

More International Communication

Channing Dooley, President of the Training Within Industry Foundation, answers the questions raised by E. J. Rossignol, President of the National Interprofessional Association for Rational Job Training in Paris in his letter appearing in the May-June issue of the Journal. These observations on appropriate use of T.W.I. programs will be of interest to our own readers.—Ed.

July 30, 1952

Mr. E. J. Rossignol
President
A.N.I.F.R.M.O.
Paris, France

Dear Mr. Rossignol:

Mr. Shaw has forwarded to me your letter of May 13th, including the article by one of your specialists on the subject "Remarks about T.W.I.," both of which I have read and forwarded to our French Representative, Centre D'Etude & D'Organisation for further reply from their experience.

On the whole your specialist seems to have a pretty clear conception of the basic philosophy of TWI, although perhaps he does not understand that it is designed wholly for use at places of work and not in educational institutions.

It is not suited to classroom use for the simple reason that students have no opportunity to practice under the direction of their instructor. To understand the principles is not sufficient. In fact, the principles used in TWI are very old and can be acquired from many sources. Therefore, it is the use of these principles which represents the basic contribution of TWI.

Some of the difficulties described in the article are natural for the professional teacher to encounter, since TWI was not designed for professional teachers. In our work here we do not strive to make instructors or teachers or even trainers from a professional point of view, but rather to give production people some skill in teaching while they remain essentially production people. Thus they are primarily concerned with coaching in the *use* of these principles rather than in the normal methods of teaching *understanding* of principles.

During the war we tried to get this concept over through using the term "skill," that is, we are endeavoring to develop skill in the use of principles and not just information or understanding.

Your specialist refers to a certain advantage gained by allowing a student to make mistakes and then having his mistakes corrected by his instructor. This is one way and, of course, is frequently used, but where at all possible TWI believes that the worker should learn the right way first and thus avoid the necessity of unlearning his many mistakes. This not only saves time but it has a better psychological effect. Near the bottom of page two your specialist

seems to approve of this method of learning, but we would disagree with him. In a great many cases of a workman's learning a new job, it is just as easy for him to learn the right way first. He then establishes correct habits without having to unlearn any bad ones. Of course, this cannot be done 100% and so the "reminder card" says to "correct mistakes," but it is assumed that this correction will take place immediately upon the observance of the instructor-supervisor that the workman is going to make a mistake.

At this point a good deal depends upon how the instructor corrects the mistake. Obviously he should not do the work for the worker and should not tell him bluntly and too obviously what his error is. A better way is to raise questions, make suggestions, point out possibilities and thus allow the worker to correct himself.

It is perfectly good psychology to allow a worker to find out for himself but if left wholly alone, he will waste a great deal of time and acquire many bad habits, so that he should be instructed in the right way first as far as possible and then his mistakes pointed up as early and as constructively as possible.

On page four of the article your specialist states that research should be done in cooperation with specialists during sessions, for it is a pedagogical problem. This is interesting from a pedagogical point of view but that kind of research is not necessary from the TWI point of view.

He also makes a point that time is too short to repeat the operation. Here again, TWI advises going slowly enough to do the job right the first time and for the instructor to be sure that he knows the worker knows. This extra time taken will be saved many times over through the fact that the worker makes fewer mistakes and requires less detailed supervision after being put on his own.

Many things could be said about the right kind of poise, pauses, gestures, etc., but here again we think these are unnecessary if the instructor is a practical man and just goes about the job naturally and patiently and follows the simple steps laid down on the card, according to TWI standard training. He must, of course, be trained on the job sufficiently to be really skillful in job instruction.

At the bottom of page four reference is made again to instruction in the classroom for which I would like to repeat the TWI programs are not intended. In short, the instructor is a supervisor who instructs by all the TWI devices but he is not a lecturer.

We would not recommend that TWI be started with JM because that is an extremely analytical process, which is difficult for many people. JI or JR would be better as a start and this again depends upon the local shop conditions. One thing to bear in mind is that TWI does not propose to give blanket training to all people. It gives specific training to certain people who need it. Therefore, the adoption of TWI programs should be made around a study of production needs in each given plant.

A thorough study of these needs will bring about the use of several of the TWI programs worked together in an overall company-wide plan made to suit each department of the factory under consideration by starting with different programs at different times, in different places. The process of getting four or five TWI programs developed into a company-wide plan fitted to its specific needs is a rather long one, requiring one to three years. It takes a great deal of coaching and follow-up, because in the end no lasting result will be attained unless habits are changed, and that is a long process.

You state that two years ago you found it necessary to develop key personnel in TWI and that this training is now available for all factories and that the results are good. I am wondering where you got the original training and how thoroughly was it checked up by coaching on the job.

May I close with the thought that Job Instruction Training as put forward by TWI is excellently well suited in training apprentices if and when it is used in the shops by skilled workmen who have the job of imparting their skill to the young apprentices, but as I said before, it is not suited to the professional teachers when they are instructing apprentices in classrooms.

Much of my comment will no doubt meet with your acceptance because you say in the last page of your letter that "it was difficult to avoid that Monitors compare TWI from an entirely pedagogical point of view." In other words,

you have found the difficulties which I am trying to point out.

I am sure Mr. Etienne Bechet of the Centre D'Etude D'Organisation would be able to help you a great deal in your organization.

Sincerely yours,

C. R. Dooley

Survey of Economic Education

(Continued from page 14)

5. The program should not only impart information to the individual participants but teach them how to make use of them in conversation. This is particularly important for supervision. The cost of accomplishing this with hourly workers would in many cases be prohibitive.
6. Programs which are to have wide-spread application in one or more companies should be tested on a pilot basis.
7. The program should be based on facts, should permit practice and should bring conviction.
8. The broad company program should be as varied and employ as many media as practical.
9. The program should be geared to the intelligence level of the group and this implies tests for readability wherever possible and feasible.