

1980

An analysis of the uses of educated and trained Thai returnees who attended Iowa State University

Saovakon Sudsawasd
Iowa State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd>

 Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#), and the [Higher Education and Teaching Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Sudsawasd, Saovakon, "An analysis of the uses of educated and trained Thai returnees who attended Iowa State University " (1980).
Retrospective Theses and Dissertations. 6765.
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/6765>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Retrospective Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

8019667

SUDSAWASD, SAOVAKON

AN ANALYSIS OF THE USES OF EDUCATED AND TRAINED THAI
RETURNEES WHO ATTENDED IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

Iowa State University

PH.D.

1980

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

18 Bedford Row, London WC1R 4EJ, England

An analysis of the uses of educated and trained Thai
returnees who attended Iowa State University

by

Saovakon Sudsawasd

A Dissertation Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department: Professional Studies in Education
Major: Education (Higher Education)

Approved:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

Signature was redacted for privacy.
In Charge of Major Work

Signature was redacted for privacy.
For the Major Department

Signature was redacted for privacy.
For the Graduate College

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

1980

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background Information	1
Statement of the Problem	6
Purposes	9
Hypotheses	11
Limitations of the Study	12
Organization of the Study	13
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	14
Research Related to the Overall Follow-up Studies of Foreign Students	14
CHAPTER III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY	25
The Sample	25
The Survey Instrument	26
Units of Analysis and Measurement	29
Data Gathering Procedures	35
Statistical Analysis of Data	36a
CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS	37
Background of the Thai Returnees	37
Use of Knowledge and Skills	42
Test of Hypotheses	64
CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS	82
Summary	82
Conclusions	86
Implications	87

	Page
BIBLIOGRAPHY	95
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	99
APPENDIX A: COVER LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE (English Version)	100
APPENDIX B: COVER LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE (Thai Version)	116

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Background Information

In most countries today, a period of study or training in a foreign country is a feature of the education for an increasing number of men and women. To study abroad for a while has long been recognized as a desirable part of anyone's education (Carter, 1973). For the past twenty-five years, the number of individuals going abroad for study has expanded as massively as other aspects of education. The worldwide dissemination of scientific knowledge and technology, the influences of different cultures and of the international economy -- such factors have greatly influenced people to experience directly the "wider world" through study abroad (Carter, 1973).

There will no doubt be an increasing demand from the developing countries to move faster toward greater economic and social development. A nation's political, social, and economic development can rise no higher than its human resources. The wealth of nations does not consist only of material things or capital but essentially of human-beings or human resources. Since education is the chief means of raising the level of human resources, it is not a luxury to be postponed until national development has been accomplished but is an indispensable prerequisite to the development process itself (Rusk, 1961).

Further education and training are necessary and the opportunities in certain fields are not adequate in many countries (Elvin, 1973). Institutions of the United States have provided the greatest attraction to students from abroad. One out of every four students studying outside their home countries is enrolled at a United States institution (Harari, 1971). What kinds of attraction do institutions of higher education in the United States have for foreign students? To answer this question, it may be necessary to examine the roles of a contemporary university.

The contemporary university is an accepted meeting place for people with different social and cultural backgrounds where students can identify their own beliefs and experiences and compare them with those of other students, faculty and staff. Iowa State University (ISU) is no exception and may represent that defined contemporary university as illustrated by the prospect of a large number of foreign students on the campus.

"Students from abroad have greatly enriched the University by expanding the international focus of the campus. In the fall of 1976, we enrolled more than 1,300 foreign nationals, representing 84 countries. Currently, more than 700 of our 1,900 faculty members have had international experiences through studying, teaching, consulting or research; more than 2,300 alumni are living and/or working abroad, and each year about 500 visitors from 50 countries visit our campus. The University is or has been involved in major overseas projects in Egypt, India, Mexico, Nigeria, Peru, the Philippines, Thailand and Uruguay. Thus, we

regard ourselves as a world university and members of a global community" (Iowa State Admissions Office, 1978).

According to the report of the Council on International Programs (1978), the goals of Iowa State University in serving the special needs of foreign students are:

1. To provide foreign students with knowledge and training that will be most useful to them when they return home in the service to their countries.

2. To help them understand the people, culture, traditions, and institutions of American country and other nations.

3. To provide the environment and climate of collegiality in which these students will feel at home in living as well as in learning.

To what extent have these goals been practically achieved? Do the programs provided meet the foreign students' as well as their home countries' needs? Only a follow-up study of returned foreign students may provide the answer for these questions. A follow-up study conducted on returned students from all different countries would prove to be impractical. It seems necessary to limit a follow-up study of returned students from a selected developing country, such as Thailand in particular.

Thailand, like most developing countries, depends largely on training or study abroad as one means of human

development. Young Thais were first sent abroad for study under King's scholarships and expected to work in the government following their return (Siffin, 1959). The specific purpose of studying abroad since that time, the King's scholarship, and later the Civil Service Commission in awarding scholarship to government officials and qualified citizens was to return to government service and aid in the development of the country. At first, the Civil Service Commission offered government scholarship to an average of about fifty people each year for studying abroad. Since 1938, the Civil Service Commission administered a program whereby more than 500 government officials per year were granted official leave with pay to study abroad at their own expenses or as recipients of study funds from non-government sources (International Research Associates, 1955). These figures appeared to be expanding. Undoubtedly, the number will continue to increase. In comparing the current pattern with that which existed in the mid-sixties and early seventies, Thailand has remained consistently in the top ten countries that have their largest number of students studying in the United States. The total number of Thai students enrolled in the academic year 1977-78 was 6,340 or 3 percent of all foreign students in the American higher education institutions (Open Doors, 1979).

As a whole, more than 200,000 students from other

countries including Thailand were enrolled in institutions of higher education in the United States during 1977-78 (Open Doors, 1979). This large foreign enrollment surpasses the figure for 1970-71 by more than 100 percent (117,976).

The increasing flow of Thai students as well as other foreign students to the campus with increased numbers in prospect, demands special attention and consideration by the institutions. Several studies on foreign students have been conducted but little attention has been paid to returned students. Most studies related to returned students were done at least a decade ago and were mostly under the agencies of the United States Government which investigated only government sponsored foreign students. And since there is evidence that private students have experiences which differ significantly from those of sponsored students (Orr, 1971), it is worthwhile to make a concerted effort to include a more representative population in the sample.

A follow-up study with the basic goal of evaluating the utilization of knowledge and skills acquired from the study or training will provide background material which will enable the foreign student advisors to counsel their students more effectively about their educational programs and personal problems. It can be useful administratively

as a guide to admission requirements, orientation needs, adjustment programs, and pre-departure orientation. Furthermore, it can be useful in helping prospective students plan their programs wisely so that they will experience a minimum of difficulty in developing useful knowledge and skills. In addition, students' home countries can use information obtained from such studies in planning and implementing for the full use of its educational investment.

Statement of the Problem

The assumption is that it is an advantage to have some of foreign students on American campuses, and that the role of the professional school in the preparation of graduates for international service is indispensable (Rhodes, 1969). . . Several thousand students in the early sixties proved to be absolutely crucial to their nation's later development (Edgerton, 1975). Another voiced the opinion that the American graduate education had served the purposes of his nation better than any others (Edgerton, 1975).

Two points, however, should be made concerning the increasing flow of foreign students to the professional schools in the United States. First, emphasis should be placed on the recognition of the benefit gained from foreign students' contributions to higher education. Kaplan (1973) discusses 3 reasons for welcoming foreign students:

(1) tuition (they constitute an important element in the international balance of payments); (2) educational resources, (they represent enormously rich educational resources); and (3) enrollment, (they help offset the declining domestic enrollments).

Christensen (1978), in a response to an article related to cross-cultural tension that appeared in the Iowa State Daily, stated that "a university setting provides us with an invaluable opportunity to understand and appreciate other cultures" and that we "need, as members of the university community, to become better acquainted with people possessing different cultural backgrounds".

The investment of human resource development of the other countries, especially the developing countries, is the second point.

"Human resource development is the process of increasing the knowledge, the skills, and the capacities of all the people in a society. In economic terms, it could be described as the accumulation of human capital and its effective investment in the development of an economy.... It prepares people for adult participation in political processes.... It helps people to lead fuller and richer lives, less bound by tradition. In short, the processes of human resource development unlock the door to modernization" (Harbison and Myers, 1964).

The potential contribution of the educational program is to prepare people to effectively contribute to the development of the nation.

However, some doubts about the value of the education

have been expressed. Various studies suggest that American curriculums in such fields as agriculture and engineering are not always relevant, especially for students from developing areas (Higbee, 1971). From surveys conducted both in the United States and in Asia in which student alumni (in the field of Agricultural economics), professors, and American economists working abroad were all questioned, Wharton (1959) concluded that "American agriculture is not world agriculture". In fact, he concluded "It is quite parochial in some respects; the techniques used here (US) may not be at all appropriate in Asia".

In a summary prepared for the Cornell College of Agriculture Review Committee entitled "Program in International Agricultural Development", Kenneth C. Tuck (1974), Director of Cornell University's International Agricultural Program, made the following observation.

"Too often it is found that graduate and professional training given to foreign students is unrealistic in terms of the conditions they have upon returning to their home countries".

In discussing issues related to the education of foreign students sponsored by the Field Service Steering Committee (1974), the National Consultant concluded that those involved in international education should devote more attention to the question of whether the education received by foreign students in the United States, partly at the graduate level, is relevant to the home country

situation.

Related to this issue are the questions:

1. What is the relationship between what the foreign student studies in the United States and career he or she pursues at home?;

2. How does the foreign student perceive the relevance of a United States education economically, socially, politically, and personally to his/her future outside the United States?; and

3. How would his/her education gained in the United States work in his/her home country?

One aim of this study is to search for the answer to questions, particularly in relation to Thai students. The study is, in effect, an evaluation of the usefulness of American educational programs and experiences gained by the Thai students while they were in the United States.

Purposes

This study attempts to answer the following questions:

(1) What experiences do educated and trained Thai returnees who attended Iowa State University have in using the skills and knowledge acquired during their sojourn in the United States?; and (2) to what extent do they serve as agents for change?

The specific objectives of this study are outlined as follows:

1. To ascertain whether the Thai returnees (a) are effectively utilizing their education/training experiences; (b) are transmitting to others newly acquired knowledge and skills;
2. To study types of such use;
3. To identify significant factors which contribute to or hinder utilization of education/training and communication of knowledge and skills;
4. To study the relationship between the degree of use in (1) and the characteristics of the Thai returnees: age, education, and occupational status;
5. To study the relationship between the degree of use in (1) and the Thai returnees' work setting: helpfulness of supervisor, educational background of supervisor and/or colleagues, and the availability of proper equipment and facilities;
6. To study the relationship between the degree of use in (1) and the Thai returnees' educational/training programs such as program planning involvement, field of study, and duration of the program;
7. To obtain some recommendations and suggestions for the full use of the acquired knowledge and skills.

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were tested:

1. There is no relationship between age and the degree to which the American educational programs and training experiences gained were used by Thai returnees.

2. There is no relationship between educational level and the degree to which the American educational programs and training experiences gained were used by Thai returnees.

3. There is no relationship between occupational status and the degree to which the American educational programs and training experiences gained were used by Thai returnees.

4. There is no relationship between the helpfulness of their supervisors and the degree to which the American educational programs and training experiences gained were used by Thai returnees.

5. There is no relationship between the educational background of the majority in work settings and the degree to which the American educational programs and training experiences gained were used by Thai returnees.

6. There is no relationship between the availability of proper equipment and facilities and the degree to which the American educational programs and training experiences gained were used by Thai returnees.

7. There is no relationship between the involvement of the program planning and the degree to which the American educational programs and training experiences gained were used by Thai returnees.

8. There is no relationship between the field of study and the degree to which the American educational programs and training experiences gained were used by Thai returnees.

9. There is no relationship between the duration of the program and the degree to which the American educational programs and training experiences gained were used by Thai returnees.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to educated and trained Thai returnees who attended Iowa State University. The conclusions of this study can not be generalized to all American educated and trained Thai returnees across the country. Neither are the conclusions meant to be applicable to all Thai alumni of Iowa State University. The variables used in this study are not presented as being all-inclusive, but are representative of the variables the researcher felt to be important in the light of other follow-up studies relative to evaluating the utilization of knowledge and skills acquired by foreign students.

The results of this analysis can not of course be generalized beyond the designated population.

Organization of the Study

The material included in this study is organized in the following manner: Chapter I presents the background information, a statement of the problem, purposes, hypotheses, and limitations. Chapter II reviews the literature and research thought to be most relevant to the present study. Chapter III is a discussion of the details of the sample selection, the questionnaire instrument, distribution and collection of the instrument, and statistical procedures. Chapter IV is given the analysis of the data resulting from the questionnaire instrument. Finally, Chapter V sets forth a summary of the findings, conclusions reached, and recommendations based on the findings.

The Iowa State University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research reviewed this project and concluded that the rights and welfare of the human subjects were adequately protected, that risks were outweighed by the potential benefits and expected value of the knowledge sought, that confidentiality of data was assured and that informed consent was obtained by appropriate procedures.

CHAPTER II.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of Chapter II is to present a description and discussion of the theoretical framework. Due to the lack of studies that have been concerned with the uses of American educated and trained Thai returnees, it has been necessary to incorporate research of other groups for findings of foreign students of other country which may have relevance to Thai returnees. The review will deal largely with the literature of follow-up studies of foreign students appearing several years ago. Although these studies do not deal directly with the analysis of the uses of Thai returnees, they do possess a synthesis of follow-up studies on return to home countries of foreign students which is pertinent source to anyone engaged in research in this area. This researcher found them useful in the development of her theoretical framework.

Research Related to the Overall
Follow-up Studies of Foreign Students

According to Gollin (1969), the goals of educational strategies for human resources development are not simply the diffusion of knowledge but its purposive transfer for later application. Wolf (1960) remarks: "Technical assistance, viewed as service only, may change production possi-

bilities in the static sense of what is known without providing the means to change what is done".

To support his statement, Gollin (1969) assesses the effectiveness of a trainee's program on the basis of whether the trainee (1) completes his program; (2) returns home to be placed in an appropriate job; (3) has remained continuously employed since return from training; (4) judges his program as having been satisfactory; (5) judges it as having been important to him; (6) found training to have been dysfunctional for his later career rather than having it prove to have been neutral or beneficial; (7) has made use of his training at work; (8) can specify the kind of use made of it in some innovative action he has taken since his return; and (9) has conveyed aspects of his training to others.

Utilization is conceived by Clements and Gollen (1964) in two main ways. One is the use to which the participant had put his training in his job performance and matters connected with his economic activity. The other has to do with the participant's function as a "multiplier" in dissemination or transmitting to others what he had learned during the training experience.

Many factors can counteract the usefulness of study abroad. A study made by Tuck (1974) may confirm such a statement. He observes that:

"Their (foreign students) thesis problems in the US may have no application whatever. The sophisticated equipment they have learned to use may not be available, and on other case the level of development of sciences make other knowledge more necessary than that gained in the US".

Thus, it is important that the foreign student who studies a profession in the United States develops the versatility and ingenuity needed to adapt methods and techniques to the state of the art in his/her home country.

The Education and World Affairs Report (1968) argues that foreign students must be urged as a part of their US experience to think in terms of how they can best apply what they have learned to the situation in their home country. It further states that:

"One of the major problems which the foreign students faces when he returns home is the social system of his country. In many of the developing countries, the centralization of power inhibits the growth of programs...(and often the returning practitioner is stifled)".

Chiang and Klinzing (1975) visualize the question on how the education acquired by foreign students would work back home as a threefold problem which consists of the student, the purpose, and the program.

Gollin (1969) sketches of some conceptual issues involved in training individuals to carry out the process of technological transfer. The main elements are the characteristics of the participants, the nature and structure of training, and the environments in which they perform their occupational roles.

With the above studies as a framework, this study hypothesizes that the degree of use of education and training abroad is associated with three main factors: the characteristics of the returnees, their studying or training programs, and their job organizational settings.

Due to time and budget restrictions, this study is limited to the analysis of only major characteristics assumed relevant to utilization: field of study, program planning involvement, duration of the program, helpfulness of supervisor, and the availability of proper equipment and facilities. These variables are some of the most significant influencing factors on the amount of utilization which have been identified in the studies. One may categorize these variables into two main groups: selected social status and behavioral variables. Status characteristics such as age, education, and occupational position are fundamental concepts and act as cues to individuals concerning the structure of their relations to others. In other words, the study of the characteristics of a population, especially status, is of fundamental importance in understanding the nature of social relationships. Very often, the basic causes of many problems of a society can be determined from an analysis of the characteristics of its people. The determinants of behavior may be viewed as preceding the contemporary external events and characteris-

tics. One may say that activities are likely to be discontinued when they are no longer rewarded, or a behavior will be maintained as long as it is reinforced. Thus, if one knows the external conditions for example, a situation similar to one in which a person previously rewarded for an activity, one can often predict what will happen.

