A STUDY OF PERCEPTIONS TOWARD TRAINING

AMONG SELECTED MANAGERS IN BANGKOK

METROPOLITAN ADMINISTRATION

By

WARIN DECHJAREON

Bachelor of Arts
Chiengmai University
Chiengmai, Thailand
1974

Bachelor of Law
Thammasat University
Bangkok, Thailand
1983

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
December, 1986

Thesis
1986
Dogas
Cap. 2

A STUDY OF PERCEPTIONS TOWARD TRAINING

AMONG SELECTED MANAGERS IN BANGKOK

METROPOLITAN ADMINISTRATION

Thesis Approved:

Jahn F. Baird
Thesis Adviser

Garry R. Bice

William L. Venable

Norman N. Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

1263957

ii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

There were two factors that prompted this study. The
first factor was the establishment of a Training and Develop-
ment Center, Bangkok, Metropolitan Administration. The con-
struction, which began in 1984 and will be completed in 1989,
cost approximately 130 million baht ($5 million). This center
will be operated by the Training Division. The second factor
was the implementation of the Middle Management Training Pro-
gram. This program, which was implemented once a year, cost
a great deal in comparison with other programs of the Training
Division.

Training is a kind of investment and as with any other
investment, benefits are expected. In the area of training,
the benefit is the higher quality of human resources in the
organization which helps increase the organization's produc-
tivity. The more one invests in any kind of activity, the
more benefits one expects. For the Training Division, Bang-
kok Metropolitan Administration, the establishment of a
Training and Development Center and the implementation of the
Middle Management Training Program consume the major part
of the annual budget so the benefits from the investment must
be maximized as much as possible. Experts in evaluation have

proposed many evaluation models in order to compare the out-
come and the effort of the trainers. Well-known models such
as Kirkpatrick's model (1959), Brethower and Rummler's model
(1976), Shoemaker's model (1976), and many others paid more
attention to program efficiency and program effectiveness
while the program was on course or after that (follow-up).
The areas of concentration were how participants felt about
the program, how much they learned, how much they changed and
how well the program was planned. In fact, there is another
aspect of evaluation that is also important, but this kind of
evaluation is usually overlooked by the experts. This is the
evaluation of attitudes of the target clients and their super-
visors toward training.

How did the supervisors' attitudes effect the success or
failure of training programs in the organization? The answer
was that one's attitude toward participating in any kind of
activities had a more profound effect upon performance than
any other factors. Adams (1982) stated that it was a will to
do that came before an ability to do. The supervisor had many
important roles in the training process. He or she was the
trainee in many of the management courses. He or she was the
one who could help the trainer identify problems in the train-
ing needs assessment. He or she was the one who was respon-
sible in selecting his or her subordinates to join the training
program. Because of those important roles of supervisors, their
attitudes toward training is critical to the training program.
Positive attitudes mean cordial cooperation; on the contrary,

negative attitudes mean negligence or opposition. It was obvious that attitudes of the supervisors were critical to success or failure in the program even before it started.

Statement of the Problem

The specific problem which encouraged this study was the lack of information regarding attitudes of middle managers toward training programs at Bangkok Metropolitan Administration.

Need for the Study

The Bangkok Metropolitan Administration (BMA) is an organization that serves almost six million residents with various kinds of municipal services. In order to maximize the human potential of its approximately 40,000 officers, numerous training programs were designed to develop knowledge, skills and attitudes toward their jobs, in many different careers and levels, by the Training Division every year. The Middle Management Training Program was the one that had been presented every year since 1978 and was the program that consumed a lot of training resources in comparison with the others. According to the report on the program evaluation submitted to the top executives, this three month program was highly successful in regard to the reaction of the participants in the program. If this impressive result is reliable, this program had been producing almost 200 middle managers who had positive attitudes toward training and the Training Division which conducted the

program. However, there were two factors that were ques-

tionable about this assumption: Did the participants express

their positive attitude independently or were they influenced

by the environment, atmosphere, or peers? Were they still

impressed with the value of training when they got back to

their working environment? The answers to these questions

could help the trainers not only in testing the reliability

of the evaluation result but also as a clue to building up

positive images of the Training Division to its clients. The

comparison of attitudes of the middle managers who had at-

tended the Middle Management Training Program with those who

had not attended would provide pertinent information to clarify

those problems. If the participants were candidly impressed

by the program, this attitude would remain even when they were

back in the working environment. Thus, their attitudes toward

training programs would be positively stronger than those who

had not attended management training courses.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to compare perceptions

about training between those middle managers who had attended

the Middle Management Training Program and those who had not

attended.

Hypothesis

The middle managers who attended the Middle Management

Training Program had more highly positive perceptions toward

training than did the middle managers who had not attended this program.

Scope of the Study

The scope of this study was the perceptions toward training among middle managers of the Bangkok Metropolitan Administration.

Assumption

The respondents filled out the questionnaires candidly without bias regarding personal acquaintance or feeling of antagonism against any particular training officer.

Definition of Terms

1. Value of training: The benefits of training that are valuable for an individual, group, or organization in regard to development of job knowledge, job skills, and appropriate attitudes toward job.

2. Middle Managers: Managers between the first level of supervision who have management people reporting directly to them and who in turn report to the higher management level. The middle managers of the Bangkok Metropolitan Administration are the officers C.5 - C.7 (according to the personnel classification system) and are occupying managing positions.

3. Middle Management Program: A three month training program designed to develop managerial skills, knowledge, and attitudes toward job for BMA's middle managers. The programs

are offered once a year by the Training Division.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I introduced the background of the situation, the problem and the need for the study. In order to gain more details and a deeper understanding into the background and rationale for the study, the related literature is presented in Chapter II. Chapter III describes the design of the research including the population and sample, the data gathering instrument development, data collection procedure, and the methods for data analysis. The findings are presented in Chapter IV. Chapter V is the conclusion of the survey findings and recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURES

This chapter is a presentation of some literature relative to attitude, management roles in training and development, and practical training process in Bangkok Metropolitan Administration. It is divided into the following sections:

1. Definition of Attitude.

2. Attitude Formation and Attitude Change.

3. Training and Attitude.

4. Roles and Responsibility of Management in Training. and Development Process.

5. Management Training in Business Corporations.

6. Training Process of the Bangkok Metropolitan Administration (BMA).

7. The BMA's Management Training Programs.

8. Summary.

Definition of Attitude

Attitude is a popular topic among social scientists especially educators, behavioral scientists, social psychologists, and marketing surveyors. Attitude is essential in social sciences because it is the frame of reference of many social interactions. Many definitions were given to explain the meaning and components of attitude. Thurstone (1929) defined attitude as

. . . the sum-total of a man's inclinations
and feelings, prejudice or bias, preconceived
notions, ideas, fears, threats, and convic-
tions about any specific topic. (p.12)

According to Triandis (1971 - p. 2), "An attitude is an
idea charged with emotion which predisposes a class of ac-
tions to a particular class of social situations". He also
suggested they have three components:

(a) A cognitive component, that is, the idea
which is generally some category used by
humans in thinking.
(b) An affective component, that is, the emo-
tion which charges the idea.
(c) A behavioral component, that is, predispo-
sition to the action.

The definition that is more specific to this study is
that of Sorenson (1964), who defined attitude as

a particular feeling about something. It there-
fore involves a tendency to behave in a certain
way in situations which involve that something,
whether person, idea, or object. It is par-
tially rational and partially emotional and is
acquired, not inherent, in an individual (p.349).

Attitude Formation and Attitude Change

It was stated in the first part of this chapter that
attitudes have three components and are acquired, not in-
herent. This assumption is the theoretical framework of the
study. According to Rozenberg (1960), "A structure of at-
titudes is formed through the relationship between the
cognitive, affective, and behavioral component".

Measurable
Independent
 Variables

Intervening

Measurable
Dependent
Variables

```
                          ┌─────────────┐   ┌──────────────────────┐
                          │             │   │ Sympathetic          │
                          │   Affect    │───│ nervous system       │
                          │             │   │ responses verbal     │
                          │             │   │ statements of affects│
                          └─────────────┘   └──────────────────────┘
 ┌──────────────┐
 │ Stimuli      │
 │ (Individuals,│
 │ situation,   │         ┌───────────┐ ┌───────────┐ ┌──────────────────┐
 │ social issues│         │           │ │           │ │ Perceptual       │
 │ social groups│─────────│ Attitudes │─│ Cognition │─│ responses        │
 │ and other    │         │           │ │           │ │ verbal statements│
 │ attitude     │         └───────────┘ └───────────┘ │ of belief        │
 │ objects)     │                                     └──────────────────┘
 └──────────────┘
                          ┌─────────────┐   ┌──────────────────────┐
                          │             │   │ Overt actions        │
                          │  Behavior   │───│ verbal statements    │
                          │             │   │ concerning           │
                          │             │   │ behavior             │
                          └─────────────┘   └──────────────────────┘
```

Figure 1. A Schematic Conception of Attitudes

The cognitive component is formed in terms of categori-
zation and stereotype (Triandis, 1983). The term "categoriza-
tion" means that an individual set up categories for all
similar events presented to his daily life to help him
simplify those numerous events. One does this because it is
impossible for the human brain to employ all the information
coming through his life. For the term "stereotypes", it
means that an individual usually views other persons as
belonging to a certain set of characteristics, even when he
knows very little about him.

The affective component of attitudes is characterized
by the presence of positive or negative emotion (Triandis,

1971). It becomes positive or negative when it is cognitively interpreted.

The behavioral component is normally controlled by social norms. Social norms are ideas held by a group of people concerning what is correct or incorrect behavior.

