

PJ-ABC-051
1st 60360

**BUILDING NATIONAL CAPACITY
IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES:
INSIGHTS FROM THE EXPERIENCE
IN INDIA AND INDONESIA**

**A Comparison of
Questionnaire Response of
USAID, Former Fellows, Ford,
Rockefeller, A/D/C and IDRC
Fellows Trained in the
Social Sciences From
India and Indonesia**

June, 1988

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Evaluation of Overseas Training	3
3	Collecting the Data - Questionnaire Response	5
4	Age, Background and Gender	6
5	Other Characteristics of Fellows	7
6	Career Progress at Home	8
7	How is Overseas Training Being Used?	8
8	Professional Contribution	8
9	Usefulness of Knowledge and Skills Acquired Overseas	10
10	Satisfaction With Initial Program Decisions	11
11	Evaluation of Components of Training Program	11
12	Judgment About the Selection Process	12
13	Dealing With the Dissertation	13
14	Support During Period of Study Abroad	13
15	Level of Satisfaction With Program as a Whole	14
16	Level of Preparedness for Study Abroad	15
17	Language Problems	15
18	Graduate Advisor and Host Department	15
19	Problems Encountered on Return	16

20 Perceived Changes to Problems Facing the Returning Fellows	16
21 Networking	17
22 Help in Maintaining and Expanding Professional Competence	17
23 Looking To the Future	18

List of Tables

Preface

The proposal for this study of Human Capital Development emerged from discussions with friends and co-workers concerned with the issue. I was preparing to retire after some 27 years with the Agricultural Development Council. My friend David Hopper of the World Bank suggested that the time had come to utilize 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 Centre (IDRC) of Canada were all key organizations in this effort, as was USAID in its impressively flexible contribution to the building of 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 III Fund was most generous in its support as was the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and Winrock International.

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

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

For their review of the initial design and for their continued invaluable suggestions, I would like to thank Larry Steifel, Clarence Gray and Joyce Mook of the Rockefeller Foundation; Alan Rix and Douglas Daniels at IDRC; Ray Cohen at USAID; Russell Phillips at the RBF; Elizabeth McCormack of the JDR III 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 Ilwan Park of Korea, Sam Hsieh of Taiwan, and Gelia Catillo of the Philippines.

Former fellows in the various countries of 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 of ADC for those in Thailand, Gerry Gill in Bangladesh and John Cool in Nepal.

Thanks are owed to my professional colleagues who helped with suggestions and reviewed some of the drafts: Vern Ruttan, Hans Binswanger, Bill Sewell, Art Mosher, Ed Schuh, Adrienne Germain, David Nygard, David Hopper and Ruth Zagorin; Haven North and Ray Cohen of AID; 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 hypothesis that came to us from many sources.

And of course, to Bry Kearn who has played a major role in all phases of the study; my co-designer, my editor and my friend.

Finally, I must 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 III. It was his concern with how to prepare a younger 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 young generation of professionals.

**BUILDING NATIONAL CAPACITY IN THE SOCIAL
SCIENCES:
INSIGHTS FROM THE EXPERIENCE
IN INDIA AND INDONESIA**

1 Introduction

At the end of the 1940's, virtually all professionally trained social scientists who were directing their research at the policy issues that face the developing world were men and women who had been born and brought up in industrialized countries and were products of the universities in those countries. It soon became apparent that there was a critical need for the Third World to develop its own capacity to take an empirical approach to the study of its social and economic problems.

An essential part of the effort to meet this need was an extensive program of fellowships which took Third World nationals abroad to study and to gain proficiency in the use of the tools and methods of social science inquiry. In subsequent decades, governments and lending agencies and philanthropic organizations devoted considerable human and fiscal resources to the support of Third World students working toward advanced degrees in the social sciences in the United States and other industrialized countries.

From the start, it was recognized that this was not a permanent or definitive solution for the problem. A period of continued dependence on the industrialized world for such training was expected, but even the initial reliance on overseas fellowships included a recognition that no country would have an adequate supply of well-trained, problem-oriented social scientists unless it trained them itself. There was general concern that some elements of training abroad might have limited relevance to the developing world. At the same time, it was recognized that no other choice was available if a high level of competence was to be quickly achieved.

In addition, however, there was an obvious need for courses and curricula that paid particular attention to problems unique to developing countries (policy alternatives for primarily subsistence rural economies, for example). Overseas training offered too little opportunity for applied research on real problems of development and field data collection in the setting

where those problems were to be found.

Costs of overseas training were also high, scarce foreign exchange was required to meet them, and the specter of "brain drain" – a very real drain of fiscal as well as intellectual resources – was always an issue. Finally, overseas training made it very difficult to meet within a single program the requirements of advanced graduate education and the challenge of applied research on the problems of the individual's home country.

