

I. PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

1. PROJECT TITLE **211(d) Grant in Agricultural Economics Related to the Less Developed Countries--Cornell University**

APPENDIX ATTACHED
 YES NO

2. PROJECT NO. **931-11-140-125**

3. RECIPIENT (specify)
 COUNTRY _____
 REGIONAL _____ INTERREGIONAL **TA Bureau**

4. LIFE OF PROJECT
 BEGINS FY **1970**
 ENDS FY **1975**

5. SUBMISSION
 ORIGINAL
 REV. NO. **(2) 5/15/75**
 CONTR./PASA NO. **csd-2823**

II. FUNDING (\$000) AND MAN MONTHS (MM) REQUIREMENTS

| A. FUNDING BY FISCAL YEAR | B. TOTAL \$ | C. PERSONNEL | | D. PARTICIPANTS | | E. COMMODITIES \$ | F. OTHER COSTS \$ | G. PASA/CONTR. Grant | | H. LOCAL EXCHANGE CURRENCY RATES \$ US (U.S. CARRIED) | | |
|---------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------|-----------------|--------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------|--------|---|---|--|
| | | (1) \$ | (2) MM | (1) \$ | (2) MM | | | (1) \$ | (2) MM | (1) U.S. GRANT LOAN | (2) COOP COUNTRY (A) JOINT (B) INDIVIDUAL | |
| 1. PRIOR THRU ACTUAL FY | 240 | | | | | | 240 | 240 | | | | |
| 2. OPRN FY 75 | 50 | | | | | | 50 | 50 | | | | |
| 3. BUDGET FY | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. BUDGET 41 FY | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. BUDGET 42 FY | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. BUDGET 43 FY | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. ALL SUBQ. FY | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. GRAND TOTAL | 290 | | | | | | 290 | 290 | | | | |

9. OTHER DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS

| (A) NAME OF DONOR | (B) KIND OF GOODS/SERVICES | (C) AMOUNT |
|-------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| | | |

III. ORIGINATING OFFICE CLEARANCE

| | | |
|---|----------------------------------|-----------------|
| 1. DRAFTER FOR Lehman B. Fletcher <i>William C. Merrill</i> | TITLE Chief, TA/AGR/ESP | DATE 5/12/75 |
| 2. CLEARANCE OFFICER Leon F. Hesser <i>Leon F. Hesser</i> | TITLE Acting Director, TA/AGR | DATE 5/12/75 |

IV. PROJECT AUTHORIZATION

1. CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
 Grant Project Statement, dated April 25, 1975 attached. This Grant Extension Proposal was reviewed by the Research and Development Committee on May 6, 1975 and unanimously endorsed.

This is the final 211(d) "phase out" extension. No further extensions will be granted.

2. CLEARANCES

| BUR/OFF. | SIGNATURE | DATE | BUR/OFF. | SIGNATURE | DATE |
|----------|------------------------------------|---------|----------|--------------------------------|---------|
| TA/PPU | J. Gunning <i>J. Gunning</i> | 5/14/75 | TA/PPU | C. Molfetto <i>C. Molfetto</i> | 5/14/75 |
| TA/PPU | R.E. Kitchell <i>R.E. Kitchell</i> | 5/14/75 | TA/PPU | M. Mozynski <i>M. Mozynski</i> | 5/14/75 |
| PPC/DPRE | A. Handly <i>A. Handly</i> | | | | |

| | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|---------------------|
| 3. APPROVAL AAS OR OFFICE DIRECTORS SIGNATURE Curtis Farrar <i>Curtis Farrar</i> | DATE 5/14/75 | 4. APPROVAL A/ID (FORM NO. 1025.1 VIC) SIGNATURE John E. Murphy <i>John E. Murphy</i> | DATE MAY 20 1975 |
| TITLE AA/TA | | ADMINISTRATOR, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT DA/AID | |