Wethington (1973) noted that the development of attitude formation in one's life, through these components, is complex. It is very difficult to attribute the formation to any specific factor at a certain time. Many influences work together to bring about a particular feeling toward an object that is termed as attitudes. During the early years of life, an infant learns the favorable and unfavorable attitudes toward those who satisfy or dissatisfy him. As a child, one learns to develop his attitudes in accordance with the opinions of his parents. As he grows older, he begins to have wider experiences from other people besides parents. Teachers, friends, and other primary groups influence him and his acquired attitudes. As an adult, one's occupation and responsibilities become important in the formation of his attitudes. The development of attitudes is not only a result of a maturation process. Attitudes seem to be responses learned as a result of satisfying or frustrating experiences. Sorenson (1964) stated that

> . . . If a person has a satisfying experience,
> he will develop a favorable experience toward
> the situation in which he had that experience.
> If, on the other hand, he has an unsatisfying
> experience, his attitude toward the situation
> involved in that experience will be unfavor-
> able (p.351).

This quotation is a practical foundation of this study. If a training program does satisfy an individual, his attitude toward training will be favorable. Favorable attitudes motivate cooperation, support or mentorship. On the contrary, if training programs do not satisfy the person, his attitude toward training will be unfavorable.

In the study about factors that influence the formation of attitudes, Wethington (1973) pointed out that intelligence, age, home influence, employment and unemployment, community size and location, and also group influences and majority opinions have some influence on attitudes. It is logical to assume that since these factors are influential to the formation of attitudes, if these factors change (for example, an individual grows older) his attitudes certainly change. Many studies confirm this assumption. However, there are other methods which can change a person's attitudes toward a specific objective more rapidly. As noted earlier attitudes are acquired and not inherent. An individual's attitudes can be changed by learning something new. Wethington (1973) stated that there are three pertinent methods used in changing one's attitudes toward something. Providing an acquisition of information, propaganda, and formal education or training are those methods. According to Triandis (1971), attitude change can occur by:

> . . . First changing the cognitive component (for
> example, with new information), the affective
> component (for example, by pleasant or unpleasant
> experiences in the presence of attitude object),
> or behavioral component (for example, by norm

change or legal imposition of behavioral change).
It can be changed also by presenting him with
a "fast accomplishment." When one of the com-
ponents has changed, the others are likely to
change (p. 143).

Training and Attitudes

Sherif (1965) confirmed that

. . . there is no neutral attitude. Attitude
toward something is either positive or negative.
First of all, having an attitude means that the
individual is no longer neutral toward the refer-
ents of an attitude. He is for or against, posi-
tively inclined or negatively disposed in some
degree toward them (p.5).

In their study, Adolph and Whay (1967) noted that "an
individual's favorable or unfavorable attitudes toward the
idea of adult education may in part aid him in making a de-
cision to support or reject adult education programs. This
statement is good evidence to confirm the importance of at-
titude toward training which is a kind of adult education.
Before using training as a method to change a trainee's
attitudes toward something, attitudes of the trainee and his
management must be understood. Generally, participants and
managements attitudes toward training evolve with the pro-
gram in three parts: before training, during training, and
after training. However, most of the evaluation experts
seemed to pay attention to the attitudes of participants
during and after program implementation. Numerous reports,
articles, and other documents presented theories, models,
results, strategies, and so on in evaluating participant's
attitudes toward the particular program they attended.

Literature concerning attitudes of members of organizations toward training was scarce in publicized documents. This is different from other branches of business and education such as marketing or school survey in which many attitude surveys are conducted before a new product or program is produced.

Roles and Responsibilities of Management
in the Training Process

Top managers and line managers play important roles in the training process. Their commitments are vital to program implementation. As a staff unit responsible for providing support service to line operation, the training department has little direct authority to implement programs. Hultman (1982) pointed out that usually a decision affecting the fate of training is made by key people elsewhere in the organization and political factors limit the training manager's power. He also suggested that in order to gain and keep management commitment and support, persuasion is still the most potent tool at the training manager's disposal. If the training department can persuade top management and line managers to have favorable attitudes toward training and the training department, the frustration of seeing good training programs turned down by top executives will be alleviated.

Yeomans (1982) stated that many departments with the organization desire high-level support for their function, projects, and programs from high-level management, but

they can continue to function in its absence. Training

departments however, must have management support because

unlike other functions within the company training can

not function well without support. Top management support

enhances support from other managers. In order to clarify

this statement, Yeomans (1982) noted in his article "How

to Get Top Management Support" that

> Top management support is a continuing commitment,
> backed by words and deeds over a long period of
> time. Management truly committed to training and
> development will demonstrate that commitment by
> strong personal involvement (p. 38).

Yeomans further observes that top management support

has strong influence over line manager's attitudes.

> Management will do these things long enough over
> a continuing period of time, until managers all
> through the organization begin to believe that
> the top people seriously believe that develop-
> ing people is important and they must pay atten-
> tion to it. Top management is essential to set
> the tone and provide the resources, but it is
> the managers below that level all throughout the
> organization that make things work . . . When
> they believe top management is serious, they are
> likely to:
>
> - Become more interested in doing performance
> appraisals, on time, with some thought behind
> them.
> - Start thinking more seriously about identify-
> ing and developing back-ups.
> - Be more eager for their people to partici-
> pate in seminars, university courses, in-house
> workshops and other developmental activities,
> and even help them identify the right ones to im-
> prove performance.
> - Be more willing to let their people participate
> in developmental assignments, such as transfers
> task force membership, special projects and on-
> loan assignments. Become more receptive to
> interdepartmental transfers and promotions.
> - Begin to see training and development as part
> of their responsibilities, and not just something

somebody else takes care of in the classroom . . .
(pp. 38-39).

Hultman (1982) insists that behavior of people is a
function of their facts, beliefs, and values. He also
describes that

> A "fact" is something that can be proven with
> absolute certainty ("I've never attended a
> management training program before"), while
> "belief" is a subjective description of opinion
> ("Management Training Programs are interesting
> but they don't change behavior"). A "value"
> is a belief about what's worth pursuing in life
> ("Training isn't important to me unless it in-
> creases profits"). (p. 59).

Based on this information, we can change people's be-
havior by changing their facts, beliefs, and values using
training as a changing instrument. If this assumption is
true, managers who attend successful management training
programs must have higher feelings of commitment and support
to the training departments than those who do not attend the
programs.

Management Training in Business
Corporations

Management training has been utilized broadly in Ameri-
can business corporations. Ralphs and Stephens (1986) sur-
veyed America's top companies about the trends of human
resource development and found that 91 percent of the sur-
veyed companies have training programs for middle managers.
Olson (1986) revealed in his report about training trends
that

. . . Across companies, we uncovered a general
feeling that managerial training is more critical
to corporate success than worker training. This
applied especially to training aimed at helping
technical managers handle people, make effec-
tive presentations or better understand company
control and reward systems . . .(p. 33).

Findings from a study concerning employee training in

America, conducted by the Opinion Research Corporation and

sponsored by the American Society for Training and Develop-

ment (1986), further supports the importance of manager

training. This research found that 85 percent of the com-

panies surveyed offer supervisory skill training for their

employees and 80 percent of these companies offer management

development programs.

Training Process in Bangkok Metropolitan
Administration

Bangkok Metropolitan Administration (BMA) is the biggest

local government organization in Thailand. In 1985, (Per-

sonnel Division 1985) the BMA had 40,519 employees cate-

gorized into 147 careers. It is very common to find

Training and Development Division as a sub-structure in this

organization. According to Laird (1985), the Training and

Development Department is responsible for:

    - Training people to do their present task pro-
    perly.
    - Educating certain employers so they can assume
    greater responsibilities in the future and
    - Developing people and entire organizations for
    futures . . . sometimes for undefined and unde-
    finable futures (p.16).

Since the BMA is a very big organization, the Training

Division which is a subgroup in the Office of Under Secretary of State for Bangkok Metropolitan Administration offered many human resource development programs. These major programs are training programs in different levels and different careers are Organization Development Program (OD), Quality Circle Programs, and Top Executive Development Programs. The training process in the BMA is similar to the training process in other organizations. According to Laird (1985), training process includes the following steps:

    Step 1: Identification of Training Needs
    Step 2: Conversion of Identified Needs into
             Training Options
    Step 3: Development and Implementation of Training
    Step 4: Evaluation of Training (p. 34)

According to the traditional procedures in the BMA's Training Division, Step 1: Identification of Training Needs, is conducted by the Follow-up and Research Section. Steps 2 and 3 are carried out by the Technical Development Section and Management Development Section. The Follow-up and Research Section is also responsible for evaluation of the training in Step 4.

The Follow-up and Research Section assesses training needs from three main sources; the employees in the target careers or departments, the managers and supervisors in the departments, performance records, and requirements of top executives especially the Governor and the Under Secretary of State. After analysing the data gathered, the Follow-up and Research Section will report the needs together with analysed data to the training director for approval. The

approved needs will be sent to the Technical Development

Section and Management Development Section for curriculum

development and program design. The curriculum which is

roughly developed by the training staff will be criticized,

corrected, recommended, and approved by a curriculum cimmit-

tee consisting of subject matter experts and training officer

who is responsible for the program implementation. The

Training Director will pass the designed program, curriculum,

and budget to the Under Secretary of State for BMA for his

final decision. The approved program is implemented by the

task force comprised of training experts from the three men-

tioned sections. The Follow-up and Research Section is also

responsible for planning and implementing evaluation tech-

niques. The results will be reported directly to the

trainees and their managers, Training Officer, and top execu-

tives.

The BMA's Management Training Programs

According to the BMA's Annual Report (1985), the Train-

ing Division offered four management training programs in

1985. These programs were Supervisory Training Program,

Middle Management Training Program, Senior Management Train-

ing Program, and Top Management Annual Seminar. The BMA's

personnel management system is the Position Classification

(P.C.) System. All officers are ranked in one of a total of

eleven classes according to authority and responsibility.