Following is a review of literature of each individual concept contained in each major element which leads to the establishing of hypotheses.

The Characteristics of Returnees

Age is related to subsequent use of training. In exploring the value of US graduate training with industrialists in Asia, Groves (1967) cited that the older men were most likely to state "American education trains a man out of usefulness" or "we have no place in which to fit the American mold". Gollin (1969) found that those who were in the youngest (under 25) and oldest (over 50) groups entering training were poor utilizers. Among the rest, the older the participant, the greater was the tendency for utilization to be higher. This finding, however, is not supported when Thai returnees are the population. An evaluational survey of Thai Participant Training Program, conducted by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) (1963) found that there was no relationship between the age in year at time of departure and the utilization of train-

ing. Since that study focused only those Thai participants who were under the US sponsored programs and since students in the unsponsored ones were older (Myers, 1973), this study aims to determine whether or not the age of Thai returnees, whether in sponsored or unsponsored programs, is related to utilization.

Education is related to subsequent utilization. Orr (1971) found that those with the highest education at the time of departure are higher utilizers of training after return than those with lesser previous education. This result was supported by Gollin (1969) who found university graduates have made greater use of their training than others, while those with no previous university work or vocational training of any sort make substantially poor use of their training.

However, number of degrees obtained may be varied. Those whose previous educational level was low may obtain more than one degree while those whose previous educational level was high may obtain only one degree. Consequently, these two groups have attained the same level of education. Do they utilize the knowledge and skills acquired at the same rate? Such a question leads to the study of whether or not the level of education completed before return to Thailand of Iowa State University educated and trained Thais is associated to subsequent utilization.

Occupational status of returnees influences utilizations. John and Ruth Hill Useem (1955) found that the choice of communication in India which required approval by top administrators of all new ideas and procedures, dictated that few innovations were possible unless the subject was placed in a position to make decisions or had access to the support from those in such a position. The evidence is that the higher the status at the time of the departure, the higher the subsequent utilization of skills (US Department of State, 1966). In a research report on the Thai student exchange prepared for the International Educational Exchange Service (International Research Associates, 1955) illustrated the advantage of authority. Exchangees who return to positions of authority are able to impose their new ideas with relatively less concern for the opposition or resistance of others:

"I'm supervisor of the...Agency, and also teach part-time in the one-year course for social work students. Everyone is very receptive to the new ideas I introduce...."

And a top legal officer in the Foreign Ministry remarks: "People can't prevent me from putting my ideas into practice...."

Since the above studies were conducted several years ago, this study aims to test whether the present situation still confirms those findings that there is a relationship between the returnees' occupational position and the utili-

zation of American education.

Work Settings

The work place in which a returnee is situated can be viewed analytically as a milange of material, social, and cultural facts with which he must contend in making use of his study or training (Gollin, 1969).

Several aspects of the work setting appeared to have been influential. First, the attitude of supervisors was important since their cooperation or lack of it is critical in the implementation of new ideas. The International Research Associates (1955) reported that about one in every four Thai respondents, whether exchangee or other trainee, complained of the attitude of his superiors, or of other colleagues, as being a major hindrance to full application of his American training on his job. The AID studies, cited by Orr (1971), found that participants who characterized their supervisors as "very helpful" were far higher utilizers than those rated their supervisors as "less helpful" or "hostile".

Working with colleagues (particularly superiors) who have also had abroad training is a second important aspect of the work situation. Kuppuswamy (1964) found that Indian returnees whose colleagues and subordinates were helpful and sufficiently well-trained to provide support

for new ideas and procedures were higher users of their training than those participants whose colleagues were non-supportive and/or untrained. A teacher of a kindergarten school observed:

"On the whole, I can use almost all of what I have learned. Sometimes there are things I would like to do, but can't do because my superior doesn't agree or can't see the usefulness of it. But she is studying in the United States herself now, and when she comes back I imagine she will be much more receptive to these new ideas" (International Research Associates, 1955).

The availability of proper equipment and facilities is the third aspect of the work setting which influences utilization. The inadequacy of facilities, which consists of deficiencies in materials, equipment, facilities, or personnel was found to be a major hindrance to utilization of exchange training. "The exchangee complained that the new methods, the improved techniques, the increased skills often cannot be applied fully, if at all, simply become what may be termed the "physical' base for their application does not exist" (International Research Associates, 1955).

Barakat (1964) found that the lack of appropriate equipment and facilities, especially in the developing countries, was a limiting factor for some Eastern students.

This study is designed to test whether there is a significant relationship between the utilization of Ameri-

can knowledge/skills and the attitude of supervisor, the educational background the availability of proper equipments and facilities.

Program Characteristics

Some characteristics of the program have been found to relate to subsequent use of American learned skills and information. Preplanning was found to be a very significant factor. Bennett, Passin and McKnight (1958) in "In Search for Identity" found that preplanning which involved both the student and the prospective employer strongly related to the utilization of training since such planning usually resulted in educational programs designed to prepare the student for his planned employment. Gollin (1969) found that participants' satisfaction with their role in planning their programs was related to subsequent use. The greater the involvement, subjectively appraised, the higher the utilization. Another variable Gollin (1969) found related to subsequent use was the supervisory involvement. The more active the supervisors were (i.e., recommending or helping to plan the training of participants), the greater the utilization of their subordinates.

The duration of the sojourn is also an influential factor for utilization. Bennett et al. (1958) found that the longer programs usually resulted in higher utilization of training. The program, however, should not be lengthy

enough to cause the student to lose all contacts with his home culture.

Various fields of study or training should be differentially related to the use of training. Orr (1971) stated that the degree of utilization was related to the student's academic field. The more "professionalized" the field, the higher the degree of utilization. The study conducted by the US Department of State (1966) found that those students in health and education used more of their training than those in less "professionalized" areas, such as labor. Data indicate that, in general, those in medicine and health services were the highest users, followed in descending order by those in education, engineering, agriculture, business, and industry. Students in such fields as public administration and government were reported among the lowest users.

Since most of the above studies were conducted years ago, this study aims to test whether or not those results are significant in the present situation. Further, is there a relationship between the degree of use of American knowledge and skills gained by Thai returnees and the planning involvement, field of study, and the duration of the program?

CHAPTER III.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This chapter contains a description of the method of study. It includes details concerning the sample, the survey instrument, the data gathering procedures, and the statistical analysis of data.

The Sample

The purpose of this study was to analyze the uses of educated and trained Thai returnees who attended Iowa State University. Therefore, the criterion considered in the selection of the sample was the existence of Thai alumni in Thailand. From lists of Thai returnees for whom addresses were available at the Office of International Education Services (OIES) of Iowa State University and the current local directory of Iowa State University's Alumni Association in Thailand, 240 Thai returnees who attended Iowa State University and returned to their jobs in Thailand for at least six months following their graduation could be traced.

Due to the small numbers of alumni available, the whole population was utilized for this study.

The Survey Instrument

The mail questionnaire technique was employed in this study. The decision to use this technique as an instrument for data gathering was based on the following reasons:

1. The nature of the population in term of their education level.
2. Economy.
3. The questionnaire provides an objective and standardized behavior sample which lends well to statistical analysis.

The Questionnaire

The questionnaire instrument used in this study is a modified version of the one developed by the United States Agency for International Development along with the other developed by the International Educational Exchange Service. The main purpose of the instrument was to ascertain Thai returnees' attitudes and opinions, level of knowledge, and behavior pattern with respect to the period while they were in the United States and the period following their return to the home country.

Although questionnaire and survey forms constructed by the two agencies are widely used in the United States, the validity of its use in other cultures is subject to considerable question. A few comments are in order.

First, some modified questions were added in an effort

to overcome the problem, but too many questions bored the respondents. It was found that some questions, especially ones at the later part of the form, were frequently skipped by the respondents.

A second problem which had been encountered was the difficulty in translating the questionnaire from English into Thai language. However, a pretest to clarify the language was done to minimize obscurity.

A third problem concerned the lack of supplementary sources of information to serve as a means for checking the accuracy of returnees' responses. However, a review of the original instrument conveys the impression that the validity of the measurement was originally proved in three ways:

1. The participants were probed to describe some specific accomplishments in which their training had a central role. Those who were able to specify successively more such examples should demonstrate correlatively higher use of training.

2. The supervisors of a majority of the participants were asked about the importance of their subordinate's training as a qualification for his present job. Those whose training was judged as a more important qualification should make greater use of their training.

3. American technicians were asked to judge the contributions of training to the job performance of individual

participants. Again, those whose training was rated as having made more of a contribution ought to show proportionately higher use of training.

As cited in previous studies, validity was tested through comparison of responses from both returnees and supervisors. In studies of sponsored programs, this procedure was relatively easy to carry out. In this study of returnees from both sponsored and unsponsored programs, supervisors were difficult to locate. The validity procedures itemized above were then substituted.

However, a trial run or pretest was designed to validate the questionnaire instrument. The purpose of the pretest was not only to test the written material for clarity and conciseness, but also to test the data collection procedures. A sample of ten faculty members consisting of those American educated and trained Thais who returned to Thailand for at least six months was included in the pretest.

The researcher sent a package containing the questionnaire and a cover letter to the faculty members selected. Each individual faculty member was requested to respond the questionnaire and provide some comments if possible. All of them completed and returned the questionnaire to the researcher. In accordance with their suggestions, several items were subsequently revised but no substantial changes of the original version were required.

In view of the pretest, it appeared that the questionnaire instrument was feasible for further use with the sample of the study. The data collection procedures were considered workable.

Units of Analysis and Measurement

The principal units of analysis in this study are the individual Thai returnees: their judgements, perceptions, actions, and experiences related to their educational program and its aftermath. With respect to further statistical analysis of data, an explanation of the various scales of measurement used in the questionnaire instrument is necessary.

Utilization of Knowledge and Skills

To measure utilization of knowledge and skills of returnees, it is focused on (1) the direct use of the acquired knowledge and skills in their job performance; and, (2) the sharing-imparting or direct use of the acquired knowledge and skills to the other. A series of questions which was aimed to ascertain both of job application and dissemination aspect of study or training utilization was derived from the following questions:

Item 2, Part III: Since you returned from the educational/training programs, have there been any periods when you were not employed?

Scoring Points

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, never had a job since
return | 0 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, given period | 0 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | 6 |

Item 10, Part III: In talking about the knowledge and some aspects acquired from the educational program, have you ever been able to use any of the knowledge or skills that you learned on the program?

Scoring Points

- | | |
|------------------------------|----|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | 20 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | 0 |

Item 11, Part III: Could you say how much it is used (in Question # 10)?

Scoring Points

- | | |
|---|----|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nearly all | 24 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Quite a lot | 18 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Some | 12 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> A little | 6 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Practically none | 0 |

Item 12, Part III: Do you have any plans to make your knowledge from the educational program (in Question # 10) useful but have not had the opportunity to do so?

Scoring Points

- | | |
|------------------------------|----|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | 15 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | 0 |

Item 16, Part III: Have you ever passed on to others the knowledge and skills you have obtained from the educational program?

Scoring Points

- | | |
|------------------------------|----|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | 15 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | 0 |

If response is yes, how much knowledge and other things acquired from the program you passed on others?

	<u>Scoring Points</u>
() Almost all or all	20
() A lot	15
() Some	10
() A little	5
() None	0

A perfect score on all six questions would be 100 points while utter failure would score zero. The returnees must have provided answers for all six questions to achieve a valid total score. Returnees responding to all six questions are classified in four groups according to the total scores received as follows:

<u>Utilization Scale</u>	<u>Score Range</u>
High	75 or more points
Upper middle	50 - 74 points
Lower middle	26 - 49 points
Low	25 or fewer points

Work Settings

Some questions were designed in the instrument to obtain information about work settings which could be used to delineate returnees' occupational settings as contexts for making use of their knowledge and skills. It is at the work place where cultural value and social norms affecting the adoption of modernizing ideas and practices. No returnee, however, well-motivated or superly equipped through

specialized training, can achieve much if he/she is confronted by apathetic or hostile work associates including his/her supervisors, or if he/she works in an organization whose traditions and practices are inhospitable or resistant to change. So the attitude of the supervisor is very important and could be measured by the following question:

Item 13, Part III: Does your immediate supervisor or superior help you to apply the knowledge you acquired usefully?

- Does considerably
- Yes, to some extent
- Not at all
- Indifferently, not even interested
- Other (specify) _____

If foreign study induces new attitudes and creates stronger motivations to act as innovators, then, those in the same work setting who have undergone this experience can make common cause; by developing mutually supportive relationships based on their shared experience, to find ways of translating new skills and ideas into practice and to effect organizational change. To measure this kind of work setting, returnees were asked in the Item 15, Part III.

This item asked: Do you work in an organizational setting in which others (majority) have been trained abroad?

- Yes
- No

Full or scarcity of material resources or other physi-

cal and environmental aspects of his/her organizational setting place limits on the scope and direction of his/her efforts. To obtain such information, returnees were asked in the following question:

Item 18, Part III: How is the availability of facility in your work organization?

- Adequacy
- Inadequacy
- Other (specify) _____

The answer to this particular question would be validated by the check-list of major difficulties or barriers included in the Item 18a, Part III.

Program Characteristics

Elements composed of the program characteristics which this study explores are the involvement in program planning, the field of study or training, and the duration of the program. A returnee's own involvement in program planning and with his/her satisfaction is considered as the sources and types of information supported to him/her in advance of his/her study or training program. It also can be interpreted as reflecting a somewhat better motivational state in part of preparation and in its aftermath. Another element is the involvement of returnees' work organization in the program process. The supervisor's involvement is more decisive at the terminal state in determining the program's

effects because he/she is in a commanding position to make resources available, to demonstrate approval of innovative work, and in general to facilitate or prevent organizational changes (Gollin, 1969).

Item 6, Part II (b) designed to solicit information about the involvement of his/her supervisor in program planning. The returnees were asked: Were you or your supervisor involved in planning your study/training program?

- Yes
- No

This study is directly concerned with the returnee's field of study or training attained at Iowa State University. However, some returnees' fields of study or training intended prior to their departure from Thailand for study or training program may be varied relative to what they really took at Iowa State University.

To obtain such information, Item 3, Part II asked: What was your major field of study?

In summary, other questions included in the questionnaire instrument not cited above were designed to obtain information about personal variables and other pertinent aspects for use in this study.

Data Gathering Procedures

The questionnaires were distributed to the sample either by mail or personal contact during the first week of November 1979. A copy of the cover letter and one of the questionnaire that was sent out are included in Appendix A. The cover letter described the general purposes of the study and the procedures for completing the questionnaire. A self-addressed, pre-stamped envelope was enclosed with a copy of the questionnaire and the cover letter. To assure anonymity of individual respondents, each was requested to complete the survey instrument and mail it directly to the researcher.

Ninety questionnaires out of 240 (or 37.5% response rate) were returned before November 25, 1979. A follow-up letter and a questionnaire were sent on December 1, 1979 to those who had not responded to the first mailing. As a result, 17 more responses were received. Nineteen questionnaires were returned by the General Post Office because of uncurrent addresses. Therefore, a total of 107 questionnaires (44.6%) was used in this study.

Each returned questionnaire was reviewed for consistency and completeness, and a determination was made on each returned questionnaire as to whether it was suitable for use in the tabulation of results.

Statistical Analysis of Data

Following a thorough review of the returned questionnaires, it was found that all of them were usable in the study. The usable data were subsequently transferred from the questionnaires to IBM cards for statistical analysis.

Crosstabulations with numerical or alphanumeric were computed and displayed in two ways to n-ways. These joint frequency distributions can be statistically analyzed by Chi-square, Gamma, and Spearman's rho to determine whether or not variables are statistically independent or related.

The type of analysis chosen depends upon the characteristics of the variables and their level of measurements. A Chi-square test, a test of significant, may be used with categories which are in nominal, ordinal, interval, and ratio scale in nature (Kolstoe, 1969). In this test of independence, the population and sample are classified according to several attributes but the probability distributions are not known. By itself, the test indicates only whether or not any dependence or relationship exists between the attributes. It does not indicate the degree of association or the direction of the dependency. In other words, it tells us only whether variables are related but does not tell us how strong they are related.

Goodman-Kruskal's Gamma was employed to measure the

strength of relationship. This test is used for ordinal variables (Mueller et al. 1970) and describes the degree to which the values of one variable predict or vary with those of another (Nie et al. 1975).

Spearman rank-order correlation (Spearman's rho) was used to determine whether or not two rankings of the same cases were similar. Some differences might exist even though the two cases were very similar. Spearman's rho gives us a measure of how similar or dissimilar they actually are. This statistical procedure requires an ordinal level of measurement and a large number of categories on each of the variables.

The statistical methods of Chi-square, Gamma, and Spearman's rho are shown in more details in the SPSS Manual (Nie et al. 1975) and therefore are not presented here.

CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS

Before exploring some consequences of study/training and their relations to the diffusion of modernizing skills and knowledge, the empirical data on respondents will be reviewed. This chapter is, then, divided into two parts. The first part describes the characteristics of the returnees. The second part is devoted to an analysis of experiences of returnees as they attempted to utilize their American professional experience in job situations. The conditions affecting the use of foreign study are examined.

Background of the Thai Returnees¹

One hundred and seven former Iowa State University Thai students whose experiences are described in this report include 33 females, 73 males and 1 not-ascertained (Table 1). A strong majority (94.4%) are now 25-45 years of age (Table 2). Half of them, at the time left for the United States, were married (Table 3). Approximately 70.0% were abroad under sponsorship (Table 4). Eighty-five per cent are Thai civil servants (Table 5). A majority (56.7%) are engaged in some type of professional activities --scien-

¹This study does not intend to gauge the relative merits of study or training. In addition, those who are in training program are regular students who are on the job-training and represent only 18 out of 107 returnees. The backgrounds of the respondents, then, are overall presented.

tists and professors (Table 6).

The range of the fields of study represented by the returnees is very wide, but the greatest number are found in agriculture. This field accounts for nearly half of the total (Table 7).

Table 1. Sex of returnees

Sex	Number	Relative frequency (percent)	Adjusted frequency (percent)
Female	33	30.8	31.1
Male	73	68.2	68.9
Not ascertained	1	0.9	-
Total	107	100.0	100.0

Table 2. Age of returnees

Age	Number	Relative frequency (percent)
Under 25	1	0.9
Age 25-35	51	47.7
Age 36-45	50	46.7
Age 46-55	5	4.7
Total	107	100.0

Table 3. Marital status of returnees

Marital Status	Number	Relative frequency (percent)
Married	54	50.5
Unmarried	53	49.5
Total	107	100.0

Table 4. Sponsorship of returnees^a

Sponsorship	Number	Relative frequency (percent)	Adjusted frequency (percent)
Sponsored	96	68.6	69.5
Un-sponsored	43	30.7	30.5
Not ascertained	1	0.7	-
Total	140	100.0	100.0

^aTotal is more than 107 because some respondents chose more than one answer.

Table 5. Occupation of returnees

Occupation	Number	Relative frequency (percent)	Adjusted frequency (percent)
Civil servant	90	84.1	85.7
Others	15	14.0	14.3
Not ascertained	2	1.9	-
Total	107	100.0	100.0

Table 6. Type of job of returnees

Administrators, managers	37	34.6	35.9
Professionals, scientists, professors	59	55.1	57.3
Engineers	4	3.7	3.9
Sub-professionals and technicians	2	1.9	1.9
Supervisor	1	0.9	1.0
Inactive and not ascertained	4	3.7	-
Total	107	100.0	100.0

Table 7. Field of study of returnees^a

Fields of study	Number	Relative frequency (percent)	Adjusted frequency (percent)
Education	5	4.7	5.1
Agriculture	44	41.1	44.9
Sciences and Humanities	22	20.6	22.4
Engineering	19	17.8	19.4
Architecture	4	3.7	4.1
Home Economics	3	2.8	3.1
Veterinary	1	0.9	1.0
Not ascertained	9	8.4	-
Total	107	100.0	100.0

^aBecause returnees' fields of study are in a wide range, the classification, then, is based upon the college in which they enrolled at ISU. There are 7 colleges in ISU and the college of Sciences and Humanities is the largest one. Fields or area represented in Sciences and humanities by returnees include Transportation and Communication (1); Economics (7); Psychology (1); Sociology (4); Industrial Administration (3); Political Science (2); Distribution Studies (1); Physiology (1); History (1); and Urban Planning (1).

Use of Knowledge and Skills

The use of knowledge and skills acquired from the American study/training can be assessed by whether they (1) returned home to be placed in an appropriate job and have remained continuously employed since returning; (2) have made use of their knowledge and skills at work and to what extent; (3) have conveyed aspects of their study/training to others; and (4) have plans for using the knowledge and skills in the future. Data on each of these described criteria will be analyzed separately.

Placement and Unemployment

A series of questions is included in the questionnaire concerning returnees' work prior to departure and following their return. These questions show the extent to which returnees have been employed and have shifted in employment, and to some extent the nature of their employment.

Data on the returnees' placement and unemployment refer to their current job as well as their job upon returning home. The study shows a healthy picture with respect to returnees' opportunity to use what they have gained from their study/training through full-time employment. Ninety-four out of 107 returnees reported being continuously employed since their return. Eight returnees reported periods of employment and only two reported not having a job since their return (Table 8).

Table 8. Employment of returnees

Employment	Number	Relative frequency (percent)	Adjusted frequency (percent)
Unemployed since return	2	1.8	1.9
Unemployed given period	8	7.5	7.7
Continuously employed	94	87.8	90.4
Not ascertained	3	2.8	-
Total	107	100.0	100.0

It should be noted that those who came to the United states under the aegis of a government or sponsorship usually have relatively little difficulty in obtaining jobs upon return (Table 9). Data indicate significant differences of work employment between sponsored and unsponsored returnees. Ninety-eight percent of sponsored returnees were able to secure employment, whereas, only 83.0% of unsponsored ones were able to do so.

Table 9. Sponsorship and employment of returnees^a

Sponsorship	Employment			
	Employed		Unemployed	
	No.	%	No.	%
Sponsored	65	93.7	4	6.3
Un-sponsored	30	83.3	6	16.7
Total	95		10	
	(90.5)		(9.5)	

^aThis table includes information on study sponsorship and excludes those who are not ascertained.

Those who are unemployed (either continuously or temporarily) were asked: "Do you think that your unemployment consequential to your going abroad for the educational/training program?". Table 10 shows that 3 out of 7 respondents who are unemployed claimed their unemployment was a result of their going abroad for study/training while the rest did not list the program as the cause of such unemployment.

Table 10. Unemployment of returnees as a consequence to their study/training abroad^a

Unemployment as a consequence to study/training	Number	Percent
Yes	3	30.0
No	7	70.0
Total	10	100.0

^aThis table excludes those who are continuously employed and those who are not ascertained.

The majority of the respondents returned to jobs they had held prior to study/training. As noted in Table 11, 52.8% of the respondents returned to the same job they held prior to study/training and 47.2% to a different one. No further interpretation of the figure, however, will be made since returning to the same or a different job depends on one's study/training objective. One may study/train for his/her current job, or for advanced or specialized study prior to assuming a new one. The focus of this study is on whether the returnees were being placed in project-related positions requiring knowledge and skills that required the use of the study/training.

For this reason, returnees were asked, "Is this the job you expected to have following your return?". Table 12 shows that 70.3% of returnees who either returned to the Table 11. Jobs of returnees after their return compared to those were held prior to their departure for the US

Jobs after return	Number	Relative frequency (percent)	Adjusted frequency (percent)
Same jobs	47	43.9	52.8
Different jobs	42	39.3	47.2
Not ascertained	18	16.8	-
Total	107	100.0	100.0

same or a different job, had the job they expected to get. But the remaining of 29.7% returned to the unexpected ones.

Table 12. Job expectation of returnees

Job expectation	Number	Relative frequency (percent)	Adjusted frequency (percent)
Expected jobs	71	66.3	70.3
Unexpected jobs	30	28.1	29.7
Not ascertained	6	5.6	-
Total	107	100.0	100.0

The report of position-shifts between prior to leaving for the US and of responding to the question, presented in Table 13, affords some interesting observations. Data indicate the difference in number of those who returned to different positions (58.2%) and those who returned to the same ones (41.8%). This figure is inconsistent with what is in Table 11 which shows that more than a half of the respondents returned to the same jobs. This discrepancy may be due to the fact that even though they returned to the same jobs, their positions have changed.

Table 13. Current positions of returnees as compared to those at prior to departure for study/training

Positions	Number	Relative frequency (percent)	Adjusted frequency (percent)
Same positions	38	35.5	41.8
Different positions	53	49.5	58.2
Not ascertained	16	15.0	-
Total	107	100.0	100.0

One further point can be made about returnees with respect to different positions. The shift for 9 out of every 10 who report a job change resulted in a better job (more salary, more responsibility and status, etc.). The rest indicated the position change was due to the change

Table 14. View of returnees with respect to position change^a

Respect to position change	Number	Relative frequency (percent)	Adjusted frequency (percent)
Better jobs	40	75.5	90.9
Change in type of job within same classification	4	7.5	9.1
Did not work prior to departure and not ascertained	9	17.0	-
Total	53	100.0	100.0

^aThis table excludes those who did not change their positions.

in the type of job (table 14).

The combination of job and position represents occupational status. Table 15 and 16 show a distinct trend upward in the level of occupational status held at the time of response to questionnaires as compared to that held at the time of departure for study/training. Data indicate significant increase in number of administrators (from 3 in Table 15 to 37 in Table 16). The figures, however, are reverse for the lowest status. The number of those who fall in an inactive group at the time of departure decreases as compared to those held at the time of response to questionnaires (from 14 in Table 15 to 4 in Table 16). Such data

Table 15. Occupational status of returnees at the time of departure for the US

Occupational status	Number	Relative frequency (percent)	Adjusted frequency (percent)
Administrators, managers	3	2.8	3.2
Scientists, professors	70	65.4	75.3
Engineers	1	0.9	1.1
Technicians, sub-professionals	14	13.1	15.0
Supervisors	1	0.9	1.1
Office clerks	4	3.8	4.3
Inactive and not ascertained	14	13.1	-
Total	107	100.0	100.0

have clearly shown the shift to better occupational status.

Table 16. Occupational status of returnees at the time of response to questionnaires

Occupational status	Number	Relative frequency (percent)	Relative frequency (percent)
Administrators, managers	37	34.6	35.9
Scientists, professors	59	55.1	57.3
Engineers	4	3.8	3.9
Technicians, sub-professionals	2	1.9	1.9
Supervisors	1	0.9	1.0
Inactive and not ascertained	4	3.7	-
Total	107	100.0	100.0

The shift was noted only among the percentage of returnees who changed occupational status subsequent to their study/training. The Thai civil service policy awards an automatic salary increase when a degree is obtained. An increase in civil service rank with a corresponding pay increase within the same job position is almost always provided after returning from foreign study/training. However, the question used in this study did not ascertain such an increase in pay for a civil service rank.

The Degree of Use of Knowledge and Skills

To investigate the use in job situations of the American learned knowledge and skills, returnees were asked to respond to two questions: "In talking about the knowledge and some aspects acquired from the educational/training program, have you ever been able to use any of the knowledge and skills that you learned in the program?" (Table 17); and "Could you say how much it is used?" (Table 18).

Data obtained indicate that 98.1% of returnees were able to use their skills. Only 1.9% were not able to do so.

Table 17. The use of knowledge and skills acquired from educational/training program by returnees

Use of knowledge and skills	Number	Percent
Use	105	98.1
Not use	2	1.9
Total	107	100.0

Returnees were asked to estimate the degree to which they were using the American learned knowledge and skills. Table 18 shows that 19.0% used "nearly all"; 60.0% "quite a lot"; 19.0% "some"; and 2.0% "a little".

Table 18. Degree of use of the knowledge and skills acquired from the educational and training program by returnees

Degree of use	Number	Relative frequency (percent)	Adjusted frequency (percent)
Nearly all	20	18.7	19.0
Quite a lot	63	58.9	60.0
Some	20	18.7	19.0
A little	2	1.9	2.0
Not ascertained	2	1.9	-
Total	107	100.0	100.0

In addition to reports on work completed, it is worthy to explore whether any of the work performed was considered "notably outstanding". This will provide an efficient means for collecting testimonials on the actual benefits received from study/training. The question also forces the returnees to illustrate in concrete terms the uses they had made of study/training rather than letting their initial claims of use remain unverified. Thus, another criterion of a program's effectiveness is that a returnee is able to specify to an inquirer some accomplishment in which his study/training has figured prominently. Returnees were asked, "Following your return to work, have you ever carried out any pieces of work which were considered notably outstand-

ing?"; "To what extent have you used some of those being required from the program?"; and "What type of such uses?"

Table 19. Notably outstanding tasks carried out by returnees

Outstanding tasks	Number	Relative frequency (percent)	Adjusted frequency (percent)
Yes	58	54.2	58.0
No	42	39.3	42.0
Not ascertained	7	6.5	-
Total	103	100.0	100.0

Data indicate 58.0% report the accomplishment of notably outstanding tasks. Although this compared rather unfavorably with the fact that over 90.0% reported that they had their study/training on their jobs, it may be due to the fact that those accomplished tasks were not counted by some returnees as the "outstanding" ones.

For the use of knowledge and skills acquired from study/training in the notably outstanding tasks, data clearly support that the program was effective since all outstanding tasks appear to have used such knowledge and skills (Table 20). A majority (91.4%) used knowledge and skills to a very great extent and to some extent. Less than 10.0% used them to a very little extent.

Table 20. Degree of use of the knowledge and skills by returnees^a

Degree of use	Number	Relative frequency (percent)
To a very great extent	10	17.2
To a great extent	22	38.0
To some extent	21	36.2
To a little extent	5	8.6
Total	58	100.0

^aThis table excludes those who do not accomplish their outstanding tasks and those who are not ascertained.

Table 21. Type of use of the knowledge and skills in the outstanding tasks by returnees^a

Type of use	Number	Percent
Planning	31	40.8
Problem solving	17	22.4
Decision making	7	9.2
Research/publication	21	27.6
Total	76	100.0

^aThis table includes those who chose more than one answer.

This set of activities provides a more concrete basis for suggestion where the value of study/training lies. Almost 41.0% of returnees used the knowledge and skills in planning. Research/publication and problem solving were channels of use in the lower order (27.6% and 22.4% respectively). Only 9.2% of returnees had used their knowledge and skills in decision making. Related to this figure is the evidence, as shown in Table 16, that none of returnees currently occupy the top and secondary policy maker or executive status where there is a tendency to make more uses of training in decision making.

The returnee's general outlook and attitude toward his/her study/training program and its importance are presented in Table 22, 23, and 24.

Table 22. Attitudes of returnees toward the preparation of the program for their present jobs

Preparation for jobs	Number	Relative frequency (percent)	Adjusted frequency (percent)
Very much	17	15.9	16.7
Quite a lot	45	42.1	44.1
Some	32	30.0	31.4
A little	3	2.8	2.9
None at all	5	4.6	4.9
Not ascertained	5	4.6	-
Total	107	100.0	100.0

The table shows that 95.1% of respondents think their educational/training program prepared them for present jobs to a certain degree. Only 4.9% think that the program did not prepare them for their current jobs. These findings are consistent with the returnees' view of the importance of the program for their present jobs (Table 23).

Table 23. View the importance of the educational/training program by returnees as an added qualification to their present jobs

Important to the job	Number	Relative frequency (percent)	Adjusted frequency (percent)
Essential	61	57.0	60.4
Very important	20	18.7	19.8
Helpful but not very important	14	13.1	13.9
Not useful	1	0.9	1.0
Better off without it	5	4.7	4.9
Not ascertained	6	5.6	-
Total	107	100.0	100.0

Data strongly support findings in Table 22. About 94.0% think that the program were essential, very important, and helpful to their present jobs. About 6.0% believed they could do the jobs better without it or viewed the program

as unuseful.

However, when asked: "Suppose that you had not taken the educational/training program, how do you think you could perform your current tasks?", Table 24 indicates 60.0% would not be able to perform as well as they presently do. Interestingly, 39.0% indicate the ability to perform as being as good as or better than what they do at present. This illustration indirectly indicates that not only study/training programs but also some other factors were counter-acting with the job performance. Unfortunately, clarifying data were not gathered.

Table 24. View of returnees how well they can perform their jobs without the study/training abroad

Job performance	Number	Relative frequency (percent)	Adjusted frequency (percent)
Better	1	0.9	1.0
Good	39	36.4	39.0
Poor	60	56.2	60.0
Not ascertained	7	6.5	-
Total	107	100.0	100.0

The paths taken by individuals who are cast in the role of knowledge utilizers are beset by many common problems and difficulties. Some problems are personal, some are the results of features of the environment in which returnees

are located. Unfortunately, the questioning procedure did not establish the operation of personality variables. The features of the environment include hurdles, barriers, and social and cultural factors (Table 25).

Table 25. Major difficulties of returnees in using knowledge and other aspects acquired from the program^a

Major difficulties	Number	Percent
Lack of equipment, material, and transportation	39	21.1
General conditions (government, society, etc.) not amenable	33	17.8
Lack of money	28	15.1
Lack of trained staff	20	10.8
Lack of authority to use or apply	20	10.8
Supervisor unhelpful and/or unsympathetic	18	9.7
Lack of time to use or apply	16	8.7
Top leadership uncooperative and/or resistance to new ideas	8	4.3
Substance too different or too advanced for local use	1	0.6
Did not learn anything useful for application	2	1.1

^aThis table includes those who chose more than one answer.