INSTITUTIONAL GRANT PROJECT STATEMENT

Proposal for Extension of 211(d) Grant

Applicant: Cornell University

Date: April 25, 1975

Grant Title: A Grant to Strengthen Competence in the
Economics of Agricultural Development in
Less Developed Countries

Amount and Term of Grant - \$50,000 through FY 1976

I. Relevance of the Problem and Need for Expertise

There is urgent need in most developing countries to improve the performance of the agricultural sector as a means to promote their overall economic and social development. The current world food crisis is a grave reminder that the rate of growth of world agricultural output is still insufficient. In many developing countries food production has barely kept pace with population growth, while in Africa and parts of other continents per capita food production has actually declined. This inadequate output growth is in spite of expenditures of hundreds of billions of dollars on agricultural programs, including billions of dollars of external development assistance. The Green Revolution has produced a significant surge in output since the mid-1960s, but primarily of a few basic grains grown largely in irrigated areas. Notwithstanding its demonstration that major output gains are possible and its stimulus of substantial new efforts, the Green Revolution has not solved many problems that require much more attention if LDCs are to have the capacity to produce adequate food for their burgeoning populations in the future.

The situation in many countries is even less satisfactory in regard to objectives other than increasing food production. Improving income distribution, reducing underemployment, raising productivity and levels of living of the rural and urban poor, and maintaining price and balance-of-payments stability, are some of the goals that are being increasingly emphasized in LDCs. More and more, countries and aid agencies are placing priority on programs whose benefits will be widely distributed by the output and productivity increasing process itself, rather than deferring concern with equity objectives until adequate output levels have been achieved.

"Rural development" is becoming widely used to reflect the idea that the objectives of agricultural development should include expansion of productive employment opportunities both on and off farms and greater sectoral, regional, and personal equity in the distribution of income and social services, as well as substantial increases in output, if the large number of rural poor in LDCs are to benefit from growth. In this sense, rural development looks at the LDC growth process from the viewpoint of a target population--the majority of people in rural areas who now exist in varying degrees of absolute and relative poverty and whose conditions are tending to deteriorate in many countries as rural populations grow relative to available resources, technology in use, and prevailing institutional structures.

This express concern of rural development with multiple economic and social goals for the target rural population has not yet produced an adequate analytical framework or an approach that shows how the benefits of the development process can be widely extended to the small farmers, landless laborers and non-farm workers, who constitute the poor majority of LDC rural populations. The need to assist LDCs to develop their own capacity to analyze agricultural and rural development problems has been identified

by AID as a Key Problem Area. LDCs need to be able to explore a wide variety of kinds of questions about agricultural and rural development analytically--using relevant tools and reliable data. They need to know, for example, how best to allocate resources among different crops. They need to know whether their land, labor, and capital resources are being used efficiently in pursuit of their multiple goals. They need to know the implications of technological and policy choices on output, input, employment, and income distribution objectives. They need to better understand how agricultural change effects the total economy and how the agricultural sector is affected by growth and change in other sectors of the economy. They need to understand how to affect and organize for participation their population groups that have largely been excluded from past growth processes. At present, most LDCs are unable to obtain useful answers to these questions due to a lack of analytical capacity and a poor data base. Nevertheless, in a number of countries, policy makers are beginning to recognize the significance of the questions and the importance of the analytical capability needed to answer them, and to make provisions for agricultural and rural sector analysis in their staffing and budget plans as a crucial component of their overall planning systems.

Following the concern with world food supplies in the mid-60s the less developed countries and AID began to attach much higher priority to agricultural development. This shift in priorities soon revealed a critical deficiency in the Agency's skilled manpower. To provide the help the developing countries needed in the shaping of programs and policies which would substantially increase their agricultural production, research, skilled methodology, sophisticated analysis, and professional expertise were required and could only be provided by economists with understanding of and experience in agricultural development. But the Agency had very few professionals of this category on its rolls and in a period of reduced appropriations, lowered manpower ceilings, and diminished Agency attraction to career professionals, it did not seem possible to add significantly to their numbers by direct hire.