Figure two illustrates the relationship of officers' class

with authority and level of responsibilities:

Class (C.)		Level of Authority and Responsibilities
1		Clerks
2		Clerks, Technicians
3		Technicians
4		First Line Supervisors
5		Head of Sections (Small)
6	Middle Management	Head of Sections (Large)
7		Head of Professional Sections or Head of Sub-Divisions
8	Senior Management	Director of Divisions
9		Deputy Director of Departments
10	Top Management	Director of Departments
11		Under Secretary of State to the BMA

Figure 2: Officers' Classification and
            Level of Authority

The 1985 Training Division Annual Report, (1985) re-
vealed that all Management Development Programs are success-
ful. The results were assessed by program evaluation ques-
tionnaires, achievement tests, and some follow-up.
Information pertaining to those programs is presented in
Figure 3.

Program	Length (Weeks)	From Year	Number of Participants in Each Session
Supervisory Training	8	1985-	30
Middle Management Training	15	1978-	30
Senior Management Training	16	1984-	20
Top Management Seminar	2 days	1976	--

Figure 3: Management Development Programs Implemented by Training Division
Note: Each program is offered once a year.

According to the evaluation results reported to the Under Secretary of State (1984-1985), these programs especially the Middle Management Training Program and Senior Management Training Program were highly successful regarding the participants' reaction. They felt that training is a valuable experience and is useful for their personal development.

Summary

Attitude toward a particular object is the framework of one's perception on that object. Positive attitude means cooperation and support to any kind of activities relative to one's favorable object. Training is a kind of activity that essentially needs commitment and support from top

management and line managers in order to implement the train-
ing programs. Since the attitudes can be changed by means
of training and education, the training managers must be aware
of these facts and take advantage by using management train-
ing programs to change management's attitudes into a favor-
able direction. This study is focused on the effects of Mid-
dle and Senior Management Training Programs on management's
attitudes toward training.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

This chapter describes the procedures used in collecting the data for the study. This study was designed to identify attitudes toward training among those middle managers in Bangkok Metropolitan Administration and also to compare the attitudes between middle managers who attended the management training program with those who had never attended the programs.

The Instrument

The instrument used in collecting data for this study is the questionnaire developed by Mr. Onyema Gilbert Nkwocha, an M.S. Candidate of Oklahoma State University. According to the developer, the "Organizational Training Support Inventory" was developed by using the Delphi methodology. The instrument is divided into four forms for responses by top executives, trainees, managers and supervisor, and training director, respectively.

The inventory focuses on three components of training support in organizations, structural support, behavioral support, and perceptual support. Some items on the inventory were identified as reflecting more than one kind of support.

Selection of the Questionnaire

The researcher selected the inventory form for managers and supervisors for this study. This format consists of 47 questions about training support. Among 47 questions about training support, there are 19 questions that deal with perceptual support, and 31 questions that deal with behavioral support. The total number of questions based on the inventory exceeds 47 because some questions concern more than one factor.

Questionnaire Administration

The questionnaire was then translated into the Thai language with some recommendations about wording from the former Head of the Organization Development Section, Training Division, BMA. After correcting some vague wordings, the questionnaires were printed and mailed to the target population by the trainers in Training Division, BMA, during September 15-30, 1986.

Statistical Treatment and Analysis of Data

The five point rating scale was used in the questionnaire to assess the attitudes toward training of these middle managers. The interpretation of the rating scale was:

1. None or never

2. Very little

3. Sometimes

4. Usually

5. Always

The mean and percentage were used to identify trends of their attitudes and also the "t-test" statistic was employed to compare the differences between these two groups of population.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

Introduction

This study was designed to determine and compare the
attitudes toward the value of training and perceptions about
training programs implemented by the Training Division between
the middle managers who had and had not attended Middle Manage-
ment Training Programs. This chapter presents the findings
of the study by comparing the means of questionnaire items
related to perceptions about training using the "t-test value
to find out the significant differences. Subjects were asked
three demographic questions and 47 questions which are about
training supports in the Bangkok Metropolitan Administration.
Responses to those 47 questions were presented in Table I
(Responses From Those Who Attended Management Training Programs)
and Table II (Responses From Those Who Never Attended Manage-
ment Training Programs) in terms of number of responses, per-
centage, and mean of responses to each question. A comparison
of the mean scores by both groups, for each item, along with
statistical analysis information is provided in Table III.

Response Rate

Questionnaires were distributed to 125 middle managers

25

who attended Middle Management Training Programs from 1981 to 1985. The same questionnaire was also distributed to 100 middle managers who never attended Management Training Programs. All of these middle managers are the incumbents of managerial positions in Bangkok Metropolitan Administration. Seventy-five (or 60 percent) of the middle managers who attended Management Training Programs responded and 55 (or 55 percent) of the middle managers who never attended any kind of Management Training Program responded. One factor that may have caused the response rate to be lower than was expected might be the length of the questionnaire (6 pages). The questionnaire was longer when translated into Thai language. In order to keep the original meaning of the questions, some were translated with long explanations to make sure that the respondents would not misunderstand the original meaning.

Presentation of Responses by Middle
Managers Who Attended Management
Training Program

The number, percentage, and mean of responses for each question by this group of middle managers is presented in Table I. The items are listed in Appendix A.

TABLE I

RESPONSES TO INSTRUMENT BY MIDDLE
MANAGERS WHO ATTENDED MANAGEMENT
TRAINING PROGRAM (N=78)

Questionnaire Item Number	Never		Very Little		Sometimes		Usually		Always		Mean
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
1	7	8.97	26	33.33	42	53.85	3	3.85	–	–	2.53
2*	–	–	16	20.51	37	47.44	21	26.92	4	5.13	3.17
3	4	5.13	31	39.74	29	37.18	10	12.82	4	5.13	2.73
4*	–	–	12	15.38	37	47.44	23	29.49	6	7.69	3.30
5*	–	–	14	17.95	33	42.31	23	29.49	8	10.66	3.32
6*	1	1.28	8	11.54	28	35.90	26	33.33	15	19.23	3.59
7*	1	1.28	5	6.60	18	23.08	30	38.46	24	30.77	3.91
8	1	1.28	32	41.03	28	35.90	9	11.54	8	10.20	1.97
9	–	–	9	11.54	37	47.33	22	28.21	10	12.82	3.42
10	2	2.56	15	19.23	37	47.44	18	23.08	6	7.69	3.14
11	–	–	12	15.38	9	11.54	28	35.90	29	37.18	3.95
12*	9	11.54	29	37.18	33	42.31	6	7.69	1	1.28	2.50
13	–	–	5	6.40	27	34.62	30	38.46	16	20.51	3.73
14*	1	1.28	5	6.40	22	28.27	33	42.31	17	21.29	3.77
15	35	44.87	14	17.95	15	19.27	9	11.54	5	6.41	2.17
16	13	16.67	19	24.36	11	26.92	12	15.38	13	16.87	2.91
17	12	15.38	21	26.92	25	32.05	9	11.54	11	14.10	2.82
18	3	3.85	11	14.10	31	39.74	21	26.92	12	15.38	3.36
19	6	7.69	12	15.38	26	33.33	22	28.21	12	15.38	3.47
20	–	–	14	17.94	23	29.49	26	33.33	15	19.27	3.54
21	–	–	3	3.85	29	37.18	31	39.74	15	19.23	3.74
22*	1	1.28	25	32.05	26	33.33	23	29.49	3	3.85	3.03
23	4	5/;3	36	46.15	24	30.77	11	14.10	3	3.85	2.65
24	28	35.90	24	30.77	21	26.92	3	3.85	2	2.56	2.07

TABLE I (Continued)

Questionnaire Item Number	Never N	%	Very Little N	%	Sometimes N	%	Usually N	%	Always N	%	Mean
25	12	15.38	37	47.44	21	26.92	6	7.69	2	2.56	2.35
26*	9	11.54	17	21.79	29	37.18	18	23.08	5	6.41	2.91
27*	1	1	21	26.92	29	37.18	21	26.92	7	8.97	3.18
28	1	1.28	11	14.10	25	32.05	29	37.18	12	15.38	3.51
29	-	-	21	26.92	22	28.21	30	38.46	5	6.41	3.24
30	1	1.28	24	20.77	33	42.31	16	20.51	4	5.13	2.97
31	4	5.13	21	26.92	27	34.62	23	29.49	3	.3.85	3.00
32*	1	1.28	15	19.23	27	34.62	25	32.05	10	12.82	3.36
33	7	8.97	33	42.31	29	37.18	8	10.26	1	1.28	2.53
34	17	21.79	17	21.79	23	29.49	16	17.95	7	8.97	2.71
35	1	1.28	10	12.82	31	39.74	18	23.08	18	23.08	3.54
36	1	1.28	22	28.21	33	42.31	16	20.51	6	7.69	3.05
37	8	10.26	30	38.46	26	33.33	12	15.38	1	2.56	2.62
38*	1	1.28	16	20.51	40	51.28	13	16.67	8	10.26	3.14
39	38	48.71	24	37.18	12	15.38	4	5.13	-	-	1.79
40	2	2.56	7	8.97	16	20.51	32	41.01	20	26.92	3.78
41	3	3.85	15	19.23	38	48.72	14	17.95	8	10.26	3.12
42*	-	-	5	6.41	30	38.46	30	38.46	13	16.67	3.65
43*	1	1.28	16	20.51	38	48.72	17	21.79	6	7.96	3.14
44*	1	1.28	20	25.64	37	47.44	14	17.95	6	7.96	3.05
45*	25	32.05	17	21.79	22	28.21	10	12.82	4	5.13	2.37
46	17	3.85	35	44.87	22	28.21	3	3.85	1	1.28	2.37
47*	3	3.85	8	10.26	16	20.51	29	37.18	22	28.21	3.76

* Questions Related to Perceptual Supports to Training.