The most pressing difficulties are those with the organizational setting: scarcity of resources, i.e., lack of

equipment, material, and transportation; lack of money; and general conditions, i.e., government or society not amenable (54.0%). Problems were indicated by people in their organizational setting, especially with lack of trained staff, and unhelpful and/or unsympathetic supervisor (20.5%). Relatively few difficulties were cited (under 10.0%) under top leadership's resistance to change, too advanced material, and unuseful learning.

It should be noted that 1.1% reported they did not learn anything useful.

Transmittal of Knowledge and Skills to Others

As we have seen, one of the uses of study/training involves a returnee's passing on his/her acquired knowledge and skills to others. The returnees' communication behavior is ascertained by a direct question: "Have you ever passed on to others the knowledge and skills you have ob-

Table 26. Transmittal of knowledge and skills to others by returnees

Transmittal of knowledge and skills to others	Number	Relative frequency (percent)
Yes	106	99.1
No	-	-
Not ascertained	1	0.9
Total	107	100.0

tained from the educational/training program?" (Table 26). If response is yes, "How much knowledge and other things acquired from the program have you passed on to others?" (Table 27).

Table 27. Extent to which returnees conveyed knowledge and skills from the study/training program to others

Extent conveyed to others	Number	Relative frequency (percent)	Adjusted frequency (percent)
All or almost all	8	7.5	7.5
A lot	45	42.1	42.5
Some	36	33.6	34.0
A little	17	15.9	16.0
None	-	-	-
Not ascertained	1	0.9	-
Total	107	100.0	100.0

Table 26 shows that 106 returnees claimed to have engaged in a substantial amount of this activity. An addition (one returnee) is not ascertained. Sixteen percent of returnees indicated they had done little about communicating the lessons of their study/training to others (Table 27). Others (83.1%) had conveyed at least to some extent.

Those who disclosed that they had conveyed their knowledge and skills from the study/training to others added validity to their claim by indicating specific ways in which the transmittal occurred (Table 28). The most common method

of transmitting or conveying knowledge or skills was through formal lectures or training programs (45.7%). About 28.0% reported that transmission occurred in articles or published works and 26.7% in informal settings.

Table 28. Means of transmitting the knowledge and skills from the study/training program to others by returnees^a

Means of transmitting	Number	Relative frequency (percent)	Adjusted frequency (percent)
Formal lectures or training programs	53	44.5	45.7
Informal discussions	51	26.0	26.7
Articles or published works	34	26.9	27.6
Not ascertained	3	2.6	-
Total	119	100.0	100.0

^aThis table includes those who chose more than one answer.

Plan for Future Use

In addition to the reports on the extent to which study/training programs have been applied on the job and transmitted to others, this study elicited returnees' intentions for using skills and knowledge which, as yet, they have been unable to use. The applicable answer was taken to be one hallmark of a program's effectiveness. If a returnee had not yet made any use of his/her study/training

but has plans to do so, then, some future application is more probable. Whether he/she had already made some use or not, if he/she can document some plans for future use, one can infer a probability that some use may eventually be made. A plan represents an expectation or commitment to future action.

Table 29. Future use of the knowledge and skills acquired from study/training abroad by returnees

Plan for future use	Number	Relative frequency (percent)	Adjusted frequency (percent)
Plan	90	84.1	91.8
No plan	8	7.5	8.2
Not ascertained	9	8.7	-
Total	107	100.0	100.0

Data indicate that 91.8% of returnees had such plans, and 8.2% said they had none.

An interrelated factor was concomitant of the existence of plans for future use. The length of time returnees had been back from their study/training abroad varied greatly at the start in their desires to put it into practice. Table 30 shows that during the first three years after the respondents returned, 100.0% of them had plans for future use

of their American study/training. But after the third year of return, the number of those who had plans for future use tapered off. That is, 83.3% and 88.2% of those who have returned for 4 year to almost 5 years, and for 5 years and over respectively had such plans for future use of their knowledge and skills acquired from study/training abroad.

Table 30. Time after return of returnees and their plans for future use^a

Number of years after return	Plan for future use			
	No.	Plan %	No plan No.	plan %
1 year to almost 2 years	14	100.0	-	-
2 years to almost 3 years	12	100.0	-	-
3 years to almost 4 years	9	100.0	-	-
4 years to almost 5 years	10	83.3	2	16.7
5 years and over	45	88.2	6	11.8
Total	90 (91.8)		8 (8.2)	

^aThis table excludes those who are not ascertained.

Moreover, if some uses have already been made, plans for some future uses should be more likely to persist than if no substantial use of study/training has occurred. The evidence is, however, that 97.8% of those who indicated

they had used their knowledge and skills on their jobs have plans for future use while 100.0% of those who had not used it have such plans. Even though no action has been taken in the past, the intention to use it as expressed in plans for future use still persists. The causes of such evidence should be further investigated especially those who had past uses but do not have plans for future ones. Unfortunately, no details of such data were available.

Table 31. Past uses of the knowledge and skills of returnees and their plans for future use^a

Past use	Plan for future use			
	No.	Plan %	No plan No.	%
Have used	88	97.8	2	2.2
Have not used	8	100.0	-	-
Total	96 (98.0)		2 (2.0)	

^aThis table excludes those who are not ascertained.

Test of Hypotheses

One of the primary objectives of this study was to ascertain which of the hypothesized factors relate to utilization. In looking at the results of this investigation, a development of scores of utilization described in Chapter III will be used for testing of hypotheses.

As indicated in the unit of analysis and measurement of Chapter III, the scores were derived from six questions from the original questionnaire developed by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). Ranking and judging procedures were applied to assign weights to various types of response to the six questions in order to obtain a score that would vary directly with the amount indicating utilization. These questions dealt with actual employment, use of skills or knowledge gained, transmittal of knowledge and skills gained, and plans for future use of study/training as reported by returnees. The scoring system functions so that the more utilization is reported, the higher the score. In application, an individual returnee's score could be as low as "0" or as high as "100".

As shown earlier in this chapter, each of the indicators reviewed was directed at a different facet of use. Moreover, when all the scores of the six questions were combined, it facilitated the range from 58 to 78 which was further divided and labeled as upper middle (58-74); and high (75-78) utili-

zation.

Table 32. Utilization score of returnees

Utilization score	Number	Percent
Upper middle	11	12.2
High	79	87.8
Total	90	100.0

It should be noted that a returnee must have recorded answers for all six questions to achieve a valid total score. If any of the six were not answered or have been omitted, that returnee was not included in the distribution of total scores.

All crosstabulations of returnees' utilization scores, then, were reported by 90 respondents who completely answered a series of utilization index.

The crosstabulation made on the developed scale (Table 32) shows that 12.2% of returnees rated themselves "upper middle", and 87.8% "high" users.

In order to provide a realistic picture of the relationship of various factors to the utilization of educational/training programs, a technique of discriminating the high and low group should be employed. Thus, the middle group

which is non-discriminating, will not be reported.

The application of such technique to this study, however, was impossible due to the nature of the respondents. As shown in Table 32, no one obtained a low score. Moreover, the majority of returnees were in the high user group.

All crosstabulations of returnees' utilization scores were, then, reported by the 11 upper middle, and the 79 high utilizers. This classification of scores was used to test the nine general forms of null hypotheses as follows:

Hypothesis I:

There is no relationship between age and the degree to which the American educational programs and training experiences gained were used by Thai returnees.

Unlike previous studies, age in this study did not associate with the scores of utilization. The number of those who were under 25 years of age being classified as the high users was the same as those between 46-55. However, with the exception of those who were under 25 years old, the figures in Table 33a indicate a positive relationship between age and utilization. Eighty-three percent of those who were between 25-35 years old obtained high scores of utilization and the tendency was greater for those who were older (90.9% and 100.0% of those who were between 36-45, and 46-55 years of age respectively).

Table 33a. Age of returnees and their scores of knowledge and skills utilization

Age	Utilization			
	Upper No.	middle %	High No.	%
Under 25	-	-	1	100.0
Age 25-35	7	17.1	34	82.9
Age 36-45	4	9.1	40	90.9
Age 46-55	-	-	4	100.0

In terms of statistically testing for significance, data were divided into 2 groups: those whose ages were 35 or under, and 36 or older. The logic underlying such a division was the age opportunity. It is believed that the chance of using innovations is decreasing for those Thais whose ages are 35 and older. However, the relationship of age and utilization is only 0.7772. Such a small value of Chi-square indicates the absence of relationship in which is referred to as statistical independency (Nie et al., 1975). The degree to which the value of age can predict or vary with the degree of utilization is .38.

Table 33b. Age of returnees as combined into two groups and their scores of knowledge and skills utilization

Age	Utilization			
	Upper No.	middle %	High No.	%
35 or under	7	16.7	35	83.3
36 or over	4	8.3	44	91.7
Total	11 (12.2)		79 (87.8)	

Corrected Chi-square = .7772; significant at .3780;
Gamma = .3750.

Hypothesis II:

There is no relationship between educational level and the degree to which the American educational programs and training experiences gained were used by Thai returnees.

Education is believed to be related to subsequent utilization. Those with high levels of education have made greater use than the others. In other words, the higher the level of education one has achieved, the greater the tendency to use one's knowledge and skills. The findings as shown in Table 34 indicate that 71.4%, 85.2%, and 96.6% of those who hold Associate or Bachelor's degree, Master's degree, and Doctoral degree respectively, were classified as high users. The value of Chi-square is 4.1633 and statistically significant at .12. In terms of predictions, 61 percent of

the education variable can predict the level of utilization or vice versa.

Table 34. Education level of returnees and their scores of knowledge and skills utilization

Education level	Utilization			
	Upper No.	middle %	High No.	%
Associate or Bachelor's degree	2	28.6	5	71.4
Master's degree	8	14.8	46	85.2
Doctoral degree	1	3.4	28	96.6
Total	11 (12.2)		79 (87.8)	

Chi-square = 4.1633; significant at .1247; Gamma = .6069.

Hypothesis III:

There is no relationship between occupational status and the degree to which the American educational programs and training experiences gained were used by Thai returnees.

There is no evidence to indicate that returnees' current occupational status and scores of knowledge and skills utilization are statistically associated. The Corrected Chi-square value as shown in Table 35 is 0.0544. The group of supervisors, scientists, and professors obtained nearly the same score as the group of engineers, administrators, and managers.

The results may differ if each occupational status was categorized separately. If they were separated into cells the number of respondents would be too small to be used a statistical test of significance.

Table 35. Occupational status of returnees and their scores of knowledge and skills utilization

Occupational status	Utilization			
	Upper middle		High	
	No.	%	No.	%
Supervisors, scientists, and professors	6	12.0	44	88.0
Engineers, administrators, and managers	3	8.1	34	91.9
Total	9 (10.3)		78 (89.7)	

Corrected Chi-square = 0.0544; significant at .8156.

Hypothesis IV:

There is no relationship between the helpfulness of their supervisors and the degree to which the American educational programs and training experiences gained were used by Thai returnees.

The weighty role played by the work supervisor in the process of study/training has been a dominant factor in determining the program's effectiveness because he/she is in a commanding position to make resources available, to demonstrate approval or innovative work, and in general, to facilitate or prevent organizational change. His/her assump-

tion of a broker role in the initial formulation of a program is an indicator of a greater organizational investment in the study/training of his/her staff members, and can, therefore, signify an organizational setting more favorable to technical transfer.

Returnees were asked "Does your immediate supervisor or superior help you to apply the knowledge and skills you acquired?". Table 36 indicates that 92.6% of the returnees who characterized their supervisors as "very helpful" in their efforts to apply their study/training made high use. Ninety-one and 82.0% of those who viewed their supervisors as "considerably helpful" obtained high scores of utilization. The upper middle user group included those who characterized their supervisor as "not helpful" (18.2%);

Table 36. View of returnees to supervisors and their scores of knowledge and skills utilization

Helpfulness of supervisors	Utilization			
	Upper middle		High	
	No	%	No	%
Not helpful at all or not even interested	2	18.2	9	81.8
Helpful to some extent	4	8.9	41	91.1
Very helpful	2	7.4	25	92.6
Total	8	(9.6)	75	(90.4)

Chi-square = 1.1052; significant at .5755; Gamma = .2609.

"helpful to some extent" (8.9%); and "very helpful" (7.4%) respectively. Chi-square value is only 1.1052 and statistically significant at .58 level. This relationship provided a low predictability of the view of their supervisors and returnees' scores of utilization (26%).

Hypothesis V:

There is no relationship between the educational background of the majority of employees in work setting and the degree to which the American educational programs and training experiences gained were used by Thai returnees.

Another attribute of the returnees' work setting was the presence or absence of others who have been studied/trained abroad. The introduction of innovation is facilitated by the presence of other foreign-trained co-workers in the returnees' work settings. They can form a "community of innovators" and support each other in bringing about organizational change.

The findings presented in Table 37 indicate that those who worked in an organizational setting with a majority of employees who had studied/trained abroad made greater use of their study/training than those who were unique in their exposure to foreign study/training. The association is 4.1813 and statistical significance is at the .04 level.

Table 37. Educational backgrounds of the majority in returnees' work organization and their scores of knowledge and skills utilization

Educational backgrounds of the majority	Utilization			
	Upper No.	middle %	High No.	%
Study/training in the home country	8	23.5	26	76.5
Study/training abroad	3	5.9	48	94.1
Total	11 (12.9)		74 (87.1)	

Corrected Chi-square = 4.1813; significant at .0409.

Hypothesis VI:

There is no relationship between the availability of proper equipment and facilities and the degree to which the American educational programs and training experiences gained were used by Thai returnees.

The availability of proper equipment and facilities is another aspect of the work setting which influenced utilization. According to Table 25, there was general awareness of the problems raised for returnees by the lack of needed facilities. The crosstabulation, however, showed that 100.0% of those who complained about the inadequacy of proper equipment and facilities obtained high scores of utilization but only 80.0% of those who indicated the availability of proper equipment and facilities obtained such

scores (Table 38). In comparing Table 25 with Table 38, it was evident that even though they viewed the lack of appropriate equipment and facilities as the limiting factor, the degree of their utilization of knowledge and skills was high. The Gamma of -1.000 shows a perfect negative relationship for those who viewed the inadequacy of proper equipment in making the full use of their study/training. This may partly due to the fact that some of them by any means completely overcame problems relative to inadequacy of equipment.

Table 38. The adequacy of proper equipment and facilities in returnees' work organization and their scores of knowledge and skills utilization^a

Adequacy of equipment	Utilization			
	Upper No.	middle %	High No.	High %
Inadequacy	-	-	36	100.0
Adequacy	10	20.0	40	80.0
	10 (11.6)		76 (88.4)	

Chi-square = 6.3173; significant at .0120; Gamma = -1.000.

^aThis table excludes those who are not ascertained.

Hypothesis VII:

There is no relationship between the involvement of the program planning and the degree to which the American educational programs and training experiences gained were used by Thai returnees.

The crosstabulation of program planning is presented in Table 39 and is found to be not a significant factor. Ninety-seven percent of those who ranked as high users indicated that they planned their own program and 85.7% who were also categorized in the same group partly arranged their program planning. Eighty-four percent of those whose program was arranged by others (i.e., government sponsorship, etc.) obtained high scores of utilization and the rest (16.0%) obtained upper middle scores.

Table 39. Planning involvement of returnees and their scores of knowledge and skills utilization^a

Planning involvement	Utilization			
	Upper middle		High	
	No.	%	No.	%
One's own planning	1	3.4	28	96.6
Partly planning	3	14.3	18	85.7
Other(s) planning for	6	15.8	32	84.2

Chi-square = 2.9952; significant at .2232.

^aFor the plan of study only.

Hypothesis VIII:

There is no relationship between the field of study and the degree to which the American educational programs and training experiences gained were used by Thai returnees.

There was an evidence that the field of study pursued influenced the degree of utilization. Figures in Table 40 show that 100.0% of those in Architecture, Home Economics, and Veterinary reported high utilization compared to 66.7%, 81.3%, 88.2%, and 92.1% of those in Education, Sciences and Humanities, Engineering, and Agriculture respectively. The Chi-square of the relationship between the two variables is of a small value.

It is interesting to review the relationship between the field of study on the needs of the returnees' job assignment and the utilization. The workings of bureaucracy being what they often are. It is not surprising that there are instances in which returnees are primed to plunge into the jobs for which they underwent advanced study/training. When civil servants go to the United States, they have to sign a contract to return and work with the government. There is no choice of job upon their return. Such work situations, then, may influence the degree of utilization of knowledge and skills acquired from study/training. Unfortunately, the questionnaire procedure did not acquire such information.