Social science theories and methodologies acquired abroad have, in fact, been used effectively to shape and carry out sound policies in most developing countries. At the same time there has been a gratifying growth in the ability of many developing countries to meet their need for local social science training capacity. This has inevitably called for rethinking the role of international donor agencies and the educational institutions of the developed countries.

The initial study encompassed four of the major fellowship programs carried on since the 1950's to build the capacity of Asian countries to take a scientific approach to the study of socio-economic issues. It included the programs of the Ford Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation, Agricultural Development Council (A/D/C), and the International Development Research Centre (IDRC).

USAID was also concerned with building the Asian capacity to deal with socio-economic issues and funded a fellowship program to deal with this question. USAID and others agreed that it would be useful to broaden the study and include former USAID fellows and compare the findings between the two groups. USAID provided funds to collect data on USAID fellows from India and Indonesia. Questionnaires given to USAID fellows were identical to those distributed to Foundation fellows to facilitate a comparison to the findings between the two groups. Since the AID data was limited to India and Indonesia, the AID/Foundation comparison presented in this report is limited to these two countries. A report reviewing the Foundation experience in all of Asia is available in a separate report.

Both studies asked how well past programs have succeeded and what insight they offer for the future. It explores the place the former fellows have filled and are filling in the world of social science and governmental policy, how they evaluate their overseas experience, and what advice they can offer to donor agencies for future programming. Special emphasis is

given to how the former fellows have contributed to the growth of social science training capacity in their home countries since their return and what they think is necessary to maintain and expand that capacity.

An important source of data on the effectiveness of past programs is the record of performance of those who have participated in it. This study asked former fellows to respond to a detailed questionnaire about their training and employment experience. It has been supplemented by personal interviews with their present or potential employers in the Third World. This latter group included university leaders, government administrators, and executives in the private sector. Representing the "user group", these leaders were asked to appraise the value of social scientists and social science methodologies in the developing countries. More specifically, they were asked to comment on the usefulness of what social scientists trained abroad are doing in their countries and what steps are required to maintain whatever level of social science competence they believe is needed.

2 Evaluation of Overseas Training

Support to permit Third World nationals to study abroad has had a variety of goals.

Some fellowship programs have been aimed simply at increasing the number of individuals with advanced training to fill an expected demand that is not necessarily tied to any particular positions or organizations.

In contrast, many fellowship awards have been part of institution-building programs in which study grants in such fields as economics and sociology have been part of a concerted plan to produce staff for planned teaching and research positions. With limited resources, most funding organizations have tried to target their support to specific needs of national institution-building.

Most groups supporting overseas graduate fellowships have seen research as at the heart of the training process. A person who is successfully utilizing such training is capable of doing research and does it. As a well-trained social scientist, he or she builds modern research concepts into teaching and applies them in policy analysis. The research done is of sufficiently high quality that it enters into the mainstream of discussion, internationally as

well as within the country. Teachers and researchers as well as policy makers are kept in touch with a wider world, affected by it but also themselves influencing it.

In countries where food supply is critical, an evaluation of recent social science training would ask how well it integrates knowledge of the agricultural production sciences. Most developing countries have set as a high priority goal the improvement of their agricultural productivity. They are also concerned about the distribution of benefits of technological advance. The complex interplay of human and technical or biological factors requires a kind of teamwork not generally understood or recognized even a couple of decades ago. Sensitivity to the need for biological, physical and social scientists to work together is increasingly being accepted as a criterion for successful training.

In evaluating career outcomes, the individual's personal goals and achievements must also be taken into account. From his or her own perspective, how useful has overseas training proved to be and in what ways?

This study does not begin to cover more than a narrow range of these issues and questions. In evaluating effectiveness, it proposed to focus on what it considers the absolutely crucial criteria for social science teaching, research and policy analysis at home.

Career progress of the fellows is an uncertain measure considering the wide range in their ages and recency of their programs and the unavailability of a suitable control group against whom to compare them.

Much reliance has been placed on the respondents' own evaluation of the quality and usefulness of their overseas training. Admittedly, their expressed levels of "satisfaction" with the fellowship experience do not tell the whole story. Similarly, their recollections as to "problems encountered" and their judgments as to program details are perhaps colored by sentiment and certainly limited by accuracy of recall. There is a consistency to these responses, however, that encourages confidence in their usefulness.

Field observations by the authors and interviews with university and governmental officials in their home countries confirm that a large share of the returned fellows are effectively using the theory and methodology of their graduate study in investigating real problems at home and that they generally accept the need to gather empirical data as a basis for conclusions. These latter requirements have been the essence of modern social

science training, and the general purpose both of donor agencies and of home governments in supporting fellowship programs has been to apply them as aids to development.