Presentation of Responses by Middle

Managers who Never Attended

Management Training Programs

Table II contains a listing of responses to the same
47 questions asked in Table I but to the group of middle mana-
gers who never attended management training programs. Table
III is the "t-value" and Probability Levels after comparing
the mean of responses between the group of middle managers
who attended management training programs and the group of
middle managers who never attended such a program.

TABLE II

RESPONSES TO INSTRUMENT BY MIDDLE MANAGERS
WHO HAD NOT ATTENDED MANAGEMENT
TRAINING PROGRAM (N=55)

Questionnaire Item Number	Never N	%	Very Little N	%	Sometimes N	%	Usually N	%	Always N	%	Mean
1	18	32.73	19	34.55	16	29.09	2	3.64	—	—	2.04
2*	—	—	18	32.73	29	52.73	8	14.55	—	—	2.82
3	17	30.91	23	41.82	13	23.64	2	3.64	—	—	2.00
4*	—	—	17	30.91	25	45.45	10	18.18	3	5.45	2.98
5*	—	—	12	21.82	33	60.00	8	14.55	2	3.64	3.00
6*	—	—	15	27.27	22	40.00	13	23.64	5	9.09	3.15
7*	1	1.82	8	14.55	18	32.73	19	34.55	9	18.18	3.49
8	1	1.82	20	36.36	22	40.00	10	18.18	2	3.64	2.86
9	—	—	13	23.64	27	49.09	13	23.64	2	3.64	3.07
10	4	7.27	14	25.45	24	43.64	9	16.36	4	7.27	2.91
11	4	7.27	11	20.00	20	36.36	6	10.91	14	25.45	3.72
12*	14	25.48	20	36.36	14	25.45	7	12.73	1	1	2.26
13	—	—	17	30.09	28	50.91	8	14.55	2	3.64	2.91
14*	3	5.45	11	20.00	25	45.45	12	21.82	4	7.17	3.06
15	25	45.45	15	27.27	11	20.00	3	5.45	1	1.82	1.91
16	11	20.00	14	25.45	19	34.55	8	14.55	3	5.45	2.60
17	13	23.64	26	47.27	11	20.00	4	7.27	1	1.82	2.16
18	2	3.64	5	9.09	20	36.36	21	38.18	7	12.73	3.47
19	9	16.36	11	20.00	20	36.36	11	20.00	4	7.27	2.82
20	4	7.27	21	38.18	16	29.09	5	9.09	9	16.36	2.89
21	2	3.64	12	21.82	26	47.17	13	23.64	2	3.69	3.02
22*	2	3.64	26	47.27	18	32.73	8	14.55	1	1.82	2.64
23	12	21.82	28	50.91	11	20.00	4	7.27	—	—	2.13

TABLE II (Continued)

Questionnaire Item Number	Never		Very Little		Sometimes		Usually		Always		Mean
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
24*	24	43.64	25	45.45	5	9.09	1	1.82	–	–	1.69
25	21	38.18	24	43.64	10	18.18	–	–	–	–	1.80
26*	9	16.36	21	38.18	24	43.64	1	1.82	–	–	2.30
27*	1	1.82	21	38.18	26	47.27	5	9.09	2	3.69	2.74
28	1	1.82	15	27.27	23	41.82	15	27.27	1	1.82	3.00
29	1	1	14	25.45	21	38.18	20	36.36	–	–	3.11
30	2	3.64	15	27.27	30	54.55	6	10.91	2	3.64	2.84
31	2	3.64	13	23.64	20	36.36	16	29.09	4	7.27	3.12
32*	3	5.45	21	38.18	16	29.09	11	20.00	4	7.27	2.85
33	5	9.09	19	34.55	26	47.27	4	7.27	1	1.82	2.58
34	19	34.55	19	34.55	12	21.82	4	7.27	1	1.82	2.07
35*	2	3.64	14	25.45	27	49.09	9	16.36	3	5.45	2.95
36	–	–	21	38.18	19	34.55	14	25.45	1	1.81	2.94
37	15	27.27	25	45.45	14	25.45	1	1.82	–	–	2.02
38*	1	1.82	22	40.00	25	45.45	4	7.27	3	5.45	2.75
39	34	61.82	15	27.27	5	9.09	1	1.82	–	–	1.51
40	2	3.64	8	14.55	26	47.27	12	21.82	7	12.73	3.26
41	3	5.45	13	32.73	22	40.00	12	21.82	–	–	2.78
42*	1	1.82	11	20.00	26	47.27	13	23.64	4	7.27	3.15
43*	1	1.82	15	27.27	22	40.00	16	25.45	3	5.45	3.06
44*	7	12.73	17	30.91	20	36.36	8	14.55	3	5.45	2.69
45*	21	38.18	21	38.18	9	16.36	3	5.45	1	1.82	1.95
46	8	14.55	22	40.00	20	36.36	5	9.09	–	–	2.40
47*	–	–	11	20.00	16	29.09	18	32.73	10	18.18	3.49

* Questions Related to Perceptual Supports to Training.

TABLE III

COMPARISON OF THE MEANS OF RESPONSES
BETWEEN TWO GROUPS OF
RESPONDENTS

Questionnaire Item Number	Means of Group A *	Means of Group B **	t-value	Probability Level
1	2.53	2.04	3.526	<.001
2	3.17	2.82	2.615	<.01
3	2.73	2.00	4.628	<.001
4	3.30	2.98	2.131	.033
5	3.21	3.00	2.209	.027
6	3.59	3.15	2.662	<.01
7	3.91	3.49	2.477	.015
8	1.97	2.86	-.105	.913
9	3.42	3.07	2.391	.017
10	3.14	2.91	1.388	.164
11	3.95	3.72	3.363	<.01
12	2.50	2.26	1.536	.123
13	3.73	2.91	5.634	<.001
14	3.77	3.06	4.228	<.001
15	2.17	1.91	1.230	.219
16	2.91	2.60	1.414	.156
17	2.82	2.16	3.304	<.01
18	3.36	3.47	-.644	.528
19	3.47	2.82	3.201	<.01
20	3.54	2.89	3.384	<.01
21	3.74	3.02	4.920	<.001

TABLE III (Continued)

Questionnaire Item Number	Means of Group A *	Means of Group B **	t-value	Probability Level
22	3.03	2.64	2.447	.013
23	2.65	2.13	3.360	<.01
24	2.07	1.69	2.352	.019
25	2.35	1.80	3.653	<.001
26	2.91	2.30	3.536	<.001
27	3.18	2.74	2.795	<.01
28	3.51	3.00	3.186	<.01
29	3.24	3.11	.876	.613
30	2.97	2.84	.918	.638
31	3.00	3.12	-.743	.534
32	3.36	2.85	2.846	<.01
33	2.53	2.58	-.379	.797
34	2.71	2.07	3.099	<.01
35	3.54	2.95	3.459	<.01
36	3.05	2.91	.905	.63
37	3.62	2.02	3.817	<.001
38	3.14	2.75	2.547	.012
39	1.79	1.51	1.767	.076
40	3.78	3.26	2.988	<.01
41	3.12	2.78	2.055	.039
42	3.65	3.15	3.364	<.01
43	3.14	3.06	.550	.59
44	3.05	2.69	2.125	.033
45	2.37	1.95	2.170	.03

TABLE III (Continued)

Questionnaire Item Number	Means of Group A *	Means of Group B **	t-value	Probability Level
46	2.37	2.40	1.458	.143
47	3.76	3.491	1.418	.155

Note: *Group A = Middle Managers who attended management training program.

**Group B = Middle Managers who did not attend management training program.

Presentation of Responses to the Questions

Related to Perceptions About Training

By Both Groups of Middle Managers

Among 47 questions in the questionnaire, only 19 questions are directly related to the perceptual support of the respondents to training. These questions are question numbers 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 14, 22, 24, 26, 27, 32, 35, 38, 42, 43, 44, 45, and 47. These questions were reranked and presented in Table IV.

TABLE IV

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO INSTRUMENT ITEMS
RELATED TO PERCEPTIONS ABOUT TRAINING

Item	Respondents With Training		Respondents Without Training			
	N	Average Rating	N	Average Rating	t	Probability
1. To what extent do employees believe they receive needed training?	78	3.167	55	2.818	3.526	<.01
2. To what extent is a needs assessment procedure regularly used to identify the training needs of employees?	78	3.295	55	3.00	2.018	.033
3. To what extent do employees express positive feelings about the training programs?	78	3.321	55	3.00	2.209	.027
4. To what extent is training perceived as a mechanism for facilitating organizational behavior modification?	78	3.590	55	3.145	2.662	<.01
5. To what extent do managers perceive their role as being responsible for both employee development and work supervision?	78	3.910	55	3.491	2.477	.015

TABLE IV (Continued)

Item	Respondents With Training		Respondents Without Training			
	N	Average Rating	N	Average Rating	t	Probability
6. To what extent do managers and supervisors participate in advisory committees for the purpose of keeping training programs up-to-date and design new programs?	78	2.500	55	2.255	1.536	.123
7. To what extend do managers and supervosors communicate with employees to discuss and reinforce the importance of training?	78	3.769	55	3.055	4.338	<.001
8. To what extent are expenditures for training adequate to meet the training needs of the organization?	78	3.026	55	2.636	2.497	.013
9. To what extent are the training personnel consulted by managers and supervisors for assistance in employee and organizational performance problems?	78	2.064	55	1.691	2.352	.019
10. To what extent does management convey to employees the importance of participation in training programs?	78	2.910	55	2.309	3.536	<.001