Table 40. Field of study of returnees and their scores of knowledge and skills utilization^a

Field of study	Utilization			
	Upper No	middle %	High No	%
Education	1	33.3	2	66.7
Agriculture	3	7.9	35	92.1
Sciences and Humanities	3	18.8	13	81.3
Engineering	2	11.8	15	88.2
Others (Architecture, Home Economics, and Veterinary)	-	-	7	100.0
Total	9 (11.1)		72 (88.9)	

Chi-square = 3.3316; significant at .5039.

^aThis table excludes those who are not ascertained.

Hypothesis IX:

There is no relationship between the duration of program and the degree to which the American educational programs and training experiences gained were used by Thai returnees.

The length of the program is a variable that is linked with utilization. Longer programs usually resulted in higher utilization of study/training. The data show high use made by those whose program took three to almost four years and longer. The shorter time of the program, the lesser the number of returnees to be included in high user group.

Table 41. Length of returnees' program and their scores of knowledge and skills utilization

Length of program	Utilization			
	Upper middle		High	
	No.	%	No.	%
Under 1 year	1	25.0	3	75.0
1 to almost 2 years	2	14.3	12	85.7
2 to almost 3 years	6	14.6	35	85.4
3 to almost 4 years	-	-	12	100.0
4 to almost 5 years	1	9.1	10	90.9
5 years and over	-	-	5	100.0
Total	10 (11.5)		77 (88.5)	

Spearman's rho = 0.1578; significant at .072.

There is some indication that after too long a program, the tendency toward full use of knowledge and skills decreases. The length of program will cause the students to lose all contacts with the home cultures. Consequently, there is a difficulty in readjusting to the work situation. Nevertheless, figures in Table 41 indicate full use by those whose programs took 5 years and over even though percentages of 4-5 year programs decreased compared to a 3-4 year ones. The relationship between the two variables (Spearman's rho) is 0.1578 and statistically significant at .07 level.

In summary, empirical data reject null hypotheses V and VI. Certain variables were found to be significant at .05 level in terms of returnees' utilization of knowledge and skills acquired from study/training abroad.

The results of Chi-square, Gamma, and Spearman's rho tests indicate that the utilization score was related to the study/training abroad of the majority of employees in returnees' work organizations, and the adequacy of proper equipment and facilities. The former was positively directed. Those with the majority of employees in their work organizations who have studied/trained abroad, were more likely to make full use of knowledge and skills acquired from the program. The later association indicated a negative direction. Those who claimed inadequacy of proper equipment and facilities had a tendency to record higher scores of utilization.

It should be noted that relationships between utilization and factors cited above do not imply that one factor caused the other, although that may be true or partially true. It means only the two factors are related to each other. Thus, it is not safe to say, for example, that a high or low score on utilization as measured by the questionnaire in this study was a result of being in a particular level of education.

Additional Findings

Even though it was not hypothesized, programs viewed by returnees as preparing them for their present jobs were also investigated. Programs were found to have positive relation at .007 level of significance with the degree of utilization. Table 42 shows that those who viewed their programs as preparing them for their present jobs at least to some extent were more likely to be high users as compared to those who indicated the programs played little role in preparing them for the present jobs.

Table 42. Attitudes of returnees toward the programs as prepared them for the present jobs and their scores of knowledge and skills utilization

Preparing for jobs	Utilization			
	Upper middle		High	
	No.	%	No.	%
None at all	1	25.0	3	75.0
A little	1	33.3	2	66.7
Some	7	22.6	24	77.4
Quite a lot	1	2.9	34	97.1
Very much	1	6.7	14	93.3
Total	11 (12.5)		77 (87.5)	

Spearman's rho = 0.2626; significant at .007.

The counseling services provided for Thai students were also investigated. It was found that those who maintained consulting with their advisors tended to be high users.

The Spearman's rho is 0.2168 and significant at .021.

Table 43. Returnees who remain consulting with their advisors and the scores of knowledge and skills utilization

Maintain consulting with advisors	Utilization			
	Upper No.	middle %	High No.	High %
Never	6	26.1	17	73.3
Occasionally	2	6.3	30	93.8
Sometimes	1	5.3	18	94.7
Always	1	7.1	13	92.9
Total	10 (11.4)		78 (88.6)	

Spearman's rho = 0.2168; significant at .021.

This test was run on the correlations between sustained use of the consulting service and degree of use of educational and training programs, although the question of possible correlations in this area was not listed in the hypotheses. These variables (in additional findings) tested by Spearman's rho were found to be significant influences at .007 and .021 level respectively in the degree of use.

CHAPTER V.
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

Study or training abroad is necessary as one means of human development especially in countries where educational opportunities in certain fields are not adequate.

On the campus of Iowa State University, there were almost 1,300 foreign students enrolled for the 1977-78 academic year, an increase in number compared to the previous years. The increasing flow of foreign students to the campus demands special attention and consideration by the institution. Providing foreign students with knowledge and training that will be most useful to them when they return home to service their countries is one of several goals of the university. This study investigated how adequately the program's utilitarian goal was being fulfilled, what evidence showed the influence of utilization. Especially, it sought to furnish those charged with planning and administering the program with information regarding its strengths and weaknesses in the interest of maintaining and increasing the program's effectiveness. A follow-up study with the basic goal of evaluating the utilization of knowledge and skills acquired from the study or training, in other words, will provide background material which will

enable the foreign student advisors to counsel their students more effectively about their educational programs and personal problems. It can be useful administratively as a guide to admission requirements, orientation needs, adjustment programs, and pre-departure orientation. Furthermore, it can be useful in helping prospective students plan their programs wisely so that they will experience a minimum of difficulty in developing useful knowledge and skills. Most of all, it will be a guideline to fulfill the goal described above.

The principal units of analysis in this study were the individual Thai returnees who attended Iowa State University: their judgements, perceptions, actions, and experiences related to their educational program and its aftermath. From a list of Thai returnees for whom addresses are available at the Office of International Education Service of Iowa State University and the current directory of Iowa State University's Alumni Association in Thailand, 240 Thai returnees who returned to their jobs in Thailand for at least six months following their graduation could be traced. One hundred and seven questionnaires (44.6%) were returned and used in this study.

The evaluation of returnees' experiences sought by this study was based on a three-fold approach. First, general information; second, experiences gained in the United

States; and third, experiences after returning from the United States.

The questionnaire instrument used was a modified version of the one developed by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) along with another developed by the International Education Exchange Service.

Utilization scores were derived from six questions. The questions dealt with actual employment, use of skills or knowledge gained, transmission of skills or knowledge gained, and plans for future use of study/training. By accepted ranking and judging procedures, USAID's researchers assigned weights to various types of responses to these questions to obtain a score that would vary directly with the amount that indicates utilization. The scoring system functions so that the more utilization is reported, the higher the score. In application an individual returnee's score could be as low as "0" or as high as "100". Total scores that ranked from 0 through 24, 25 through 49, 50 through 74, and 75 through 100 are classified as low, lower middle, upper middle, and high users respectively.

In presenting the findings, the emphasis was placed on returnees' utilization of their education/training experiences subsequent to their attending Iowa State University. The descriptions of their visits to the United States were presented here only when they serve to illuminate or clari-

fy assertions of the returnees. Two out of 9 hypothesized relationships are rejected at .05 level of statistical significance. A summary of the findings is as follows:

1. There is no evidence to support a relationship between age and the degree to which the American educational programs and training experiences gained were used by Thai returnees.

2. The relationship between educational level and the degree to which the American educational programs and training experiences gained were used by Thai returnees is not statistically significant.

3. There is no evidence to indicate a relationship between occupational status and the degree to which the American educational programs and training experiences gained were used by Thai returnees.

4. The helpfulness of returnees' supervisor is found not to be related to the degree to which the American educational programs and training experiences gained were used by Thai returnees.

5. Thai returnees who are in work setting where the majority of employees had studied or trained abroad were high users of their knowledge and skills acquired from educational/training programs.

6. It is found that the degree of use of the American educational programs and training experiences is negatively

related to the adequacy of proper equipment and facilities in the Thai returnees' work organization.

7. There is insufficient evidence to indicate a relationship between the involvement of program planning and the degree to which the American educational programs and training experiences gained were used by Thai returnees.

8. There is no evidence to support a relationship between the field of study and the level of knowledge and skills utilization gained were used by Thai returnees.

9. The duration of the program is found to have no relationship with the degree to which the American educational programs and training experiences gained were used by Thai returnees.

Conclusions

In this study, nine hypothesized relationships involve returnees' characteristics, work settings and program characteristics. Only two null hypotheses were rejected. The remaining of seven hypotheses were supported. Two variables on work settings influenced the full use of knowledge and skills of Thai returnees. No variable of returnees' and program characteristics was found to be related to the level of utilization.

The fact is that a high proportion of returnees reported effective utilization of their study/training and

that no group reflects low scores of utilization. Consequently, no practical distributions would provide any discrimination. Thus, such low values of the associations seem to be unavoidable. These are found to be not particularly useful for interpretation. Further, factors that proved to be statistically significant contributed little information that is useful for predicting utilization or vice versa.

Implications

As previously noted on the limitations relative to the scope of the study, these findings may not have general applicability. In reviewing study results, some additional limitations should be cited. There are:

1. Due to the small sample size, a number of questions had a low response rate. This created difficulty in using certain statistical tests for data analysis. Furthermore, a small number of responses in each category of individual questions may not have adequately represented the population. The low response rate may have resulted from unknown addresses of respondents; respondents having no interest in the area of study, not using the knowledge and skills gained from the study/training, unable to graduate with the intended degree due to financial or language problems, or changing in the field of study. As a result, the response may have been

obtained only from those favorable respondents who were interested and not representative of the whole population. The extent to which the results are colored by "courtesy bias" remains unknown.

2. In a review of problems relative to translation from English into Thai, it was found that some of the items in the questionnaire may have different connotations in the two languages although the translation is correct. For example, the word "outstanding" was questioned by the respondents as referring "to any extent" in which the inquirer and the respondent were agreed upon. In addition, there may have some difficulties of translating information from Thai to English.

3. The characteristic portion of the questionnaire utilized to large of a response range in certain questions. This reflected in not providing enough raw data for further investigation. Such a limitation along with the form style of the questionnaire provided data which could not be used for statistic analysis. If the form could have been modified, some significant differences may have been noted. For example, the age was listed as those under 25, 25-35, 36-45, and 46-55 respectively. Such wide range of age could not be narrow because of the limitation of the characteristic of the questionnaire, however, specific breakdowns could have provided more specific data.

With these limitations in mind, however, there do appear to be some implications which should be noted. These are presented according to three categories: implications for Thai students, for some American colleges and universities, especially Iowa State University, and for home country or work organizations. The final section gives some suggestions for future research.

Implications for Students

The data indicate returnees' work settings as influential factors on their utilization, preplanning and planning should be done with the knowledge, aid, and support of the employer or supervisor if the student is working and plans to return to the same job situation. Those who are planning to change job or who are unemployed before departure should carefully assess the job possibilities and attempt to pre-arrange post-study employment.

Data indicate that after three years of study there is a tendency for utilization decrease. Students, especially those who remain for more than three years, should maintain contact with their home countries while in the United States. Sojourning students, living for a certain period of time in different culture, go through a process of adjustment and value change. They temporarily become part of a new system with unfamiliar relationships, roles, and expectations.

Not keeping contact with their home countries may result in difficulties in re-entry adjusting.

As the time approaches for return to the home country, students should begin to prepare physically and psychologically. Pre-departure efforts to assess training and its implications for use at home may make the transition from the American academic setting to foreign work situation less traumatic.

Contact with American professional organizations and former universities should be maintained in an effort to keep the knowledge and skills learned during the sojourn from becoming state and obsolete. It is found from this study that 66.0% of returnees have maintained contact with their advisors or professors but only 37.0% of those who have done so point out an academic area as the subject of such contacts. For the professional organizations, data gathering indicate that 74.0% of Thai returnees have joined some of the US professional societies. However, only 38.0% have received some professional publications from the US. It is suggested that returnees retain their personal and professional contacts with the university and faculties. Receiving some professional publications is also encouraged.

Implications for Colleges and Universities

In general, the departments have learned from their prior experience in admitting foreign students which admis-

sions criteria and guidelines best suit their individual programs. Selecting should involve much more than simply choosing educationally qualified candidates. Department heads and admission officers also need to consider the extent to which their academic programs match the applicants' stated purposes.

Student counseling services are necessary for relating the US academic experience to the student's situation at home country situation and concern for students' useful employment on return.

Innovations are needed in admissions and in curriculum. Collaboration and cooperation are also needed. Interinstitutional arrangements must be developed between universities here and abroad, between the government and private sectors, and among organizations in this field. Currently, most universities decide what is best for foreign students without any consultation with their foreign counterparts. Those who are experts in international affairs should be fully utilized. Iowa State University can provide such services since more than one-third of the university staff has participated in study, seminars, and assistance programs in other countries.

Students educated in countries other than their home country face special adjustment problems upon returning home. Thai returnees, with no exception, certainly encoun-

ter the same situation. Pre-departure seminars should be convened in the host countries with the objective of preparing students for their return home. Those seminars should highlight the problems students may encounter and offer possible solutions. They should emphasize the way in which the returnees may most effectively contribute to the well-being of their country. These seminars would also help the foreign students adapt to the changing socio-economic and political situation back home.

Doctoral candidates should be encouraged to write their theses in absentia in their own countries or to write on topics pertinent to their countries. Only 11.4% of Thai returnees graduated from Iowa State University had done so. An advantage of doing the research at home is that government officials and others in policy-making positions would be more aware of the problems and the importance of the research. This recommendation seems possible since about 70% of Thai returnees were sponsored and may have been granted research time upon returning home. A disadvantage, however, is the lack of interaction with the student's graduate committee as he/she programs with his/her research.

It is recommended that the faculty in cooperation with individual students make an effort to determine the unique needs of a student's home country in planning his/her program. Departments should offer courses or seminars de-

signed to help foreign students better understand how they can use their American education in their homeland. Assistance to return to the US for short training programs, meetings, tours, and etc., to help keep them abreast of new developments should be offered.

Implications for Home Countries

Since a majority of Thai returnees are government employed and the data imply that the helpfulness of work supervisors could greatly facilitate the educated's use of study/training, several areas seem particularly pertinent for government or home country action. First, governments should provide prospective students with adequate information about the skilled manpower needs of the country, thus, allowing students to plan an educational program which will produce usable skills.

Second, home country governments should actively encourage employers to use the skills of returnees and should help provide any necessary equipment and facilities which may be beyond the resources of individual employers.

Governments should make an effort to support the professional standing of returnees, perhaps through using them as consultants or inviting them to participate in conferences. Governments should re-examine on a project basis the allocation of returnees in an attempt to assure that their skills are put to appropriate use.

Finally, governments should encourage returnees to join appropriate US professional societies by bearing initial costs of such membership.

Recommendations for Future Research

With some limitations found from this study, the following observations and suggestions for future research seem appropriate.

1. From a small population size, the findings show unclear relationships between degree of knowledge and skills being used and other variables. A single university is too small to yield a good research sample. A much more concentrated country-wide effort must be mounted.

2. Questionnaires on evaluative studies usually concern more than one approach and there is an evidence that data on pre-departure of on sojourn are not complete, which may be partly due to the difficulty to remember events that happened a long time ago. It is recommended that longitudinal studies should be undertaken.

3. It is suggested that researchers seriously consider the possibility of standardized methods of conducting research so that comparisons of findings can be made.

4. The data provided only the evaluation of attitudes, utilization of study/training, and students' experiences and changes. It is suggested that the relationship between

foreign and US students should be examined further to discover what the benefits are for each of them as a result of contacting one another.

5. Feelings of nationalism, of manifest destiny and of anti- or pro-American attitudes ebb and flow in intensity through time. Such natural behavior is often influenced by how US relations with other countries are perceived. An understanding of the factors which influence those behavioral changes and if and how they affect the objectives of cross-cultural learning are needed and research on such issues should be pursued.

6. This study attempts to assess what has happened to returnees in terms of the association of various factors and the utilization of knowledge and skills that returnees obtain from study/training abroad. And since that association is not the cause, it is suggested that future research explore not only what has happened, but also the causes of such evidences.

7. Finally, further investigation of the differences in experience between returnees from the United States and those in other countries will be helpful in comparing program effectiveness.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agency for International Development/United States Operations Mission to Thailand. Participant Training Program: An Evaluational Survey. Bangkok: Thai-American Audio Visual Service, 1963.
- Barakat, Mohamed. United Arab Republic Study: Studies in the Roles as Culture Carriers of Eastern Students Who Received Their University Education in Western Countries. Report for a Conference, UNESCO. Paris, 1964. (Mimeographed.)
- Bennett, J. W.; Passin, Herbert; and McKnight, Robert K. In Search of Identity. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1958.
- Carter, William D. Study Abroad and Educational Development: Fundamental of Educational Planning. United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, Paris, 1973. ERIC ED 093 068.
- Chiang, S. H., and Klinzing, G. E. How Would That Work Back Home? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society for Engineering Education (Ft. Collins, Colorado), 1975. ERIC ED 118 409.
- Christensen, George C. Letters to Editor. The Iowa State Daily 107 (January 5, 1978): 4.
- Clements, R. E., and Gollen, A. E. Evaluation of the Technical Training Program in the United States Foreign Aid. US Department of State, Agency for International Development. Washington, D.C., 1964. (Mimeographed.)
- Colloquium on the Foreign Graduate Students, 2d, Wingspread Conference Center, Raedie, Wis., 1970. The Foreign Graduate: Priorities for Research and Action. Report of a Colloquium Sponsored by the National Liaison Committee on Foreign Student Admission. New York, 1971.
- Council on International Programs. Serving the Needs of Foreign Students. Chapter IX in Iowa State University' Role in International Affairs. Report of the Council on International Programs. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1978.

