 - 18 & 19). The May/64 report, Section 4, showed an almost identical picture.

Part III, Section 1; Referenced Tables/A

2. (a) Is your present assignment related to joint Thai/American project activity?

Table P/5 - 2a

	Response by Technical Field of Activity							
	AG	CP	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Yes	16	23	15	43	8	2	2	109
No	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Participants Reporting	16	24	15	43	8	2	2	110

3. As compared to the position you held before you went abroad for training does your present assignment have--

a. an equivalent level of responsibility, lower level of responsibility, or higher level of responsibility?

Table P/5 - 3(a)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity							
	AG	CP	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
An equivalent level of responsibility	3	10	5	11	0	1	0	30
Lower level of responsibility	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	4
Higher level of responsibility	13	13	10	29	8	1	2	76
Participants Reporting	16	24	15	43	8	2	2	110

b. An equivalent salary, a lower salary, or a higher salary?

Table P/5-3(b)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity							
	AG	CP	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
An equivalent salary	5	6	8	12	0	1	0	32
Lower salary	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Higher salary	11	18	6	31	8	1	2	77
Participants Reporting	16	24	15	43	8	2	2	110

/A Tables P/5 - 14 - P/5 - 16 in this section relate to activity No.5, USOM's Policy Order No. 800.4, Participant Follow-Up.

4. Is your present assignment what you expected to get on your return from training abroad?

Table P/5 - 4

	Response by Technical Field of Activity							
	AG	CP	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Yes	11	11	10	20	6	1	1	60
No	2	7	1	8	0	0	0	18
Had no expectations; return assignment not discussed prior to departure for training.	3	6	4	13	2	1	1	30
Not Answered	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Participants Reporting	16	24	15	43	8	2	2	110

5. Suppose that you had not gone abroad for training, do you think that you would now have about the same kind of position, a better position, or one not so good? (Check one)

Table P/5 - 5

	Response by Technical Field of Activity							
	AG	CP	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
About the same	9	12	11	22	1	1	0	56
Better	2	3	1	4	2	0	0	12
Not as good	2	5	1	11	5	1	0	25
Don't know	3	4	2	6	0	0	2	17
Participants Reporting	16	24	15	43	8	2	2	110

6. As you see it now, when you were on your training program should you have had: (Check one or more as appropriate)

Table F/5 - 6

	Response by Technical Field of Activity							
	AG	CP	FH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
The same program as you did	0	1	3	3	0	1	0	8
More specialization	5	11	5	27	3	1	2	54
Less specialization	1	1	0	1	0	6	0	3
More practical experience (on-the-job training or observation)	5	17	2	28	8	1	1	62
Less practical training (on-the job or observation)	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
A longer program	6	9	4	22	3	0	1	45
A shorter program	1	1	2	3	0	0	0	7
More academic work	9	9	4	13	0	0	2	37
Don't know: undecided	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Total Mentions	27	49	23	99	14	3	6	221
Participants Reporting	11	24	15	45	8	2	2	110

7. Thinking of your present assignment and your own work situation, to what exten are you able to use the knowledge, skills, techniques, etc., which you acquire in training: (Check one)

Table F/5 - 7

	Response by Technical Field of Activity							
	AG	CF	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Practically none of it.	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Only a little of it (less than 25%)	0	2	1	5	0	0	0	9
Some of it (25 - 50%)	4	5	6	14	1	1	1	32
Quite a bit of it (50 - 75%)	6	10	5	18	5	0	0	44
Almost everything, or all of it (75 - 100%)	6	5	3	5	2	1	1	23
Participants Reporting	16	24	15	43	8	2	2	110

8. Do you have any plans for using some ideas, skills or knowledge, etc., acquired in training which as yet you have not been able to carry out?

