

Building National Capacity in the Social Sciences

*Insights from
Experience in Asia*

Abe Weisblat
and
Bryant Kearn

Winrock International
Occasional Paper

Winrock International Institute for Agricultural Development was formed in 1985 by the merger of three organizations with a common heritage of helping rural people of developing countries by providing technical assistance and encouragement to their agricultural development: Agricultural Development Council, International Agricultural Development Service, and Winrock International Livestock Research and Training Center. The commitment and motivation of these organizations continues through Winrock International's mission to reduce poverty and hunger in the world through sustainable agricultural and rural development. Winrock helps people of developing areas -- in Asia, Africa and the Middle East, Latin America and the Caribbean, and the United States -- to strengthen their agricultural institutions, develop their human resources, design sustainable agricultural systems and strategies, and improve their policies for agricultural and rural development. It provides services independently as well as in partnership with other public and private organizations. Winrock is an autonomous, nonprofit, operating foundation whose activities are funded by grants, contracts, and contributions from public and private sources and by its endowment. The institute is recognized as a private and voluntary organization.

PN-ABY-650

BUILDING NATIONAL CAPACITY IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Insights from Experience in Asia

by Abe Weisblat and Bryant Kearl

Revised April 1989
Winrock International Institute for Agricultural Development

Copyright © 1989 by Winrock International
Institute for Agricultural Development
Route 3, Box 376
Morrisilton, Arkansas 72110-9537, USA
All rights reserved.
Printed in the United States of America.

An earlier version of this document was published as Winrock
International's Working Paper Number 1 in August 1988.

CONTENTS

	Page
List of tables.....	v
Acknowledgments.....	ix
Why a study was needed.....	1
How the study was done.....	2
The subjects.....	2
The questionnaire.....	3
The respondents.....	3
What the study revealed.....	8
What have the fellows accomplished professionally?.....	8
How useful was the fellowship experience to the fellows' work?.....	14
How satisfactory were the fellows' choices of major field, university, and dissertation topic?.....	15
How satisfactory were the elements of the program?.....	16
How appropriate was the process used to select fellows?.....	17
What subjects were neglected or overemphasized?.....	19
How appropriate were the dissertation research practices?...	19
How helpful was the agency that funded the fellowship?.....	20
How satisfactory was the program as a whole?.....	22
What problems were caused by language barriers?.....	26
How involved were the adviser and host department in third world issues?.....	27
What problems did fellows have when they returned home?.....	27
How much contact do former fellows have with their peers?...	32
What help have former fellows received in maintaining and expanding their professional competence?.....	33
What continuing role did fellows see for donors?.....	34
How USAID-supported fellows compare.....	36
Age, background, sex, and field of study.....	37
Brain drain.....	38
Overseas training.....	39
Problems of reentry.....	43
The demand side: Employers' views.....	45
Past performance and future needs.....	47
Needed innovations.....	48
How the programs measured up.....	49
What donors should do now.....	50

CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
Appendix 1: Overview of related studies.....	55
Training Agricultural Economists for Work in International Development by Darrell F. Fienup and Harold M. Riley.....	55
Evaluation of the General Participant Training Project (USAID) by Charles Hefferman.....	57
IDRC Training Policy Study by the Office of the Vice-President, Planning.....	58
IDRC Training Program in Asia: An Evaluative Study by Pedro V. Flores.....	60
A Study of Former Rockefeller Foundation Scholars and Fellows by James Coleman.....	61
Ford Foundation Support for Education Abroad of Third World Nationals by Robert G. Myers.....	63
CIMMYT In-service Trainee Questionnaire: A Partial Analysis.....	64
East-West Center Alumni by William Cummings.....	65
Bibliography.....	67
Appendix 2: Questionnaire to fellows and scholars supported by grants from Ford Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation, A/D/C, and IDRC.....	69

TABLES

Number		Page
1	Rate of fellows' response to questionnaire by country....	4
2	Rate of fellows' response to questionnaire by funding agency.....	4
3	Proportions of men and women participating in the fellowship programs.....	5
4	Distribution of fellows by discipline.....	6
5	Locations of fellows' jobs.....	7
6	Types of organizations employing fellows.....	8
7	Occupations of fellows on return home and in 1985.....	9
8	Teaching contributions of fellows employed in universities, 1985.....	12
9	Fellows' research and other professional activities.....	13
10	Fellows' evaluations of the usefulness of their overseas training to their jobs.....	14
11	Fellows' assessments of the usefulness of their overseas training in preparing them to perform certain tasks.....	15
12	Fellows' expressions of satisfaction with initial fellowship-program decisions.....	16
13	Fellows' expressions of satisfaction with elements of their training programs.....	17
14	Fellows' recommendations about procedures for selecting new fellows.....	18
15	Fellows' assessments of the emphasis that should be placed on the various qualifications of potential fellows.....	19
16	Fellows' assessments of alternatives for combining graduate course work and dissertation research.....	20
17	Fellows' evaluations of donor support during study abroad.....	21
18	Fellows' expressions of satisfaction with their fellowship programs.....	22

TABLES (continued)

Number		Page
19	Fellows' expressions of satisfaction with the fellowship experience compared to satisfaction with help received from funding agency	23
20	Fellows' expressions of satisfaction with the fellowship experience by recency of return home.....	23
21	Fellows' expressions of satisfaction with the fellowship experience compared to amount of contact with home institution during study abroad.....	24
22	Fellows' expressions of satisfaction with the fellowship experience compared to perceived adequacy of preparation.....	25
23	Fellows' assessments of adequacy of preparation.....	25
24	Fellows' assessments of problems caused by language barriers.....	26
25	Fellows' expressions of satisfaction with the fellowship experience compared to degree of language difficulty.....	27
26	Fellows' assessments of involvement of advisers and host departments in third world issues.....	28
27	Fellows' assessments of personal and family-related problems encountered on return home.....	29
28	Fellows' assessments of employment-related problems encountered on return home.....	29
29	Fellows' assessments of professional development problems encountered on return home.....	30
30	Comparison of difficulties encountered by earlier and more recent fellows on return home.....	30
31	Fellows' perceptions of changes in problems facing fellows on return home.....	31
32	Fellows' assessments of opportunities for contact with professional peers.....	32
33	Fellows' assessments of the frequency of continuing contact with personal acquaintances they met during study abroad.....	33

TABLES (continued)

Number		Page
34	Fellows' sources of help in maintaining professional competence in the years immediately after return home....	34
35	Fellows' needs for help of external donors in meeting critical professional needs.....	35
36	Rate of USAID fellows' response to questionnaire.....	37
37	Distribution of fellows by discipline -- India and Indonesia.....	39
38	Fellows' research and other professional activities -- India and Indonesia.....	40
39	Fellows' recommendations about procedures for selecting new fellows -- India and Indonesia.....	41
40	Fellows' assessments of alternatives for combining graduate course work and dissertation research -- India and Indonesia.....	42
41	Fellows' assessments of professional development problems encountered on return home -- India and Indonesia.....	44
42	Fellows' sources of help in maintaining professional competence in the years immediately after return home -- India and Indonesia.....	45

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The proposal for this study emerged from my discussions with friends and coworkers concerned with the issue. I was preparing to retire after 27 years with the Agricultural Development Council. My friend David Hopper of the World Bank suggested that the time had come to use my lifetime of experience in the foundation world by taking a look at the fellowship programs these organizations had supported to strengthen the professional capacity of Asian social scientists dealing with problems of agriculture and rural development.

The philanthropic world had played a special role in these programs, largely because it was able to maintain some independence from the factional issues within nations and the tensions of international relations. Except in a few special situations, changes in political leadership and ideology had done remarkably little to disrupt or interrupt these programs. Foundations were able to experiment with new approaches to the process of human capital development and to think beyond the urgencies and tactics of the moment in establishing training goals and strategies.

The Ford and Rockefeller foundations, the Agricultural Development Council, and the International Development Research Centre of Canada were key organizations in this effort, as was the U.S. Agency for International Development, which made an impressively flexible contribution to building social science capacity in Asia at that time. We thus focused on their projects.

All of the above groups helped fund the study. Without their support and encouragement, we could not have moved ahead.

The John D. Rockefeller 3rd Fund was most generous in its support, as was the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and Winrock International Institute for Agricultural Development.

In addition to its financial support, the Rockefeller Foundation made it possible for Bryant Kearn, then vice chancellor at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and a former A/D/C colleague, to work with me for a month in Bellagio, Italy, to develop the basic questionnaire.

I was invited to join Rutgers University and the Department of Agricultural Economics and Marketing of Cook College, which provided me with the infrastructure I needed and colleagues on whom to test my ideas.

For their review of the initial design and for their continued invaluable suggestions, I thank Lawrence Stifel, Clarence Gray, and Joyce Moock of the Rockefeller Foundation; Alan Rix and Douglas Daniels at IDRC; Russell Phillips at Rockefeller Brothers Fund; Elizabeth McCormack of the John D. Rockefeller 3rd Fund; and Peter Geithner and Norman Collins of the Ford Foundation.

Several Asian former fellows also offered indispensable help in the planning, among them V. S. Vyas and the late Raj Krishna of India, Jin Hwan Park of Korea, Sam Hsieh of Taiwan, and Gelia Castillo of the Philippines.

Former fellows in Asia helped get the questionnaire distributed and encouraged responses. They also checked on addresses and dealt with the logistics of mailing the questionnaires out and sending the returned forms to Rutgers. The USAID offices in India and Indonesia took care of the logistics for their group in these two countries, while Vijay Pande, director of the IDRC office in India, was responsible for the other respondents in India, Gerry Rixhon for those in Thailand, Gerry Gill in Bangladesh, and John Cool in Nepal.

I owe thanks to my colleagues who helped by making suggestions and reviewing some of the drafts: Vern Ruttan, Hans Binswanger, David Hopper, and Ruth Zagorin; Haven North and Ray Cohen of USAID; and Carl Pray, Reed Hertford, and Les Small of Rutgers.

David Manfredonia at Rutgers was responsible for data analysis as well as for an enormous amount of day-to-day work relating to the study, including computer programming to test a variety of ideas, conjectures, and hypotheses that came to us from many sources.

And, of course, I thank Bry Kearl, who has played a major role in all phases of the study; my codesigner, my editor, and my friend.

Finally, I pay special tribute to Elizabeth McCormack, who encouraged me from the beginning; to Blanchette Rockefeller, who was first to fund the project; and especially to John D. Rockefeller 3rd. It was his concern with how to prepare a young generation to deal with the problems of their own countries that stimulated a wide range of human capital development programs. The impact of his philosophy on other organizations is perhaps less visible than his own direct contribution in founding and supporting the Agricultural Development Council and the Population Council and thus giving impetus to the development of a generation of professionals.

Abraham M. Weisblat

BUILDING NATIONAL CAPACITY IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES Insights from Experience in Asia

WHY A STUDY WAS NEEDED

By the end of the 1940s, a small but growing number of professionally trained social scientists were directing their research at policy issues that face the developing world; however, virtually all of these individuals had been born and brought up in industrialized countries and were products of the universities of those countries. The third world needed to develop its own capacity to study its social and economic problems empirically.

To meet this need, fellowship programs were begun that took third world nationals to developed countries to study and to become proficient in using the tools and methods of social science inquiry. Governments, lending agencies, and philanthropic organizations devoted great human and financial resources to supporting third world students who pursued advanced degrees in the social sciences in the United States and other industrialized countries.

Donors and third world policy leaders were aware that overseas-fellowship programs did not offer a definitive or permanent solution to the problem. Developed-world universities rarely offered courses or curricula that focused on the problems of developing countries, such as policy alternatives for primarily subsistence rural economies. By training abroad, fellows had few opportunities to conduct applied research into development problems and to collect data in settings where those problems occurred. The costs of overseas training were high, scarce foreign exchange was required to meet them, and the possibility of losing the newly trained scientists to jobs in the developed world was an important financial (as well as intellectual) risk.

But the donors saw no other option for achieving a high level of competence quickly. They expected the third world to depend on the industrialized world for training temporarily, but they recognized that no country would have an adequate supply of well-trained, problem-oriented social scientists until it could train them itself.

The fellowship programs had a variety of goals. Some tried simply to increase the number of individuals with advanced training; that is, they were not focused on particular positions or organizations. Some were part of institution-building programs; they produced graduates in specific fields such as economics and sociology to fill emerging positions in teaching and research.

Regardless of approach, the programs made a difference. Most developing countries now have their own groups of scholars using social science theories and methodologies effectively to shape and implement sound policies. At the same time, the abilities of many developing

countries to train their own social scientists have grown dramatically. In these changed circumstances, the roles of international donor agencies and developed-country educational institutions need to be rethought.

HOW THE STUDY WAS DONE

This study looked at four major fellowship programs carried on since the 1950s to build the capacities of Asian countries to examine socioeconomic issues scientifically. It paid particular attention to four countries, each of which has unique university and governmental traditions and each of which has devised its own strategy for human resource development.

The study sought information on the accomplishments and problems of these programs as a source of insights for the future. It gathered information on the places the former fellows have taken in the world of social science and governmental policy, their evaluations of their overseas experiences, and their advice to donor agencies on future programming. It emphasized how the fellows have helped their home countries become better able to train social scientists and what must be done to maintain and expand that training capacity.

This study asked former fellows to respond to a detailed questionnaire about their training and employment experiences. It also included supplementary interviews with fellows' present or potential employers in the third world: 33 university leaders, government administrators, and private-sector executives in India, Indonesia, the Philippines, and Thailand. These employers were asked to comment on the usefulness to their countries of the work of social scientists who were trained abroad and on steps that must be taken to achieve or maintain the level of social science competence their countries need.

The Subjects

This study drew its data from a comprehensive survey of Asian social scientists who had received fellowships for graduate study in industrialized countries. Questionnaires were mailed to 944 men and women who

- were from Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Korea, Malaysia, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, Republic of China, Singapore, Sri Lanka, or Thailand
- studied in social science fields
- were in fellowship programs between 1960 and 1985
- were supported by the Ford Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation, Agricultural Development Council (A/D/C, now Winrock International Institute for Agricultural Development), or International Development Research Centre (IDRC)

A copy of the questionnaire was sent to the best available address for each of the former fellows. Of course, in three decades donor agencies and home institutions had lost track of some of the fellows; thus, 105 questionnaires were returned unopened because the addressee was deceased or was unknown at the address given.

The Questionnaire

The questionnaire consisted of 44 questions that solicited information and opinions on a wide range of issues related to the respondent's employment history, study program, and professional activities. It also requested demographic data (see appendix 2).

The Respondents

Of the 839 questionnaires that we assume reached their addressees, 435 were completed and returned. (Some of the tables in this report show fewer than 435 responses. We omitted the no response or not applicable groups in calculating percentages when doing so presented a clearer, more informative picture.)

Considering the geographic dispersion of the respondents and the long period during which most had been out of touch with the fellowship donors and programs, the response rate of 51.8% for a mailed questionnaire is acceptable and compares favorably with the response rates for similar studies.

The response rate varied considerably from country to country (see table 1). Three regions that have few former fellows (Korea, Sri Lanka, and Taiwan) responded most promptly and in the highest percentages. In each of these countries virtually all of the former fellows were concentrated in a few institutions in the national capital or major university cities. The help of individuals at these centers made it possible to deliver questionnaires and collect responses personally.

In countries that are larger or have more former fellows (such as India, the Philippines, and Thailand), potential respondents were more scattered. We could follow up only by letter, and some of the resulting response rates were lower.

Rates of response differed somewhat among funding agencies (see table 2). IDRC had the highest rate, probably because its fellowship program was more recent and, therefore, its contact with the fellows was more recent and its mailing list was more current. A/D/C also had a good response rate, probably because follow-up activities are strong and, therefore, the mailing list is up to date.

Although the Asian fellowship programs of the Ford and Rockefeller foundations were larger than A/D/C's or IDRC's, they included physical and biological scientists, and we did not send questionnaires to those individuals. A/D/C limited its funding in Asia to social scientists,

Table 1. Rate of fellows' response to questionnaire by country.

Country	Questionnaires delivered	Questionnaires returned	Rate of response
Bangladesh	81	18	22.2
India	158	69	43.6
Indonesia	103	68	66.0
Korea	22	22	100.0
Malaysia	55	23	41.8
Nepal	42	15	35.7
Pakistan	36	14	38.9
Philippines	147	86	58.5
Singapore	22	4	18.2
Sri Lanka	13	12	92.3
Taiwan	21	16	76.2
Thailand	139	88	63.3
TOTAL	839	435	51.8

Table 2. Rate of fellows' response to questionnaire by funding agency.

Funding agency	Questionnaires delivered	Questionnaires returned	Rate of response
Ford Foundation	290	105	36.2
Rockefeller Foundation	165	71	43.0
A/D/C	363	243	66.9
IDRC	21	16	76.2
TOTAL	839	435	51.8

so all of its former fellows in the 12 countries received questionnaires. It is more heavily represented among respondents because it played a more prominent role than the others in supporting social science training in Asia.