TABLE IV (Continued)

Item	Respondents With Training		Respondents Without Training		t	Proba-bility
	N	Average Rating	N	Average Rating		
11. To what extent do employees in your organization understand the meaning and purpose of training and development as intended by organization?	78	3.179	55	2.745	2.795	<.01
12. To what extent are executives and managers willing to attend regular training sessions?	78	3.359	55	2.855	2.846	.01
13. To what extent are managers and supervisors expected to support training programs?	78	3.538	55	2.945	3.459	.01
14. To what extent are training activities perceived to address both individual needs and organizational needs?	78	3.141	55	2.745	2.547	.012
15. To what extent does your training program address special needs of your organization?	78	3.654	55	3.145	3.364	.01
16. To what extent are different kinds of training for personnel at different levels of responsibility provided?	78	3.141	55	3.055	.550	.59
17. To what extent are executives and managers willing to review contents of training programs?	78	3.051	55	2.691	2.125	.033

TABLE IV (Continued)

Item	Respondents With Training		Respondents Without Training		t	Proba-bility
	N	Average Rating	N	Average Rating		
18. To what extent does organizational policy specify minimum levels of training for promotion consideration?	78	2.372	55	1.945	2.170	.03
19. To what extent does your organization have provisions to support employees who seek relevant training for current jobs in outside institutions such as colleges, vocational schools, etc.?	78	3.756	55	3.491	1.418	.155

The data from Table IV indicates that there were posi-
tive relationships between management training experience
and positive perceptions toward the value of training since
the relationship pointed consistently to the same direction.
These are discussed, in detail, later in this chapter.

Analysis of Demographic Questions

Question 48 asked about sex, age, and educational back-
ground. The information received from the respondents are in
Tables V, VI, and VII, respectively.

TABLE V

SEX OF RESPONDENTS

Sex	Attended Management Training	Never Attended
Male	44 (56%)	31 (56%)
Female	34 (44%)	24 (44%)

TABLE VI

AGE OF RESPONDENTS

Age	Attended Management Training	Never Attended
29 - 34	-	7 (13%)
35 - 40	19 (24%)	18 (33%)
41 - 45	20 (26%)	9 (16%)
46 - 50	25 (32%)	16 (29%)
Over 50	14 (18%)	5 (9%)

TABLE VII

FORMAL EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND
OF RESPONDENTS

Educational Background	Attended Management Training	Never Attended
Below Bacalaureate Degree	7 (9%)	9 (14%)
Bacalaureate	52 (67%)	33 (62%)
Higher Than Bacalaureate Degree	19 (24%)	13 (23%)

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS

AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Middle Management plays many roles in a large organiza-
tion such as Bangkok Metropolitan Administration, the largest
local government in Thailand, employing more than 40,000
officers to serve 5.5 million residents. In terms of train-
ing, the attitudes of managers toward the value of training
and the image of training institutions are critical to the
success or failure of the programs. Training departments had
little direct authority to implement the program without com-
mitments or cooperation from these people. More important
than that, some part (if not all) of these people are going
to be top management in the future and their commitment is
vital to future training program implementation, especially
in budgetary support. One way to achieve top and middle
management support for training is to systematically build
their positive attitudes toward the training institution by
means of implementing successful training programs for middle
management.

The Middle Management Training Program implemented by
the Training Division, Bangkok Metropolitan Administration is

specifically a program designed to develop managerial knowledge and skills of the participants to help increase their performance effectiveness and prepare them for the higher responsibility in the future. A by-product of this training, the favorable or unfavorable perceptions about the program, affects the participants future commitment to training programs.

In assessing the middle management perceptions about training for this study, the writer used "The Organizational Training Support Inventory", Form M/S (Managers and Supervisors) developed by Onyema Nkwocha, an M.S. Candidate at Oklahoma State Univeristy. The questionnaire was slightly adapted and translated to fit the Bangkok Metropolitan Training Support version by permission of the developer and Dr. John L. Baird, the graduate advisor. The data collected by questionnaires was tabulated and analyzed using frequencies, percentage and mean scores to determine if responses to the items indicate the direction and degree of training support in Bangkok Metropolitan Administration. The responses to 47 items from both groups of managers were presented in Table I and Table II.

The T-test statistical method was employed to test the significant differences between the perceptual support of the two groups toward training by comparing the mean of response to each question at the significant level of $p. < 0.05$ as presented in Table III. At this level of significance, the T-scores higher than 1.645 were judged significant.

Findings

The specific findings emerging from this study are presented for all of the 19 questionnaire items pertaining to perceptions as follows:

1. Of 19 items concerning perceptual support about training (see Table III), all were in the same direction on 16 items and were significantly at the .05 level of confidence.

2. Of the items (6, 16 and 19) which were not significant at .05 level of confidence, they were also different in the same direction with other items. The reasons behind non-significant differences for each of these items may be explained.

Item 6: The question "To what extent do the managers and supervisors participate in advisory committees for the purpose of keeping training programs up-to-date and design new programs?" limits the perception of respondents because of the program design process in Bangkok Metropolitan Administration. Programs are designed by the Training Division with recommendations from advisory committee whose members are top executives for the most part. Only a few middle managers who are subject matter experts, are members of the advisory board. The mean scores 2.5 (Group A) and 2.255 (Group B) also emphasize this fact since it means that middle managements from both groups have very little opportunity to participate in the process due to traditional implementation of the programs.

Item 16: "To what extent are different kinds of training for personnel at different levels of responsibility provided?" The mean score for Group (those who attended management training) is 3.141. The mean score for Group B (those who never attended management training) is 3.055. The T-value is .550. There is no significant differences between the perceptions of the two groups of people because of the fact that the Bangkok Metropolitan Administration is a very big organization with total employees in excess of 40,000 in 1986. It is difficult for the Training Division which comprises 55 training officers (secretaries are excluded) and limited budget to provide sufficient training programs for various kinds of training needs from every level of employees.

Item 19: "To what extent does your organization have provisions to support employees who seek relevant training for current jobs in outside institutions?" The mean score for Group A is 3.756 and 3.491 for Group B. The T-value is 1.418, not significant at $p < 0.05$. There is no significant differences in the perception of the two groups because this question deals with structure more than perception. According to the Bangkok Metropolitan Administration regulation, only 2 percent of total employees are permitted to attend full-time college each year. Another way, in which their perceptions were limited by fact.

Conclusion

The following conclusion was drawn from this study.

Middle managers who attended management training programs
have more positive perceptions toward training than do middle
managers who had never attended the management training pro-
gram.

Recommendations

Recommendations for Practice:

1. The Training Division should implement more manage-
ment training programs each year in order to gain broader sup-
port among middle and top managers.

2. The Training Division should find ways to make train-
ing available to all employees.

Recommendation for Additional Research:

Surveys should be conducted into the cost-effectiveness
of management training programs in terms of the program effec-
tiveness in improving managerial skills and knowledge of atten-
dants. Such research can help improve the program and keep
it up-to-date.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adams, H. Charles. "A Limit Study of Relationship be-
      tween Supervisory Attitude, Job Knowledge, and
      Performance Rating." (Unpub. Ed.d. Dissertation,
      Oklahoma State University, (1982)

2. Adolph, T. and R. F. Whaley. "Attitudes Toward Adult
      Education." Adult Education. 1967, pp. 152-156.

3. Brethower, K.S. and Rumler, G.A. "Evaluating Training."
      Training and Development Journal. Washington,
      D.C.: American Society for Training and Develop-
      ment, Inc., May, 1982, pp. 103-120.

4. Clement, W. Ronald. "Evaluating the Effectiveness of
      Management Training." Human Resource Management.
      Washington, D.C.: American Management Association.
      Vol. 18 (Winter, 1981) p.8.

5. Hultman, Kenneth E. "Gaining and Keeping Management Sup-
      port." The Training and Development Sourcebook.
      Ed. Lloyd S. Baird. Amberot, Massachusetts: Human
      Resource Development. Press, 1985, pp. 58-61.

6. Kirkpatrik, L. Donald. "Techniques for Evaluating Train-
      ing Program." Training and Development Journal.
      Alexandra, VA: American Society for Training and
      Development, Inc., (November, 1959), p. 4.

7. Laird, Dugan. Approach to Training and Development. 2nd
      Ed. Ontario: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc.
      1985.

8. Olson, Lawrence. "Training Trends: The Corporate View."
      Training and Development Journal. Washington, D.C.:
      American Society for Training and Development, Inc.,
      September, 1986, p. 33.

9. Opinion Research Corporation. "Employee Training in Amer-
      ica." Training and Development Journal. Washington,
      D.C.: American Society for Training and Development,
      Inc., July, 1986, pp. 34-37.

10. Public Relation Division, Bangkok Metropolitan Administra-
      tion. BMA Annual Report 1985. Bangkok, Thailand,
      1985.

11. Ralphs, T. Lenny and Eric Stephan. "HRD in the Fortune 500." Training and Development Journal. October 1986, pp. 69-76.

12. Rozenberg, J. Milton. "A Structural Theory of Attitudes." Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. XXIV (Summer, 1960) pp. 319-340.

13. Sherif, W. Carolyn. Sherif, Muzafer and Nebergaril, E. Roger. Attitude and Attitude Change. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunder Co., 1965, 0. 5.

14. Shoemaker, H.A. "Evaluation of Training Staff: A Case History." Improving Human Performance Quarterly, Publisher Unknown. Vol. 5. pp. 183-202, 1983.

15. Sorenson, Herbert. Psychology in Education. 4th Ed. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., Inc., 1964, p. 349.