Table F/5 - 8

	Response by Technical Field of Activity							
	AG	CF	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Yes	14	23	13	40	8	2	2	102
No	2	1	2	2	0	0	0	7
Not Answered	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Participants Reporting	16	24	15	43	8	2	2	110

9. Since your return, have you suggested any changes based on your training experience? (Check one)

Table P/5 - 9

	Response by Technical Field of Activity							
	AG	CP	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Yes; many of them	1	11	7	6	2	1	1	29
Yes; several	7	2	3	23	4	1	1	41
Yes; one or a few	7	6	3	13	0	0	0	29
No; none made	1	5	2	1	2	0	0	11
Participants Reporting	16	24	15	43	8	2	2	110

10. What degree of interest has been shown by those to whom you made suggestions for changes? (Check one)

Table P/5 - 10

(Reports only those who had suggested changes)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity							
	AG	CP	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Very interested.	2	5	2	9	3	1	0	22
Moderately interested.	11	7	5	21	2	0	2	48
Slightly interested.	0	1	2	6	1	1	0	11
Not interested at all.	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	5
Don't know or can't say.	1	5	3	4	0	0	0	13
Participants Reporting	15	19	13	42	6	2	2	99

11. About how much of the skills, ideas, techniques or knowledge which you acquired in training have you been able to transmit to others since you returned? (Check one)

Table P/5 - 11

	Response by Technical Field of Activity							
	AG	CP	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Practically none	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
Only a little (less than 25%)	2	2	5	7	0	0	0	16
Some (25 - 50%)	6	10	3	22	1	1	1	44
Quite a bit (50 - 75%)	7	9	7	9	6	0	1	39
Almost everything; all of it (75 - 100%)	1	2	0	4	1	1	0	9
Participants Reporting	16	24	15	43	8	2	2	110

12. Which of the following ways have you gone about passing on to others things you learned: (Check all that are applicable)

Table P/5 - 12

	Response by Technical Field of Activity							
	AG	CP	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Through staff meetings.	3	8	11	34	5	2	2	65
On-the-job instruction or suggestions	12	19	11	28	5	0	2	77
By formal regular training courses	3	4	6	14	1	0	0	28
By formal occasional training courses.	4	5	6	16	2	1	2	36
Giving special lectures.	7	4	5	20	2	0	1	39
Writing special articles.	6	4	2	13	4	1	2	32
Personal chats	2	1	1	4	0	0	0	8
Total Mentions	37	45	42	129	19	4	9	285
Participants Reporting	16	24	15	43	8	2	2	110

13. Does your present supervisor, (your immediate superior), help you in utilizing the training you received? (Check one)

Table P/5-13

	Response by Technical Field of Activity							
	AG	CP	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Neither helpful nor unhelpful	1	4	1	1	1	0	1	9
Somewhat helpful	5	7	7	15	2	0	1	37
Very helpful	6	5	3	9	4	2	0	29
Not helpful	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	4
I have no supervisor	4	7	3	16	1	0	0	31
Participants Reporting	16	24	15	43	8	2	2	110

14. Since your return, has there been a USOM technician, or USOM Contract representative available to you for consultation or advice?

Table P/5 - 14

	Response by Technical Field of Activity							
	AG	CP	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Yes	12	10	11	21	4	2	2	62
No	4	13	4	20	3	0	0	44
Don't know	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	4
Participants Reporting	16	24	15	43	8	2	2	110

15. In the past six months about how many times have you personally talked with a USOM (or Contract) technician? (Check one)

Table P/5 - 15

	Response by Technical Field of Activity							
	AG	CP	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Have had no contact.	5	14	5	25	4	0	0	53
One to three times, but less than four	5	6	2	16	2	1	0	32
Four to six times, but less than seven	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	7
Seven times or more	4	2	6	1	2	1	2	18
Participants Reporting	16	24	15	43	8	2	2	110

16. In your opinion how helpful is the USOM (or Contract) technician in giving returned participants like yourself assistance in putting what was learned abroad into practice in Thailand? (Check one)

Table P/5 - 16

	Response by Technical Field of Activity							
	AG	CP	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Neither helpful nor unhelpful	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3
Somewhat helpful	6	9	7	16	1	0	1	40
Very helpful	6	6	3	9	4	2	0	30
Not helpful	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	3
Don't know - can't say--have had no contact with USOM technicians.	3	9	4	15	3	0	0	34
Participants Reporting	16	24	15	43	8	2	2	110

17. There are many factors which may prevent full utilization of the training received. Whic of the following do you believe are limiting factors in your work now? (Check all that are applicable)