Age. The age distribution of respondents reflected the trend in support for overseas graduate study and was affected by the retirement and death of members of the older generation. Only 15% were under 35, 40% were between 35 and 44, 27% were between 45 and 55, and 18% were 55 or older.

Parents' characteristics. Education stopped in primary school for 28.5% of the fathers of respondents and 57.0% of the mothers. Farmer was listed as the occupation of 22.8% of the fathers and 12.2% of the mothers of respondents. Business was listed for 19.1% of the fathers and 8.0% of the mothers.

Rural-urban distribution. It is difficult for any third world fellowship program to direct opportunities for graduate study to students of rural background because there is a geographical bias toward urban areas in primary and secondary education as well as at the university level. The four fellowship programs described in this study have had at least modest success in breaking this barrier to support students with rural backgrounds and interests. Just 29.2% of respondents grew up in cities of 100,000 population or more; 50.1% came from rural areas or communities of less than 20,000.

Sex. The fellowship programs have been less successful in coping with sex bias than with geographical bias. The reasons for the widespread bias that favors men are complex, but they include a societal expectation that women's career aspirations and plans revolve around marriage and motherhood. Families, school systems, and ultimately fellowship selection committees have all had to deal with an unspoken societal assumption that it is better to invest scarce educational resources in men than in women. Lists of candidates who are qualified by education and experience for overseas graduate study are still dominated by men's names.

Some progress has been made in offering opportunities to women, but the gap is still wide (see table 3). Nevertheless, the pool of qualified women applicants for graduate study has been growing, and donors and funding agencies have become increasingly sensitive to the need to support women students.

Table 3. Proportions of men and women participating in the fellowship programs.

Sex	Before 1970		1970-1985		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Men	108	88.5	250	80.9	358	83.1
Women	14	11.5	59	19.1	73	16.9

Date degree completed. Most of the respondents completed their overseas programs after 1975. This total reflects the way that fellowship support built up slowly through the fifties and sixties. The decline in support that occurred in the eighties is not reflected because the study only included persons whose overseas study ended by 1985. The

response rate was somewhat higher for recent fellows because address lists for them were more up to date.

Developed- vs developing-country institution. Nearly all of the fellows (99.3%) completed master's degrees, about half with financial support from an international funding agency. The growth in third world capacity to offer work beyond the baccalaureate is evidenced by the fact that a little more than half earned their M.S. or M.A. degrees in a developing country.

Two-thirds of the fellows completed Ph.D. degrees. A small but growing proportion (11.7% of the total holding the doctorate) received that degree from a third world institution.

Discipline. The social science discipline that received the greatest attention in the fellowship programs was economics (see table 4). Of all fellows, 55% listed an economics major -- 33% in agricultural economics and 22% in general economics.

Table 4. Distribution of fellows by discipline.

Discipline	Before 1970		1970-1985		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Economics (agricultural or general)	67	55.3	167	54.4	234	54.7
Sociology (rural or general)	12	9.9	39	12.7	51	11.9
Education (including extension)	8	6.6	22	7.2	30	7.0
Business administration	10	8.3	16	5.2	26	6.1
Political science and public administration	3	2.5	15	4.9	18	4.3
Rural development	6	5.0	12	3.9	18	4.3
Anthropology	3	2.5	5	1.6	8	1.9
Psychology	0	0.0	7	2.2	7	1.6
Communication	2	1.7	3	1.0	5	1.2
Home economics	2	1.7	1	0.3	3	0.7
Other	8	6.6	20	6.5	28	6.5
TOTAL	121		307		428	

Sociology was the major field for about 12%, education for 7%, and business administration for about 6%. Other fields studied by at least 1% of graduates included political science and public administration, rural development, anthropology, psychology, and communication.

The distribution by discipline is significant. It represents joint decisions by home countries and donors about which social science fields had the most to offer at the time and could benefit most from programs to strengthen staffing and research capacity.

In fields other than economics, modest gains have been made in recent years; 15 of the 18 persons doing graduate work in political science or public administration completed their studies after 1975.

Career progress. A large number of fellows returned to work in their home countries after completing study abroad (see table 5). Of those who responded, about 97% indicated that their first jobs after overseas study were in their home countries. Five persons went to other third world countries and only four took employment in an industrialized country. There is no evidence of a later exodus. In 1985, 95% of the respondents were still at work in the third world.

Table 5. Locations of fellows' jobs.

Location	First job after return home		Job as of 1985	
	N	%	N	%
Home country	421	96.8	402	92.4
Other third world country	5	1.1	11	2.5
Developed country	4	0.9	20	4.6
No response	5	1.1	2	0.5
TOTAL	435		435	

A clear majority of the fellows returned to academic positions, for the most part in junior ranks (assistant professor, instructor, research associate). About 56% still serve in universities (see table 6).

Although none of the four fellowship programs carried an employment obligation, the first-job choices of returned fellows were influenced by national and agency human resource goals. University employment was the predominant first-job choice for returning fellows, particularly those from Thailand, the Philippines, Taiwan, India, Indonesia, and Bangladesh, at least 60% of whom found their first employment in the academic world. Respondents from Pakistan were somewhat more likely to begin their careers in research institutions and those from Korea, Sri Lanka, and Nepal in governmental administrative and policy agencies. Respondents who were funded by the Ford and Rockefeller foundations were most likely to return to university employment (86% for Ford and 87% for Rockefeller); 57% of A/D/C fellows and 50% of IDRC fellows returned to universities.

Table 6. Types of organizations employing fellows.

Type of organization	First job after return home		Job as of 1985	
	N	%	N	%
University	272	62.5	242	55.6
Research institute	70	16.1	71	16.3
Governmental administrative or policy agency	60	13.8	64	14.7
Foundation	13	3.0	25	5.7
Private firm or self-employed	13	3.0	28	6.4
Other	2	0.5	2	0.5
No response	5	1.1	3	0.7
TOTAL	435		435	

Whatever their official title and employment unit, most fellows (57.9%) continued to have teaching responsibilities in their jobs as of 1985 (fewer, however, than the 66.8% for whom teaching was a part of the first jobs they held on their return home). Nearly 60.2% continued to have research responsibilities. The biggest single change, as might be expected, was the increasing percentage who held university or governmental administrative and managerial duties: 29.2% in their first jobs and 46.8% in their 1985 jobs.

WHAT THE STUDY REVEALED

The results of our survey revealed the following characteristics and opinions of the former fellows.

What have the fellows accomplished professionally?

The career advancement and increased responsibilities of the returned fellows were evidenced in their answers to questions about job titles on their return and in 1985 (see table 7).

In each country, fellows' employment shifted modestly over the years from university to private business or self-employment. This was particularly pronounced in the Philippines, where 4.8% of the respondents initially took jobs in private business and 10.6% were in the private sector in 1985. Conditions of employment in the Philippines during this period, especially in government, may have contributed to this trend.

Returned fellows could expect to move into positions where they would influence the methods and materials of teaching, research, and policy analysis. Answers to the questionnaire indicate that this has occurred.

Table 7. Occupations of fellows on return home and in 1985.

Occupation	First job after return home		Job as of 1985	
	N	%	N	%
Academic administrator (president, rector, vice chancellor, dean, department chair, etc.)	33	7.8	68	15.7
Director of research or policy review	27	6.4	45	10.4
Governmental administrator	26	6.1	38	8.8
Senior teacher (professor, associate professor)	58	13.7	101	23.4
Institute or governmental research worker	57	13.4	52	12.0
Private business person	12	2.8	28	6.6
Junior research or teaching staff member (assistant professor, instructor, research associate)	208	49.1	97	22.5
Other	3	0.7	3	0.7
TOTAL	424		432	

Even a cursory review of the titles currently held by the respondents leaves no doubt as to their critical roles in socioeconomic policy in their countries. There is probably no better way to show how significant these four programs of fellowship support have been than to catalog some of these titles. Among the former fellows are persons who held the following positions of senior academic leadership at the time of this study:

- Rector for general administration, Hasanuddin University
- President, University of the Philippines
- Vice chancellor, University of Peredeniya
- Rector, University of Lampung
- Member of the board, Allahabad Agricultural Institute
- Vice chancellor, University of Agricultural Sciences, India
- President, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University

- Director, Notre Dame School of Greater Manila
- Vice rector, Thammasat University
- President, Leyte Institute of Technology
- Director, Allahabad Agricultural Institute

Others with major university administrative assignments included

- Dean of graduate studies, University of Indonesia
- Dean, School of Social Work, University of the Philippines
- Dean, Lambung Mankurat University, Indonesia
- Dean, Maharaja Sayajirao University, India
- Vice dean of financial affairs, Syiah Kuala University
- Dean, Korean College of Agricultural Cooperatives
- Director, General Affairs Division, Mahidol University
- Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences, Kasetsart University
- Associate deans of business administration and of development economics, National Institute of Development Administration, Thailand
- Dean, College of Management, Seoul City University
- Registrar, University of Dhaka
- Dean, Universiti Pertanian Malaysia
- Director, Post-Graduate Institute of Agriculture, University of Peredeniya
- Dean, College of Business Administration, University of the Philippines
- Vice president for planning, Central Mindanao State University

For many others, administration was combined with research leadership in university-based posts:

- Director, Institute for Economic and Social Research, University of Indonesia
- Director, Center for Policy Research, Universiti Sains Malaysia
- Director of development and research, Administrative College of India
- Director, Population Research Center, Hasanuddin University
- Director, Sarmaul Institute, Seoul National University
- Research director, Korean Rural Economics Institute
- Director, Population Studies Center, Gadjah Mada University
- Director, Research and Development Institute, Khon Kaen University
- Director of research, Bangladesh Academy for Rural Development
- Associate director of extension and training, Kasetsart University
- Director, Library and Information Center, National Institute of Development Administration, Thailand
- Director, Applied Economics Research Centre, University of Karachi
- Director of extension programs, University of Indonesia
- Chief of research, Pakistan Institute of Development Economics
- Assistant director, Research and Development Center, Central Luzon State University
- Director, Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo University

Former fellows were also administrative leaders in governmental agencies:

- Assistant minister, Ministry of Agriculture, Indonesia
- Chairman, Agricultural Development Authority, Sri Lanka
- Chairman, Bangladesh Agricultural Research Council
- Deputy chief, Agricultural Prices Commission, Pakistan
- Governor, Ministry of Interior, Thailand
- Director general, Malaysian Farmers' Organization Authority
- Director, Ministry of Health, India
- Director, Ministry of Lands and Development, Sri Lanka
- Deputy director, Ministry of Agricultural Development and Research, Sri Lanka
- Deputy minister, Ministry of Agriculture, Philippines
- Director-general of international monetary affairs, Ministry of Finance, Indonesia
- Deputy director of rural development, Sri Lanka
- Minister coordinator for economics, finance, and industry, Indonesia
- Chief executive officer, Government of Malaysia
- Director of cocoa marketing, Federal Agricultural Marketing Authority, Malaysia
- Deputy director, Agricultural Extension Service, Sri Lanka
- Rural development officer, Office of Accelerated Rural Development, Thailand
- Deputy director, National Institute of Local Governments, Bangladesh
- Chief economist and senior economist, Agricultural Projects Services Center, Nepal
- Chairman, national development planning agency, Indonesia
- Planning officer, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Philippines

The highest-level government official in Taiwan (the president) is a former fellow, and Taiwan's coordinating structure for agricultural administration (the Council for Agricultural Planning and Development) rests heavily on persons who took part in the four fellowship programs. They include the chairman, deputy director, and deputy secretary-general of the council and the chief of its agricultural trade division. Other former fellows are the commissioner of the provincial Department of Agriculture and Forestry and the chief of its farmer's assistance division.

Some former fellows perform governmental or quasi-public duties in research and administration:

- Deputy secretary general, National Research Council, Thailand
- Director, Land and Development Institution, Indonesia
- Director, Ground Water Research Institute, India
- Director of sociology, National Institute of Rural Development, India
- Director, Council of Agricultural Research and Development, Philippines

- Chief, Center for Agro-Economic Research, Indonesia
- Director, Bureau of Economic Analysis, National Planning Agency, Indonesia
- Director, Training Institute for Agricultural Officials, Ministry of Agriculture, Korea
- Research director, Unibraw Research Center
- Executive director, Ecumenical Foundation for Minority Development, Philippines
- Executive director, Philippine-American Educational Foundation
- Director, Netherlands Foundation
- Project manager, Philippine Rainfed Resources Development Project
- President, Dansalan College Foundation

Those working in academic institutions have been active contributors to efforts to improve course content and curriculum. Almost all continue to contribute to their professions and scholarly fields (see table 8).

Table 8. Teaching contributions of fellows employed in universities, 1985 (N=242).

Activity	Frequency of activity			
	Often	Sometimes	Never	No response
Supervised graduate students	57.4	22.3	12.8	7.4
Developed or presented new courses	36.4	48.8	7.0	7.9
Designed changes in curriculum	34.7	49.6	8.7	7.0
Prepared and published teaching materials	15.7	54.5	21.9	7.9

Note: Figures are percentages of respondents.

The returned fellows also were expected to engage in social science research and, more particularly, make use of theory and test it empirically with data collected in the field. This expectation, too, was largely met (see table 9). Nearly half (46.4%) often participated in research requiring field data collection. These studies included personal scholarly research as well as applied studies on behalf of government, international agencies, and the private sector.

On the administrative side, a majority of fellows (52.2%) have participated in interagency planning, provided special planning or

administrative seminars, helped revise administrative procedures, and advised government, the private sector, and international agencies. As might be expected, earlier fellows were more deeply involved in a number of these activities than the more recent fellows.

Table 9. Fellows' research and other professional activities (N=435).

Activity	Frequency of activity			
	Often	Sometimes	Never	No response
Research activities				
Participated in research requiring field data collection	46.4	38.9	6.4	8.3
Directed research for government or institution	42.8	33.3	14.5	9.4
Submitted proposals for research funding	35.9	44.6	9.4	10.1
Other professional contributions				
Presented papers at professional meetings	28.5	52.4	10.8	8.3
Planned workshops for colleagues	19.8	53.8	17.0	9.4
Published articles in professional journals	19.8	50.1	20.2	9.9
Published material in scholarly books	15.6	46.2	26.4	11.7
Refereed articles for professional journals	10.8	37.0	38.6	13.6
Wrote notes or book reviews for journals	6.4	37.7	44.6	11.3

Note: Figures are percentages of respondents.

Those who received degrees from 1970 to 1975 were clearly different from their predecessors and successors. For the most part, they

returned to units where the pioneering work of establishing their field had been done but a shortage of trained personnel still existed. As a result, the 81 in this group (18.3% of all respondents) were more likely than any comparable group to have collected research data in the field, proposed research for funding, planned workshops for colleagues, initiated services and programs, developed or revised institutional policies, and served as consultants to business, government, or foundations.

Those who returned before 1970 seemed to have been slightly more active in publication; those since 1975 were more likely to have taught quantitative or policy-related courses and to have conducted quantitative and policy-related research.

How useful was the fellowship experience to the fellows' work?

Fellows said the knowledge and skills they acquired overseas were useful both in their first jobs on return home and, to a lesser degree, in their current work (see table 10). Only 2.3% said that their fellowship experiences were of slight or no value in preparing them for their first jobs on return home, and only 2.8% expressed that opinion about their fellowships' usefulness to their present work.

Table 10. Fellows' evaluations of the usefulness of their overseas training to their jobs.

Evaluation	First job after return home		Job as of 1985	
	N	%	N	%
Extremely valuable	250	57.5	241	55.4
Valuable	105	24.1	126	29.0
Somewhat valuable	27	6.2	36	8.3
Slightly valuable	8	1.8	10	2.3
Not valuable	2	0.5	2	0.5
No response	43	9.9	20	4.6
TOTAL	435		435	

To provide more information about the strengths and weaknesses of overseas training, the fellows were asked which items on a list of tasks were currently important responsibilities for them. Those identifying a task as important were then asked about the contribution their graduate study had made to their ability to perform it (see table 11).

The heavy involvement of former fellows in managerial duties should come as no surprise, nor is it surprising that their graduate study

did less to prepare them for management than for other aspects of their present work. This situation suggests that in-service management training may be needed.

Table 11. Fellows' assessments of the usefulness of their overseas training in preparing them to perform certain tasks.

Task	Number of fellows identifying task as <u>important</u> to their jobs	Percentage of those fellows who said their graduate study overseas was <u>very useful</u> or <u>useful</u> in making them able to perform the task
Teaching		
Teaching theory or research methods	220	95.0
Teaching applied social science	225	89.8
Researching		
Doing applied research on local problems	307	87.0
Doing scholarly research	180	92.8
Providing expert advice on economic and social issues	217	84.8
Performing managerial duties	197	49.8

How satisfactory were the fellows' choices of major field, university, and dissertation topic?