16. Thurston, L. L. and E. J. Jones. The Measurement of Attitude. Chicago: University of Chicago Press., 1929.

17. Triandis, Henry C. Attitude and Attitude Change. Canada: John Wiley and Son, Inc., 1971, p. 2.

18. Training Division, Bangkok Metropolitan Administration. Annual Report 1985. Bangkok, Thailand 1985.

19. Wethington, Charles. "Attitudes and Academic Success." Kentucky University Bureau of Social Service Bulletin, Vol. 38, N.4, (November, 1973) p. 5.

20. Yeoman, William N. "How to Get Top Management Support." Training and Development Journal. Washington, D.C.: American Society for Training and Development, INc., June, 1982, pp. 38-40.

APPENDIX A

ORGANIZATIONAL TRAINING SUPPORT INVENTORY

FORM M/S

To be completed by managers or supervisors.

Directions

1. Read each of the following questions.

2. On a scale of 1 to 5 mark your perception of
how training is conducted in your organization.

> 1 = None or Never
> 2 = Very Little
> 3 = Sometimes
> 4 = Usually
> 5 - Always

Please keep in mind that there are no right or wrong
responses. We need only to know your opinions on each
question.

APPENDIX A (Continued)

1 = Never
2 = Verry Little
3 = Sometimes
4 = Usually
5 = Always

1. To what extent is the performance of trainees
   evaluated after return to the work assign-
   ment?   1 2 3 4 5   (SB)

2. To what extent do employees believe they
   receive needed training?   1 2 3 4 5   (P)

3. To what extent is there an effort to calcu-
   late return on investment for training
   activities?   1 2 3 4 5   (SB)

4. To what extent is a needs assessment pro-
   cedure regularly used to identify the train-
   ing needs of employees?   1 2 3 4 5   (SBP)

5. To what extent do employees express positive
   feelings about the training programs?   1 2 3 4 5   (SP)

6. To what extent is training perceived as a
   mechanism for facilitating organizational
   behavior modification?   1 2 3 4 5   (SP)

7. To what extent do managers perceive their
   role as being responsible for both employee
   development and work supervision?   1 2 3 4 5   (BP)

8. To what extent is there an identifiable
   budgetary commitment to training and
   development?   1 2 3 4 5   (SB)

9. To what extent is there a systematic process
   used for the selection and evaluation of train-
   ing programs used in the organization?   1 2 3 4 5   (SB)

10. To what extent do managers and supervisors
    provide feedback to training specialists
    concerning the effectiveness of the training? 1 2 3 4 5   (SB)

11. To what extent does the chief training offi-
    cer have access to management business strategy? 1 2 3 4 5 (SB)

APPENDIX A (Continued)

1 = Never
2 = Very Little
3 = Sometimes
4 = Usually
5 = Always

12. To what extent do managers and supervisors
participate in advisory committees for
the purpose of keeping training programs
up-to-date and design new programs?   1 2 3 4 5 (SP)

13. To what extent is there a systematic effort
to correlate employee success in training
with successful performance on the job?   1 2 3 4 5 (SB)

14. To what extent do managers and supervisors
communicate with employees to discuss and
reinforce the importance of training?   1 2 3 4 5 (P)

15. Is there an established HRD or training
unit within the organization?   1 2 3 4 5 (S)

16. To what extent does your organization have
a policy specifically related to training
practices?   1 2 3 4 5 (SB)

17. To what extent is training included as part
of corporate strategic planning?   1 2 3 4 5 (SB)

18. To what extent is the training staff involved
in setting the organization's training goals
and objectives?   1 2 3 4 5 (SB)

19. To what extent does the organization use a
systematic process for selection of employee
participation in training?   1 2 3 4 5 (SB)

20. To what extent is the chief training officer
involved in executive level planning?   1 2 3 4 5 (S)

21. To what extent does the training department
assist other organizational units in the
achievement of unit goals and objectives? 1 2 3 4 5 (SB)

22. To what extent are expenditures for training
adequate to meet the training needs of the
organization?   1 2 3 4 5 (SP)

23. To what extent do employees have opportunity
to help determine the kinds of training
programs made available?   1 2 3 4 5 (SB)

APPENDIX A (Continued)

<div align="center">

1 = Never
2 = Very Little
3 = Sometimes
4 = Usually
5 = Always

</div>

24. To what extent are training personnel con-
    sulted by managers and supervisors for
    assistance in employee and organizational
    performance problems?   1 2 3 4 5 (BP)

25. To what extent is there an established
    mechanism through which management person-
    nel and training staff regularly come toge-
    ther to exchange views regarding the effects
    and outcomes of training programs?   1 2 3 4 5 (B)

26. To what extent does management convey to
    employees the importance of participation
    in training programs?   1 2 3 4 5 (BP)

27. To what extent do employees in your organi-
    zation understand the meaning and purpose
    of training and development as intended by
    the organization?   1 2 3 4 5 (SBP)

28. To what extent is there a corporate HRD or
    training plan which is monitored by execu-
    tive level management?   1 2 3 4 5 (SB)

29. To what extent does the training unit respond
    to the training needs identified by other
    units of the organization?   1 2 3 4 5 (SB)

30. To what extent do mid-level managers and super-
    visors participate in training and develop-
    ment activities?   1 2 3 4 5 (SB)

31. To what extent does top level management
    participate in training and development
    activities?   1 2 3 4 5 (SB)

32. To what extent are executives and managers
    willing to attend regular training programs? 1 2 3 4 5 (SP)

33. To what extent are managers encouraged to
    serve as instructors or resource people in
    the training programs?   1 2 3 4 5 (SB)

APPENDIX A (Continued)

1 = Never
2 = Very Little
3 = Sometimes
4 = Usually
5 = Always

34. To what extent is there formalized policy
which holds managers and supervisors
accountable for the training and develop-
ment of employees?   1 2 3 4 5 (S)

35. To what extent are managers and supervisors
expected to support training programs?   1 2 3 4 5 (SBP)

36. To what extent are adequate facilities
specifically committed to training
activities?   1 2 3 4 5 (S)

37. To what extent does your organization main-
tain detailed training and development
records?   1 2 3 4 5 (S)

38. To what extent are training activities per-
ceived to address both individual needs and
organizational needs?   1 2 3 4 5 (SP)

39. To what extent does the reward system reflect
successful employee participation in train-
ing activities?   1 2 3 4 5 (SB)

40. To what extent does management accomodate
to problems of employees being away from the
work station during training periods?   1 2 3 4 5 (SB)

41. To what extent are supervisors expected to
provide training opportunities to employees
as part of their supervisory responsibility? 1 2 3 4 5 (SB)

42. To what extent does your trianing program
address special needs of your organization? 1 2 3 4 5 (BP)

43. To what extent are different kinds of train-
ing for personnel at different levels of re-
sponsibility provided?   1 2 3 4 5 (SBP)

44. To what extent are executives and managers
willing to preview contents of training pro-
grams?   1 2 3 4 5 (BP)

APPENDIX A (Continued)

1 = Never
2 = Very Little
3 = Sometimes
4 = Usually
5 = Always

45. To what extent does organizational policy
specify minimal levels of training for
promotion considerations?   1 2 3 4 5 (P)

46. To what extent are there identifiable super-
visor or manager disincentives for support
of training programs?   1 2 3 4 5 (B)

47. To what extent does your organization have
provisions to support employees who seek
relevant training for current jobs in out-
side institutions such as colleges, voca-
tional schools, etc.?   1 2 3 4 5 (SBP)

48. About yourself:

Sex: ____Male ____Female

Age: ___29-34 ___35-40 ___41-45 ___46-50 Higher
                                                 ___than 50.

Education: ____Lower than Bachelor degree

            ____Bachelor

            ____Higher than Bachelor

APPENDIX B

MIDDLE MANAGEMENT TRAINING
PROGRAM'S CURRICULUM
(1985)

1.	Cognitive Contents	192 Hours	
1.1	Management	63 Hours	
(1)	Principles of Management	3	"
(2)	M.B.O.	3	"
(3)	Systematic Problem Solving Techniques	6	"
(4)	Planning and Programming Techniques	12	"
(5)	Organization Development	9	"
(6)	Quality (Control) Circle	3	"
(7)	Budgeting	3	"
(8)	Personal Management	3	"
(9)	Inventory Control	3	"
(10)	Auditing	3	"
(11)	Financial Procedures and Regulations	3	"
(12)	Public Information	6	"
(13)	The Authority of the Committee of Corruption	3	"
(14)	The Authority of Civic Service Commission Suppression	3	"
1.2	General Knowledge on B.M.A. Tasks		
(1)	The brief of each Department (12 Departments)	16 1/2 Hours	
(2)	The brief of District Office	3	"

APPENDIX B (Continued)

(3)	The Task of the Public Relation Section	21 Hours
(4)	B.M.A. Industrial Control	41/2 "
1.3	Government and Politics	12 Hours
(1)	Political Theories	3 "
(2)	Thai Political Culture	3 "
(3)	Thai Government Structure	3 "
(4)	Administrative Law	3 "
1.4	National Security	15 Hours
(1)	Prevention and Suppression of Riot	6 "
(2)	National Safety	3 "
(3)	Civilian Defense	3 "
1.5	Economic and Social Development	48 Hours
(1)	National economicand Social Development Plan	3 "
(2)	B.M.A. Development Plan	3 "
(3)	Principles of Bangkok Community Development	3 "
(4)	Human Ecology	3 "
(5)	Environmental Improvement	3 "
(6)	Public Welfare	3 "
(7)	Irrigation and Flood Control	3 "
(8)	Traffic Management	3 "
(9)	Public Disaster Prevention and Relief	3 "
(10)	Prevention and Suppression of Drugs	3 "

APPENDIX B (Continued)