Table P/5 - 17

	Response by Technical Field of Activity							
	AG	CP	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Training I received was not in line with current job needs-(my program was not at the proper level ~~to meet job requirements~~)	2	3	5	9	1	1	0	21
Training I received was not well done. (Instruction and/or program was carried out poorly).	0	1	3	4	0	0	1	9
Current assignment is at level which does not require full use of training.	1	4	2	11	3	0	1	22
In the current situation I lack the assistance of other trained personnel, making full utilization of training impossible.	6	4	4	21	3	1	0	39
In the current situation I lack the materials, equipment, etc. to fully utilize my training.	13	13	6	27	3	1	1	64
In general, the organizational structure within which I function makes full utilization of my training very difficult	3	4	5	12	4	1	1	30
The attitude of my supervisor makes full utilization of my training rather difficult.	1	2	3	7	0	1	2	16
Total Mentions	26	31	28	91	14	5	6	207
No limiting factors reported	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	6
Participants reporting	16	24	15	43	8	2	2	110

20. Please list the name(s) of Thai professional association, or organizations to which you belong now?

Table P/5 - 20

	Response by Technical Field of Activity							
	AG	CP	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Listed one Thai Association	1	12	9	32	3	1	0	58
Listed two Thai Associations	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Listed three Thai Associations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Listed none	15	12	6	10	5	1	2	51
No Answer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Participants Reporting	16	24	15	43	8	2	2	110

18. While you were in the United States for training did you join (hold membership) in a professional society or organization?

19. (If "Yes" to Q. 18 above, please enter below the name(s) of the professional association(s) or organization(s) which you jointed, and check wether or not you have continued your membership.

Table P/5-18-19

	Response by Technical Field of Activity							
	AG	CP	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Yes; and I'm still a member	9	7	7	21	5	2	1	52
Yes; but I'm no longer a member	0	3	2	3	0	0	0	8
No; did not join	7	14	6	12	3	0	0	42
Did not go to U.S.	0	0	0	5	0	0	1	6
Not Answered	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Participants Reporting	16	24	15	43	8	2	2	110

Q. 21. Please indicate your current Thai civil service grade and level

Table P/5 - 21

		Response by Technical Field of Activity							
		AG	CP	PT	ED	PA	PS	SP	Total
Special Grade: Level	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
First Grade: Level	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	4
Second Grade: Level	1	2	0	2	10	0	0	0	14
	2	13	12	2	26	7	0	2	62
	3	1	0	3	5	1	0	0	10
Third Grade: Level	1	0	3	2	1	0	0	0	6
	2	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5
Fourth Grade: Level	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Special	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not Answered		0	3	1	0	0	1	0	5
Participants Reporting		16	24	15	43	8	2	2	110

SECTION 2

Evaluation

Participant Follow-up/ Technician's One Year Report /1

Introduction

This section deals with 112 T/2 questionnaires completed by USOM Technical Advisors between April 30, 1964 and May 1, 1965. The 112 questionnaires represents slightly better than a 67% coverage in getting a T/2 report on all participants for which it was requested. Due to several factors the aforementioned coverage is considered quite good. In addition to the fact that these participants have been back one year, many are in activity areas in which there is no longer a project, or an American technical advisor.

The foregoing section reported the participants' own appraisal of their positions, working relationships one year after their return from training. Since most of the participants covered in the foregoing section were the participants who reported 6 months earlier (May/64 report, Section 4) a comparison was logically made between the reports for the two post-training time periods; six months and one year after return.

A comparison, however, between the Technicians Six (6) month and one year reports is not logical for two specific reasons. First of all, a substantial number of the participants technicians report on in this section are not the ones who were reported on by technicians in section 5 of the May/64 report. Secondly, due to USOM personnel turnover the same technicians did not report for the two time periods involved.

Some comparisons can be made, however, between the data presented in this section by USOM technicians (T/2) and in the preceding section by participants (P/5).

Seventy-nine (71%) of the 110 participants who reported in the preceding section are included in the 112 participants reported on by technicians in this section.