For a student from a third world country, the choices involved in study abroad are difficult and often bewildering. Language limitations must be taken into account, as must the student's level of preparation in mathematics and in research tools and theory.

The problem is compounded by the fact that in a fellowship program the student is not the only one whose views must be considered. His or her home institution and home government, in consultation with the donor agency, may have some preferences as to the fields they will

support and universities they will consider for placement. It would be surprising to find unanimity about how well the student adapted to a strange country, a new institution, and a discipline whose vocabulary, tools, and concepts may have been unfamiliar.

This survey gave the former fellows an opportunity to respond generally to their initial program decisions (major field of study, choice of university, and dissertation-research topic for doctoral students). Of those responding to the questions, 86.2% described themselves as either very satisfied or satisfied with the choice of overseas university to attend and 94% expressed satisfaction about the choice of field of overseas study. Of the 376 who responded to the question about choice of a dissertation topic, 84.9% said they were very satisfied or satisfied (see table 12).

Table 12. Fellows' expressions of satisfaction with initial fellowship-program decisions.

Level of satisfaction	Choice of major field (N=429)	Choice of university (N=429)	Choice of dissertation topic (N=376)
Very satisfied	76.0	68.7	61.2
Satisfied	18.6	17.5	23.7
Somewhat satisfied	2.8	8.2	11.2
Dissatisfied	1.9	4.2	2.7
Very dissatisfied	0.7	1.4	1.3

How satisfactory were the elements of the program?

A variety of elements made up the fellows' overseas training programs -- the courses offered, academic counseling and guidance, contacts with other students, participation in professional activities, support services for conducting research, and the like. The former fellows were given a list of 12 such elements and asked to indicate their satisfaction with each of them. One rating stands out: the returned fellows would have liked a great deal more opportunity to attend professional meetings during their studies abroad (see table 13).

The respondents did not give as high a rating to special services for foreign students as they did to other components; however this may have been a matter-of-fact comment that they were for the most part treated like other students, not a complaint that their needs were unmet.

Table 13. Fellows' expressions of satisfaction with elements of their training programs.

Element	Average rating for all respondents
Access to faculty for help and advice	3.25
Variety and range of courses offered	3.28
Quality of courses in major field	3.27
Medical and health-care facilities	3.12
Amount of contact with fellow students	3.13
Guidance in planning academic program	3.04
Special services for foreign students	2.72
Chances to attend professional meetings	2.64
For research students only:	
Access to research-support services	3.44
Help in planning research project	3.05
Help in analyzing data and writing dissertation	2.95
Help in collecting data	2.67

Note: 4.0 = very satisfactory; 0.0 = not at all satisfactory.

The part of their program that research students found least satisfactory was help in data collection. This may reflect the special circumstances of data collection in social science. All of the research students in this study faced the choice of collecting data in a strange land or collecting data at home without direct and frequent contact with a dissertation adviser.

We compared levels of satisfaction with program components among fellows from India, Indonesia, the Philippines, and Thailand. The Indian fellows gave a slightly higher overall rating than did the rest of the group, but they reported less satisfaction with amount of contact with fellow students and access to research-support services. These lower ratings may relate to the fact that many from India completed their overseas study earlier, when universities in developed countries were less familiar with foreign students and less well prepared to meet their needs. Students from Thailand reported slightly less satisfaction than the others with the guidance they received in planning their academic programs and research projects.

How appropriate was the process used to select fellows?

Respondents were not asked directly about the selection process by which they were chosen for fellowships, but the question was posed in terms of how future fellows should be selected.

In the four fellowship programs studied, there was considerable interaction between home institution, home country, donor agency, and fellow. Home-country personnel and institutions were good at evaluating fellows and creating opportunities for them on return home. Donor agencies were good at identifying appropriate overseas sources of training, evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of graduate institutions and programs, and assessing the likelihood that an individual would complete an overseas program successfully. Donors also were better able sometimes to make selections without considering politics and personal matters.

On balance, however, it would not have been surprising to see the respondents urge a much bigger role for home-country institutions and personnel and a smaller role for outsiders such as donors. Instead, fellows still seemed to prefer the kind of partnership that existed in the past (see table 14).

Table 14. Fellows' recommendations about procedures for selecting new fellows.

Recommendation	Former fellows agreeing with recommendation grouped by year of completion of latest degree					
	Before 1970		1970-1979		1980 or later	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Fellows should be selected entirely by home-country personnel	27	22.1	39	20.4	30	25.4
Fellows should be selected entirely by donor agency	21	17.2	22	11.5	25	21.2
Fellows should be selected by donor after local nominations and consultation	62	50.8	120	62.8	57	48.3
Other or no response	12	9.8	10	5.2	6	5.1
TOTAL	122		191		118	

Respondents agreed with donor agencies about criteria that are important for selecting fellows (see table 15). All four donor agencies have emphasized two criteria above all others: likelihood of success in graduate study and potential for using social science training at home.

Table 15. Fellows' assessments of the emphasis that should be placed on the various qualifications of potential fellows.

Qualification	Fellows' assessments, grouped by year of completion of latest degree		
	Before 1970	1970-1979	1980 or later
Academic merit	3.37	3.40	3.42
Potential as a staff member	3.32	3.28	3.15
Interest in national development	2.90	2.98	3.07
Probability of being influential through position, background, etc.	1.12	1.25	1.22

Note: 4.0 = should be given great emphasis; 0.0 = should be given little emphasis.

The similarity of responses among the different age groups suggests that, despite the variety of nationalities, disciplines, ages, and backgrounds represented among the former fellows, there is consensus about what a fellowship should require and represent.

What subjects were neglected or overemphasized?

About 66% of all respondents mentioned some subject area to which they would give greater attention if they were starting graduate study again. Research methods were mentioned by 29%, more intensive study of the theory of their disciplines by 16%, and more courses that relate directly to third world issues by 15%.

Only 18% mentioned subject areas they felt received too much attention in their graduate study. Most mentioned theory as an overemphasized area; a smaller number mentioned mathematics and the history of their disciplines.

How appropriate were the dissertation research practices?

Students from the third world who expect to do a dissertation and receive a Ph.D. degree now have many alternatives. Recognizing that large Western universities offer a broad range of graduate-level courses and seminars, they can turn to such universities for a breadth they cannot yet expect to get at home. Some of the same considerations apply to dissertation research. A large university will have, among its professors and graduate students, a breadth of knowledge and experience and a variety of research-support services (particularly

libraries and computer services) that can enrich almost any research project. At the same time, the student who expects to carry on a lifelong career of research in the home country may want the dissertation to be a foundation on which later work can be built. In some cases, the fellows' experiences did not conform to what they believed to be the best practices (see table 16).

Table 16. Fellows' assessments of alternatives for combining graduate course work and dissertation research.

Practice	Fellows who experienced this practice		Fellows who considered this practice more useful and practical than the alternatives	
	N	%	N	%
Course work and research in home country	15	4.4	8	2.0
Course work in home country, research abroad	6	1.8	13	3.2
Course work abroad, research in home country	120	35.3	241	59.2
Course work and research abroad	199	58.5	145	35.6
TOTAL	340		407	

The fellows' enthusiasm for directing dissertation research at their own countries' problems is unmistakable. Only slightly more than a third would recommend doing dissertation research at the overseas university, whereas 94.8% approve of the doctoral course work being done there. However, these figures can be expected to change as the universities of Asia grow in social science breadth.

How helpful was the agency that funded the fellowship?

The amount of encouragement and support the donor agency gave its fellows while they were studying abroad correlates with the satisfaction fellows expressed about their programs and the success they have attained in their careers. The donor agency can help to ensure that fellows will benefit from their study programs by providing them with adequate assistance.

The former fellows were asked about five areas in which individuals studying abroad are most likely to experience problems: travel, immigration, academic work, family, and health. They were asked whether they had required help in any of these areas and, if so, whether they received adequate help from the agency funding the fellowship. Funding agencies were most likely to be needed and helpful with problems of travel and immigration (see table 17).

Table 17. Fellows' evaluations of donor support during study abroad.

Area in which help was needed	Number responding ^a	Former fellows' evaluations grouped by year of completion of latest degree		
		Before 1975	1975-1985	Total
Travel	363	3.81	3.64	3.72
Immigration	317	3.69	3.58	3.63
Academic work	309	3.32	2.86	3.06
Health	266	3.12	2.97	3.04
Family	235	2.83	2.41	2.59

Note: 4.0 = adequate help; 0.0 = not enough help.

^aExcludes those who reported they needed no help.

All of the funding agencies provided help that their fellows considered adequate. Comparisons among the four funding agencies showed no important differences. However, the differences between earlier and later groups are striking in each problem area. The more recent groups of fellows were more likely to report inadequate levels of help from the agencies funding their work. The widest variance was in academic matters.

Have donors become less sensitive to the nonmonetary needs of their fellows and less willing to help them deal with personal problems? Probably not. For example, the generational difference appeared among fellows supported by all four funding agencies. It could not be explained by any pattern of change in the staffing, policies, or resource allocations of these agencies, and such changes were not uniform across the agencies. The earlier group of fellows may have benefited from being a new phenomenon in Western universities; however, their novelty could have created as many burdens as benefits. Probably a better hypothesis is that time has lent both nostalgia and realism to the judgments of the older group.

The area in which the fewest fellows needed help was family problems; however, those who felt they needed help with family problems were more dissatisfied with the help they received than those who received help in other areas.

How satisfactory was the program as a whole?

The questions about program components made it possible to correlate the fellows' judgments about the adequacy of the program to other variables. Since most funding agencies supported students at the same universities and in the same general range of social science fields, there was virtually no difference among them in their fellows' judgment about adequacy of their programs (see table 18).

Table 18. Fellows' expressions of satisfaction with their fellowship programs.

Level of satisfaction	Fellowship program							
	Ford		Rockefeller		A/D/C		IDRC	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Very satisfactory to satisfactory	90	84.9	58	84.1	194	80.8	13	81.3
Less than satisfactory	16	15.1	11	15.9	46	19.2	3	18.8
TOTAL	106		69		240		16	

The levels of satisfaction that fellows expressed about their programs were related, as expected, to their appraisals of the help they received from their funding agencies with problems concerning travel, immigration, academic work, family, and health (see table 19). Those who indicated that they did not need this kind of assistance or that the assistance they received was adequate tended also to be those who described their overall fellowship experiences as fully satisfactory.

Anyone who had academic, family, or health problems in a strange land probably would be less likely to describe the fellowship experience as fully satisfactory than someone who had no such problems. Nevertheless, the responses suggest that by giving help at a crucial time, the donor can make a big difference in the fellow's satisfaction with the overseas experience.

Although all of the former fellows expressed general approval of the various aspects of their programs, those who completed their training most recently were somewhat less satisfied (see table 20).

Recent graduates approved slightly less than earlier graduates of the variety and range of courses offered, the quality of courses in their major field, the guidance they received in planning their academic programs, the amount of contact they had with fellow students, and the

level of special services provided for foreign students. Those who finished after 1975 reported satisfactory experiences, but they were more sparing than the earlier graduates in their use of superlatives to describe it.

Table 19. Fellows' expressions of satisfaction with the fellowship experience compared to satisfaction with help received from funding agency.

Satisfaction with fellowship experience	Satisfaction with help received			
	Adequate		Inadequate	
	N	%	N	%
Very satisfactory	111	34.4	11	16.2
Satisfactory	176	54.5	24	35.3
Less than satisfactory	36	11.1	33	48.5
TOTAL	323		68	

Note: Excludes those who reported they needed no help.

Table 20. Fellows' expressions of satisfaction with the fellowship experience by recency of return home.

Level of satisfaction	Year of completion of latest degree			
	Before 1975		1975-1985	
	N	%	N	%
Very satisfactory to satisfactory	175	87.1	176	77.9
Less than satisfactory	26	12.9	50	22.1
TOTAL	201		226	

There is no basis for determining how much of this generational gap represents a real and lasting difference. Perhaps the earlier graduate students have had a longer perspective from which to appraise what they learned, or perhaps the passage of time has made their recollections more nostalgic.

An important finding was the relationship between satisfaction with the study program and extent of continued contact with the home institution during the period abroad (see table 21). The fellows were

asked how often they communicated with their home institutions about progress on their study programs, research plans, and future roles at home.

Table 21. Fellows' expressions of satisfaction with the fellowship experience compared to amount of contact with home institution during study abroad.

Level of satisfaction	Amount of contact with home institution					
	Frequent		Occasional		Little or none	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Very satisfactory to satisfactory	53	91.4	194	81.5	92	78.0
Less than satisfactory	5	8.6	44	18.5	26	22.0
TOTAL	58		238		118	

More than a fourth had little or no continuing contact about their academic work and research. Nearly half had no contact about their expected roles at home. The lack of contact represented lost opportunities for both the fellow and the home country. Contact with the home institution correlated significantly with satisfaction with the study program; fellows with frequent contact were more likely to describe their study experiences as very satisfactory or satisfactory.

Perceived level of preparation for graduate study had surprisingly little relationship to degree of satisfaction with the fellowship experience (see table 22).

In mathematical skills, knowledge of statistics, research methodology, and theory, most fellows felt they started their overseas study at least as well prepared as other students. Even in mathematics, where the greatest weakness was reported, more than two-thirds said they were as well or better prepared than their fellow students.

The fellows from Thailand indicated a little less confidence in their level of academic preparation than did those from other Asian countries. Nearly 29% described themselves as not adequately prepared in one of the four academic areas. Only 20% of all other respondents said they were not adequately prepared. Language may have been a factor; however, students from other countries where English was not the language of university instruction (Indonesia, Korea, and Taiwan) were more likely than Thais to express confidence in their ability to compete on equal terms.

The responses on level of preparation give indirect but impressive evidence that fellowship programs have been achieving their goal of strengthening undergraduate education in developing countries. At any rate, year by year each new group of fellows has reported increased confidence in the quality of its undergraduate preparation (see table 23).

Table 22. Fellows' expressions of satisfaction with the fellowship experience compared to perceived adequacy of preparation.

Level of satisfaction	Perceived adequacy of preparation			
	Less well prepared than other students		As well or better prepared than other students	
	N	%	N	%
Very satisfactory to satisfactory	151	81.2	183	82.8
Less than satisfactory	35	18.8	38	17.2
TOTAL	186		221	

Note: The areas considered were mathematics, statistics, research methodology, and theory.

Table 23. Fellows' assessments of adequacy of preparation.

Perceived adequacy of preparation	Year of completion of study abroad			
	Before 1965 (N=46)	1965-1974 (N=147)	1975-1979 (N=109)	1980-1985 (N=112)
Better prepared than other students	4.3	11.6	12.8	12.5
As well prepared as other students	60.9	57.8	67.0	71.4
Less well prepared than other students	34.8	30.6	20.2	16.1

Notes: The areas considered were mathematics, statistics, research methodology, and theory. Figures are percentages of respondents.

What problems were caused by language barriers?

Of the many variables examined, language problems were the greatest cause of fellows' dissatisfaction with their study programs. Even in countries where English is the language of university instruction, it may be a second language for a large number of students (see table 24).

Table 24. Fellows' assessments of problems caused by language barriers.

Task hindered by language problems	Respondents for whom language skills presented serious to very serious problems	
	N	%
Participating in class discussions	72	18.4
Writing examinations within time limits	54	13.2
Writing assigned papers	50	12.1
Understanding lectures	32	7.7
Reading assigned literature	20	4.8
Communicating with friends and teachers	19	4.6
One or more of the above	91	23.0

Reading was much less of a problem for the fellows than were participating in class discussions and preparing written assignments. As might be expected, the most serious language problems were reported by fellows from regions where university instruction was not conducted in English -- Indonesia, Korea, Taiwan, and Thailand. At least 44% of the respondents from these areas reported moderate to serious problems in reading, understanding lectures, writing papers and examinations, and taking part in classroom give-and-take. The fellows who reported the least difficulty with English also reported greater satisfaction from their overseas study experiences (see table 25).

Unfortunately, many of the kinds of students an externally funded fellowship program has the greatest obligation to serve are particularly susceptible to language problems: In almost every country, students who grew up in rural areas or in lower-income families are

less likely to be fluent in English or other languages of overseas study.

Part of this problem will solve itself as programs of graduate study are expanded in Asia so fewer students need to go abroad for advanced training. For those who do go abroad, however, language preparation is essential and must be thought of as an investment in the success of the program and the satisfaction of students and institutions.

Table 25. Fellows' expressions of satisfaction with the fellowship experience compared to degree of language difficulty.

Satisfaction with fellowship experience	Degree of language difficulty		
	No serious problems (N=307)	Some problems (N=84)	Serious or very serious problems (N=23)
Very satisfactory to satisfactory	86.5	73.8	52.2
Less than satisfactory	13.4	26.2	47.8

Note: Figures are percentages of respondents.

How involved were the adviser and host department in third world issues?