3 Collecting the Data - Questionnaire Response

The study drew its data from for a mailed questionnaire sent to Indian and Indonesian social scientist who receive USAID or Ford, Rockefeller, A/D/C, IDRC fellows for graduate study abroad from 1960-85.

The forty-four page questionnaire that was used asked for information and opinions on a wide range of issues related to the respondents' employment history, study program and professional activities. It was a survey of demographic information about the respondent. Questionnaires were sent to the best available address for each of the USAID and Foundation fellows in Indian and Indonesia.

In the Foundation group, 158 questionnaires were sent to former Indian fellows with 69 responses, (a response rate of 43 percent). One hundred and three Indonesian fellows were sent questionnaires and 68 responded for a 66 percent response.

In India, questionnaires were mailed to 123 former USAID fellows. Twenty-one were returned unopened due to incorrect addresses or to the fact that the former fellow is deceased. Of the 110 surveys that are assumed to have reached their intended destination, a total of 38 have been completed and returned to the United States. This is a response rate of 38 percent.

In Indonesia, questionnaires were sent to 500 former fellows. This number represents about 50 percent of the total number of Indonesians who had their postgraduate training funded by USAID. Indonesian former fellows to whom questionnaires were distributed were chosen at random. Forty questionnaires were returned due to "unknown address". A total of 128 completed responses were received - a response rate of 28 percent (Table 1).

In an effort to boost rates of return, two waves of follow-up letters were circulated. Some of the letters were sent from U.S. embassies in India and

Indonesia. The rest were mailed from Rutgers University in New Jersey. The letters emphasized the importance of the study and requested the former fellow to respond. Unfortunately, the follow-up system was ineffective in generating additional responses (Table 1).

4 Age, Background and Gender

The age distribution of respondents are quite similar for both groups and reflects the trend in support for overseas graduate study. The smallest group is under 35 with the bulk between the age of 35-54 (Table 2).

In both India and Indonesia, the majority of the population is in the rural areas. But it is difficult for any fellowship program to direct opportunities for graduate study to students of rural background. In the Third World there is a geographic bias toward urban areas in primary and secondary education as well as at the university level.

Both USAID and the Foundation fellowship program have had some success in breaking the barrier to support students with rural background and interests. Nearly half of the Foundation and USAID fellows in India and Indonesia came from rural areas and communities of less than 20,000 population.

Both USAID and the Foundation Fellowship programs studied have had greater difficulty in coping with educational systems that are biased toward the male. The reasons for this bias has been widely discussed. Families, school systems, and, ultimately, fellowship selection committees have faced an unspoken assumption that scarce educational resources are better invested in opportunities for males than for females.

The Fellowship lists for both donor groups reflect this problem. Table 3 indicates some improvement in the ratio in the later years. This reflects the increase in the pool of qualified female applicants and that the private and public donors have become increasingly sensitive to the need for supporting women students.

5 Other Characteristics of Fellows

Almost two-thirds of the respondents for both groups completed their overseas programs since the early 1970's. Response rates were even higher for recent fellows, but this probably reflects the fact that address lists for them are more up-to-date. There are some significant differences between the Foundation and USAID groups as to social science discipline that received the largest number of trainees.

The distribution of fellows in the two groups by social science disciplines is quite different. Although economics has been the social science discipline receiving the greatest attention in both fellowship programs, even here there are significant differences. Forty-nine percent of the Foundation group put economics as their major in contrast to 31 percent of USAID. In the USAID group, the next largest group was in education at 20.3 percent, followed by political science and public administration at 13.3 percent. Other fields represented were sociology at 7.9 percent and business administration at 7 percent. The Foundation group has sociology, business administration 7.3 percent, education 5.1 percent and political science and public administration at 2.2 percent. The remainder of the social science field were fairly small in both group (see Table 4).

The distribution of fellows by discipline is significant. It represents joint decisions by home countries and donors as to which social science fields at any given time had most to offer and could benefit most from programs to strengthen staffing and research capacity. USAID and the Foundation fellowship support in supporting social science capacity in India and Indonesia has some difference in emphasis. The Foundation support was primarily in building professional training in social sciences in the universities. USAID recognized this need but also felt there was a real need to strengthen the administrative side of the university, building primary and secondary school capacity and for strengthening government agencies that needed social scientist for research, administration and management. This is reflected in Table 4.

6 Career Progress at Home

One of the most encouraging findings of this study is the large number of fellows from both donor groups who returned to work in their own countries after completing their study abroad and are still there. Ninety-eight percent of the Foundation respondents from India and Indonesia indicated that their first jobs after training were in their home country, and 93 percent were still in their own country at the time of the study. The USAID figures were even higher. Nearly 100 percent reported their first job in their home country, and all are still working in their home country (see Table 5).