- Edgerton, Wallace G. Trends in Educational Exchange. International Educational and Cultural Exchange XI (Summer 1975): 11-16.
- Education and World Affairs. The Professional School and World Affairs. Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Press, 1968.
- Elvin, H. L. Preface in Study Abroad and Educational Development: Fundamental of Educational Planning by William D. Carter. United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. Paris, 1973. ERIC ED 093 068.
- Field Service Steering Committee. Crucial Issues in Foreign Student Education. A Report of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs. National of Foreign Student Affairs, Washington, D.C., 1974. ERIC ED 107 170.
- Gollin, Albert E. Educational Development: Effects of US Technical Training Programs. Praeger Special Studies in International Economic and Development. New York, 1969.
- Groves, Marion H. Contributions to Development by Asians Who Have Studied Abroad. International Educational and Cultural Exchange (Summer 1967): 13-20.
- Harari, George H. The Foreign Graduate Students: An opportunity for Higher Education in America. In The Foreign Graduate Students: Priorities for Research and Action. College Entrance Examination Board, New York, 1971.
- Harbison, Frederick, and Myers, Charles A. Education, Manpower, and Economic Growth: Strategies of Human Resource Development. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.
- Higbee, Homer D. Research on Foreign Graduate Students: A Review of Literature. In The Foreign Graduate Students: Priorities for Research and Action. College Entrance Examination Board, New York, 1971.
- International Research Associates. The Thai Students Exchange Service. A Research Report for US Department of State, International Educational Exchange Service, New York, 1955.

- Iowa State Admissions Office. Information for International Applicants. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1978.
- Kaplan, Robert B. Foreign Students in State University System of Florida. Report of the Consultation for the Auspices of the Field Service of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs. NAFSA, Washington, D.C., 1973. ERIC ED 087 306.
- Kolstoe, Kalph H. Introduction to Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1969.
- Kuppuswamy, B. India: Studies on the Role as Culture Carriers of Eastern Students Who Received Their University Education in Western Countries. Report to Conference on the Role of Eastern Students as Culture Carriers, UNESCO. Paris, 1964. (Mimeographed.)
- Mueller, J. H.; Schuessler, K. F.; and Costner, H. L. Statistical Reasoning in Sociology. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1970.
- Myers, Robert G. International Education, Immigration and National Policy. Comparative Education Review 17 (February 1973): 72-90.
- Nie, Norman H.; Hull, Hadlai C.; Jenkins, Jean G.; Steinbrenner, Karin; and Bent, Dale H. SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.
- Open Doors, 1979: Report on International Educational Exchange. New York: Institute of International Education, 1979.
- Orr, James D., Jr. The Foreign Scholar Returned Home: A Review of Selected Research. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation. Library, Columbia University, New York, 1971.
- Rhodes, Kathleen. Adapting the Curriculum of the Professional School to Meet the Needs of Students for International Service. Educational and World Affairs, New York, 1969.
- Rusk, Dean. Education: Key to National Development. Overseas VI (September 1961): 6.

- Siffin, William J. (ed.). *Toward the Comparative Study of Public Administration*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1959.
- Tuck, Kenneth C. *Program in International Agricultural Development*. In *Crucial Issues in Foreign Student Education*. A report of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs. National of Foreign Student Affairs, Washington, D.C., 1974. ERIC ED 107 170.
- US Department of State, Agency for International Development. *AID Participant Training Program: The Transfer and Use of Development Skills*. Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C., 1963.
- Useem, John, and Useem, Ruth Hill. *The Western Educated Man in India: A study of His Social Roles and Influence*. New York: The Dryden Press, 1955.
- Walton, Barbara J. *Research on Foreign Graduate Students*. *International Educational and Cultural Exchange* 11 (Winter 1971): 17-28.
- Wharton, Clifton R., Jr. *The United State Graduate Training of Asian Agricultural Economists*. Council on Economic and Cultural Affairs, New York, 1959.
- Wolf, Charles J. *Foreign Aid: Theory and Practice in Southeast Asia*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to those who have been helpful in the preparation of this dissertation and my graduate career. I am especially grateful to Dr. Ray J. Bryan and Dr. Larry H. Ebberts, my major professors, for their advices and guidances during the preparation of this dissertation. I would like to thank Dr. Milton D. Brown for his help in guiding my graduate career through the last stormy year of my graduate study.

I would like to thank Dr. Leonard G. Smith, Dr. Richard D. Warren, and Dr. Leslie D. Wilcox for serving on my advisory committee and providing helpful comments.

I also wish to express my thanks to Prof. Richard Wright who helped correcting the grammatical errors in the first draft.

Appreciation is expressed to those of my colleagues at the College of Social Sciences of Kasetsart University, Bangkok, Thailand who participated in the pretest for their valuable comments. Acknowledgement is also extended to Thai alumni of Iowa State University for their cooperation during the data gathering process.

Finally, I wish to express my appreciation to my son, Sasatra, for his love and understanding, and my husband, Sophon, for his encouragement and untiring support during my graduate study.

APPENDIX A: COVER LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE
(English Version)

Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Faculty of Social Sciences
Kasetsart University, Bangkok
Bangkok

Dear

I am one of the faculty members in Kasetsart University and now working on my dissertation entitled "An Analysis of the Uses of Educated and Trained Thai Returnees who Attended Iowa State University". It is a case study limited to only Iowa State University's Thai alumni. This project is being carried out as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for my doctoral degree, which is conducted under general supervision of Dr. Ray Bryan of Iowa State University.

The findings of this research could be useful for agencies responsible for planning and implementing programs for foreign students, particularly Thai students at Iowa State University. It will also be useful in helping prospective students plan their programs wisely so that they can utilize their knowledge and skills fully for their own benefit, and for the country as a whole.

The success of this research depends upon your participation. It will take you approximately 45 minutes or so to complete this questionnaire. After completing, please return it in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed enveloped by . Please be assured that your answers will be held in the strictest confidence. This commitment is absolute.

Because your answers are such a crucial part of the project, I will certainly appreciate your contribution and effort.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) Saovakon Sudsawasd

QUESTIONNAIRE

Section I - General Information

This first section of the questionnaire consists of questions about your background information in general. You are to select one answer only to each question. Please answer the following questions by placing a check mark (✓) and/or writing your response in the blank.

1. Your sex:

Female

Male

2. Your age:

Under 25

age 25-35

age 36-45

age 46-55

age 56-60

age 61 or above

3. Your marital status when left for the United States:

Married

Not married (single, widowed, divorced)

4. Your current highest educational level:

Below high school graduate

High school certificate or diploma

high school certificate plus formal training
other than college

Associate degree

Associate degree plus several undergraduate courses

Bachelor's degree

Bachelor's degree plus several graduate courses

Master's degree

Doctoral degree

5. Your main job before going to the United States was _____

6. Was it the same job as the one you studied or were trained for in the US?

Yes

No

7. Your position held when you left for the US:

8. Your present job and position:

<u>Type of Job</u>	Position Held
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

9. Your present occupation:

Civil servant
 Other (specify) _____

7. Program and courses planning in the US institution were selected by:
- Yourself
 - Your academic advisor
 - Your sponsor (other than government)
 - Your government
 - Other (specify) _____
8. While in school, how often did you contact with your advisor?
- Always
 - Often
 - Sometimes
 - Occasionally
 - None
- If response is none, skip to question # 10
9. Did you have as much help from your advisor as you needed?
- Yes
 - No
10. While concentrating your work toward a degree, were you able to take other courses that might have been more valuable?
- Yes
 - No
- If response is yes, please specify _____
11. Did you write thesis or creative component?
- Yes
 - No
- If response is no, skip to question # 14, page 6
12. Where did you write thesis or creative component?
- In the US
 - In Thailand
 - Other (specify) _____
13. Was your thesis or crative component related to Thailand?
- Yes
 - No
14. Do you think your thesis or crative component topic relevant to the needs of your country?
- Yes
 - No

Part II - b. If you were trained in the United States, please respond by placing a check mark (✓) or supplying the appropriate information in the blank.

1. While you were under the training program, did you attend other schools, colleges and universities?
 Yes
 No

2. Please indicate names of schools, colleges or universities that you attended and the length of time at each place.

Names of institutions	Length of time spent
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

3. In attending institutions listed on question # 2, what type of student status did you have?
 A regular student
 A special student
 A member of a group
4. Did you receive a degree or diploma?
 Yes
 No
5. Who paid for your trip and your expenses in the US?
 Solely from personal savings or parents
 Solely from foreign organization
 Solely from my government
 Other (specify) _____
6. Were you or your supervisor involved in planning your training program?
 Yes
 No
7. How satisfied were you in your involvement (in question # 6)?
 Very satisfied
 Satisfied
 Neutral
 Dissatisfied
 Very dussatusfied

8. Please indicate criteria used for program planning:
- Relevant to previous work and background
 - Relevant to application in home country
 - Other (specify) _____
 - Don't know
9. Do you think the length of your training program was:
- Too long
 - Just about right
 - Too short
- If response is too long or too short, what length do you think that would have been suitable? _____
10. With regards to social activities, which of the following would you answer?
- Too many, there should be less in _____
 - Just about right
 - Too few, there should be more in _____
11. What type of activities (in question # 10) would you like most _____ and/or less _____
12. At the end of your program, have you ever attended the seminar in communication?
- Yes
 - No
- If response is no, skip to question # 14.
13. Did you incorporate in your work some of the things or ideas obtained from the seminar?
- Yes, please specify _____
 - No, why not _____
14. What were some special aspects in your field in which you hoped to gain knowledge or skills in the US?
- _____
15. Many Thai students indicate that it takes them time to adjust to the American system of instruction. How long were you in the United States before you got a feeling that you were able to grasp most of the lectures and feel at home in classes?
- _____ Years _____ Months
16. Have you completed your program prior to your return to Thailand?
- Yes
 - No
- If response is no, why? _____

17. If you had a chance to do it over again, would you have chosen the same institution?

- Yes
- No

If response is no, why? _____

18. Would you have taken the same program of courses that you had before (in question # 17)?

- Yess
- No

If response is no, what would you like to take? _____

19. In considering the background and experience which you had at the time, how would you rate the program in general?

- Very difficult
- Difficult
- Adequate
- Easy
- Very easy

20. There are probably some other aspects which are not covered in this questionnaire about educational/training program for Thai students in the United States that you would like to comment on. Any remarks or comments you wish to make would be appreciated.

Part II - General Experiences

If you studied or were trained in the United States, please respond by placing a check mark (✓) or supplying appropriate information in the blank for the following questions:

1. While you were in the United States, to what extent did you spend your spare time for personal interest?

<input type="checkbox"/> to a very great extent	<input type="checkbox"/> to a little extent
<input type="checkbox"/> to a great extent	<input type="checkbox"/> to a very little extent
<input type="checkbox"/> to some extent	

2. Have you ever been invited to visit any American families during your educational/training period?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No

If response is yes, how did you feel about your visit?

<input type="checkbox"/> Liked very much
<input type="checkbox"/> Rather liked
<input type="checkbox"/> Did not like
<input type="checkbox"/> Neutral

3. How much traveling did you do outside of the place where you were studying or trained?

<input type="checkbox"/> Quite a lot
<input type="checkbox"/> A few
<input type="checkbox"/> Not at all

4. Would you like to have done some more traveling?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No

If response is yes, what were the main reasons hindering from such traveling plans? _____

5. Did you have as many American friends as you would have liked?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No

If response is no, why not? _____

6. Did you have friends of other nationalities?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No

7. How much chance did you have to observe any other institutions or schools connected with your specialized field other than the one you attended?

<input type="checkbox"/> Quite a few
<input type="checkbox"/> One or two
<input type="checkbox"/> None at all

8. Were there any other things you would have liked to observe or do in the United States?

Yes

No

If response is yes, what? _____

9. How often did you happen to participate in any student activities on campus?

Always

Often

Occasionally

10. Would you like to have participated more than you had in student activities (in question # 9)?

Yes

No

If response is no, why not? _____

11. How did you feel about the amount of leisure time you had outside your study/training program?

Too much

Enough or sufficient time

Too little

Section III - After your return from the United States.

Please respond to the following questions by placing a check mark (✓) or completing the blank with the appropriate information.

1. How long has it been since your return from the US?
 - 6 months to almost one year
 - 1 year to almost 2 years
 - 2 years to almost 3 years
 - 3 years to almost 4 years
 - 4 years to almost 5 years
 - 5 years and over

2. Since you returned from the educational/training programs, have there been any periods when you were not employed?
 - Yes, never had a job since return
 - Yes, given period
 - No

If response is no, skip to question # 4.

3. Do you think that your unemployment was consequential to your going abroad for the educational/training programs?
 - Yes
 - No

4. Is the job you were assigned after your return the same as the one you were assigned before?
 - Yes
 - No

5. Is this the job you expected to have following your return?
 - Yes
 - No

6. Is your current position the same as the one when you just returned?
 - Yes
 - No

If no, what is the difference? _____

7. As an added qualification to your present job, how do you feel about the important of the program?
 - Essential
 - Very important
 - Helpful but not very important
 - Not useful
 - Better off without it

8. Suppose that you had not taken the educational program, how do you think you could perform your current tasks?
- Better
 - Good
 - Poor
9. How do you think the educational/training program prepared you for your current job?
- Very much
 - Quite a lot
 - Some
 - A little
 - None at all
10. In talking about the knowledge and some aspects acquired from the educational program, have you ever been able to use any of the knowledge or skills that you learned on the program?
- Yes
 - No
- If response is no, skip to question # 12.
11. Could you say how much it is used (in question # 10)?
- Nearly all
 - Quite a lot
 - Some
 - A little
12. Do you have any plans to make your knowledge from the educational program (in question # 10) useful but have not had the opportunity to do so?
- Yes
 - No
- If response is yes, why do you put it off? _____
13. Does your immediate supervisor or superior help you to apply the knowledge you acquired (in question # 10) usefully?
- Does considerably
 - Yes, to some extent
 - Not at all
 - Indifferently, not even interested
 - Other (specify) _____
14. Is there anyone working with you who has been trained abroad?
- Yes
 - No
- If response is no, skip to question # 16. If yes, is he or she your colleague? supervisor?

15. Do you work in an organizational setting in which others (majority) have been trained abroad?
 Yes
 No

16. Have you ever passed on to others the knowledge and skills you have obtained from the educational program?
 Yes
 No

If response is no, skip to question # 18

If response is yes, how much knowledge and other things acquired from the program have you passed on to others?

- Almost all or all
 A lot
 Some
 A little
 None

17. By what means have you done this? (check all that apply):
 By formal training program or lecture
 By informal discussion in personal dealing with colleagues
 Other (specify) _____

18. How is the availability of facility in your work organization?
 Adequacy
 Inadequacy
 Other (specify) _____

- 18a. What are major difficulties or barriers in using knowledge and other aspects acquired from the educational program?

- Lacking of facilities
 Lacking of fund supported
 General conditions (government, society, etc.) not amenable
 Top leadership uncooperative and/or resistance to new ideas
 Lacking of trained staff
 Supervisor unhelpful and/or unsympathetic
 Lacking authority to use or apply
 Program substance too different or too advanced for local use
 Having gained nothing useful for application

19. Have you ever made any contacts with you advisor or professors in the United States after your return?
 Yes
 No

If response is yes, how often do you keep in touch with him or her?

- Always
 Sometimes
 Occasionally
 None at all

20. Have you ever asked for any assistance from him or her (in question # 19)?

- Yes
 No

If response is yes, what kind of assistance have you asked for? _____

21. How often have you ever made contacts with any friends of other nationalities whom you have known in the US?

- Always
 Often
 Sometimes
 Occasionally
 Never

22. Have you ever joined any of the US professional societies during or after your educational/training program?

- Yes
 No

If response is yes, are you still remaining as a member of such US professional societies?