Home-country institutions and donor agencies have done an impressive job, right from the start, in placing their fellows in departments that are involved in third world problems, where they can work with advisers familiar with the subject and with other students from the developing world (see table 26). However, the growth in enrollment of students from developing countries has not only slowed down in recent years but also may have become more concentrated in fewer institutions.

What problems did fellows have when they returned home?

Few of the fellows (less than 10%) reported serious problems in relocation, reestablishment, or adjustment on completing their study programs. In specific areas, however, some problems take on increased significance.

Fewer than 8% reported any serious difficulty adjusting to family obligations, the tempo of life, cultural norms, or the political situation at home when they returned from studying abroad (see table 27). Since the respondents had adjusted successfully to the tempo, life-style, cultural norms, and other elements of the foreign country in

which they studied, it was no surprise to learn how little difficulty they had in coping with similar personal adjustments on their return.

Even fewer had serious difficulty finding appropriate jobs and gaining the acceptance of their coworkers. Much more difficulty centered around getting the resources the fellows felt they needed to perform their duties successfully at their home institutions (see table 28).

Most dissatisfaction and concern were expressed about professional development. Of half a dozen potential problems in professional development, all but one (local opportunities to publish research) were considered serious by significant numbers of respondents (see table 29).

Opportunities to attend professional meetings abroad, to get additional training, to finance research activities, and to purchase books and journals were the areas most often cited as presenting serious problems. Somewhat less difficulty was reported in arranging to attend in-country professional meetings.

Table 26. Fellows' assessments of involvement of advisers and host departments in third world issues.

Type of involvement	Fellows' responses grouped by year of completion of latest degree					
	Before 1965		1965-1975		After 1975	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Host department's involvement in third world issues was						
Great	6	12.0	39	25.5	67	28.9
Limited	26	52.0	75	49.0	125	53.9
Little (or <u>no response</u>)	18	36.0	39	25.5	40	17.2
Adviser had experience						
In student's country	8	16.0	38	24.8	66	28.4
In other third world country	18	36.0	61	39.9	112	48.3
In developed world only (or <u>no response</u>)	24	48.0	54	35.3	54	23.3
The number of third world students in the host department was						
5 or more	25	50.0	93	60.8	159	68.5
1 to 5	17	34.0	47	30.7	48	20.7
None (or <u>no response</u>)	8	16.0	13	8.5	25	10.8

Table 27. Fellows' assessments of personal and family-related problems encountered on return home.

Problem area	Fellows describing problem as					
	Serious		Minor or none		No response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Financial settling in	76	17.5	328	75.4	31	7.1
Logistical arrangements	68	15.6	339	77.9	28	6.4
Adjustment to political situation	32	7.4	369	84.8	34	7.8
Adjustment to family obligations	26	6.0	375	86.2	34	7.8
Adjustment to tempo and style of life	24	5.5	379	87.1	32	7.4
Readjustment to cultural norms	13	3.0	389	89.4	33	7.6

Table 28. Fellows' assessments of employment-related problems encountered on return home.

Problem	Respondents describing problem as					
	Serious		Minor or none		No response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Lack of equipment and supplies	127	29.2	274	63.0	34	7.8
Lack of economic rewards	113	26.0	288	66.2	34	7.8
Heavy professional responsibilities	85	19.5	312	71.7	38	8.7
Lack of transport for job-related travel	83	19.1	316	72.6	36	8.3
Limited institutional interest in research	68	15.6	329	75.6	38	8.7
Heavy teaching load	65	14.9	312	71.7	58	13.3
Poor employment policies of institution	62	14.3	340	78.2	33	7.6
Difficulty in finding appropriate job	23	5.3	375	86.2	37	8.5
Poor social status of professional work	16	3.7	389	89.4	30	6.9
Lack of acceptance by coworkers	16	3.7	391	89.9	28	6.4

Table 29. Fellows' assessments of professional development problems encountered on return home.

Problem area	Fellows describing problem as					
	Serious		Minor or none		No response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Opportunities to attend professional meetings abroad	246	56.6	157	36.1	32	7.4
Opportunities for further training	180	41.4	221	50.8	34	7.8
Funds for research	180	41.4	218	50.1	37	8.5
Availability of books and journals	169	38.9	237	54.5	29	6.7
Opportunities to attend in-country professional meetings	154	35.4	249	57.2	32	7.4

Besides responding to individual items, the fellows were asked to summarize their experiences in getting relocated and reestablished. Of those responding, 11% said they encountered major difficulties, 41.5% minor difficulties, and 47.7% few or no difficulties.

Differences between the more recent and the earlier fellows were few in terms of major difficulties encountered on return home (see table 30). A larger share of earlier fellows reported few or no difficulties.

Table 30. Comparison of difficulties encountered by earlier and more recent fellows on return home.

Level of difficulties	Year of completion of study abroad			
	Before 1975		1975-1985	
	N	%	N	%
Major difficulties	18	9.7	24	11.5
Minor difficulties	64	34.4	99	47.6
Few or no difficulties	104	55.9	85	40.9
TOTAL	186		208	

Respondents were asked to compare the problems they encountered on their return with those that young people in a similar situation today would face (see table 31). The most striking difference is the respondents' perception that today's returnees face a more difficult employment situation than they did: Finding an appropriate job was not the problem for them that they believe it would be for young

Table 31. Fellows' perceptions of changes in problems facing fellows on return home.

Problem area	Respondents describing problem as one of the three most difficult			
	For themselves		For today's fellows	
	N	%	N	%
Opportunities for professional travel abroad	249	57.2	121	27.8
Opportunities for additional training	180	41.4	83	19.1
Funding for research	178	41.0	160	36.8
Opportunities to attend in-country professional meetings	167	38.5	42	9.7
Equipment and supplies	141	32.3	116	26.7
Economic rewards	112	25.8	225	51.7
Support for job-related travel	85	19.5	35	8.0
Heavy work load	75	17.2	88	20.2
Local outlets for research publication	67	15.3	23	5.3
Finding an appropriate job	26	5.9	139	32.0
Social status of professional work	18	4.1	33	7.6
Acceptance by colleagues and superiors	16	3.7	24	5.5

social scientists returning today from study abroad. The need for qualified staff continues, but thanks to the kind of training programs in which they participated and the building of local training capacity, it no longer has the urgency it once did.

Lack of equipment and supplies, inadequate research funding, heavy work loads, and few opportunities for professional travel abroad appear to be continuing problems. The fellows perceive that opportunities for additional training have grown but still are deficient.

How much contact do former fellows have with their peers?

One of the essential factors in maintaining professional capacity in the social sciences is contact with a peer group. Nearly all of the respondents report occasional or frequent contact with faculty members in their fields in other countries -- both third world and industrialized countries (see table 32).

Table 32. Fellows' assessments of opportunities for contact with professional peers (N=435).

Peer group	Frequency of contact					
	Frequent		Occasional		Never or no response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Faculty members at other universities in home country	195	44.8	184	42.3	56	12.9
Faculty members at other universities in Asia	40	9.2	244	56.1	151	34.7
Professors at university of overseas study	66	15.2	265	60.9	104	24.0
Professors at other universities in developed countries	31	7.1	258	59.3	146	33.6
Government personnel in country or region	209	48.0	165	37.9	61	14.0
Professional personnel in international agencies	76	17.5	260	59.8	99	22.8

Membership in scientific and professional societies is one device commonly used to help widely scattered professionals keep up with developments in their field. Society membership is difficult to

obtain for men and women in the third world because it is expensive and salaries in the third world often are low. In addition, in any country where foreign exchange is a problem, membership in international scholarly bodies is one of the first casualties. In spite of that, nearly two-thirds of the returned fellows (64.8%) belong to such organizations.

Personal acquaintanceships dating from the period of overseas study do not necessarily contribute to a fellow's maintenance of professional capacity (see table 33). They may, however, offer modest protection from insularity or provincialism. At least two-thirds of the fellows in this study continued to have contact with staff members of the agencies that funded their work or with fellow students, local families, and other friends they met in the communities where they studied.

Table 33. Fellows' assessments of the frequency of continuing contact with personal acquaintances they met during study abroad (N=435).

Personal acquaintances	Frequency of contact					
	Frequent		Occasional		Never or no response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Friends and families in the community	60	13.8	207	47.6	168	38.6
Staff members of agency that funded fellowship	38	8.7	255	58.6	142	32.6
Other students at university	34	7.8	250	57.5	151	34.7

What help have former fellows received in maintaining and expanding their professional competence?

A thread that runs through almost all responses is the concern of returned fellows for ways to maintain and expand their professional competence. The earlier fellows, in particular, often returned to situations in which they had few colleagues of similar background and interest, not much access to recent professional publications, and limited opportunities to travel and meet with social scientists elsewhere. They reported that their needs were recognized in a variety of ways and that they received help from various sources in keeping abreast of their field during the critical first 4 or 5 years after their return (see table 34).

Table 34. Fellows' sources of help in maintaining professional competence in the years immediately after return home.

Area in which fellow needed help	Help needed but not obtained		Helped by employer		Helped by other local source		Helped by external agency	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Getting funding to begin research	53	16.4	185	56.7	19	5.9	68	20.0
Organizing workshops or seminars	62	20.5	165	54.5	13	4.3	63	20.7
Attending professional meetings	98	27.4	151	42.2	8	2.2	101	28.2
Consulting in professional field	83	30.5	113	41.5	22	8.1	54	19.9
Getting information on developments in professional field	95	32.1	84	28.3	11	3.7	106	35.9

Note: Individuals who did not respond to a question were excluded from the total and percentage calculations.

The major source of help was their own employing agency or institution. This was especially true in the areas of getting started in research, attending in-country conferences, and organizing workshops and seminars. International organizations, including the agencies that funded their study abroad, have played a fairly active role in helping them attend professional conferences and get information on new developments in their disciplines.

The large figure in the column help needed but not obtained tells only part of the story. Others who listed sources from whom they received help did not say whether their needs were fully or even adequately met. Answers to other questions make it clear that the need is great, even today, for better ways to help returned fellows maintain and build their professional competence (see table 35).

What continuing role did fellows see for donors?

In terms of the advice this study might give to international donor agencies, the question of unmet needs might be approached in another way. Table 35 lists fellows' unmet needs and categorizes them according to whether returned fellows believe they do or do not offer a challenge for donor-agency assistance. For example, many fellows said

their salaries were not satisfactory but they do not see this as a problem amenable to outside help. They saw a much larger role for the outsider in supporting research and offering individual opportunities for professional development.

Table 35. Fellows' needs for help of external donors in meeting critical professional needs.

Factor in professional development	Percentage of respondents who described factor as important (A)	Of those term- ing it impor- tant, percentage dissatisfied with provisions for it at home institution (B)	Index of unmet need (AxB/100)	Percentage of all respondents who see a role for outside agencies in meeting this need
Research funding	70.3	75.7	53.22	34.6
Professional meetings abroad	59.5	64.5	38.38	33.0
Books and journals	72.8	77.1	56.13	25.2
Postdoctoral training	48.5	58.8	28.52	23.1
Other kinds of training	48.3	57.4	27.72	16.5
Visiting professors	36.6	42.3	15.48	15.6
Professional meetings in home country	48.5	54.5	26.43	12.6
Equipment and supplies	36.2	46.2	16.72	8.0
Access to computers	49.2	54.7	26.91	7.8
Institutional support for research	60.0	65.7	39.42	5.9
Local opportunities to publish	38.0	39.0	14.82	3.4
Salary	63.4	68.6	43.49	1.8
Social status of profession	30.9	36.8	11.37	0.2
Work load	40.5	46.7	18.91	0.0

HOW USAID-SUPPORTED FELLOWS COMPARE

The framework of this inquiry offered an opportunity for a separate study of fellows who were supported in two Asian countries by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID).

The initial study reached only the foundation-supported fellows. In countries receiving U.S. technical assistance, however, USAID also was a major contributor to support of postbaccalaureate social science training. USAID indicated interest in a parallel survey of its former social science trainees from two countries (India and Indonesia), so questionnaires were sent to them. Because the response rate for USAID fellows was much lower than for the other groups (29.5% compared to 51.8%), the responses are tabulated separately.

USAID's programs differ significantly from those of the foundations. Except for its staff of in-country nationals, USAID periodically reassigns its personnel. Thus, the person who initiates a USAID program may be on the other side of the world by the time that program grows and matures. The foundations do not generally have such systematic staff rotation. With small programs and longer periods of staff assignment to a particular country, they presumably have a better opportunity to maintain ties with fellows, their home institutions, and the universities at which they studied abroad.

USAID's programs have been part of a regular governmental technical assistance effort that is supported by tax money and subject to review directly by congress, the president, and ultimately, if only indirectly, by the nation's voters. The four foundations, in contrast, have made a conscientious effort not to be part of any nation's foreign policy. Their programs and allocations of resources are affected by public opinion but are not answerable to it.

One consequence is that USAID programs have generally had specific, measurable goals. USAID fellows were more likely to be selected and trained to take specific kinds of employment in institutions to which they definitely planned to return. USAID has phased down or terminated its help when, in its view, the economy of a recipient country has made such assistance no longer necessary. Foundations have usually enjoyed the luxury of greater flexibility. In the development of human capital they were under less pressure to target each program to the staffing of particular institutions in the recipient countries. (Often, of course, the foundations were also explicitly involved in institution building. In those cases, fellowship support was more directly targeted.)

USAID missions in India and Indonesia expressed interest in joining in this study, and both had reasonably good mailing lists for their former fellows. All former USAID social science fellows from India received questionnaires. For Indonesia, the USAID numbers were so

large that questionnaires went only to a random sample representing 50% of the total.

In all of the comparisons that follow, the data for USAID fellows from India and Indonesia are compared with those for foundation fellows from those two countries only.

For India, the foundation study produced 69 completed questionnaires from a mailing to 158 former fellows. The USAID study brought in 38 completed questionnaires from a mailing of 102. For Indonesia, the foundation study produced 68 returns from a mailing of 103. The USAID study yielded 128 returns from a mailing of 460.

Rates of return from India were not greatly different for foundation and USAID fellows (see table 36). For Indonesia, the foundation fellows were much more responsive than those supported by USAID (66% compared to 27.8%).

Table 36. Rate of USAID fellows' response to questionnaire.

Country	Questionnaires delivered	Questionnaires returned	Rate of response
India	102	38	37.3
Indonesia	460	128	27.8
Both countries	562	116	29.5

Despite some small differences in what the foundation and USAID fellows had to say about their overseas study experiences, the degree of similarity in views was remarkable. Independently, the two groups identified many of the same strengths and weaknesses in their programs; for example, results for both demonstrated how important competence in language is to satisfaction with overseas study. Other comments were equally reinforcing.

Age, Background, Sex, and Field of Study

Respondents from India were, on the average, older than those from Indonesia. The distribution of ages reflects the fact that the foundations continued their programs in India after USAID had substantially phased down its assistance.

USAID and foundation fellowship programs had similar success in extending support to students of rural background. Nearly half of the fellows in both groups came from rural areas or communities of less than 20,000 people.

Women made up a small minority of both fellowship groups -- the foundation group was 13% women and the USAID group was 11.6% women. Some improvement occurred in the later years for USAID as well as for the foundations.

Fields of study for the two groups reflect USAID's special interest in preparing people for administrative roles and the somewhat greater emphasis on university teaching and research in the foundation programs.

About two-thirds of all foundation students majored in economics or sociology compared to 39.2% of those in the USAID program (see table 37). Business administration and political science or public administration were more popular for the USAID group (20.6% compared to 9.5%).

Brain Drain

The USAID fellows were as likely as the foundation fellows to return to their own countries to live and work, and neither group lent much credence to the contention that overseas study produces a brain drain. Admittedly, the responses to a mail questionnaire are likely to underestimate numbers of persons working abroad, but 100% of the USAID respondents and 93.4% of the foundation group reported being currently employed in their native lands.

As might be expected, USAID fellows were more likely than foundation fellows to find employment in governmental administrative or policy agencies on return from study abroad (41% compared to 11.7%). The foundation group gravitated more toward employment in universities or research institutes (82.5% compared to 54.3%).

Earlier in this report, the success of the foundation fellows was evidenced by a list of some of the responsible positions they now hold in their home countries. A similarly impressive listing could be made for the USAID group. The USAID fellows are more heavily represented in government (division leadership in four major Indonesian ministries, for example) and in business (chief executive of a major Indian textile firm, to give another example).

Considerably fewer of the USAID fellows entered university work, but many of those who did have also moved to important leadership posts. Their pattern of teaching contributions is like that of their foundation-supported colleagues.

A large majority of the fellows in both groups have engaged in field research since their return, but only about half as many of those supported by USAID described themselves as often publishing books or articles reporting their findings (see table 38).

Table 37. Distribution of fellows by discipline -- India and Indonesia.