A large part of the Agency's needs, of course, could be met through contracts with private consultants and with universities, and these devices were extensively used. But there remained the responsibility of establishing the framework of a total program, or ordering priorities, of evaluating results and of seeing that results were applied. Moreover, there were AID missions with substantial agricultural development programs in some of the more important food-deficit countries which would obviously profit by having agricultural economists as regular staff members. These requirements could be met only if the Agency and LDCs had access to a larger number of capable economists professionally trained and working on problems of agricultural development.

The need for trained and experienced agricultural development specialists has continued to increase both within AID and LDCs. Missions, Regional Bureaus, and Central Bureaus have been unable to attract and retain personnel with the skills they need in this key problem area. The deficit supply in talent has been accentuated by the recent strong shift in emphasis in the Agency toward agricultural and rural development objectives,

especially in terms of their relationship to small farmers and the rural poor. Needs for additional manpower and analytical results are reflected on the overall agency approach to food production and increased equity and in the country strategies proposed in many of the DAPs. TAB, in collaboration with the Regional Bureaus, is planning a new initiative to mobilize additional talent in U.S. universities and to expand agency activities designed to strengthen LDCs capabilities to undertake their own planning and policy analysis. These Grants have been an important element in building the basis for the new system and their extension as proposed is an integral component of the evolutionary approach to an expanded program that has been formulated.

Agency needs for manpower and analytical expertise were important considerations in the Agency's decision in 1970 to negotiate the agreements which are the subject of this proposal. Section 211(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act provides authority to grant assistance "to research and educational institutions in the United States for the purpose of strengthening their capacity to develop and carry out programs concerned with the economic and social development of less developed countries."

II. Grantee Performance and Results-to-Date

The requirements for analytical work generated by the Agency's high-priority agricultural programs were already being met considerable part by the faculties of American universities. Increased and improved research on agricultural economics related to the problems of the developing countries was needed as was the specialized training of greater numbers of students, particularly those from the developing countries. These requirements justified the use of the 211(d) authority. And, since a faculty dealing with the agricultural development in the poor countries would obviously benefit from direct exposure to the problems of these countries and first-hand experience with current efforts to cope with them, it was considered appropriate to include in the grant agreement an arrangement under which some members of the department receiving financial support from AID would do a regular tour of duty with the Agency. Further, a pool of jointly approved staff members from the participating institutions was to be available for short-term services.

This was the rationale of the 211(d) grants made to the four universities in June 1970. The objectives were stated in virtually identical language in all four grants:

1. To create a framework within which a significant number of U.S. agricultural economists interested in the international aspects of their discipline can work cooperatively on certain research problems of urgent importance to developing countries, thereby increasing the effectiveness of their efforts, and making the most efficient use of scarce research resources; to provide an efficient means for applying the product of this research in a way which will be helpful to the developing countries; and to contribute to the development of professional contacts and collaboration among agricultural economists in the United States and in the developing countries.

2. To increase the competence of the University in the area of economic development problems, particularly as they relate to the agricultural sector and the relationship between agriculture and other economic sectors, by providing a continuing arrangement for faculty members to conduct research on campus and abroad and to carry on work in developing countries.

3. To enable the University to provide increased training in economic development and agricultural economics at the graduate level for students from the U.S. and the developing countries.

4. To provide members of the University faculty the enriching experience of dealing directly with problems of agricultural development in the less developed countries by arranging for them to serve with AID in capacities which will contribute to the development of their professional skills and to their understanding of how to accelerate agricultural growth in the less developed countries and deal with the practical problems involved in the process.

A. General Evaluation of Performance

The grants were evaluated during October-December, 1974 by campus visits of an intra-agency team that included outside experts. The team reviewed the grants both in terms of performance and in light of the Agency's policy to emphasize utilization as the basic element in any grant renewal. The Evaluation Team recommended a limited extension for each of the four grants. (See Attachment A, Report of Evaluation Team.)