- Yes
 No

23. Have you ever received any professional publications from the US?

- Yes
 No

If no, skip to question # 25

24. How useful are these publications (in question # 23) to you?

- Very much
 Quite useful
 Not so much

25. Suppose you were to begin your educational program all over again, what, in general, do you think must be improved in order to be more useful to you? And why?
-
-

26. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions to make in connection with your program?
-
-
27. Following your return to work, have you carried out any pieces of work which were considered notably outstanding?
 Yes
 No
If response is no, skip to question # 31
28. To what extent have you used some of those being acquired from the program (in question # 27)?
 To a very great extent
 To a great extent
 To some extent
 To a little extent
 To a very little extent
29. What type of such uses (in question # 27)?
(Check all that apply)
 Planning
 Problem solving
 Decision making
 Research/publication
 Other (specify) _____
30. Is your performance listed on the Question # 27 a part of your current job assignment?
 Yes
 No
31. Have you ever performed other tasks (besides those listed on the Question # 27) in an area related to your program after your return?
 Yes
 No
32. Have you planned for further use of your knowledge and other things acquired from your program in your present job?
 Yes
 No

33. Generally speaking, to what extent are you satisfied with your educational/training program in the US?
- To a very great extent
 - To a great extent
 - To some extent
 - To a little extent
 - To a very little extent
34. Some of the returnees who were in the United States for their educational/training programs have considered their programs as the most important aspect they have ever had; some believe that it was a purely waste of time spent; and the others compromisingly indicate that it was somewhere in between. What is your opinion about it?
- The most important aspect to me
 - Somewhere in between
 - Purely waste of time spent
35. In looking back over your whole experience in the United States, which parts would you consider as the most valuable to you? And why?
-
-

36. Please add any specific comments you may have about your US educational/training programs which are not covered above. Thank you for your help.
-
-
-

APPENDIX B: COVER LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE
(Thai Version)

ภาควิชาสังคมวิทยา-มานุษยวิทยา
คณะสังคมศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยเกษตรศาสตร์
บางเขน กรุงเทพมหานคร

เรียน ท่านที่เลขาศึกษา/อบรม ณ Iowa State University ที่เคาร์พ

ดิฉันเป็นข้าราชการในสังกัดของมหาวิทยาลัยเกษตรศาสตร์ กำลังทำการวิจัยเรื่อง "การนำเอาความรู้และทักษะที่ได้รับจากการศึกษา/อบรม ณ ต่างประเทศ มาใช้ในหน่วยงานที่สังกัด" อันเป็นการศึกษาเฉพาะกรณี คือ ศึกษาเฉพาะผู้ที่สำเร็จการศึกษา/อบรมจาก Iowa State University เพื่อประกอบการศึกษาตามระเบียบปริญญาโทที่มีผลของสถาบันดังกล่าว โดยมี Prof. Dr. Ray Bryan, เป็นผู้ควบคุมและให้คำปรึกษาในการวิจัย ผลการวิจัยนี้ วางนำมาใช้ประกอบการพิจารณาในการวางแผน, จัดโครงการเรียน/อบรมแก่นักศึกษาค้นคว้า โดยเฉพาะนักเรียนไทยใน Iowa State University เพื่อให้ นักศึกษาเหล่านี้สามารถนำเอาความรู้และทักษะที่ได้รับมาไปประโยชน์แก่ตนเองและประเทศชาติให้มากที่สุด

การวิจัยนี้จะไม่สามารถทำได้ ถ้าไม่ได้รับความร่วมมือจากท่าน จึงใคร่ขอความกรุณาจากท่านได้โปรดตอบแบบสอบถามตามความเป็นจริง โดยครบถ้วน เพื่อว่าผลที่ได้รับจากการวิจัยนี้จะ เป็นประโยชน์ต่อการศึกษา และต่อประเทศชาติมากที่สุด ท่านอาจใช้เวลาในการตอบแบบสอบถามนี้ประมาณไม่เกิน ๔๕ นาที เมื่อท่านกรอกแบบสอบถามแล้ว โปรดส่งแบบสอบถามลงในซองส่งเจ้าหน้าที่และปิดแสกมปิดไปรษณีย์ให้เรียบร้อยแล้วส่งมายังที่ฉัน ภายในวันที่

เกินนี้ด้วย ล่าตอบของท่านจะรักษาไว้เป็นความลับเฉพาะ

ดิฉันหวังเป็นอย่างยิ่งว่า คงได้รับความอนุเคราะห์จากท่านเป็นอย่างดี และขอกราบขอบพระคุณล่วงหน้า ณ โอกาสนี้

ขอแสดงความนับถืออย่างสูง

(นางสาวฉวี สุกสวัสดิ์)

แบบสอบถามเรื่องการนำเอาความรู้/ทักษะที่ได้รับจากการ
ไปศึกษา / อบรม ณ. Iowa State University ใช้ในหน่วยงานที่สังกัด

แบบสอบถามแบ่งออกเป็น ๓ ตอน

ตอนที่ ๑ สอบถามสถานภาพทั่ว ๆ ไป

ตอนที่ ๒ สอบถามการไปศึกษา/อบรม ณ. ประเทศสหรัฐอเมริกา

ตอนที่ ๓ สอบถามการนำเอาความรู้/ทักษะมาใช้ในหน่วยงานที่สังกัด

คำชี้แจงทั่ว ๆ ไป สำหรับท่านที่มีโอกาสได้ไปศึกษา / อบรม ณ. สหรัฐอเมริกา หลังจากที่ได้กลับ
จากการศึกษา/อบรม ณ. Iowa แล้ว โปรดตอบแบบสอบถาม โดยใส่ข้อมูลที่
เกี่ยวกับเหตุการณ์ที่ได้จากการศึกษา/อบรม ณ. Iowa State University เท่านั้น

ตอนที่ ๑ สถานภาพทั่ว ๆ ไป

คำถามในแบบสอบถามตอนนี้ ประกอบด้วยคำถามเกี่ยวกับภูมิหลังทั่ว ๆ ไปของท่าน
โปรดเลือกคำตอบแต่เพียงข้อเดียวต่อคำถามแต่ละคำถาม ซึ่งเกี่ยวกับตัวท่านตามความเป็นจริง
แล้วกาเครื่องหมาย (✓) หรือเติมข้อความที่เหมาะสมลงในช่องว่างที่กำหนด

๑. เพศ

() หญิง

() ชาย

๒. อายุ

() ต่ำกว่า ๒๕

() ๒๕ ถึง ๓๕

() ๓๖ ถึง ๔๕

() ๔๖ ถึง ๕๕

() ๕๖ ถึง ๖๐

() ๖๑ และมากกว่า

๓. สถานภาพทางการสมรส (ขณะที่จากประเทศไทยไปสหรัฐอเมริกา)

() แต่งงาน

() โสด (โสดยังไม่ได้แต่งงาน, หย่า, ว่าง)

๔. ระบุถึงความสูงสุดของภาระในปัจจุบัน:

- () ๑. ต่ำกว่าเตรียมอุดม
 () ๒. จบเตรียมอุดม
 () ๓. จบเตรียมอุดมและฝึกอบรวม
 () ๔. วิทยาลัย หรือเทียบเท่า
 () ๕. เรียกเกินกว่า ๓ ปี อุดมศึกษา แต่ไม่สำเร็จ
 () ๖. ปริญญาตรี
 () ๗. ปริญญาตรี และอบรม
 () ๘. ปริญญาโท
 () ๙. สูงกว่าปริญญาโท

๕. งานหลักที่ท่านทำก่อนจะไปสหรัฐอเมริกา

๖. เป็นสาขาเกี่ยวกับที่เรียนหรืออบรมที่สหรัฐอเมริกา

- () ใช่
 () ไม่ใช่

๗. ตำแหน่งงานที่ทำก่อนไปสหรัฐอเมริกา

๘. ชนิดของงาน และตำแหน่งงานในปัจจุบัน

ชนิดของงาน

ตำแหน่งงาน

๙. อาชีพปัจจุบัน

- () รับราชการ
 () อื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ)

ตอนที่ ๒. ประสพการณ์ในสหรัฐ

แบบสอบถามตอนนี้อย่างออกเป็น ๒ ส่วน คือ ประสพการณ์เกี่ยวกับการศึกษา/อบรมและ
 ประสพการณ์ทั่วไป แบบสอบถามเกี่ยวกับโครงการศึกษาได้แยกจากแบบสอบถามโครงการการ
 อบรม กล่าวคือ ผู้ที่ไปศึกษาแต่เพียงอย่างเดียว โปรดตอบแบบสอบถาม ตอนที่ ๒ ก (หน้า ๓)
 ส่วนผู้ที่ไปอบรมงานโปรดตอบแบบสอบถาม ตอนที่ ๒ ข (หน้า ๔) สำหรับผู้ที่ไปศึกษาและอบรม
 ในเวลาเดียวกัน โปรดตอบแบบสอบถามทั้ง ๒ ตอน

ประสพการณ์ในการศึกษา/อบรม

ก. ผู้ตอบคำถามตอนนี้ คือ ผู้ที่กลับจากศึกษา ณ สหรัฐอเมริกา

คำชี้แจง : โปรดกาเครื่องหมาย (✓) หรือเติมข้อความที่เหมาะสม ลงในช่องว่างที่กำหนด

๑. การเดินทางไปสหรัฐอเมริกาครั้งล่าสุด เพื่อศึกษาแต่เพียงอย่างเดียว

() ใช่

() ไม่ใช่ (โปรดตอบส่วน ข. ด้วย)

๒. ท่านได้รับปริญญาบัตร หรือประกาศนียบัตรหรือไม่

() ได้

() ไม่ได้

๓. สาขาที่ศึกษา คือ

๔. สถาบันที่ท่านศึกษา/อบรมในสหรัฐอเมริกา และระยะเวลาที่ศึกษา

ชื่อสถาบันที่ศึกษา

ระยะเวลาที่ศึกษา(ปี, เดือน)

๕. หน่วยงานและ / หรือผู้ที่ออกค่าใช้จ่ายในขณะที่ศึกษาอยู่ ณ สหรัฐอเมริกา

- () ทุนส่วนตัว
 () ทุนรัฐบาลไทย
 () ทุนต่างประเทศ
 () อื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ) _____

๖. ผู้เลือกสถาบันในการศึกษา

- () ตนเอง
 () เพื่อน
 () หน่วยงานที่ให้ทุน
 () ทุนต่างประเทศ
 () รัฐบาล หรือ หน่วยงานที่ให้ทุนในประเทศ
 () อื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ) _____

๗. การวางโครงการ การเรียนอบรมจัดทำโดย

- () ตนเอง
 () อาจารย์ที่ปรึกษา
 () ทุน (นอกเหนือจากรัฐบาล)
 () รัฐบาล
 () อื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ) _____

๘. ในขณะที่ศึกษาอยู่ ณ สหรัฐอเมริกา ท่านได้ติดต่อกับอาจารย์ที่ปรึกษาบางใหม่ มากน้อยเพียงไร

- () เคย บ่อยมากที่สุด
 () เคย บ่อยมาก
 () เคย บ่อยพอสมควร
 () เคย น้อยนัก
 () ไม่เคยปรึกษาเลย (โปรดตอบค่าตามต่อไป ข้อที่ ๑๐ หน้า ๕)

๙. อาจารย์ที่ปรึกษาได้ให้ความช่วยเหลือ

- () ตามที่ท่านคาดหวัง () ไม่เป็นไปตามคาดหวังของท่าน

๑๐. การเขียนเพื่อปรับบุคลิก หรือประกาศนียบัตรทำให้ท่านไม่อาจเลือกวิชาที่น่าจะเป็นประโยชน์
ในงานที่ท่านทำ ใช่หรือไม่
- () ใช่ (โปรดอธิบาย) _____
- () ไม่ใช่
๑๑. ท่านได้เขียนวิทยานิพนธ์ หรือ Creative Component หรือไม่
- () เขียน
- () ไม่เขียน (โปรดตอบคำถามข้อไปข้อที่ ๑๔ หน้า ๗)
๑๒. สถานที่ ๆ ท่านเขียนวิทยานิพนธ์ หรือ Creative Component คือ
- () ในสหรัฐอเมริกา
- () ในประเทศไทย
- () ในที่อื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ) _____
๑๓. วิทยานิพนธ์ หรือ Creative Component ของท่านเกี่ยวกับประเทศหรือไม่
- () เกี่ยว
- () ไม่เกี่ยว
๑๔. วิทยานิพนธ์ หรือ Creative Component ของท่านเกี่ยวกับความต้องการของ
ประเทศหรือไม่
- () เกี่ยว
- () ไม่เกี่ยว
- โปรดตอบคำถามข้อไปข้อที่ ๑๔ หน้า ๗
- ข. คำถามต่อไปนี้ สำหรับผู้ที่กลับจากการอบรม ณ ประเทศสหรัฐอเมริกา
- คำชี้แจง : โปรดกาเครื่องหมาย (✓) หรือเขียนข้อความที่เหมาะสมลงในช่องว่างที่กำหนด
๑. ในการฝึกอบรมนี้ ท่านได้เข้าศึกษาในมหาวิทยาลัย, วิทยาลัยหรือไม่
- () ศึกษา
- () ไม่ศึกษา

๒. สถาบันที่ท่านเข้ารับการอบรม และระยะเวลาที่ท่านอบรม

ชื่อสถาบันที่อบรม

ระยะเวลา (ปี, เดือน)

๓. ท่านเข้าศึกษาในสถาบันดังกล่าวในข้อ ๒ ในลักษณะของ

() นักเรียนธรรมดา

() นักเรียนพิเศษ

() เฉพาะกลุ่ม

๔. ท่านได้รับปริญญาบัตร หรือประกาศนียบัตรหรือไม่

() ได้

() ไม่ได้

๕. หน่วยงานหรือบุคคลที่ออกค่าใช้จ่ายในการฝึกอบรม

() ตนเอง, หรือพ่อแม่, หรือญาติ

() ทุนต่างประเทศ

() ทุนรัฐบาล

() อื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ) _____

๖. ท่านหรือผู้บังคับบัญชาโดยตรงของท่าน ได้มีส่วนร่วมในการวางโครงการอบรมหรือไม่

() มีส่วน

() ไม่มีส่วน (โปรดตอบคำถามต่อไป ข้อที่ ๑๐)

๗. ถ้าท่านได้มีส่วนร่วมในการวางโครงการอบรมดังกล่าวในข้อ ๖ ท่านพอใจกับการมีส่วนร่วมนี้เพียง

() พอใจมาก

() เฉย ๆ

() ไม่พอใจมาก

() พอใจ

() ไม่พอใจ

๘. วัตถุประสงค์หลักหรือมาตรการที่ใช้ในการวางแผนโครงการอบรมดังกล่าว คือ

- () ความเกี่ยวข้องกับงานที่ทำอยู่ก่อน หรือภูมิหลัง
- () การนำมาใช้
- () อื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ)
- () ไม่ทราบ

๙. ระยะเวลาในการฝึกอบรม

- () ยาวไป เวลาที่คิดว่าเหมาะสมคือ _____ ปี _____ เดือน
- () พอคิ
- () สั้นไป เวลาที่คิดว่าเหมาะสม คือ _____ ปี _____ เดือน

๑๐. เกี่ยวกับกิจกรรมทางสังคม ท่านคิดว่าโครงการอบรมได้จัดไว้

- () มากเกินไป กิจกรรมที่ควรลด คือ _____
- () พอคิ
- () น้อยเกินไป กิจกรรมที่ควรเพิ่ม คือ _____

๑๑. กิจกรรมใดที่ท่านชอบมากที่สุด _____

และ / หรือ กิจกรรมใดที่ท่านชอบน้อยที่สุด _____

๑๒. ท่านได้มีโอกาสเข้าร่วมสัมมนา (Seminar in Communication) บ้างไหม

- () มีโอกาส
- () ไม่มีโอกาส (โปรดตอบคำถามต่อไป ข้อที่ ๑๔)

๑๓. ท่านได้นำแนวความคิดที่ได้รับจากสัมมนาไว้ในงานที่ท่านทำอยู่หรือไม่

- () ใช่ โปรดระบุว่า ใช้อย่างไร ในรูปไหน _____
- () ไม่ใช่ สาเหตุที่ไม่ได้ใช้ _____

๑๔. ยังมีความรู้ หรือความชำนาญอื่น ๆ อีกบ้างไหมเกี่ยวกับการศึกษา/อบรมของท่าน ที่ท่านต้องการ
จะได้รับ ถ้ามีโปรดระบุว่าเป็นความรู้ ความชำนาญอะไร

๑๕. มีนักเรียนไทยหลายคนกล่าวว่าใช้เวลาในการปรับตัวให้เข้ากับระบบการเรียนการสอนหรือการบรรยายในอเมริกาพอสมควร ท่านใช้เวลาานเท่าไรที่จะทำให้ท่านตามทัน (grasp) คือสามารถติดตามการบรรยาย ได้เหมือนกับเรียนในเมืองไทย