	Sponsor	Before 1970		1976 or later		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Economics	Foundation	27	48.2	40	49.4	67	48.9
	USAID	12	25.5	38	33.3	50	31.6
Sociology	Foundation	8	14.3	1	19.8	24	17.5
	USAID	1	2.1	11	9.7	12	7.6
Education	Foundation	2	3.6	5	6.2	7	5.1
	USAID	10	21.3	22	19.3	32	20.3
Business administration	Foundation	7	12.5	3	3.7	10	7.3
	USAID	8	17.0	3	2.6	11	7.0
Political science and public administration	Foundation	2	3.6	1	1.2	3	2.2
	USAID	6	12.8	15	13.2	21	13.3
Rural development	Foundation	2	3.6	3	3.7	5	3.6
	USAID	0	-	4	3.5	4	2.5
Anthropology	Foundation	1	1.2	0	-	1	0.7
	USAID	0	-	2	1.8	2	1.3
Communication	Foundation	1	1.2	2	2.5	3	2.2
	USAID	3	6.4	1	0.9	4	2.5
Home economics	Foundation	2	3.6	1	1.2	3	2.2
	USAID	1	2.1	2	1.8	3	1.9
Other	Foundation	4	7.1	10	12.3	14	10.2
	USAID	6	12.8	13	11.4	19	12.0
Total	Foundation	47		81		137	
	USAID	47		111		158	

Overseas Training

Both groups agreed that the skills and knowledge they acquired abroad were greatly useful. At least half of each group described the experience as extremely valuable for their work.

Of those with managerial responsibilities in their present work, 68.2% of the USAID fellows but only 38.1% of the foundation group described

Table 38. Fellows' research and other professional activities --
India and Indonesia.

Activity	Sponsor	Frequency of activity			
		Often	Sometimes	Never	No response
Research activities					
Participated in research requiring field data collection	Foundation	57.7	29.2	6.6	6.6
	USAID	29.5	53.0	10.2	7.2
Directed research for government or institution	Foundation	49.6	32.1	10.9	7.3
	USAID	27.1	41.0	23.5	8.4
Submitted proposals for research funding	Foundation	43.1	44.5	5.1	7.3
	USAID	21.1	52.4	18.1	8.4
Other professional contributions					
Presented papers at professional meetings	Foundation	37.2	53.3	2.9	6.6
	USAID	21.1	49.4	21.1	7.8
Planned workshops for colleagues	Foundation	25.5	54.0	12.4	13.5
	USAID	25.9	46.4	22.9	4.8
Published articles in professional journals	Foundation	27.0	51.1	16.1	5.8
	USAID	13.9	39.2	38.6	8.4
Published material in scholarly books	Foundation	16.1	48.9	25.5	9.5
	USAID	9.6	40.4	38.6	11.4
Refereed articles for professional journals	Foundation	15.3	40.9	34.3	9.5
	USAID	11.4	22.9	54.8	10.8
Wrote notes or book reviews for journals	Foundation	9.5	44.5	38.7	7.3
	USAID	8.4	25.3	54.8	11.4

Note: Figures are percentages of respondents.

their study abroad as very useful or useful for that purpose. Recognizing that many of both groups would move up to leadership posts, in retrospect it appears that some provision for special training in administration and management would have been useful for almost all of the fellows.

There were no important intergroup differences in satisfaction with basic choices about the overseas study program or the services that accompanied it.

A majority in each group endorsed the selection of fellows through interaction between home country personnel and the donor agency. USAID fellows were noticeably less willing to see the donor agency have complete control and correspondingly more favorably to selection entirely by the home country (see table 39).

Table 39. Fellows' recommendations about procedures for selecting new fellows -- India and Indonesia.

Recommendation	Former fellows agreeing with recommendation		
	Sponsor	N	%
Fellows should be selected entirely by home-country personnel	Foundation	26	19.3
	USAID	49	29.5
Fellows should be selected entirely by donor agency	Foundation	24	17.7
	USAID	15	9.0
Fellows should be selected by donor after local nominations and consultation	Foundation	71	52.6
	USAID	91	54.8
Other or no response	Foundation	14	10.4
	USAID	11	6.7
TOTAL	Foundation	135	
	USAID	166	

In the selection of fellows, both groups were strongly in support of giving greatest weight to academic merit and potential as a staff member. USAID fellows were more receptive, however, to probability of being influential as a criterion.

The interest of foundation fellows in carrying on dissertation research in their home countries has previously been mentioned. USAID fellows felt even more strongly about the value of home-country dissertation research (see table 40).

USAID fellows echoed almost exactly the sentiments of the foundation fellows as to help from the donor agency on personal problems (travel, health, academic performance, and family concerns) during their time abroad. In general, they evaluated highly the help they received. USAID fellows took a more favorable view of the help they received on family matters and were much less enthusiastic about assistance on health concerns.

Like the foundation fellows, those from USAID who said they received adequate help when they needed it were much more likely to describe their program as satisfactory or very satisfactory. Those with most frequent contact with their home institutions were also somewhat more likely to report a satisfactory experience in overseas study.

Table 40. Fellows' assessments of alternatives for combining graduate course work and dissertation research -- India and Indonesia.

Practice	Sponsor	Fellows who experienced this practice		Fellows who considered this practice more useful and practical than the alternatives	
		N	%	N	%
Course work and research in home country	Foundation	8	8.2	5	4.1
	USAID	6	6.1	12	7.6
Course work in home country, research abroad	Foundation	1	1.0	6	5.0
	USAID	1	1.0	7	4.4
Course work abroad, research in home country	Foundation	27	27.8	56	46.3
	USAID	31	31.6	99	62.7
Course work and research abroad	Foundation	61	62.9	54	44.6
	USAID	60	61.2	40	25.3

Perceived level of preparation for advanced study did not have an overwhelming effect on the degree of satisfaction the fellows reported with their programs. Those who felt least well-prepared were only a little less likely to report a satisfactory experience.

For USAID students, as for the the foundation group, language problems colored the experience of overseas study more than any other single factor. Even in India, where English had been the language of university study, at least a quarter of the USAID students reported difficulty in writing examinations and participating in class discussions. Those from Indonesia, getting their first experience in an English-language classroom, reported even more difficulty. This obviously influenced their views of their experiences abroad. Regardless of source of funding, Indonesians who reported serious language problems were the group least pleased with their overseas program. Language deficiencies were so visibly the source of academic and other difficulties that the message about the importance of adequate language preparation could not be stronger or more obvious.

The answers of respondents as to host department involvement in third world issues suggest two conclusions. First, both the USAID and foundation fellows had a strong likelihood of being placed with an adviser who had worked in a third world country and in a department that had other graduate students from developing countries. Second, that likelihood has improved over the years. The percentage of recent fellows (since 1975) describing their host department as having great involvement in third world affairs is still low (23.8% for foundation fellows and 27.4% for USAID fellows) but more than double what it was in the early years. About three-quarters of the later fellows were being placed in departments with five or more third world graduate students, up from about 50% at an earlier time.

Problems of Reentry

It seemed reasonable to inquire whether the foundation and USAID fellows encountered similar problems on their return from study abroad. Three categories of problems were examined: personal, employment, and professional.

Again the similarity between responses of USAID and foundation fellows is remarkable. Even the problems mentioned most often -- financial settling in and logistical arrangements -- were described as serious by no more than a quarter of the respondents in either group. Other personal problems (adjustments to family obligations, tempo and style of life, political situation, and local cultural norms) were even less troublesome for most of the returnees.

Employment-related problems gave them considerably more reason for concern. Lack of equipment, inadequate economic rewards, and lack of institutional interest in research were viewed as serious problems for more than a quarter of the group.

It was in professional development that both groups described the greatest problems and deficiencies. The USAID fellows, even more than the foundation group, expressed concern about the unavailability of professional books and journals, opportunities to attend in-country professional meetings, and funds for research (see table 41). More

than half of the USAID group saw all of these deficiencies as serious. In both groups, nearly two-thirds reported a need to attend professional meetings abroad and a serious lack of opportunities to do so.

Recent fellows reported somewhat greater problems of readjustment than earlier fellows did, and USAID fellows consistently reported more difficulty than did those supported by foundation funding. Major problems were reported by only 8.9% of the foundation group and 14.7% of the USAID group returning before 1975. The comparable figures for fellows returning between 1975 and 1985 were 10.5% and 21.7%.

Table 41. Fellows' assessments of professional development problems encountered on return home -- India and Indonesia.

Problem area	Sponsor	Fellows describing problem as					
		Serious		Minor or none		No response	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Opportunities to attend professional meetings abroad	Foundation	89	65.0	35	25.5	13	9.5
	USAID	106	63.9	52	31.4	8	4.8
Opportunities for further training	Foundation	54	39.4	67	48.9	16	11.7
	USAID	68	41.0	89	53.6	9	5.4
Funds for research	Foundation	67	48.9	55	40.2	15	10.9
	USAID	91	54.8	60	36.2	15	9.0
Availability of books and journals	Foundation	56	40.9	68	49.6	13	9.5
	USAID	91	54.8	70	42.2	5	3.0
Opportunities to attend in-country professional meetings	Foundation	56	40.9	68	49.6	13	9.5
	USAID	83	50.0	74	40.6	9	5.4

The foundation and USAID fellows agreed that the more recent fellows have better opportunities for additional training, research funding, and participation in professional meetings at home and abroad. On the other hand, they face greater problems in finding suitable jobs, getting adequate pay, and having reasonable work loads, the respondents said.

USAID fellows expressed more dissatisfaction with the level of help they received in maintaining their professional competence in the years immediately following their return (see table 42). They reported receiving less help from external agencies, including the agencies

that funded their fellowships, which suggests that the foundations had better follow-up programs than USAID to support fellows on their return.

In summary, however, although USAID fellows responded differently in several predictable ways because of differences in organizing and handling their programs, none of the conclusions from the full survey of foundation fellows are invalidated or thrown in doubt when the responses from USAID fellows are added. The recommendations in the concluding section of this report reflect the needs and problems expressed by both groups.

Table 42. Fellows' sources of help in maintaining professional competence in the years immediately after return home -- India and Indonesia.

Area in which fellow needed help	Sponsor	Help needed but not obtained	Helped by employer	Helped by other local source	Helped by external agency
Getting funding to begin research	Foundation	11.7	40.9	0.7	13.1
	USAID	30.7	4.3	5.4	6.6
Organizing workshops or seminars	Foundation	13.9	42.3	2.2	11.0
	USAID	23.5	42.2	3.0	9.6
Attending professional meetings	Foundation	18.2	43.1	1.5	17.5
	USAID	38.6	36.1	4.2	9.6
Consulting in professional field	Foundation	18.2	31.4	5.1	9.5
	USAID	27.7	27.1	3.0	3.0
Getting information on developments in professional field	Foundation	21.9	16.8	0.7	25.5
	USAID	33.7	19.3	3.6	27.7

Note: Figures are percentages.

THE DEMAND SIDE: EMPLOYERS' VIEWS

The data collected from former USAID- and foundation-supported fellows was supplemented by personal interviews with the employers of social scientists in Asia. These employers included 33 university leaders,

governmental administrators, and private-sector executives in India, Indonesia, Thailand, and the Philippines. The interviews probed the value of social scientists in developing countries: Are social scientists trained abroad useful to the employing institutions? What steps should be taken to build and maintain social science competence in third world countries?

The employers agreed that talented professionals are needed to deal with the economic and social issues of development. Leaders of universities and other training institutions were especially aware of the need for social scientists and of the institutions' responsibility for maintaining strong social science departments to help develop professional capacity.

Those interviewed generally agreed that, when fellowship programs began 30 years ago, there was some skepticism about the usefulness of social science research in developing countries. However, in the last three decades employers have realized that Asian social scientists are important contributors to understanding and resolving problems of development.

An interview with Raj Krishna brought out the importance to him of the emphasis placed on empirical data in his graduate work at the University of Chicago in the fifties: "I came back to India with a radical approach to problem solving. Logic is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for problem solving. You also need empirical evidence."

Many others who studied abroad have a similar appreciation of the research skills and insights they acquired. Most of the former fellows who responded to the questionnaire said learning to use the tools of applied research was one of the major benefits of their training.

Many of the employers interviewed acknowledged that it has taken time for applied social science research to be accepted and, meanwhile, some talented social scientists have immigrated to developed countries. Again Raj Krishna's response was typical: "Brain drain occurs when there is no demand for your skills. For the first 10 years after I returned to India, I could get no support for my research program. It was the Ford and Rockefeller support that allowed me to continue my work. Otherwise I, too, might have left."

The employers agreed that the status of social science is rising. As one pointed out, two decades ago no social scientist was in a senior policy-making position, but this has changed. The policy-makers who were interviewed valued social scientists' analysis of economic and social problems; they acknowledged that social scientists are needed to carry out empirical research on which sound, practical policy recommendations can be based. University and academic leaders reported continued demand from the public and private sectors for professionals who help their employers understand human behavior and economic and social issues.

One matter of concern to employers was the need for greater interaction between rural social scientists and agricultural production scientists. Many of those interviewed said that universities in the third world should play a more active role in coordinating the research of the two groups. Some said more should be done to foster working relationships between social and production scientists during overseas training. The consensus of those interviewed was that students in production-related agricultural disciplines should have to take some rural social science courses, and rural social science students should have to take some production-related courses.

Past Performance and Future Needs

All of the employers interviewed were asked to comment on the value of donors' programs for building social science capacity in Asia that have been undertaken during the past 30 years. Although they identified some deficiencies in specific programs, they agreed unanimously that the programs have been effective and beneficial to third world institutions and countries. Most said no other approach would have been as satisfactory in providing the social science training needed to confront third world issues. Some senior people said they thought foundation programs were particularly important because they involved long-term commitments. Dioscuro Umali, who was for some time the dean of agriculture at the University of the Philippines at Los Baños, said, "Only long-term commitment creates a critical mass, which is a must for developing departments."

The employers were concerned about getting the external support necessary for maintaining social science teaching and research capacity in their institutions. University administrators and government officials said they find it difficult to provide for their social scientists to maintain contacts with colleagues in other countries -- funds are needed to allow research to be performed by Asian social scientists with their peers (in their own countries, other Asian countries, and the West) on problems of mutual concern.

Employers emphasized the importance of social scientists' interacting with their peers in the United States. Senior Asian officials are greatly concerned with the decline in the number of U.S. social scientists carrying out research in Asia; they deplore the reductions in programs for younger U.S. social scientists to travel abroad to perform thesis or postdoctoral work. Many Asian scholars formed ties early in their careers with visiting Americans, which boosted their ties to the larger scholarly community and have continued throughout their lives. As fewer young U.S. professionals go to Asia, ties with younger Asians are less likely to develop -- a disadvantage to both groups. Many of those interviewed in government, the private sector, and university administration said maintaining social science capacity in their institutions is a continuing process; new ways to deal with development problems are constantly being created and tested.

Problems facing policy-makers change, and social scientists must continue to grow so they can deal with new issues. Government policy-

makers said they thought social science training should give more attention to the political constraints to development; for example, "getting the prices right" is a key factor in increasing agricultural output, but policy-makers would like social scientists to help them find incentives for farmers that do not cause tensions and inequities among urban consumers.

University leaders need funding to provide continuous opportunities for postdoctoral training. They want long-term support so they can encourage their staffs to take full advantage of opportunities for continued professional development.

Needed Innovations

University, government, and private-sector employers agreed that closer working relationships between universities and other sectors are needed. Many suggested that universities should provide more in-service training to members of the other sectors, as the Indian Institute of Management (IIM) in Ahmedabad has done: It conducts workshops for government staff members on topics ranging from specific problems to general management techniques. It also encourages government officials and private-sector leaders to send younger staff members to IIM for advanced degrees.

The employers expressed growing concern about the need to recognize and understand the complementary roles of the public and private sectors in development. Greater professional interaction between individuals working in the two sectors is badly needed. In this area, too, universities can help and IIM provides a model. Interaction is being developed by innovative individuals in the private sector. Lakshmi Jain, who pioneered in the development of India's handicraft industry, is a consultant to groups in both sectors and heads the Institutional Development Service. Jain recruits staff members from public and private organizations for one year. They spend this time working together on social-development issues. He provides in-service training, and he fosters interaction between technologists and social scientists putting them to work as a team on problems where the skills of both groups are needed.

Another issue that must be addressed is the role of universities and other organizations in strengthening regional and local training institutions. Most of those interviewed said they did not think universities were doing as much as they could to maintain and upgrade institutions that train social scientists. Senior university people agreed that they had greater opportunities to advance than do today's young professionals. Members of the first generation of well-trained social scientists said they found rewarding employment when they returned from study abroad without much difficulty. A dean at Kasetsart University in Thailand said today's returning fellows have less chance to use their talents and skills effectively; he pointed out that two-thirds of Thailand's senior positions in the social sciences are currently held by people 45 and older. Although most of

those interviewed are interested in helping young professionals obtain better positions, they are not certain how they can best be of assistance.