The evaluation concluded that progress under the grants was excellent in those areas of greatest consistency with the Universities interests and objectives.

1. Graduate training: graduate and undergraduate curricula were broadened and improved by the addition of new courses related to agricultural development; additional graduate students, including a considerable number from LDCs were trained in relevant analytical field; equality of graduate training was improved by providing opportunities for students to undertake field research in LDCs.

2. Staff development: the number of faculty members involved in research and training on agricultural development problems was maintained, and in some cases increased, when other funding was insufficient to sustain the Universities' capability in this priority area.

3. Research: research in the high priority areas of the grant agreements was initiated and expanded. All research was improved by the flexibility afforded faculty members to travel and work in LDCs with 211(d) support.

4. Talent-Sharing: The talent-sharing commitments contained in the grant agreements, which required the Universities to move outside their normal interests and relationship to AID, have not been completely satisfied. (Only one university has fulfilled its talent-sharing commitment.) The grants did not provide AID access to the number and quality of personnel it needed on either a long-term or short-term basis.

5. Inter-university Collaboration: Similarly, cooperative work among the Universities did not develop to the extent hoped, especially in the early years of the grant program.

These deficiencies in performance are particularly regrettable because they prevented the grants from having as much direct impact on AID as had been expected and because the discrete activities of the four institutions were never integrated into a coherent program. Nevertheless, it should be clearly recognized that the weaknesses were due in large part to the failure of AID to provide leadership and direction to the program and that these dimensions of the grant activities were substantially strengthened through inter-university collaboration after AID initiated intensive discussion with the Universities in 1973.

B. Specific Evaluation of the Cornell Grant

Cornell University was awarded a 211(d) grant of \$240,000 for a five-year period on June 10, 1970. The grant was one of several made to land grant universities with substantial interests and commitments to teaching and research related to economic problems associated with the process of agricultural development. A major thrust of the grant was to expand and strengthen the competence of resident faculty committed to work related to problems in developing countries.

The objectives of the grant to Cornell University are the same as for the other institutions with 211(d) grants in agricultural economics. (See Part I). At Cornell, primary emphasis has been placed on developing programs concerned with agricultural markets and market systems, international trade and the terms of trade between agriculture and other sectors. This, in turn supplements and complements existing strength and work in production economics, land tenure systems price policy, evaluation of new technology and sector analysis with particular reference to employment and income distribution questions.

In order to assess the performance of Cornell University, the following areas and the competence and capacities developed within each will be covered: staff development, graduate training research, talent sharing and cooperation among institutions with 211(d) grants in agricultural economics.

1. Staff Development

Full-time tenured faculty members at Cornell University increased from 33 to 35 (with one vacancy) over the grant period. Supporting non-tenured faculty increased from 15 to 21 over the grant period. It appears that approximately 40% of the faculty members spend a substantial amount of time on work connected with economic development. The review team report states that the ability of Cornell University's Agricultural Economics Department to respond to the needs of AID, LDCs and other donors is limited because of commitments to teaching, research, and extension activities. The report also states that even though the grant funds were primarily used to support graduate student research, the faculty member involvement from the agricultural economics department was small, which again places limitations on the department's ability to respond to developing countries needs.

2. Graduate Training

Cornell University has performed well in this area, which the university placed greatest emphasis and the largest share of grant funds (over 50%). The number of graduate students at Cornell has remained near 100 over the grant period; however, the number of foreign graduate students increased from 21 to 33 over the same period. The focus of the 211(d) supported graduate students (presently there are 7) has primarily been on international trade. While there has been increases in foreign graduate students and research capabilities of them, it does not appear that Cornell has expanded graduate student interest in economic development to the point where that capacity could be utilized by AID and other international donors in the future, if called upon. There are only two grant-supported students from developing countries out of the total of seven students; out of the total of 100 graduate students, 50 students are either teaching or research assistants - only 12 of these are from developing countries. In general, Cornell University does not appear to have augmented its base in economic development-related research among graduate students, which implies that the ability to utilize the small capacity generated will be difficult.