Comments

(a) Post-training assignment (one year after return)

Table T/2-1 provides further evidence that Thai participants are working in assignments in line with their training. The TA's report only 1 participant in 112 assigned otherwise, and this participant was reported as working in a project related activity (Table T/2 - 2).

With respect to the data in table T/2-2, a hand-sort disclosed that the 10 participants shown in the "DK category" all reported in Table P/5-2a in the previous section that they were working in a project related activity. Hence, the combined one year reports (participants & technicians) indicate that all of the 112 participants reported on in this section by technicians were working in a project related activity one year after their return.

(b) Post training TA and participant contacts. (one year after return)

Better than 6 participants in 10 of the 112 for which a TA one year report was completed had been contacted by the TA prior to receiving the T/2 inquiry (Table T/2 - 3). This percentage exceeds somewhat that reported by the participants themselves in their

/1 Referred to in this report as T/2.

one year report (table P/5 - 15, section 1, Part III) It will be recalled that a comparison between the TA and participant six month reports, section 5, Part III, showed a similar picture. Overall, USOM TA's are more likely to report having had a personal contact with returnees than the returnees are to report a personal contact with the TA. However, as was noted in Part II, section 5, when only the "matched reports" (same participants) are considered, the picture given by the TA's and participants is, in most case the same; and where it does differ the discrepancy is equally distributed between the two reporting sources. The following table give the picture of post-training contacts as shown by the 79 "matched" one year reports.

Post-Training TA/participant contact

P/5 and T/2 Questionnaires	Response by Technical Field of Activity							
	AG	CP	PH	ED	PA	PS	SD	Total
Basically agree /1	10	8	10	20	3	1	2	54
Disagree: Participants reported (P/5) personal contact, the TA (T/2) did not	4	-	1	6	1	-	-	12
Disagree: Technicians reported (T/2) personal contact, the participant (P/5) did not.	-	4	4	3	2	-	-	13
Total "Matched Reports"	14	12	15	29	6	1	2	79

/1 Both the TA and participant report prior personal contact and basically agree on th frequency of such contacts

Table T/2 - 4 reports (by frequency of mention) the factors which limit the TA's contacts with participants who have been back for one year. The major factor shown is that there was no TA aboard one year after training who is assigned to the activity in which the participant was trained and is employed. Whereas this situation accounted for about half of the mentions, at the end of one year (table T/2 - 4), it accounted for less than 25 percent of the mentions six months after the participant's return.

(c) The TA's appraisal of the post-training situation (one year after the participant's return

Where they have enough information to comment, USOM TA's report very favorably on the value of the training received in preparing the participant for his assignment, and it's contribution to the sponsoring project (table T/2 - 5 and T/2 - 6). In only one case was it reported that the training had made no contribution to the participants ability to do his job, and in only 2 cases was the training reported as a "poor" project investment.

With relatively few exceptions the TA's are also satisfied with the effort and action of both the participants and their agencies to realize full utilization of the training completed (tables T/2 - 7 and 8).

Moreover, in most instances the TA's feel that participants are utilizing all or quite a bit of the training received (tables T/2 - 9, (a) (b) & (c)).

As was true in the case of the six-month report (part II, section 5), USOM TA's tend to rate participants (when they rate them) higher in their utilization of trainin than do the participants themselves. Sixty percent of the participants at the end of one year report using all or quite a bit of their training in their assignments, and less than half say they have transmitted all or quite a bit to others (tables P/5 - 7 & 11, Section 1, part III). Technicians, however, report three fourths of the participants at the end of a year using all or quite a bit of their training in their assignments, and two-thirds transmitting all, or quite a bit of their training to other.

In an overall rating of utilization of training, USOM TA's only reported eleven (11) of the participants as having used less than quite a bit of their training.

Table T/2 - 10 shows the factors which the TA's feel accounted for the relatively low utilization realized by these participants. It will be noted that in no instance was a "deficiency in training" given as a limiting factor.

In looking at the tables in this section of the report it will be noted that the response pattern varies significantly by Technical Divisions. Technician contacts with returned participants and their knowledge of participant assignments and job performance, is extremely important in realizing the maximum benefits from the training "input" in project activity. It is suggested, therefore, that Division Chiefs review tables T/2 - 3 and T/2 - 5 through 9 with their technical staff for the purpose of strengthening this phase of the missions follow-up activity.