Private-sector employers said that social scientists have indispensable research capacities, but more attention should be paid to developing their management and organizational skills. Private-sector leaders also said social scientists need a better understanding of technical fields. One Indian businessman said that his industry considers the ideal recruit "a good engineer with an MBA from the Indian Institute of Management."

Interviews with private-sector employers suggested that large companies are becoming increasingly aware of the impact of corporate policies on the poor. The same Indian businessman said there are practical as well as altruistic reasons for considering the poor when designing policy: "People have to have employment and income to buy our products."

Most of those interviewed foresee continued problems in generating enough funds locally to maintain institutions' social science capacity. Many said they hope outside donors will help alleviate this problem. In particular, money is needed for long-term research. Funding is available from government and private sources to deal with short-term problems; but funds are seldom available for solving problems that have long-term significance but no immediate monetary payoff. Funds for joint research, which would allow staff from several institutions to meet and work together, are especially needed. Funds also are needed to develop opportunities for greater interaction between social and production scientists and to allow social scientists to spend time at outstanding universities studying developments in the field.

Finally, senior officials said innovations are needed for maintaining institutional capacity and keeping individuals growing and working. Providing for international travel and the purchase of books and equipment will continue to be a problem, and these means of external contact are necessary if the social science fields are to progress. It would greatly benefit the universities if outside donor groups would help meet such needs for the next few years; university administrators are confident that more local funds will gradually become available.

HOW THE PROGRAMS MEASURED UP

A variety of factors must be considered in evaluating the success of a fellowship program. Most groups that support overseas graduate fellowships consider research to be at the heart of the training process. Well-trained social scientists build modern research concepts into teaching and apply them in analyzing policy. They do high-quality research that enters the mainstream of discussion, internationally as

well as nationally. They also are aware that development involves a complex interplay of factors and is fostered by a kind of teamwork that was uncommon even a couple of decades ago. One mark of successful training is sensitivity to the need for biological, physical, and social scientists to work together.

This study covered only a narrow range of the factors upon which success might be judged. It focused on the crucial criteria for social science teaching, research, and policy analysis in the home country. It relied most heavily on the respondents' evaluations of the quality and usefulness of their overseas training. Admittedly, their recollections may have been colored by sentiment or dimmed by time, but their responses were consistent enough to be useful.

However, according to the factors we measured, the fellowship effort has been remarkably successful. Contrary to some widely expressed fears, a large share of those who studied abroad have returned to their home countries to live and work. They have found their overseas experiences relevant and useful, and on their return many have given policy advice to leaders in government and the private sector and have been involved in implementing development policy. Many have also had an impact on academic institutions and curricula in their home countries and have helped to build the capacity to offer high-level university instruction in the social science fields.

This rapid development of indigenous capacity is impressive in many ways. Although Asian universities had a long and distinguished tradition, almost none offered instruction in or used contemporary social science based on theory that is tested empirically with data collected in the field. Today every Asian country has one or more universities with social science departments that meet these requirements. Traditional universities have built this capacity, and many younger institutions have strong programs: the Indian institutes of management, the Indian Agricultural Research Institute, and the new agriculturally based universities in Indonesia, Malaysia, India, Pakistan, and Thailand, to name only a few.

WHAT DONORS SHOULD DO NOW

Clearly the primary goals of overseas fellowship programs in the social sciences have been met. Are there still appropriate and necessary tasks that call for external assistance of the kind that supported this earlier effort? The overwhelming evidence is that there are.

The recommendations that follow are based on the responses of former fellows to the survey reported in this document, on interviews with university and government officials in Asia who have employed or could employ persons with social science competence, and on the authors' experience and observations in a number of Asian countries.

1. Well-established third world social scientists urgently need greater encouragement and material support for their research programs.

Almost every active social scientist responding to this study emphasized the lack of money for needed research. Social science invariably gets low priority when a nation allots its own scarce resources among development needs. Outside funding is essential if Asia's social scientists are to maintain their research skills and train a generation of successors.

The problem is not that social science is perceived as without value. The project-identification and project-review reports of World Bank teams and other international agencies show how dependent those agencies are on reliable, locally gathered socioeconomic data. Interviews with governmental policy leaders in Asia confirm this impression. They appreciate the hard facts and critical analyses contributed by social science, and they understand that research can give some protection against the formulation of unwise policies based on ideological or partisan political commitments.

It is surprising, therefore, that two-thirds of the respondents who said they consider research an important part of their work also said that inadequate institutional appreciation of the value of research is a problem for them.

These two sets of responses are hard to reconcile, and one explanation may be that the customary project approach has proved to be a particularly unsatisfactory way to fund social science research in resource-poor developing countries. What hard-headed policy leader can feel comfortable about diverting funds to social science research in preference to smaller-budget programs to build highways and irrigation structures, train teachers, or even breed higher-yielding cereals and tubers? The success of these endeavors may rest on the kind of insights a healthy social science community can produce, but the race for funding is nevertheless unequal.

At least modest support is needed for people rather than projects. Men and women who demonstrate research competence in their doctoral programs and subsequent work, who are teaching undergraduates and directing postbaccalaureate study, are not being given the tools to contribute as they might. They are well placed to judge what kind of research is needed and feasible. What they lack is adequate opportunity to use their judgment and training.

2. Donors should find ways to give experienced third world social scientists greater influence over their own research agendas.

Research priorities in any field represent a mix of the interests of the scientists and the various external agencies offering financial support. In the industrialized countries this has been a productive

partnership because both sides have operated from positions of strength. Funding based on peer review has given the scientists in each discipline considerable power to guide the direction of research. Individuals have worked within a system that often permitted them to pursue a line of inquiry far beyond its original boundaries and time limits.

Scientists and scholars in developing countries have had much less freedom. Resources are scarce to begin with. The "peers" in peer review are likely to be scientists or, more often, administrators from developed countries. The mix of the research agenda is usually tilted sharply toward projects of short duration that have limited objectives and stress immediate applicability of results.

Able senior social scientists in developing countries have much more than that to offer. It is too easy to view the respondents to this survey as the students or fellows they once were rather than as the mature scholars they now are. Physically remote from any large group of colleagues with similar training, most have much broader individual responsibility for teaching and research than the average Western social scientist does. In their own institutions many receive and deserve the kind of respect that would be represented by a chair in a Western university.

This suggests that establishing a limited number of endowed chairs in selected third world universities would give an extraordinary stimulus to the social science fields. Appointments of this kind, externally funded, would not in most cases require salary support but should provide a generous allocation for professional activities. Support should be guaranteed for at least 5 years, and the appointees should have full freedom to make their own judgments about what activities would be most productive for them and for their institutions. Some would choose to expand their research skills and broaden their range of interests through postdoctoral study or visiting professorships; this could lead to worthwhile collaboration in teaching or research. Some would use funds to support research costs; buy supplies, equipment, books, and journals; or pay travel costs. Most would use some funding to attend international professional meetings.

The kind of persons selected for such professorships are well-qualified to decide for themselves how to make best use of such support without item-by-item competitions and reviews.

3. Donors should invest in linking the social scientists of Asia with world currents in their disciplines.

Social scientists in the developing countries of Asia fear that they are getting out of touch with their colleagues elsewhere and with advances in their fields.

A person who has had academic and research experience only in U.S. or European institutions may find it hard to appreciate the conditions

under which the men and women who responded to this survey carry out their work. Some are in countries where only one or two educational institutions are engaged in scholarly work in the social sciences. At best they have only a handful of persons with whom, day by day, they can exchange ideas in their fields. Usually they must choose between publishing their work in a language confined to one or two countries or writing for (and therefore choosing research topics adapted to) the scholarly journals of the industrialized world. Often the dilemma is one of being irrelevant at home because of the heroic efforts to remain active in a mainstream that is thousands of miles away, or remaining active on home-country projects that never come to the attention of and therefore never benefit from the scrutiny of a world circle of scholars.

The problem is solvable. By choosing to return to work in their home countries, the majority of fellows have made their commitment clear. In focusing on problems of their nations and regions, they are applying their social science skills in an arena where they have a comparative advantage. But former fellows emphasize again and again their need for better access to professional books and journals, travel to international professional meetings, postdoctoral fellowships, and other advanced-training opportunities. Giving them such access would remove a serious source of frustration, enrich the quality of their work, and give scholars in other countries, including the developing world, the benefit of their contributions.

4. Donors should continue a vigorous effort to help social scientists in neighboring countries or within a region benefit from exchange of information and ideas.

Most of the respondents in this study reported some continued contact with the institutions where they did their doctoral study but not much with other universities in the industrialized world. They described even more-frequent contact with colleagues in their own countries, although often that group did not provide the numbers or diversity to meet the needs of scholarly criticism, cooperation, and interaction.

Their least-frequent professional contacts have been with academics and scholars in their own field in neighboring countries. Here, surely, regular exchange has a great deal to offer. Yet almost everywhere intercountry travel is given a low priority for the allocation of institutional resources, and the younger and less-experienced social scientists, particularly, suffer at a key time in their careers.

Promoting increased professional contact within a region would cost little. While strengthening the competence of social scientists, it could also contribute to a more-effective intercountry approach to solving shared problems.

5. Donors and technical assistance agencies should continue to sponsor a modest program of tightly targeted conventional fellowships to send outstanding undergraduates abroad for graduate study.

Much of Asia can now provide its young people with good opportunities for postbaccalaureate study at home. No longer is overseas study essential for the preparation of competent, well-rounded professors, research directors, and policy planners.

There are other strong grounds, however, for continued support for fellowships abroad. In every country the forces of insularity and provincialism need to be recognized and combatted. Persons who study overseas are a channel through which their home countries get new ideas and new perspectives. (They are also a rich source of stimulation and a broadening force for the students and professors in the foreign universities that serve as their hosts.)

Donors should give particular attention to the need to capitalize on the growing numbers of women university graduates in the developing world. As women have increasingly gained access to secondary and university education, their availability as candidates for postgraduate study has increased. There has been a built-in lag, however, in their representation as full staff members at teaching, research, and policy institutions. A nation that expects to have more women in high-level educational and policy positions must make sure they now have the same overseas educational opportunities that previous generations of men have had.

Fellowships are also needed to diversify the economic and social composition of the group of young people who study outside the country. It would be unfortunate if overseas study opportunities were limited to the wealthy and well-born and those with political connections.

The third world countries, coping with generally limited financial resources and even more-limited access to foreign exchange, will continue to count on outside help to meet these needs.

The overwhelming impression from this study is that the fellowship programs of the Ford Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation, Agricultural Development Council, International Development Research Centre, and U.S. Agency for International Development were a wise and far-sighted investment. They have borne out the high expectations on which they were based. At the same time, they point to an unfinished agenda that could have an equally rewarding outcome.

APPENDIX 1

OVERVIEW OF RELATED STUDIES

During the past 10 years, donor-sponsored fellowship programs that train third world nationals in the social and physical sciences have been under increasing scrutiny. Interest in the programs has risen because the resources required to operate them have been increasing while the funds donors give human capital development have been decreasing. Organizers of programs that give third world citizens opportunities to earn advanced degrees in developed countries are now more concerned than ever about the impact and effectiveness of their programs. More and more, these administrators are supporting in-depth analyses of their training programs to help them allocate their limited funds more effectively.

Our research uncovered a number of training-program evaluations; however, many provided only historical overviews of the programs with which they were concerned. The criticisms and recommendations they offered usually were based only on the opinions of the authors. Difficulties of tracking former trainees and getting responses from them limited the number of evaluations based on the views and perceptions of the administrators or students who participated in the programs.

This review of previous work focuses on large-scale studies whose findings have general implications for existing and future training programs. It emphasizes studies that used the opinions of persons directly involved with the programs. Most of the studies that are included used questionnaires to gather data (with varying degrees of success).

Most human capital studies examine the programs of a particular organization or discipline; consequently, many of the results pertain only to those programs and are not of general interest. This review is concerned only with studies whose results have specific, substantial implications for training programs in general.

TRAINING AGRICULTURAL ECONOMISTS FOR WORK IN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT by Darrell F. Fienup and Harold M. Riley June 1980

Fienup and Riley's 1980 study (sponsored by the American Agricultural Economics Association and funded by USAID) evaluated the training of students from less developed countries in graduate-level agricultural economics. A 14-page, 24-question survey was sent to 2,228 agricultural economics alumni. The response rate was 33.3%.

Fienup and Riley's study differed from most others in that it included students who were financed by their families or personal funds as well

as those whose studies were supported by philanthropic and governmental organizations. As a result, most of the discussion and analysis was geared toward specific aspects of agricultural economic graduate training in the United States and not toward general issues related to donor funding of overseas training. Questions on the usefulness of particular coursework to the respondent's career were examined in detail by Fienup and Riley, but the findings in these areas pertained only to agricultural economics.

Some of the results of the study that have broader ramifications for human capital development in the third world are as follows:

Brain Drain

Fienup and Riley discovered that 83% of foreign students who earned either a master's or Ph.D. degree in agricultural economics from a U.S. university were currently employed in their home regions. The authors considered this figure quite high in comparison to other disciplines. They also determined that there is wide variation in this statistic among regions and countries. For example, respondents who earned degrees in the United States and were employed in their native regions in 1980 were as follows: Malaysia and Thailand, 92%; Latin America, 90%; Africa, 85%; Asia, 73%; Taiwan, 62%; South Korea, 60%; and India, 55%. Fienup and Riley also found that only 75% of those who earned doctorates stayed in their native regions, but 92% of those who earned master's degrees did so.

All of the figures cited above were compiled from voluntary responses to a mailed questionnaire. Therefore, the actual retention rates probably are lower than those represented by the responses because the questionnaire probably was returned by fewer addressees who no longer resided in their home countries.

Employment Patterns

Fienup and Riley discovered that an overwhelming majority of the students who earned degrees in the United States (73%) began their careers either with governments of less developed countries (40%) or third world universities (33%). The first jobs of the remaining 27% were mainly in the private sector of developing nations (11%) and in universities in industrialized countries (9%). International agencies, foundations, and governments of developed countries supplied the first jobs of the remaining 7%.

Other findings about employment patterns included

- Current-employment figures varied little from first-employment data.
- A slight trend away from governments of less developed countries and toward international agencies was indicated.

- Those who earned doctorates tended to be employed by universities; those who earned master's degrees usually found employment with governments of less developed countries.

Language Problems

The study results indicated that one-third of developing-country students had difficulty with English while studying in the United States. In most cases, however, language problems were resolved during the student's first 6 months abroad. While 39% of the Asians and 34% of the Latin Americans responded that language was a major difficulty, only 6% of the Africans found lack of English skills to be a serious handicap to their graduate studies. The study did not investigate whether the students had greater difficulty with reading, writing, or speaking English.

Usefulness of U.S. Graduate Training

Of the respondents, 75% said their U.S. graduate training was extremely useful in their professional careers; 21% said their training was moderately useful. Students most often mentioned the following benefits from their experience in U.S. universities:

- increased research ability and problem-solving skills
- high status of U.S. degree in home country, which led to higher wages and more employment opportunities
- rewarding contact with students and professors

Factors that some respondents saw as disadvantages of study in the United States included

- long absence from home country (loss of career-aiding contacts)
- U.S. professors' lack of first-hand knowledge of developing countries

Most of those who responded to the questionnaire viewed their training in the United States as a highly useful and rewarding experience.

EVALUATION OF THE GENERAL PARTICIPANT TRAINING PROJECT (USAID)

by Charles Hefferman

1980

In 1980 Charles Hefferman conducted a large-scale study for the Education and Human Resources Offices of USAID in Indonesia. Hefferman's goal was to examine the effectiveness of the General Participant Training Project in which many Indonesian citizens were sponsored by USAID for study in the United States and nearby Asian countries. The main data-gathering instrument used in the study was a 6-page, 18-question questionnaire distributed to all Indonesians whose studies abroad had been supported by USAID. The survey generated 652 completed questionnaires returned by 585 men and 67 women.

Hefferman examined the frequency with which the former fellows were promoted and the impact that studying abroad may have had on their career advancement. He reported that 81% of the respondents said they had been promoted since they returned from study abroad. Of those promoted, 88% said they felt their USAID-sponsored training had helped them acquire the promotion either directly or indirectly.

Hefferman found that about 51% of the former fellows reported some difficulties with life abroad. English proficiency was a problem for 15% during their overseas studies.

In general, the USAID General Participant Training Project was given high ratings by most of the respondents; 83% said they were satisfied with program arrangements. The two most common reasons given by the 15% who said they were not satisfied were

- placement at the "wrong" university
- too little money during study abroad

Other reasons for dissatisfaction included lack of contact with academic advisers and lack of contact with USAID program officers.

Most respondents said they were able to use what they learned abroad: 16% said they were able to use everything they learned in the host country; none of the 563 respondents indicated that what they learned abroad was useless in their current occupation.

Respondents also were asked about problems they had in using the skills and information they obtained during overseas study. The most frequently indicated problem (reported by 38% of the respondents) was lack of equipment, facilities, and other resources in Indonesia. The other major difficulty was that other staff members and coworkers did not have equal knowledge of key concepts in the former fellow's field, which made professional communication with them difficult.