3. Research

Most of the research products generated by the 211(d) grant have come from graduate students under the supervision of agricultural economics faculty members in the form of master's theses or PhD dissertations. The research has dealt with topics such as farm mechanization, technology transfer, resource allocation in agriculture, trade and labor absorption, agrarian reform and economic efficiency which have helped to increase the knowledge of the effects of these issues in developing countries. These studies have primarily been developing country-oriented. Utilization of these research results in developing countries may or may not be possible since many of these studies are state-of-the-art analyses of problems in specific developing countries and may not have worldwide application.

4. Talent Sharing

Cornell University agreed to provide AID with 5 man-years of university talent. It was envisaged by AID that Cornell could best accomplish this by increasing the core staff in economic development through non-tenured staff members for AID assignments. To date, Cornell has only provided AID with one man-year of service and there are no plans for additional talent sharing. The problem appears to be twofold: university policy discourages the types of assignments contemplated by AID under talent sharing arrangements; and AID has not yet provided assurances that these assignments would have substantive professional content. As stated earlier, the core staff has not been augmented to the point where university capacity could participate in talent sharing arrangements. Further utilization of this capacity by AID, therefore, as Cornell views it, is impractical and not possible.

5. Cooperation Among Institutions

Cornell has made progress in cooperating with other 211(d) institutions. The cooperation has primarily been in the form of interaction between Cornell graduate students pursuing research studies in some of the countries where the other schools have initiated similar research efforts. Michigan State and Southern University pursuing research in Nigeria and the Camerouns, respectively have collaborated with Cornell graduate students. Cornell has also promoted interaction among the universities through presentations of research findings at these institutions and inviting these schools to do likewise at Cornell. Cooperation has not proceeded to the point where faculty exchanges and joint research efforts have taken place or are planned. However, the dialogue between Cornell and the other grantees has increased over the grant period, and the workshops and seminars which the University has sponsored can be attributed to sincere desire to share research results.

Cornell, in addition to this 211(d) grant activity, has several other contracts and grants with AID. To elaborate briefly, they are:

- a. "Agricultural Technology" - Dr. John Mellor, Department of Agricultural Economics, research contract.
- b. "Cost-Effectiveness of Controlling Vitamin A Deficiency"- Division of Nutritional Science, research contract.
- c. "Policies for Science and Technology in Developing Nations"- administered jointly by Cornell's Center for International Studies, College of Engineering and School of Science and Technology, 211(d) grant.
- d. Tropical soils development, Agronomy Department, 211(d) grant.

Cornell has maintained linkages with international research centers such as CIMMYT and IRRI; they have maintained contacts and working relationships in India, Indonesia, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Malaysia, Iran, Iran, Venezuela, Mexico, Nigeria, and Ethiopia. Contacts are also maintained with former Cornell students in these and other developing countries.

C. Summary

In short, Cornell University's Agricultural Economics Department does not appear to have expanded its capacity to the extent that AID and other donor agencies can utilize it. Utilization via AID contracts, and not the 211(d) mechanism appears to be the best alternative available at the present time.

III. Commitment to Long-Term Involvement

Cornell University is the Land Grant University of the State of New York. Over its 100 year history, it has achieved international recognition for scholarship, research and leadership in undergraduate and graduate education. The College of Agriculture is a part of the State University of New York as well as Cornell University. In recognition of the importance of problems in international agricultural development and the continuing

commitment of the faculty to research, teaching and study in the area, the College of Agriculture, in 1963, established the Office of International Agricultural Development funded by the State of New York. College-wide and department programs concerning international agriculture are coordinated thru this office. It provides a focus for graduate and under graduate programs in this area as well as encouraging research by both faculty members and students. The Department of Agricultural Economics is an integral part of the College and of the Office of International Agricultural Development.