(11)	Prevention and Suppression of Crimes	3	"
(12)	Housing	3	"
(13)	Coordination between B.M.A. and other Utility Service Organizations	3	"
(14)	City Planning	3	"
(15)	Panel Discussion on Economic and Social Development	3	"

1.6	Culture and Social Manners	9	Hours
(1)	Royal and State Ceremonies	3	"
(2)	Declaration	3	"
(3)	Religious Ceremonies	3	"

2	Attitude and Personnel Character Improvement	51	Hours
(1)	Ethics and Morals for Government Officials	15	"
(2)	The Art of Speaking in Public	30	"
(3)	Guest Speakers	6	"

3	Field Trips and Internship	29	Days
(1)	Scout	9	"
(2)	Internship in Rural District Office	5	"
(3)	Study Tour in Bangkok	1	"
(4)	Study Tour in Rural Provinces	5	"
(5)	Study Tour Abroad	9	"

4	Others	79	Hours

TOTALS:
Class Work	316	Hours
Field Training & Tour	29	Days

แบบสอบถามเกี่ยวกับการฝึกอบรม

แบบสอบถามนี้เป็นส่วนหนึ่งของการทำวิทยานิพนธ์ เรื่อง "Training Inventory in Bangkok Metropolitan Administration " ชั้นปริญญาโท สาขา Human Resource Development ณ Oklahoma State University, U.S.A. ความคิดเห็นของท่านมีค่าอย่างยิ่ง

วิธีการตอบ กรุณาเลือกคำตอบที่ตรง หรือใกล้เคียงกับความคิดเห็นของท่าน หรือความเป็นไปเกี่ยวกับการฝึกอบรมของกรุงเทพมหานคร เท่าที่ท่านทราบ โดยทำเครื่องหมาย ✕ หรือ ✓ อย่างหนึ่งอย่างใดลงบนหมายเลขท้ายคำถาม

หมายเลข ๑ = ไม่มี, ไม่เคย (None or Never)
หมายเลข ๒ = น้อยมาก (Very Little)
หมายเลข ๓ = มีบ้าง (Sometimes)
หมายเลข ๔ = บ่อยครั้ง (Usually)
หมายเลข ๕ = มีเป็นประจำ, ทำเป็นประจำ, ทุกครั้ง (Always)

หมายเหตุ ไม่มีคำตอบว่าสิ่งใดถูกหรือผิด ผู้จัดทำต้องการทราบความคิดเห็น (perception) ของท่านเท่านั้น

	ไม่มี ไม่เคย	น้อย มาก	มีบ้าง	บ่อย ครั้ง	เป็น ประจำ
ท่านทราบว่า หรือคิดว่า...............					
๑. มีการประเมินผลการทำงานของผู้ผ่านการฝึกอบรม ที่กลับไปทำงานแล้วมากน้อยขนาดไหน	๑	๒	๓	๔	๕
๒. โดยทั่วไปข้าราชการ กทม.มีความรู้สึกว่าหากเขาได้รับ การฝึกอบรมในเรื่องที่ว่าเป็นต่อการทำงานมากน้อยขนาดไหน	๑	๒	๓	๔	๕
๓. ทางราชการมีความพยายามหรือไม่เพียงใดที่จะคำนวณ ผลตอบแทนจากการลงทุนจัดกิจกรรมการฝึกอบรม	๑	๒	๓	๔	๕
๔. มีการหาความจำเป็นในการฝึกอบรมอย่างสม่ำเสมอเพียงใด เพื่อที่จะค้นหาความจำเป็นในการฝึกอบรมให้ตรงเป้าหมาย	๑	๒	๓	๔	๕
๕. ข้าราชการโดยทั่วไปมีความรู้สึกในทางบวก (positive feeling) ต่อโครงการฝึกอบรมต่าง ๆ ของ กทม. มากน้อยขนาดไหน	๑	๒	๓	๔	๕

	ไม่มี ไม่เคย	น้อย มาก	มีบ้าง	บ่อย ครั้ง	เป็น ประจำ
๖. การฝึกอบรมได้รับการยอมรับเพียงใดว่าเป็นกลไก อันหนึ่งที่จะช่วยปรับปรุงเปลี่ยนแปลงพฤติกรรมองค์การ	•	๒	๓	๔	๕
๗. หัวหน้างานโดยทั่วไปเข้าใจมากน้อยเพียงใดว่าบทบาท ของผู้บังคับบัญชานอกจากจะคอยควบคุมการปฏิบัติงาน ของผู้ใต้บังคับบัญชาแล้วยังต้องทำหน้าที่ส่งเสริมพัฒนา ความรู้ ความสามารถ ของผู้ใต้บังคับบัญชาด้วย	•	๒	๓	๔	๕
๘. ท่านคิดว่ากองฝึกอบรมได้รับอนุมัติงบประมาณ มากน้อยเพียงใด	•	๒	๓	๔	๕
๙. ในการคัดเลือกโครงการ และการประเมินโครงการ ฝึกอบรมต่าง ๆ มีการใช้วิธีการที่เป็นระบบ มากน้อยเพียงใด	•	๒	๓	๔	๕
๑๐. ท่านหรือหัวหน้างานอื่น ๆ เคยให้ความเห็น(feedback) กับเจ้าหน้าที่ฝึกอบรมหรือกองฝึกอบรมมากน้อยเพียงใด เกี่ยวกับประสิทธิภาพของโครงการฝึกอบรม	•	๒	๓	๔	๕
๑๑. ท่านคิดว่าตำแหน่งผู้อำนวยการกองฝึกอบรมมีบทบาท เพียงใดในการกำหนดนโยบายหรือแผนงานต่าง ๆ ของกรุงเทพมหานคร	•	๒	๓	๔	๕
๑๒. ผู้บริหารระดับหัวหน้างานหรือนักบริหารระดับกลาง ต่าง ๆ ได้เข้าไปมีส่วนร่วมเพียงใดในการปรับปรุง หลักสูตร หรือเสนอหลักสูตรใหม่ในการฝึกอบรม	•	๒	๓	๔	๕
๑๓. ผลของการฝึกอบรมเอามาใช้ประโยชน์ในการ ทำงานมากน้อยเพียงใด	•	๒	๓	๔	๕
๑๔. ท่านหรือผู้บังคับบัญชาท่านอื่น ๆ เคยพูดคุยและกระตุ้น ให้ผู้ใต้บังคับบัญชาเห็นความสำคัญของการฝึกอบรม มากน้อยเพียงใด	•	๒	๓	๔	๕
๑๕. ในสำนักหรือเขตของท่านมีหน่วยงานหรือคณะบุคคลที่ทำ หน้าที่ด้านการฝึกอบรมหรือไม่ (ไม่รวมกองฝึกอบรม)	•	๒	๓	๔	๕

	ไม่มี ไม่เคย	น้อย มาก	มีบ้าง	บ่อย ครั้ง	เป็น ประจำ
๑๖. ในสำนักหรือเขตของท่านมีนโยบายเกี่ยวกับเรื่อง ของการฝึกอบรมมากน้อยขนาดไหน (เช่น มีการวางหลักเกณฑ์ในการส่งคนไปฝึกอบรม ฯลฯ)	๑	๒	๓	๔	๕
๑๗. ในการวางแผนงานโครงการต่าง ๆ ของสำนักหรือเขต ของท่านมีการบรรจุเรื่องการฝึกอบรมเข้าไว้ในแผนงาน ต่าง ๆ มากน้อยเพียงใด	๑	๒	๓	๔	๕
๑๘. เท่าที่ท่านทราบ ท่านคิดว่ากองฝึกอบรมเข้าไปมีบทบาท เพียงไหนในการกำหนดเป้าหมายและวัตถุประสงค์ของ การฝึกอบรม (หรือว่าถูกกำหนดโดยผู้บริหารระดับสูง ของกรุงเทพมหานครเพียงฝ่ายเดียว)	๑	๒	๓	๔	๕
๑๙. หน่วยงานของท่านมีวิธีการที่เป็นระบบ และมีหลักเกณฑ์ ขนาดไหนในการคัดเลือกตัวบุคคลไปเข้ารับการฝึกอบรม	๑	๒	๓	๔	๕
๒๐. ท่านคิดว่าตำแหน่งผู้อำนวยการกองฝึกอบรมมีบทบาทใน ระดับใดในการกำหนดนโยบายการบริหารงานบุคคล ของกรุงเทพมหานคร	๑	๒	๓	๔	๕
๒๑. ท่านคิดว่าการฝึกอบรมมีส่วนช่วยให้หน่วยงานต่าง ๆ ทำงานได้บรรลุเป้าหมายได้หรือไม่เพียงใด	๑	๒	๓	๔	๕
๒๒. ท่านคิดว่ามีการจัดการฝึกอบรมเพียงพอต่อความจำเป็น ในการฝึกอบรมของหน่วยงานของท่านขนาดไหน	๑	๒	๓	๔	๕
๒๓. ข้าราชการโดยทั่วไปมีโอกาสขนาดไหนที่จะร้องขอหรือ เลือกเข้ารับการฝึกอบรมในโครงการที่กรุงเทพมหานคร หรือหน่วยงานภายนอกจัดขึ้น (ไม่ใช่ผู้บังคับบัญชาเป็น ผู้พิจารณาแต่ฝ่ายเดียว)	๑	๒	๓	๔	๕
๒๔. เมื่อมีปัญหาเกี่ยวกับความรู้ความสามารถหรือประสิทธิภาพ การทำงานของผู้ใต้บังคับบัญชา ท่านหรือหัวหน้าหน่วยงาน ต่าง ๆ เคยปรึกษาหารือกับเจ้าหน้าที่ฝึกอบรมเพื่อหาทาง แก้ปัญหาเหล่านี้หรือไม่เพียงใด	๑	๒	๓	๔	๕