As was true in the case of the six-month report (part II, section 5), USOM TA's tend to rate participants (when they rate them) higher in their utilization of training than do the participants themselves. Sixty percent of the participants at the end of one year report using all or quite a bit of their training in their assignments, and less than half say they have transmitted all or quite a bit to others(tables P/5 - 7 & 11, Section 1, part III). Technicians, however, report three fourths of the participants at the end of a year using all or quite a bit of their training in their assignments, and two-thirds transmitting all, or quite a bit of their training to others.

In an overall rating of utilization of training, USOM TA's only reported eleven (11) of the participants as having used less than quite a bit of their training.

Table T/2 - 10 shows the factors which the TA's feel accounted for the relatively low utilization realized by these participants. It will be noted that in no instance was a "deficiency in training" given as a limiting factor.

In looking at the tables in this section of the report it will be noted that the response pattern varies significantly by Technical Divisions. Technician contacts with returned participants and their knowledge of participant assignments and job performance is extremely important in realizing the maximum benefits from the training "input" in project activity. It is suggested, therefore, that Division Chiefs review tables T/2 - and T/2 - 5 through 9 with their technical staff for the purpose of strengthening this phase of the missions follow-up activity.

Section 2; Referenced Tables ☆

Type of Program

Table T/2-0

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	CP	PH	ED	PA	SD/2	Total
Academic: Degree obtained	13	4	11	42	5	2	77
Academic: Degree not obtained	5	/1 4	4	1	1	0	15
Non-academic	0	7	6	0	5	?	20
Participants Reporting	18	15	21	43	11	4	112

/1 FAA Academy; received certificate

/2 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant

1. Is the participant's present assignment in line with the training received?

Table T/2-1

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	CP	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Yes	10	15	20	41	11	4	101
No	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Don't know	8	0	0	2	0	0	10
Participants Reporting	18	15	21	43	11	4	112

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant

☆ Tables T/2 - 1, T/2 - 2, and T/2 - 3 through T/2 - 10 in this section relate to activities No.4 and 5 respectively, USOM's Policy Order No.800.4, Participant Follow-up.

2. (a) Is the participant currently employed in the project which sponsored the training or in a project related activity for which the training was programmed?

Table T/2-2

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	CP	PH	ED	PA	SD /2	Total
Yes	10	15	21	41	10	4	101
No	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Don't know	8 /1	0	0	2 /1	0	0	10
Participants Reporting	18	15	21	43	11	4	112

/1 These participants all reported in their one year report that they were working in joint project activity.

/2 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant

3. In the past six months about how many times have you personally talked with the participant prior to receiving this inquiry? (Check one)

Table T/2-3

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	CP	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Never contacted	11	2	2	26	2	0	43
One to three, but less than four contacts	1	7	3	14	4	1	30
Four to six, but less than seven contacts	3	4	6	1	1	0	15
Seven or more times	3	2	10	2	4	4	24
Participants Reporting	18	15	21	43	11	4	112

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant.

4. There may be many factors which make it difficult for you to see participants as often as would be desirable. Please check the following which would apply in respect to you seeing this particular participant.

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	CP	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
My workload, too many participants.	1	0	2	2	0	0	5
Job location of participant limits contacts	3	2	3	5	0	0	13
Negative attitude of participants	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
Negative attitude of participant's supervisor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Language barrier	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nothing interferred	4	12	17	3	7	3	46
At present, no TA assigned to activity in which participant was trained.	11	1	0	35	6	1	54
Total Mentions	20	15	23	45	13	4	120
Participants Reporting	18	15	21	43	11	4	112

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant

5. How do you rate the contribution that this participant's training has made to his ability to perform his present job well? (Check one)

Table T/2 - 5

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	CP	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Made a major contribution	8	12	1	31	7	3	75
Made a minor contribution	1	1	2	5	1	1	11
Made no contribution	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Don't know, can't rate	9	2	5	7	2	0	25
Participants Reporting	18	15	21	43	11	4	112

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant.