Before the grant, there were three full-time faculty positions with the Agricultural Economics Department supported by state funds where central interest is focussed upon problems associated with agricultural economic development; currently there are five positions (utilizing some 211(d) funds. In addition, approximately 23 other faculty members in the department have been involved with research, teaching or longer-term consulting assignments overseas on important agricultural economic development problems. Before the grant was established, 33% of the department's graduate students were pursuing degree programs concerned with various aspects of international development; currently 50% of the department's graduate students now pursue degree programs related to development.

Cornell University has received funds from private foundation grants, research contracts with federal and private agencies and specially funded state programs to support graduate student assistantships or fellowships in agricultural development. Several faculty members have also received support to pursue research related to economic development from some of these same sources.

From the analysis presented, it appears that Cornell University, through its College of Agriculture, Office of International Agricultural Development and Department of Agricultural Economics is truly committed to long-term involvement in economic development problems. Countries in which the department maintains special relationships include:

- Philippines - joint faculty interests with the International Rice Research Institute (IRRI)
- Nigeria - through teaching and research activities for the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA)
- Sri Lanka - concerning food policy planning and sponsored by FAO.

Cornell University has responded to requests for services from several international agencies and institutes with whom they maintain continuing relationships. The utilization of the capacity developed there by AID, other donor agencies and IDCs will be limited because of its small core staff devoted to international development problems, and its commitments to teaching, research, and extension activities at the University.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

IV. Rationale for Extension

The need for the capacity generated by these grants continues to accelerate in the Agency. The one-year grant extensions are proposed so that AID can continue to utilize the training, research and advisory capacities of the Universities while new mechanisms are being implemented to support larger AID programs in this area. They are necessary to complete training and research already in progress and to maintain the involvement of the small core staff working on LDC development.

The extension will involve support for the following purposes:

1. Completion of dissertation research by LDC and U.S. students on important agricultural development topics linked to LDC research planning and educational agencies.
2. Completion of research by faculty members on key development issues and problems where direct utilization by AID or another assistance agency is foreseen.
3. Limited salary support for faculty members that will be available to AID on a short-term basis for sector and subsector analysis, project identification and design, and evaluation and advisory services.

No further 211(d) support for these activities beyond the one-year extension is planned. AID should and will use other mechanisms to maintain the increased quantity and quality of training and research and to utilize the competence of faculty members in collaborative work with LDC personnel.

The programmatic focus and proposed allocation of funds activity areas for one-year extension is given in Section V below.

Failure to extend the grant as proposed would leave the University with resources to complete the dissertation and faculty research already in progress. The most serious consequences for the Agency would be the reduction in trained manpower and the disappearance of the staff competence that has been sustained, expanded and enhanced by the grants. Without additional financing to provide for an orderly phase-down of grant activities and a build-up in alternative approaches to mobilizing staff talent and training graduate students, many of the achievements and much of the pay-off to AID from the original grants will be dissipated.

Alternative sources of funds for training and research on agricultural and rural development are generally unavailable. Universities can seldom use state funds for these purposes. Foundation programs have been drastically curtailed. No regular source of federal funds other than AID exists. It therefore becomes essential for this Agency to continue its support in a consistent and timely manner to the primary training research.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

V. Revised Grant Project Design

Following the recommendations in the Evaluation Report, the proposed Cornell one-year extension concentrates on graduate training and, to a lesser extent, research on international trade. Six PhD candidates will be supported with the expectation that they will complete their dissertation research during the period of the extension. All of these graduate students are currently funded under the 211(d) grant and each is doing field research in an LDC. If funding is not continued at the proposed \$50,000 level during FY-76 these students will be unable to undertake their field research and complete their established research plan. Funds from the extension will be used for assistantships, travel, data collection, computer use, and publication costs.

The additional item is for support for research at Cornell on international trade. This area was identified by the Evaluation Team as one that should be maintained while arrangements are made to utilize Cornell's competence in this important field through training programs and seminars/workshops.

A budget for the planned expenditures is given in Attachment 1.