	ไม่มี ไม่เคย	น้อย มาก	มีบ้าง	บ่อย ครั้ง	เป็น ประจำ
๒๕. หัวหน้างานต่าง ๆ (ที่ส่งลูกน้องเข้าอบรม) กับ คณะเจ้าหน้าที่ฝึกอบรม เคยมีการปรึกษาหารือถึง ผลของการฝึกอบรมมากน้อยเพียงใด	•	๒	๓	๔	๕
๒๖. ผู้บังคับบัญชาระดับต่าง ๆ เคยทำความเข้าใจหรือย้ำ ถึงความจำเป็นในการเข้ารับการฝึกอบรมหรือไม่เพียงใด	•	๒	๓	๔	๕
๒๗. ข้าราชการโดยทั่วไปเข้าใจความหมายและความ มุ่งหมายของการฝึกอบรมของกรุงเทพมหานคร มากน้อยขนาดไหน	•	๒	๓	๔	๕
๒๘. ผู้บริหารระดับสูงให้ความสนใจหรือเข้าไปเกี่ยวข้องกับ การจัดการฝึกอบรมมากน้อยขนาดไหน(เท่าที่ท่านทราบ)	•	๒	๓	๔	๕
๒๙. กองฝึกอบรมตอบสนองหรือดำเนินการตามความต้องการ ในการฝึกอบรมที่หน่วยงานอื่น ๆ เสนอขอมาเอง มากน้อยเพียงใด	•	๒	๓	๔	๕
๓๐. นักบริหารระดับกลางและระดับต้นมีส่วนเข้าร่วม กิจกรรมการฝึกอบรมมากน้อยเพียงใด	•	๒	๓	๔	๕
๓๑. ผู้บริหารระดับสูงมีส่วนเข้าร่วมกิจกรรมการฝึกอบรม มากน้อยเพียงใด	•	๒	๓	๔	๕
๓๒. เท่าที่ท่านทราบ นักบริหารระดับสูงของกรุงเทพมหานคร เข้าร่วมฝึกอบรมหรือสัมมนานักบริหารประจำปีด้วย ความเต็มใจขนาดไหน	•	๒	๓	๔	๕
๓๓. นักบริหารระดับกลางได้รับการส่งเสริมหรือเชิญให้ เป็นวิทยากร หรือผู้ให้ข้อมูลด้านต่าง ๆ เกี่ยวกับ การจัดการฝึกอบรมมากน้อยขนาดไหน	•	๒	๓	๔	๕
๓๔. หน่วยงานของท่านมีนโยบายให้หัวหน้างานหรือ หัวหน้าหมวดทำการฝึกอบรมลูกน้องเองหรือไม่เพียงใด	•	๒	๓	๔	๕
๓๕. หัวหน้างานและหัวหน้าหมวดในหน่วยงานของท่าน ให้การสนับสนุนการฝึกอบรมขนาดไหน	•	๒	๓	๔	๕

	ไม่มี ไม่เคย	น้อย มาก	มีบ้าง	บ่อย ครั้ง	เป็น ประจำ
๒๖. เครื่องมือหรืออุปกรณ์อำนวยความสะดวกในการ ฝึกอบรมของกรุงเทพมหานครมีมากน้อยเพียงใด (สถานที่ ยานพาหนะ ฯลฯ)	•	๒	๓	๔	๕
๓๗. สำนักหรือเขตของท่านมีการรวบรวมรายละเอียด ของโครงการฝึกอบรม (ทั้งที่จัดอบรมเอง หรือ ส่งคนไปรับการฝึกอบรม) มากน้อยเพียงใด	•	๒	๓	๔	๕
๓๘. มีการยอมรับกันเพียงใดว่าการฝึกอบรมที่ได้ดำเนินการ มาแล้วสนองตอบต่อความจำเป็นทั้งด้านตัวบุคลากร และขององค์การ	•	๒	๓	๔	๕
๓๙. ผลการฝึกอบรมที่ดีเด่น มีผลต่อการพิจารณา ความดีความชอบบ้างหรือไม่ เพียงใด	•	๒	๓	๔	๕
๔๐. ท่านช่วยแบ่งเบาภาระของผู้ใต้บังคับบัญชาที่ไปรับ การฝึกอบรมมากน้อยเพียงใด (เช่น หาคนทำงาน แทนชั่วคราวเพื่อไม่ให้งานคั่งค้าง ฯ)	•	๒	๓	๔	๕
๔๑. ท่านคิดว่า หัวหน้าหมวด หรือผู้บังคับบัญชาระดับกัน ๆ จะเข้าใจเพียงใดว่า หน้าที่ของพวกเขาอย่างหนึ่งคือ การหาโอกาสให้ลูกน้องได้เข้ารับการฝึกอบรมเพื่อ พัฒนาความรู้ความสามารถ	•	๒	๓	๔	๕
๔๒. โครงการฝึกอบรมต่าง ๆ สนองตอบต่อความจำเป็น ของกรุงเทพมหานคร ขนาดไหน	•	๒	๓	๔	๕
๔๓. มีการกระจายการฝึกอบรมให้กับข้าราชการในระดับ ต่าง ๆ มากน้อยเพียงใด (สนองตอบต่อความจำเป็น หรือความต้องการของข้าราชการทุกระดับหรือไม่)	•	๒	๓	๔	๕
๔๔. ผู้บังคับบัญชาระดับสูงและท่านเคยมีความสนใจ ที่จะ ขอทราบรายละเอียก และเนื้อหาโครงการฝึกอบรม ต่าง ๆ ที่ส่งลูกน้องไปอบรมหรือไม่เพียงใด	•	๒	๓	๔	๕

	ไม่มี ไม่เคย	น้อย มาก	มีบ้าง	บ่อย ครั้ง	เป็น ประจำ
๔๕. ในสำนักหรือเขตของท่านมีนโยบาย (ไม่ว่าจะเป็นทางการ หรือไม่เป็นทางการ) หรือไม่เพียงใด ผู้ที่จะได้รับการ เลื่อนระดับความรับผิดชอบควร ผ่านการอบรมเรื่องใดเรื่องหนึ่งมาก่อน	•	๒	๑	๔	๕
๔๖. ท่านคิดว่ามีนักบริหารระดับกลางหรือระดับต้นที่ไม่ให้ การสนับสนุนการฝึกอบรมมากน้อยเพียงใด	•	๒	๓	๔	๕
๔๗. หน่วยงานของท่านสนับสนุนข้าราชการในสังกัดให้ไป รับการฝึกอบรมหรือศึกษาต่อกับสถาบันฝึกอบรม หรือ สถาบันการศึกษาภายนอกกรุงเทพมหานคร หรือไม่ เพียงใด	•	๒	๑	๔	๕

๔๘. เกี่ยวกับตัวท่าน

เพศ ☐ ชาย ☐ หญิง

อายุ ☐ ๒๔ - ๓๔ ☑ ๓๕ - ๔๐ ☐ ๔๑ - ๔๕ ☐ ๔๖ - ๕๐ ☐ ๕๐ ขึ้นไป

เป็นข้าราชการ ☐ เขต ☐ สำนัก

การศึกษา ☐ ต่ำกว่าปริญญาตรี ☐ ปริญญาตรี ☐ สูงกว่าปริญญาตรี

๔๙. ท่านเคยผ่านการฝึกอบรมหลักสูตรนักบริหารของกรุงเทพมหานครหรือไม่

☐ ไม่เคย

☐ เคย คือหลักสูตร ☐ นบต. ☐ นบก. ☐ นบอ.

๕๐. ท่านเคยเข้ารับการฝึกอบรมที่กองฝึกอบรม สำนักปลัดกรุงเทพมหานคร เป็นผู้ดำเนินการหรือไม่

☐ ไม่เคย

☐ เคย จำนวน (โดยประมาณ) .... โครงการ

ขอพระคุณมากครับ

ร.ท.วารินทร์ เครเวริญ รน.
กองฝึกอบรม สำนักปลัดกรุงเทพมหานคร

2

VITA

Warin Dechjareon

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: A STUDY OF PERCEPTIONS TOWARD TRAINING AMONG
         SELECTED MANAGERS IN BANGKOK METROPOLITAN
         ADMINISTRATION.

Major Field: Occupational and Adult Education

Biographical:

    Personal Data: Born in Samutprakarn, Thailand, May 17,
        1953, the son of Mr. Hem and Mrs. Nom Dechjareon.

    Education: Graduated from Amnuay-Witaya School, Samut-
        prakarn, Thailand, 1969; received a Bachelor of
        Arts degree from Chiengmai University in Chieng-
        mai, Thailand in November, 1973; received a
        Bachelor of Law degree from Thammasat University,
        in Bangkok, Thailand, in February 1983; completed
        requirements for Master of Science degree, with a
        major in Occupational and Adult Education, special
        in Human Resource Development, at Oklahoma State
        University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in December, 1986.

    Professional Experiences: Survey Supervisor for the Na-
        tional Statistical Office in Bangkok, Thailand,
        1974; commissioned as a Commission Officer in the
        Royal Thai Naval Academy, Samutprakarn, Thailand
        from 1975; promoted to Lieutenant Junior Grade in
        1977; resigned from the Navy in 1981, to accept the
        position of Training Officer, Level 3, for the
        Training Division, Bangkok Metropolitan Administra-
        tion, in May, 1981; promoted to Training Officer,
        Level 5, in December, 1984.

    Professional Organizations: President, The English Club,
        Chiengmai University, Chiengmai, Thailand, 1972;
        President, The Student Organization of the Faculty
        of Humanities, Chiengmai University, Chiengmai,
        Thailand, 1973.