6. (a) This participant's training represents a project input which was programmed 12 months ago or longer. Project requirements, and priorities in implementing project objectives undergo continuous review and frequently change. In light of the situation as you view it today, would you say this particular training investment represents an effective use of project funds? (Check one)

Table T/2 - 6(a)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	CP	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Yes, completely	7	13	16	22	6	3	67
Yes, almost completely	1	2	2	17	2	0	24
Yes, partially	2	0	2	1	1	0	6
No, poor investment	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Don't know, can't rate	8	0	1	3	1	0	13
Participants Reporting	18	15	21	43	11	4	112

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant.

7. In general would you say you are satisfied or dissatisfied with actions and effort of the department or ministry to insure the maximum utilization of the participant's training.

Table T/2 - 7

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	CP	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Satisfied	8	14	18	40	8	4	92
Dissatisfied	0	0	2	0	1	0	3
Don't know, can't rate	10	1	1	3	2	0	17
Participants Reporting	18	15	21	43	11	4	112

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant

8. Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the participant's own action and effort to fully utilize his training?

Table T/2 - 8

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	CP	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Satisfied	7	14	18	35	8	3	85
Dissatisfied	1	0	3	0	2	1	7
Don't know; can't rate	10	1	0	8	1	0	20
Participants Reporting	18	15	21	43	11	4	112

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant

9. What about the participant's actual utilization of his training; his success in putting what he learned into practice and transmitting his training to others. (Give the appropriate number from the rating code for each part a, b, and c.)

9.(a) Direct utilization on the job?

Table T/2 - 9(a)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	CP	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Uses all or almost all; full utilization - 75-100%	6	8	15	17	7	2	55
Uses quite a bit; high utilization 50 - 75%	2	6	4	17	1	2	32
Uses some; 25 - 50%	0	1	1	0	1	0	3
Uses little or none; less than 25%	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
Don't know, can't rate	10	0	0	9	1	0	20
Participants Reporting	18	15	21	43	11	4	112

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant.

9 (b) Transmission to others?

Table T/2 - 9(b)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	CP	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Uses all or almost all; full utilization - 75 - 100%	2	4	8	10	4	1	29
Uses quite a bit; high utilization 50 - 75%	2	9	7	20	5	2	45
Uses some; 25 - 50%	2	1	3	3	0	1	10
Uses little or none; less than 25%	1	0	1	0	1	0	3
Don't know, can't rate	11	1	2	10	1	0	25
Participants Reporting	18	15	21	43	11	4	112

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant

Q. 9(c) Overall rating (considering both on-the-job use and transmission)

Table T/2 - 9(c)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	CP	PH	ED	PA	SD /1	Total
Uses all or almost all; full utilization - 75 - 100%	3	4	9	13	6	1	36
Uses quite a bit; high utilization 50 - 75%	3	10	6	19	2	2	42
Uses some; 25 - 50%	1	0	4	2	1	1	9
Uses little or none; less than 25%	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
Don't know, can't rate	11	1	1	9	1	0	23
Participants Reporting	18	15	21	43	11	4	112

/1 Includes one (1) Public Safety participant.

Q. 10. If overall rating on utilization (Table T/2 - 9(c) is lower than, high (less than 50%) indicate below the major factors preventing greater utilization?

Table T/2 - 10

(Reports only those whose utilization rating overall, was only some or little or none; question permitted multiple mentions)

	Response by Technical Field of Activity						
	AG	CP	PH	ED	PA	SD	Total
Improper selection and/or personal characteristics: (Too old, too immature, inadequately qualified (technically) for the training program, does not try hard enough, is not adaptable, has personality difficulties)	1	0	4	0	1	1	7
Deficiencies in training. (Training not geared to job needs—too high a level, too low a level. Training not well done, program too short, program too long).	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
The "human element" where employed: (participant blocked by supervisor, by co-workers, etc.; lacks assistance of other trained personnel, organizational set-up and/or administrative hierarchy limits utilization—attitude of supervisors. Assignment does not require (full) utilization of training.	0	0	2	2	1	0	5
Total Mentions	1	0	6	2	2	1	12
Not Answered	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Participants Reporting	1	0	5	2	2	1	11