VI. Complementary Actions and Management Considerations

Cornell has been especially successful in establishing and maintaining linkages with IRRI, IATA and other international research centers. These relationships are of particular interest to AID and should be encouraged. It appears that the Cornell activities can serve as an effective supplement to the linkage role being played by AID. During the year, possibilities for expanding these linkages into an effective network involving the socio-economic staffs of the international research centers and U.S. universities will be undertaken. Cornell will be asked to give leadership to these efforts and share its experience with the other participants.

Attachment

Proposed Budget and Planned Expenditures
211(d) Grant Funding
Department of Agricultural Economics
Cornell University
July 1, 1975 - June 30, 1976

Planned Expenditures

I. Salary and support funds for Mrs. Judith Kramer, Research Specialist working for D. G. Sisler in support of research in international trade - Agricultural Experiment Station Project 121-449

| | |
|---|----------|
| A. Salary | \$12,900 |
| B. Support (computer use, data retrieval, supplies) | 500 |
| Total | \$13,400 |

II. Graduate Training - Assistantship salaries, University fees, computer expenses, publications, and overseas support where appropriate

A. Peter Matlon, citizen of the United States
 Completion of dissertation and publication based on field research in Nigeria (D. G. Sisler, thesis adviser)

| | |
|---|----------|
| 1. Assistantship & University fees (9 months) | \$ 3,600 |
| 2. Computer expense | 900 |
| 3. Publication expenses | 1,000 |
| Total | \$ 5,500 |

B. Peter Calkins, citizen of the United States
 Completion of dissertation and publication based on field research in Nepal (D. G. Sisler, thesis adviser)

| | |
|---|----------|
| 1. Assistantship & University fees (3 months) | \$ 1,000 |
| 2. Computer and supplies | 500 |
| 3. Publication expenses | 1,000 |
| Total | \$ 2,500 |

C. Veit Burger, citizen of Austria
 Completion of dissertation and publication based on field research in Nepal (D. G. Sisler, thesis adviser)

| | |
|--|----------|
| 1. Assistantship & University fees (12 months) | \$ 3,600 |
| 2. Computer and publications | 1,000 |
| Total | \$ 5,000 |

D. Gillian Kurt, citizen of South Africa
 Support of field research in Jogjakarta, Indonesia (J. W. Mellor, thesis adviser)

| | |
|--|----------|
| 1. Field expenses (supplies and enumerators' salaries) | \$ 6,000 |
| Total | \$ 6,000 |

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Travel expenses to Indonesia and return were included in the 1974-75 budget.

Planned Expenditures)

II. Continued

E. Fred Rukandema, citizen of Uganda
Support of field research at the Institute for Development
Studies, Nairobi, Kenya (K. L. Robinson, thesis adviser)

| | |
|---|--------------|
| 1. Assistantship overseas | \$ 4,000 |
| 2. Field research expenses (supplies and enumerators' salaries in Kenya) | 5,000 |
| 3. Tabulation and data analysis | <u>1,000</u> |
| Total | \$10,000 |

Travel expenses to Kenya and return were included in the
1974-75 budget.

F. Fahri Unsal, citizen of Turkey
Completion of coursework and dissertation at Cornell
based on field research in Turkey (O. D. Forker, thesis adviser)

| | |
|---|------------|
| 1. Assistantship & University fees (9 months) | \$ 3,600 |
| 2. Computer and tabulation | 600 |
| 3. Publication expenses | <u>800</u> |
| Total | \$ 5,000 |

III. Publications - Publication of research results of four graduate
students whose research was completed prior to July 1, 1975.
Gregory Lassiter, Michael Schultheis, John Staatz, and Ram Yadav
completed their research under the auspices of the original
211(d) grant.

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| Publications and mimeographed reports | \$ 2,000 |
|---------------------------------------|----------|

| | |
|-------------|-----------------|
| GRAND TOTAL | <u>\$50,000</u> |
|-------------|-----------------|

BEST AVAILABLE COPY