IDRC TRAINING POLICY STUDY
by The Office of the Vice-President, Planning
February 1981

In 1981, the Office of the Vice-President, Planning, of the International Development Research Centre conducted a policy study to assess the training program sponsored by IDRC. Some of the issues examined in the study included IDRC's past role in supplying trained personnel for teaching and research in third world countries, the usefulness of some of IDRC's training policies, and the future demand for trained personnel in the countries with which IDRC has historically been associated.

Although much of the data used in the study was obtained from IDRC records and files, some use was made of questionnaires: Surveys were administered to 758 former trainees, 251 project leaders, and 191

trainee supervisors. The combined response rate was 47%, but the response rate from former trainees was 54%. The trainee survey consisted of 48 questions.

Despite the use of the questionnaire and the high response from former trainees, the results of the survey were not often mentioned in the text of the final report. The report consisted mainly of a summary of the disciplines and countries that IDRC emphasized in past training programs, a description of the functions and goals of administrative branches of IDRC, and general recommendations for future programs within the organization.

Questionnaire findings that were incorporated into the text of the report included the following:

Brain Drain

The IDRC study team strongly challenged the notion that brain drain is inevitable as a result of overseas study. In fact, about 97% of the former trainees returned to their countries of origin after their training abroad was complete. The authors attributed this high percentage to the method used to select trainees in most of IDRC's programs: Candidates usually were selected from research-project teams that had been created in the home country. Since members of such teams were likely to have had rewarding employment in their home countries before starting study abroad, they were more likely to return to their jobs after their training was complete.

IDRC's estimated retention rate of 97% is not strictly comparable to Fienup and Riley's reported rate of 83% because the IDRC study included some individuals who studied abroad for 6 months or less. Such individuals are less likely to remain in the host country after completing their study than those who have longer exposure to the developed country. More importantly, Fienup and Riley's rate was the percentage of former trainees who currently lived and worked in their home countries. The IDRC rate was the percentage of individuals who returned home immediately after graduate study; it did not reflect later losses to developed countries or international agencies.

Choice of University

As in Hefferman's USAID study, some IDRC former trainees said they were dissatisfied with the universities they attended -- 35% said another institution should have been selected. Much of the dissatisfaction seemed to stem from the insufficient levels of information and advice that were offered to potential training program participants. The authors also said students may have been dissatisfied because many professors at the universities where they were placed were unfamiliar with third world problems and issues and were therefore unable to give them useful advice.

IDRC TRAINING PROGRAM IN ASIA: AN EVALUATIVE STUDY
by Pedro V. Flores
August 1983

A second study sponsored by IDRC focused on certain aspects of the organization's training programs in Asia from 1976 to 1982. Conducted in 1983 by Pedro Flores, the study examined three types of training programs: those that offered degree-oriented training, those that provided nondegree training (certificate, work-study, and study-tour types of programs), and those that recruited third world citizens to work on research programs in Canada. The study reviewed past programs and their participants, focusing on the practices, policies, and results of IDRC training programs. The analysis was meant to help IDRC recognize and apply the lessons of its training experiences in making future program decisions.

Although most of the data used in the study was obtained from the detailed files IDRC maintained on every training program participant, a brief follow-up questionnaire was sent to 96 former trainees from Asia who were supported by IDRC between 1976 and 1982. Forty-seven completed surveys were returned, a response rate of 51%.

The IDRC questionnaire was very brief (2 pages, 6 questions) and narrow in scope. It obtained data about the former trainees' current employment, major responsibilities in their current jobs, and opinions about the relevance and practicality of their courses to their work. Because of the limited number of topics explored by the questionnaire and the small number of responses, it was difficult to draw general conclusions from the survey. Therefore, the authors derived most of their conclusions and recommendations from the file data. The questionnaire responses were generally used as supplementary information.

The IDRC files contained data about some aspects of training programs that were neglected by many of the other major studies. For instance, the study examined common reasons that some applicants were rejected as program participants:

- language deficiency
- inexperience in field of training
- possibility that applicant would not return home

Another unique feature of this study was that it examined the methods by which information about IDRC training possibilities was distributed. Successful applicants' sources of information were compared to unsuccessful applicants' sources. The study's author drew no concrete conclusions, but 60% of the unsuccessful applicants learned about IDRC training programs from notices in their home universities or offices, while only 28% of the successful applicants learned about the programs in that way.

The study report did not discuss former trainees' current employment, major responsibilities, and possibilities for career advancement.

Since survey questions addressed these issues, the findings in these areas must have been inconclusive.

A STUDY OF FORMER ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION SCHOLARS AND FELLOWS

by James Coleman

February 1984

One of the most complete and in-depth training program reviews ever attempted was one conducted for the Rockefeller Foundation. James Coleman surveyed former participants in the foundation's University Development/Education for Development Program. A 17-page, 45-question survey was sent to 923 individuals who participated in the program between 1961 and 1981; 517 completed questionnaires were returned, a response rate of 56%. Coleman said the response rate was high, considering that the latest addresses available for some respondents were 20 years old.

Coleman's questionnaire covered a wide range of training program issues: respondent's selection for the fellowship, selection of university, study program experiences, current career activities and experiences, and career history. Most questions offered a choice of alternatives but also allowed the respondent to write in a response not listed among the alternatives.

Coleman's paper listed the responses to many questions in tabular form and summarized the results of his analysis.

Employment Patterns

Of the 517 former fellows who responded to Coleman's survey, 76% were currently employed in academia. This figure is significantly higher than Fienup and Riley's 40% estimate. The majority of Rockefeller University Development trainees were employed by universities before their training programs and usually returned to their former occupations when they completed their studies abroad; Fienup and Riley's study included some individuals who financed their own study, so many fewer were employed by universities before they began their training programs.

Problems with Language

Twenty percent of the respondents to Coleman's survey indicated that they were not adequately prepared for their studies abroad; 15% said they experienced serious problems with the English language. This result is identical to Hefferman's but much lower than Fienup and Riley's 33%. As with employment patterns, however, the difference may reflect the fact that some participants in Fienup and Riley's survey were not supported by any agency, so the responsibility for language training fell on the individual instead of a sponsoring organization.

Like Fienup and Riley, Coleman found that Asians had the most serious problem with English upon arrival in the United States and that Afri-

cans had the least difficulty. Coleman also found that most language problems were remedied during the first 6 months of study abroad.

Satisfaction with Study Abroad

Most of Coleman's respondents said their study abroad was satisfying. The aspects of their training programs that yielded the most satisfaction were the variety of the courses offered and the quality of courses available in their specialized fields. (In both of these areas, 95% of the respondents said they found their overseas training to be very satisfying or somewhat satisfying.) The factor that many respondents found most unacceptable was the lack or poor quality of courses about their home countries. Cross-tabulations showed that social scientists were significantly more satisfied with their overseas study than their counterparts in the health sciences or in agricultural specialties.

Contact with Home Institution and Foundation Fellow Office

Forty-one percent of Coleman's respondents said their contact with their home institutions was too infrequent. However, 77% said that their contact with the Rockefeller Foundation fellowship office was sufficiently frequent, and only 22% said their contact with the office was too infrequent.

Fellowship Recipient Procedures

Seventy-two percent of Coleman's respondents (70% of the agricultural scientists, but only 46% of the health scientists and 38% of the social scientists) said the sponsor should make the final selection of fellows. Coleman did not speculate about why members of different professions had such widely differing opinions on the issue.

Thesis and Dissertation Topics

Coleman's study also examined the selection and completion of research topics. Typically, the two most important issues in this area are

- What is the most common method for selection of research topics?
- Should the research be conducted in the student's home country or abroad?

Coleman found that 53% of students chose their own research topics and 34% accepted research problems proposed by their overseas academic advisers. Social science majors were more likely to choose their own topics (73% did), and health scientists and agriculturalists were more likely to accept topics suggested by their host institutions.

Although 62% of Coleman's respondents said they completed both their academic coursework and dissertation research overseas, only 48% said they felt that this was the best approach. In fact, half of the respondents said that, in the ideal situation, coursework would be

completed overseas and dissertation research would be carried out at home or in a third country. Those in the health and agricultural fields especially preferred overseas coursework and home research.

Difficulties upon Return

On returning to their home countries, Coleman's respondents had the greatest difficulties in the areas of professional employment and personal finances. Many respondents said their biggest problems were insufficient funds for research and heavy teaching responsibilities. Many also said that, when they first returned home, they had little money and their salary payments were irregular. Only 6 of 516 respondents said they encountered no problems at all.

Resources Needed to Maintain a Strong Teaching and Research Environment

Respondents were given 12 alternatives and were asked to choose the three resources they felt were most vitally needed for their institutions to be highly effective in research and teaching. The respondents ranked the alternatives that pertained to finances as the most important: The two major concerns of the respondents were lack of funds for research and insufficient economic rewards for teaching. Other important factors were the organization and direction of research, availability of postdoctorate training programs, and opportunities for travel to conferences and meetings abroad.

FORD FOUNDATION SUPPORT FOR EDUCATION ABROAD OF THIRD WORLD NATIONALS by Robert G. Myers September 1983

Robert G. Myers prepared a detailed summary of the Ford Foundation training programs implemented from 1960 to 1980. Although he did not use a widely distributed questionnaire, some of his more general findings and recommendations have implications for all types of training programs. In fact one of Myers' goals was to describe some of the Ford Foundation's training experiences so organizers of future training programs could learn from those experiences.

Most of the data that Myers used came from Ford Foundation files. The information was augmented by interviews with former fellows from Peru and Indonesia, which were instrumental in creating some noteworthy comparisons between former trainees from the two countries; for example, both Indonesians and Peruvians said they felt that studying abroad was beneficial to their careers but Peruvians said they realized the benefits immediately upon their return home, while Indonesians said they were initially worse off than their colleagues who did not study abroad. Many Indonesians said that after studying abroad their pay and seniority resumed at prefellowship levels; in the meantime, the careers of their peers who remained at home continued without interruption.

Myers also found that brain drain was minimal in some countries during the 10 years under analysis, but it was significant in other countries. Of 300 Indonesians supported by Ford Foundation, for example, only one failed to return home. By contrast, 30% of the fellows from Chile and Argentina migrated to developed countries within a short time after completing their studies abroad. Myers suggested that unstable political situations may have contributed to such high percentages; other factors may have been lack of needed equipment and low salaries in those countries.

Myers offered several recommendations about selecting fellows, deciding on a level of training, and choosing a location for training. Myers found that when the purpose of the training program was to build institutions, it was desirable to select fellows directly from those institutions. Myers noted that when overseas study was used to induce people to join an institution, the result was rarely positive. When knowledge generation was the objective of the program, the Ford Foundation had the greatest success when it set up local committees to choose among fellowship candidates. In virtually all programs, however, Myers found that competence in English was given too much emphasis in the selection process.

Choice of training location was sometimes found to be a problem regardless of the method used to match fellows with overseas institutions. Myers examined some training programs in which university selection was made by the grantee, some programs in which the home institutions chose the training location, and others in which the selection was made by the Ford Foundation. None of these methods was significantly superior to the others.

CIMMYT IN-SERVICE TRAINEE QUESTIONNAIRE: A PARTIAL ANALYSIS **January 1984**

CIMMYT used a mailed questionnaire to survey people it trained in maize, wheat, and economics programs from 1966 to 1982. Of 1,400 in-service trainees supported by CIMMYT during that period, questionnaires were distributed to 650; 219 responses were returned, a response rate of 45%. A large percentage of those who responded were supported after 1976. (The addresses used for people funded before 1976 were outdated and yielded a low response rate.) Completed questionnaires were received from 64 countries in Asia, Africa, the Caribbean, and South America.

As with most of the other programs covered in this review, persons who were trained by CIMMYT were highly pleased with the training they received and with the use they made of that training since they returned to their home countries. Ninety percent of the respondents indicated that the level of training they received of CIMMYT was about right. About 85% said they found at least a moderate amount of their training to be useful after they returned home.

Many of the CIMMYT respondents were increasing professional capacity in their home countries by spending some of their time training others in the skills they acquired at CIMMYT. A quarter of all respondents said they spent at least half of their time training others; 45% said they spent at least a quarter of their time training others.

Contact between CIMMYT and its former fellows had remained high since the respondents returned home: 62% said their communication with CIMMYT was regular since returning home. Respondents from all 64 countries indicated that CIMMYT staff members had visited them since they returned home. About half were visited an average of more than once a year; 22% were visited more than twice a year.

CIMMYT's study concluded that its training program was valuable to most of those who participated in it. It pointed out that 85% of the respondents gave very positive assessments of the CIMMYT training program. Most of the criticisms or suggested improvements were minor and, in most cases, did not adversely affect the former fellows' perceptions of their training experiences.

EAST-WEST CENTER ALUMNI
by William Cummings
August 1986

One of the more recent studies of a fellowship program was one conducted by William Cummings and published in August 1986 that followed up on East-West Center alumni. The center was established in 1960 to "promote better relations and understanding among the nations of Asia, the Pacific, and the United States through cooperative study." About two-thirds of the students who were funded to study at the center were from abroad; the rest were American citizens.

Cummings distributed 2,664 questionnaires to East-West Center alumni. Of these, 1,093 were returned, a response rate of 41%. The responses came from more than 45 countries, mostly in Asia and the South Pacific; about one-third of the responses came from American alumni. Seventy-five percent of the respondents earned their master's degrees at the center.

Ninety percent of the respondents said they were generally pleased with their training at the East-West Center, especially the scientific knowledge and skills they acquired. Ninety-five percent said their experience had a profound impact on their personal or career development. After studying at the center, about 20% of the respondents went elsewhere to further their education. Many others were able to use the skills they learned at the center to get new jobs or advance to higher levels in their old jobs.

Unlike most of the studies we examined, this study found that many of the respondents were no longer living and working in the countries of which they were citizens during their studies at the center. More

than 15% changed their citizenship after completing their studies; most of these were residents of Asian countries who took American or Canadian citizenship.

Cummings' study also differed from the other studies we reviewed in the greater attention it paid to the selection process used by the East-West Center. Cummings used questionnaire responses to determine characteristics that were significantly related to the students' satisfaction and performance while at the center as well as later in their careers:

- **Region of origin.** In general, American students were more negative than students of other nationalities in their appraisals of their education and subsequent career opportunities; they were unhappy about irrelevancy in their training and inadequacy of their first jobs after studying at the center. Alumni from Asian countries were more positive in their responses on these issues.
- **Age.** Cummings found that, while younger participants were more impressionable during the time they studied at the center, they had greater problems readapting to their previous way of life after completing their studies. Older fellows had better defined their professional goals and therefore made somewhat better use of their experiences at the center.
- **Marital status.** In general, married students gave their education a more positive appraisal than single students. But married students who came to the East-West Center with their spouses and children were significantly less satisfied with their living conditions than married students whose spouses and children remained home.
- **Job status.** Students who had stable jobs when they began studying at the center made better use of their center experiences than those who were unemployed or saw their work as temporary. Cummings said job-oriented students tended to have a clear understanding of what they wanted to achieve through training and were more likely than unemployed students to feel they profited from what they learned.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Centro Internacional de Mejoramiento de Maíz y Trigo (International Center for the Improvement of Maize and Wheat). 1984. In-service training analysis. Unpublished manuscript. AP Postal 6-641-06600, Mexico, D.F.
- Coleman, James. n.d. A study of former Rockefeller Foundation scholars and fellows -- 1984. Unpublished manuscript. Rockefeller Foundation, New York, NY, USA.
- Coleman, James. 1987. Sociology analysis and social policy. In: Tom Boltomore and Robert Wisket (eds.). History of Sociology and Analysis. Basic Books.
- Cummings, William K. 1986. East-West Center degree student alumni -- Report of the survey reviewing the alumni from the first twenty-five years. East-West Center, Honolulu, HI 96848, USA.
- Development Associates, Inc. 1983. A study of research priorities in the field of international training. Produced under contract to Offices of International Training, Bureau for Science and Technology, U.S. Agency for International Development, Washington, DC 20523, USA.
- Fienup, D. and H. Riley. 1980. Training agricultural economists for work in international development. Agricultural Development Council, New York, NY, USA. (Now Winrock International, Morrilton, AR 72110, USA.)
- Fisher, Donald. 1983. The role of philanthropic foundations in the reproduction and production of hegemony: Rockefeller Foundation and the social sciences. Sociology 12(2).
- Flores, Pedro. 1983. Training programme in Asia: An evaluative study. Unpublished manuscript. Fellowship and Awards Division, International Development Research Centre, P. O. Box 8500, Ottawa, Canada K16 3-9.
- Hefferman, Charles. 1984. Evaluation of the general participant training project in Indonesia. Education and Human Resource Office, U.S. Agency for International Development, Washington, DC 20523, USA.
- Hibbs, Mark D. 1982. Rockefeller Foundation fellowships, 1971-1982, a statistical overview of three programs: Conquest of Hunger, Education for Development, Population and Health. Unpublished document. Food Policy Program, Rockefeller Foundation, New York, NY, USA.