_____ ปี _____ เดือน _____ สัปดาห์

๑๖. ท่านสำเร็จการศึกษา/อบรมตามโครงการหรือไม่

() สำเร็จ

() ไม่สำเร็จ สาเหตุที่ไม่สำเร็จ _____

๑๗. ถ้าท่านมีโอกาสได้ไปอบรมหรือศึกษาอีกครั้งหนึ่ง ท่านคิดว่าท่านจะเลือกสถาบันใดใหม่

() เลือก

() ไม่เลือก สาเหตุที่ไม่เลือก _____

๑๘. ถ้าท่านมีโอกาสอีกครั้งกล่าว (ในข้อ ๑๗) ท่านจะเลือกโครงการการศึกษา/อบรมแบบเดิมหรือวิชาเหมือนเดิมหรือไม่

() เลือก

() ไม่เลือก สิ่งที่แตกต่างไปจากเดิมที่ท่านต้องการคือ _____

๑๙. พิจารณาจากภูมิหลัง และประสบการณ์ของท่านในขณะนั้น ท่านคิดว่าโครงการที่ท่านได้อบรมและศึกษานั้น

() ยากมาก

() ยาก

() ไม่ยาก - ไม่ง่าย

() ง่าย

() ง่ายมาก

๒๐. อาจมีบางคำถามที่ไม่ครอบคลุมเกี่ยวกับการศึกษาและอบรมนักเรียนไทยในต่างประเทศ ซึ่งท่านอยากจะเพิ่มเติม หรือให้คำแนะนำ ข้อคิดเห็นใด ๆ ที่ท่านให้ จะเป็นประโยชน์ต่อการวิจัยนี้

ประสบการณ์ต่าง ๆ ไป คำถามตอนนี้และตอนต่อ ๆ ไป สำหรับผู้ที่กลับจากการศึกษาและ / หรือ
อบรม ณ ประเทศสหรัฐอเมริกา

คำชี้แจง : โปรดกาเครื่องหมาย (✓) หรือเติมข้อความที่เหมาะสม ลงในช่องว่างที่กำหนด

๑. ขณะที่ท่านศึกษา/อบรมอยู่ ณ สหรัฐอเมริกา ท่านมีเวลาสำหรับความสนใจส่วนตัว
(personal interest) หรือไม่ มากน้อยเพียงไร

() มี มากที่สุด

() มี มาก

() มี พอประมาณ

() มี น้อย

() ไม่มีเลย

๒. ท่านเคยได้รับเชิญไปเยี่ยมบ้านของชาวอเมริกัน ในขณะที่ท่านอยู่ ณ สหรัฐอเมริกา
หรือไม่

() เคย

() ไม่เคย

ถ้าเคย ท่านมีความรู้สึกต่อการไปเยี่ยมนั้นอย่างไร

() ชอบมาก

() ชอบ

() ไม่ชอบ

() เฉย ๆ

๓. ท่านมีโอกาสเดินทางไปต่าง ๆ นอกเหนือจากที่ ๆ ท่านได้ศึกษา/อบรม บ้างไหม
มากน้อยเพียงไร

() เคย บ่อย ๆ

() เคย บ้าง

() ไม่เคย ไปที่อื่นเลย

๔. ท่านต้องการได้มีโอกาสเดินทางไปที่อื่น ๆ ในข้อ ๓ มากกว่าที่เคยในอดีตไหม
- () ต้องการ สาเหตุที่ไม่ได้เดินทางให้มากตามที่ต้องการ _____
- () ไม่ต้องการ
๕. ท่านมีเพื่อนชาวอเมริกันมากเท่าที่ต้องการไหม
- () มีเท่าที่ต้องการ
- () มี ไม่มากเท่าที่ต้องการ เพราะ _____
- () ไม่มี และไม่ต้องการ
๖. ท่านมีเพื่อนต่างชาติ (ยกเว้นอเมริกัน) หรือไม่
- () มี
- () ไม่มี
๗. ท่านได้มีโอกาสไปสังเกต (observe) สถาบันอื่น ๆ เกี่ยวกับสาขาวิชาที่ท่านศึกษา/อบรม นอกเหนือจากสถาบันเดิมหรือไม่ น้อยเพียงไร
- () เคย มากกว่า ๒-๓ ครั้ง
- () เคย เพียงครั้ง หรือ ๒ ครั้ง
- () ไม่เคยเลย
๘. ยังมีสิ่งอื่นอีกบ้างไหม นอกเหนือจาก สาขาวิชาศึกษา/อบรม ที่ท่านอยากสังเกต หรือทำ ในขณะที่อยู่ในสหรัฐอเมริกา แต่ไม่มีโอกาสได้ทำ
- () มี (ไประบุ) _____
- () ไม่มี
๙. ท่านได้มีโอกาสร่วมกิจกรรมของนักศึกษาบ้างไหม น้อยเพียงไร
- () เคย ไม่ค่อย
- () เคย น้อย ๆ
- () เคย ไม่ค่อยนัก

๑๐. ท่านต้องการมีส่วนร่วมกับกิจกรรมของนักศึกษา ในข้อ ๕ มากกว่าที่ท่านเคยในอดีตไหม

() ต้องการ

() ไม่ต้องการ สาเหตุที่ไม่ต้องการ _____

๑๑. ท่านรู้สึกอย่างไรต่อเวลาว่าง นอกเหนือจากการศึกษา/อบรม

() มากเกินไป

() พอใช้

() น้อยเกินไป

ตอนที่ ๓ การนำเอาความรู้/ทักษะมาใช้ภายหลังจากกลับการศึกษา/อบรมในสหรัฐอเมริกา

คำชี้แจง : โปรดกาเครื่องหมาย (✓) หรือเขียนข้อความที่เหมาะสมสำหรับข้อความต่อไปนี้

๑. ท่านได้กลับจากการศึกษา/อบรมมานาน

() ๖ เดือน ถึง เกือบ ๑ ปี

() ๑ ปี " — " ๒ ปี

() ๒ ปี " — " ๓ ปี

() ๓ ปี " — " ๔ ปี

() ๔ ปี " — " ๕ ปี

() ๕ ปี หรือมากกว่า

๒. หลังจากการศึกษา/อบรมดังกล่าว ท่านเคยว่างงานตอนไหนบ้าง

() ว่างงานตั้งแต่นั้นมา

() ว่างงานเป็นครั้งคราว

() ไม่เคยว่างงานเลย (โปรดตอบคำถามต่อไป ข้อที่ ๔)

๓. ท่านคิดว่าการว่างงานดังกล่าวนี้เป็นผลสืบเนื่องจากการไปศึกษา/อบรมต่างประเทศใช่ไหม

() ใช่

() ไม่ใช่

๔. ชนิดของงานที่ท่านทำก่อนจากไปอเมริกาและชนิดของงานที่ท่านทำภายหลังกลับจากสหรัฐอเมริกา
- () เหมือนกัน
- () ไม่เหมือน
๕. งานที่ท่านทำอยู่ปัจจุบันนี้ เป็นงานที่ท่านหวังจะเลิกทำหลังจากกลับจากสหรัฐอเมริกาใช่ไหม
- () ใช่
- () ไม่ใช่
๖. ตำแหน่งงานปัจจุบันของท่านกับตำแหน่งที่ท่านทำภายหลังกลับจากสหรัฐอเมริกาถึงเมืองไทย
- () เหมือนกัน
- () ไม่เหมือน แตกต่างกันคือ _____
๗. โครงการการศึกษา/ฝึกอบรมของท่านจำเป็นต่องานปัจจุบันของท่านอย่างไร
- () จำเป็น
- () สำคัญมาก
- () ช่วยบ้างแต่ไม่สำคัญเท่าไรนัก
- () ไม่สำคัญ
- () ทำได้ก็ทำโดยไม่ได้ศึกษา/อบรม
๘. สมมติว่าท่านไม่ได้ศึกษา/อบรม ท่านคิดว่าท่านจะหางานในตำแหน่งที่คล้ายอยู่ในปัจจุบันได้ไหม
- () ได้ดีกว่า
- () ได้พอๆ
- () ไม่ได้เท่า
๙. การศึกษา/อบรม ณ ประเทศสหรัฐอเมริกา ได้เตรียมท่านสำหรับงานปัจจุบันอย่างไรบ้าง
- () มากที่สุด
- () มาก

- () หอควร
 () นอย
 () ไม่ใกล้เคียงเลย
๑๐. ท่านให้นำเอาความรู้และสิ่งต่าง ๆ ที่ท่านได้รับจากการศึกษา/อบรมมาใช้ในงานของท่านใหม่
 () ใช่
 () ไม่ใช่ (โปรดตอบคำถามต่อไป ข้อ ๑๑)
๑๑. ท่านได้ใช้ความรู้และสิ่งต่าง ๆ ในข้อ ๑๐ ในงานของท่านแค่ไหน
 () เกือบทั้งหมด
 () มาก
 () บ้าง
 () เล็กน้อย
๑๒. ท่านเคยมีโครงการที่จะนำความรู้และสิ่งต่าง ๆ ในข้อ ๑๐ มาใช้ แต่ไม่มีโอกาสได้ใช้
 บ้างไหม
 () เคย สาเหตุที่ไม่ได้ใช้ _____
 () ไม่เคย
๑๓. หัวหน้าท่านได้ให้ความช่วยเหลือในการนำเอาความรู้และสิ่งต่าง ๆ ในข้อ ๑๐ มาใช้ใน
 งานปัจจุบัน มากน้อยแค่ไหน
 () มาก
 () บ้าง
 () ไม่ค่อยเลย
 () ไม่แน่แท้จะสนใจ
 () ไม่มีหัวหน้า

๑๔. มีผู้ทำงานร่วมกับท่านเคยได้รับการศึกษา/อบรมจากต่างประเทศไหม
- () มี
- () ไม่มี (โปรดตอบคำถามต่อไป ข้อ ๑๖)
๑๕. เพื่อนร่วมงานส่วนไหนที่ได้รับการศึกษา/อบรมต่างประเทศใช้หรือไม่
- () ใช่
- () ไม่ใช่
๑๖. ท่านได้เคยถ่ายทอดความรู้ และสิ่งอื่น ๆ ที่ท่านได้รับจากการศึกษาอบรมแก่ผู้อื่นใหม่
 มากน้อยเพียงไร
- () เคย เก็บรวบรวม () เคยบ้างพอสมควร
- () เคยมาก () เคยเล็กน้อย
- () ไม่เคยเลย (โปรดตอบคำถามต่อไปข้อที่ ๑๘)
๑๗. ท่านถ่ายทอดความรู้ดังกล่าวโดยวิธีไหนบ้าง
- () การอบรมหรือ การบรรยาย
- () การอภิปรายอย่างไม่เป็นทางการ หรือ อภิปรายกับเพื่อน ๆ
- () อื่น ๆ เช่น _____
๑๘. อุปสรรคในการนำความรู้ และอื่น ๆ ที่ได้จากการศึกษา อบรมมาใช้ คือ
- () ขาดเครื่องมือเครื่องมือนำ
- () ขาดเงิน
- () สถานภาพทั่วไป (เช่น รัฐบาล, สังคม) ไม่เอื้ออำนวย
- () ผู้ใหญ่ไม่ให้ความร่วมมือ หรือไม่ยอมรับสิ่งเปลี่ยนแปลงใหม่ ๆ
- () ผู้เกี่ยวข้องหรือเพื่อนร่วมงานขาดความพร้อมทางค่านนั้น ๆ
- () ทัศนคติโดยวางใจช่วยเหลือ, เห็นใจ
- () ไม่มีอำนาจในการใช้
- () ไม่มีเวลาพอ
- () โครงการศึกษา/อบรมส่วนมากต่างไปจากงานที่ทำ หรือก้าวหน้า
 เกินกว่าที่จะทำได้ใช้ในขณะนี้
- () ไม่เคยเรียนรู้วิธีที่เป็นประโยชน์

๑๙. ตั้งแต่ท่านกลับมา ท่านได้เคยติดต่อกับอาจารย์ที่ปรึกษาข้างใหม่ มากน้อยเพียงไร
- () เคย สม่่าเสมอ
- () เคย บางครั้งบางครั้ง
- () เคย นาน ๆ ครั้ง
- () ไม่เคย
๒๐. ตั้งแต่กลับมา ท่านเคยขอความช่วยเหลือจากอาจารย์ที่ปรึกษาข้างใหม่
- () เคย ชนิดของความช่วยเหลือ _____
- () ไม่เคย
๒๑. ปัจจุบันท่านได้ติดต่อกับเพื่อน ๆ ต่างชาติ ที่ท่านได้รู้จัก ณ สหรัฐอเมริกาข้างใหม่ มากน้อยเพียงไร
- () เคย บ่อยมาก () เคย ไม่บ่อยนัก
- () เคย บ่อย ๆ () ไม่เคยเลย
- () เคย บ่อยพอสมควร
๒๒. ปัจจุบัน ท่านเป็นสมาชิกของสมาคมเกี่ยวกับวิชาการ-วิชาชีพของท่านในอเมริกาข้างใหม่
- () เป็น
- () ไม่เป็น
๒๓. ปัจจุบัน ท่านได้บอกรับเป็นสมาชิกหนังสือหรือสิ่งตีพิมพ์ทาง วิชาการจากอเมริกาใหม่
- () รับ
- () ไม่ได้รับ (โปรดตอบคำถามต่อไป ข้อ ๒๔)
๒๔. หนังสือและสิ่งตีพิมพ์ดังกล่าว (ข้อ ๒๓) เป็นประโยชน์แก่ท่านแค่ไหน
- () เป็นประโยชน์มากที่สุด
- () เป็นประโยชน์มาก
- () ไม่มากนัก
๒๕. ถ้าท่านต้องเริ่มโครงการศึกษา/อบรมใหม่ทั้งหมด ท่านคิดว่าจะแก้ไขโครงการเดิมอย่างไรบ้าง เพื่อที่จะได้นำความรู้และทักษะมาใช้ให้เป็นประโยชน์มากที่สุด
-

๒๖. ท่านมีข้อเสนอแนะ หรือ ข้อคิดอย่างไรบ้าง เกี่ยวกับโครงการเรียนหรืออบรมของท่าน

๒๗. ภายหลังจากกลับจากการศึกษา/อบรมดังกล่าว ท่านได้ทำงานที่เดิมมา ๆ ๑ หรือ ๒
ชิ้นใหม่

() เคย

() ไม่เคย (โปรดตอบคำถามต่อไป ข้อ ๓๑)

๒๘. งานชิ้นดังกล่าวในข้อ ๒๗ ได้ใช้ความรู้หรืออื่น ๆ ที่ได้รับจากการศึกษาอบรมใหม่มากน้อย
เพียงไร

() ใช้ มากที่สุด

() ใช้ มาก

() ใช้ พอประมาณ

() ใช้ ไม่มากนัก

() ไม่ได้ใช้

๒๙. งานชิ้นดังกล่าว เป็นงานเกี่ยวกับ

() ธารวางแผน

() การแก้ปัญหา

() การตัดสินใจ

() การวิจัย, สิ่งพิมพ์

() อื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ)

๓๐. งานชิ้นดังกล่าวได้ทำในขณะที่ทำงานในหน่วยงานปัจจุบันใช่หรือไม่

() ใช่

() ไม่ใช่

๓๑. ท่านได้ทำงานอื่น ๆ อีกบ้างไหมที่เกี่ยวกับการศึกษา/อบรมตั้งแต่ท่านกลับจากสหรัฐอเมริกา

() เคย

() ไม่เคย

๓๒. ท่านมีโครงการที่จะนำความรู้/ทักษะมาใช้ในอนาคตบ้างไหม

() มี

() ไม่มี

๓๓. โดยทั่วไปแล้ว ท่านพอใจกับเนื้อหาที่ได้จากการศึกษา/อบรมแค่ไหน

() พอใจมาก

() พอใจพอสมควร

() เฉย ๆ

() ไม่พอใจ

() ไม่พอใจเลย

๓๔. มีผู้เคยไปศึกษา/อบรมในอเมริกาเมื่อกลับมาแล้ว มีความคิดเห็นว่าโครงการดังกล่าว เป็นสิ่งที่สำคัญมาก, สำคัญปานกลาง, ไม่สำคัญเลย ท่านมีความคิดเห็นอย่างไรเกี่ยวกับโครงการศึกษา/อบรมของท่าน

() สำคัญมาก

() สำคัญปานกลาง

() ไม่สำคัญเลย

๓๕. จากประสบการณ์ของท่าน ท่านคิดว่าประสบการณ์ส่วนไหนที่ท่านได้รับในการศึกษา/อบรม
๑. ประเทศสหรัฐอเมริกาที่เป็นประโยชน์มากสำหรับท่าน และทำไมถึงคิดเช่นนั้น

๓๖. โปรดแสดงความคิดเห็นเพิ่มเติมเกี่ยวกับโครงการศึกษา/อบรม ซึ่งแบบสอบถามนี้ไม่ได้ครอบคลุมถึง และขอขอบพระคุณที่ได้ให้ความร่วมมือตอบแบบสอบถาม