- Kobes, J. and R. Horn. 1984. The study of grant alumni -- Training high level human resources for African development, 1963-1980. Unpublished manuscript. African American Institutes, New York, NY, USA.
- Meyers, Robert G. 1983. Ford Foundation support for education abroad of third world nationals, 1960-1980. Unpublished manuscript. Ford Foundation, New York, NY, USA.
- Simpson, Donald. 1985. Human resources development: A study of the capacity of Canadian institutions to respond to increasing and changing requests from developing countries. Produced by Kanchar/Salasan Group, 784 Richmond Street, London, Ontario, Canada, for International Development Research Centre, P. O. Box 8500, Ottawa, Canada K16 3-9.
- Sumner, Daniel. 1985. The contribution and influence of the agricultural economics program at Chicago: With emphasis on Rockefeller Foundation support. Unpublished manuscript. Department of Economics and Business, North Carolina State University, Box 8110, Raleigh, NC 27695-8110, USA.
- Swenson, C. Geoffrey. 1977. A review of Departemen Sosio-Ekonomi, Institute Pertanian. Indonesia.
- U.S. Agency for International Development. 1988. Universities for development: Report of the joint Indo-U.S. impact evaluation of the Indian agricultural universities. A.I.D. Project Impact Evaluation Report no. 68. Washington, DC 20523, USA.
- U.S. Agency for International Development. 1988. Kasetsart University in Thailand: An analysis of institutional evolution and development impact. A.I.D. Impact Evaluation Report no. 69. Washington, DC 20523, USA.

APPENDIX 2

QUESTIONNAIRE
TO FELLOWS AND SCHOLARS SUPPORTED BY GRANTS FROM
FORD FOUNDATION, ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION, A/D/C, AND IDRC

1. Name _____

2. Male ____ Female ____

3. Mailing address _____

4. At what universities have you studied?

Name of university	Years attended	Degree and major
--------------------	----------------	------------------

_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

5. What is the principal job you now hold? (If not currently employed, describe your most recent employment.)

Employer _____

City and country where you work _____

Period of employment _____

Job title and duties _____

6. What was your first full-time job on your return from donor-sponsored study abroad?

Employer _____

City and country where you worked _____

Period of employment _____

Job title and duties _____

SELECTING INDIVIDUALS TO STUDY ABROAD

7. In selecting men and women to study abroad, how much emphasis do you think should be put on each of the following criteria:

	Should be given great emphasis	Should be given little emphasis
Academic merit, based on grades and examinations	_____	_____
Potential as a staff member in the home institution, based on staffing plans	_____	_____
Evidence of interest in issues of national development	_____	_____
Probability of being influential through position, background, or connections	_____	_____
Other (specify)	_____	_____

8. If you were asked to advise a donor agency as to the selection procedures that would give the best results, which one of the following would you recommend?

- ___ Administrators of the home institution should make the selections.
 - ___ The donor agency should advertise the scholarships and receive the applications, but a committee of local professors and(or) others from the home country would choose among the applicants.
 - ___ The donor agency should advertise the scholarships and make its own selections from among the persons who apply.
 - ___ The home institution should be invited to make nominations but the final selection should be made by the donor agency after interviews.
 - ___ The donor agency should consult with local people who are knowledgeable about promising candidates but should then offer awards to persons of its own choosing.
 - ___ Other: please specify _____
-

PREPARATION FOR STUDY ABROAD

9. At the start of your study abroad, how much of a problem did you have with the language of instruction in your host country?

	Not a serious problem	_____	_____	_____	A very serious problem
In reading assigned texts and references		_____	_____	_____	_____
In understanding lectures		_____	_____	_____	_____
In writing papers		_____	_____	_____	_____
In writing examinations within assigned time limits		_____	_____	_____	_____
In participating in class discussions		_____	_____	_____	_____
In communicating with friends, fellow students, and teachers		_____	_____	_____	_____

10. In matters other than language, how well prepared do you feel that you were at the start of your period of overseas study?

	Not adequately prepared	_____	Could compete on an equal basis	_____	Better prepared than most other students
In mathematical skills		_____		_____	_____
In statistics		_____		_____	_____
In research methodology		_____		_____	_____
In theory courses in your discipline		_____		_____	_____

PLANNING THE OVERSEAS STUDY PROGRAM

11. How much were you yourself involved in the planning of your study program as a fellow or scholar?

	Very little involvement		Very active involvement	
Selecting the university at which to study	_____	_____	_____	_____
Choosing your field of study or specialization	_____	_____	_____	_____
Selecting a dissertation topic (if applicable)	_____	_____	_____	_____

12. Who else played important roles in planning your program of study abroad? (Check as many as apply in each column.)

	Selecting overseas university	Choosing field of study	Selecting dissertation research topic
Academic administrator in home institution (dean, department head, etc.)	_____	_____	_____
Professors or other colleagues in home institution	_____	_____	_____
Foreign professors teaching in your home country	_____	_____	_____
Representatives of the organization funding your study abroad	_____	_____	_____
Family members or close friends	_____	_____	_____

13. How satisfied are you with the choices that were made in your fellowship or scholarship program?

	Very satisfied		Quite dissatisfied	
Choice of university	_____	_____	_____	_____
Choice of field of study	_____	_____	_____	_____
Choice of dissertation topic	_____	_____	_____	_____

EVALUATION OF YOUR STUDY PROGRAM

14. Please check which of the tasks listed below are an important part of the job you now hold or, if not now employed, of the most recent job you held.

15. Now, indicate how useful you feel your overseas training was in equipping you to do the tasks you have checked as "important."

	Extremely useful		Of little or no value	
— Doing scholarly research that meets international standards	_____	_____	_____	_____
— Conducting applied research on problems of locality, country, or region	_____	_____	_____	_____
— Providing advice or leadership on economic or social problems and policies	_____	_____	_____	_____
— Teaching graduate level courses in theory or research methodology	_____	_____	_____	_____
— Teaching graduate or undergraduate courses in applied areas of social science	_____	_____	_____	_____
— Carrying out administrative or managerial responsibilities	_____	_____	_____	_____

16. All in all, how valuable were the knowledge or skills learned overseas?

	Extremely valuable		Of little or no value	
In preparing you for your first full-time job after your return	_____	_____	_____	_____
In helping you to do your current or most recent job	_____	_____	_____	_____

17. If you were studying abroad again, are there subjects or skills you feel were neglected which you would now include or study in more depth?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, please list:

18. Are there any subjects or skills to which you would give less time and attention now than you did then?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, please list:

19. Thinking back on your own experience as a fellow or scholar studying abroad, indicate how satisfactory you feel your program was in each of the following respects.

	Very satisfactory			Not at all satisfactory
Variety and range of courses offered	_____	_____	_____	_____
Quality of courses in field of specialization	_____	_____	_____	_____
Access to faculty members for academic help and advice	_____	_____	_____	_____
Guidance in planning your academic program	_____	_____	_____	_____
Opportunities to attend scientific or professional meetings	_____	_____	_____	_____
Medical and health care facilities	_____	_____	_____	_____
Amount of contact with fellow graduate students	_____	_____	_____	_____

Special services provided
to foreign students
by the institution _____

If applicable in your case:

Help in planning your research _____

Help in data collection _____

Help in analysis and
dissertation writing _____

Access to research support
services (libraries,
computing services, etc.) _____

20. In the department where you studied as a fellow or scholar, what kind of involvement had there been with agricultural or rural problems of third world countries?

___ A widespread involvement throughout the department

___ Involvement limited to only a few faculty members

___ Little or no involvement of any departmental staff

21. Did your own adviser have first-hand experience with agricultural or rural issues in developing countries?

___ In your own country?

___ In other developing countries?

___ No first-hand experience

22. Besides yourself, about how many other students from third world countries were doing graduate work in the same department as you at any time during your period of study abroad?

___ None

___ One to four

___ Five or more

23. As part of your program of study abroad, did you complete a thesis or dissertation?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, what was your thesis title or subject?

24. If you completed a thesis or dissertation, which of the following best describes your combination of graduate coursework and research?

Both academic coursework and dissertation research were done overseas.

Academic coursework was done overseas and dissertation research was carried out at home.

Basic academic coursework was done at home, dissertation research and writing were carried out overseas.

Other (explain): _____

25. For other students from your country going abroad to work on graduate degrees, which of the following recommendations would you consider most useful and practical?

Both academic coursework and dissertation research should be done at the overseas institution.

Coursework should be done at the overseas university, research at home.

Basic academic coursework should be done at home, dissertation research and writing at an overseas university.

Other (explain): _____

CONTINUING CONTACT WITH DONOR AGENCY AND HOME INSTITUTION

26. During your period as a fellow or scholar studying abroad, how often did you have contact with your home institution, either by letter or in person, on the following matters?

	Frequent contact	Occasional contact	Little or no contact
Your study program	_____	_____	_____
Your research progress and plans	_____	_____	_____
Your future role in your home institution	_____	_____	_____

27. Did the organization which funded your study program give you as much help as you expected in regard to:

	Adequate help		Not enough help		Help not needed
Immigration problems	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Travel arrangements	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Academic matters	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Family problems	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Health problems	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Other (please specify)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED ON RETURN

28. Upon your return from your period of study as a fellow or scholar, which of the following difficulties or problems, if any, did you encounter in adjusting to life and work in your own country?

Personal and Family Problems	Serious problem	Minor problem	No problem
Financial "settling in" (e.g., delay or irregularity in salary payments, need to take a second job, etc.)	_____	_____	_____
Logistical arrangements (e.g., living accommodations, transportation, etc.)	_____	_____	_____
Readjusting to tempo and style of life (working hours, meals, etc.)	_____	_____	_____
Adjusting to the local or national political situation	_____	_____	_____
Other (please specify)	_____	_____	_____

Employment Problems	Serious problem	Minor problem	No problem
Difficulty in finding a job that made best use of your overseas educational experience	_____	_____	_____
Economic rewards for your professional work	_____	_____	_____
Social status for your professional work	_____	_____	_____
Acceptance by colleagues and superiors who remained in home country	_____	_____	_____
Infrastructure for Professional Work	Serious problem	Minor problem	No problem
Lack of institutional interest in research activities	_____	_____	_____
Heavy teaching load	_____	_____	_____
Too many other professional responsibilities	_____	_____	_____
Lack of equipment and supplies	_____	_____	_____
Lack of transportation for job-related travel	_____	_____	_____
Funds for research	_____	_____	_____
Facilities and funding for professional meetings and conferences in your home country	_____	_____	_____
Travel opportunities for professional meetings and conferences abroad	_____	_____	_____
Opportunities for additional training	_____	_____	_____
Availability of professional books, journals, etc.	_____	_____	_____
Local opportunities to publish research results	_____	_____	_____

Other (explain) _____

29. Taking everything into account, would you say that in getting relocated and reestablished after your return from study abroad you encountered:

- major difficulties
 only minor difficulties
 few or no difficulties

30. Would the problems faced by young professionals returning from study abroad today be similar to or different from those that you encountered? Please list in order below (1, 2, 3, etc.) the problems you think will be most difficult for them.

- Finding an appropriate job
 Acceptance by colleagues and superiors
 Level of economic rewards
 Social status of their professional work
 Heavy teaching loads and other professional responsibilities
 Lack of equipment and supplies
 Support for job-related travel
 Research funding
 Facilities and funds for in-country professional meetings
 Opportunities for professional travel abroad
 Local outlets for publishing research results
 Other (explain) _____

31. During the first 4 or 5 years after your return from your period as a fellow or scholar studying abroad, from whom did you get help in maintaining your professional competence and advancing your professional career?

	Help received from:				
	Agency funding your study abroad	Your employer	Other (specify)	Help needed but not received	No help needed
Funds to help you get started in research?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Opportunities to attend scientific and professional conferences?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Opportunities to organize workshops or seminars?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Opportunities to be a consultant on scientific or professional matters?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Information on new developments in fields of professional interest to you?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

32. Since completing formal studies overseas, which of the following professional activities have you been engaged in, either by yourself or working with colleagues?

	Often	Sometimes	Never
Teaching			
Developed or presented new courses	_____	_____	_____
Designed changes in the curriculum	_____	_____	_____
Supervised graduate student research	_____	_____	_____
Published textbooks (including translations) or other materials for use in teaching	_____	_____	_____
Promotion of Scholarship	Often	Sometimes	Never
Directed research for government agencies, the university, international agencies, or businesses	_____	_____	_____
Took part in research projects that required collection of data in the field	_____	_____	_____
Submitted proposals for research funding	_____	_____	_____
Planned workshops or seminars for professional colleagues	_____	_____	_____
Presented scholarly papers at professional or scientific seminars or meetings, at home or abroad	_____	_____	_____

Published professional or scientific books or monographs	___	___	___
Published original articles in professional or scientific journals	___	___	___
Published notes or book reviews in professional or scientific journals	___	___	___
Refereed articles for professional or scientific journals	___	___	___
Administration	Often	Sometimes	Never
Participated in interagency planning committees	___	___	___
Initiated new services or programs	___	___	___
Developed or revised policies or procedures for a government agency, university, or business	___	___	___
Consultation	Often	Sometimes	Never
Served as a consultant to government	___	___	___
Served as a consultant to a private business	___	___	___
Given program or other advice to the donor agency that supported your study abroad	___	___	___
Served as a consultant to any other international agency or foundation	___	___	___

33. In the past year, have your duties included a significant teaching responsibility?

Yes ___ No ___

If yes, please give the title of the courses involved and add a few words of description if the title does not indicate the course content.

34. If you are currently engaged in research, what are the research problem(s) on which you are working?

NETWORKS MAINTAINED

35. Since returning from your period as a fellow or scholar studying abroad, how often have you been in touch, personally or by letter, with:

	Frequently	Occasionally	Never
Representatives of the agency which funded your overseas study?	_____	_____	_____
Faculty members at the foreign university where you studied?	_____	_____	_____
Fellow graduate students at the foreign university where you studied?	_____	_____	_____
Host families or other friends in the community where you studied?	_____	_____	_____

36. How frequently do you have professional contacts with:

	Frequently	Occasionally	Never
Faculty members outside your own university:			
In your own country?	_____	_____	_____
In other universities in Asia	_____	_____	_____
In other parts of the world	_____	_____	_____
Governmental agency personnel in your country or region?	_____	_____	_____
Professionals in international agencies working in your field?	_____	_____	_____

37. Are you now an active member of one or more scientific or professional associations in your field?

Yes ____ No ____

If yes, please list: _____

38. In the efforts of your institution to carry on work of high professional quality, how important is each of the following? And how satisfactory is the situation in your institution with regard to each item?

Very important	Not important	Not Fully satis- factory	at all satis- factory
_____	_____	_____	_____
Availability of professional books, journals, and other library resources			
_____	_____	_____	_____
Access to computer service			
_____	_____	_____	_____
Other necessary equipment and supplies			
_____	_____	_____	_____
Funds for research			
_____	_____	_____	_____
Institutional support for research in your field			
_____	_____	_____	_____
Local opportunities to publish research results			
_____	_____	_____	_____
Facilities and funding for professional meetings and conferences in your home country			
_____	_____	_____	_____
Travel opportunities for professional meetings and conferences abroad			
_____	_____	_____	_____
Salary levels for your kind of work			
_____	_____	_____	_____

_____	_____	_____	Social status of professional work in your field	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	Reasonable work loads	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	Postdoctoral training opportunities	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	Other opportunities for additional training	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	Availability of visiting professionals from other nations	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	Other (explain)	_____	_____	_____

39. Are there any of the needs you have checked above on which outside agencies (international organizations, foundations, technical assistance agencies, etc.) can be of help? What kinds of help would be most needed and most welcome?

SOME DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

40. In what year were you born? _____
41. In what country were you born? _____
42. What was the population of the community in which you spent most of your life before entering secondary school?
- ___ 100,000 or more
 - ___ 20,000 to 100,000
 - ___ between 5,000 and 20,000
 - ___ less than 5,000
43. When you were growing up, what was the major occupation of each of your parents?
- Father _____
- Mother _____

44. Please check the highest level of education completed by your parents:

	Your father	Your mother
No formal education	_____	_____
None beyond primary school	_____	_____
Some secondary schooling	_____	_____
Completed secondary school	_____	_____
Some postsecondary education but no diploma, certificate or degree	_____	_____
Completion of a degree, diploma, or certificate program beyond secondary school	_____	_____

We realize this has been a long questionnaire, but we appreciate your willingness to share your experience and ideas through it.

We also realize that there may be important points not covered in the questionnaire which you feel should be called to the attention of donor agencies and the international educational community. Would you please add, in the space below or in a separate statement, whatever ideas or advice you think will be helpful?

Thanks again, and best wishes.