While these results underestimate the effects of the so called "brain drain" because the level of response was no doubt lower for persons working abroad, there is no question that both programs added significantly to the professional capacity of these two

7 How is Overseas Training Being Used?

Both the first and current jobs of returning fellows strongly reflect the donors training goals. The Foundation's expectation that the major share of returning fellows would be employed in universities has been realized. Nearly two-thirds returned to academic positions and still are in the universities. In contrast, although USAID was also interested in building social science capacity in academic institutions, they made a special effort to provide this capacity in government, and other nonuniversity areas. They were equally successful in achieving their goals with about the same number of their fellows returning to government jobs (41 percent) as those going to universities (40.4 percent) (see Table 6).

8 Professional Contribution

The career achievements and increased responsibilities of the returnees are evidenced in their answers to questions about job titles on their return and present (see Table 7). The major differences between the USAID and Foundations fellows are the areas in which they are operating. This reflects the

differing objective of the two programs. The Foundation fellows are achieving the academic leadership one would have hoped for. A large number of USAID fellows have major responsibilities in government positions. Even those who came from the academic community have, in a number of cases, moved into academic administrative roles.

Even a cursory review of the titles currently held by the respondents leaves no doubt as to their critical role in socio-economic policy in their countries. It may seem superfluous to catalog these titles, but there is no better way to show how significant the fellowship support has been.

Indonesia

Dean, Faculty of Law, Surabaya

Chief, Ministry of Agriculture, Pasar Mangu

Family Coordinator, Surabaya

Head, Health Education Division, Yogyakarta

Head, Bureau of Planning, Ministry of Education and Culture, Jakarta

Head, Program Evaluation, Ministry of Agriculture, Jakarta

Head, Center For Foreign Trade Research Development, Ministry of Trade,
Jakarta

Head, Ministry of Energy, National Development Planning Agency, Jakarta

Chief, Education and Training Division, National Institute of Administration,
Jakarta

Head, Marketing and Extension Service, Province of West Java

Manager, Jalan Accounting Firm Head, Capital Marketing Executive Agency,
Jakarta

India

Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Agricultural Department,
Madras

Principal, Extension and Education Institute, Ammand

Extension Coordinator, University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore

Vice Chancellor, Tamilnadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore

Professor and Head Extension Educator, Udiapur

Head, Agricultural Economics, Gobchale Institute of Politics, Economics,
Poona

Chief Executive, Soma Textiles, Ahmedabad

Vice-President, Jct. Mills, New Delhi

Table 9 provides a picture of the research activities and other professional contributions of returned fellows.

Those currently working in academic institutions regardless of donor have been active contributors to improving course content and curriculum (Table 8). Fellows from both donor groups are actively engaged in social science research involving field data collection, as well as directing research for government and other institutions. Both groups are also active in planning workshops for professional colleagues. As might be expected, more Foundation fellows published articles, books, etc. than USAID. This reflects the fact that, as noted earlier, more Foundation fellows came from and returned to academic institutions where the peer group pressure requires you publish.

9 Usefulness of Knowledge and Skills Acquired Overseas

There was strong agreement in both groups that the knowledge and skills required overseas was of considerable usefulness both in their first and current positions (Table 10). To provide more information about the strengths and weaknesses of overseas training, the fellows were asked which of a series of tasks are currently an important responsibility for them. Those identifying each task as "important" were then asked about the contribution their

graduate study had made to their ability to perform it (Table 11). As would be expected, a larger percent of USAID fellows found managerial duties of great importance in contrast to the academic oriented majority of Foundation respondent. What is interesting to note was that two-thirds of the management oriented USAID fellows found the overseas program very useful in this area in interest to about one-third of the Foundation fellows.

10 Satisfaction With Initial Program Decisions

For a student from a Third World country, the choices involved in study abroad are often bewildering the seldom easy to make. 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 preferences as to the field they will support and the overseas universities they consider suitable. The survey gave the returned fellows an opportunity to respond generally to their initial program decisions. What is heartening is that between 80 and 90 percent of both groups were pleased with their choice of major fields, choice of the universities and choice of the dissertation topic (Table 12).

11 Evaluation of Components of Training Program

A more important issue of satisfaction concerns the elements that made up the students' overseas program – the courses offered, academic counseling and guidance, contacts with other students, participation in professional activities, support services for the conduct of research, the former fellows were given a list of twelve components and asked to indicate how adequate the provision was for each on a scale that extended from "very satisfactory" to "not at all satisfactory" (see Table 13). Both groups would have liked

greater opportunity to attend professional meetings during their period of study abroad. The part of their program that research students found least satisfactory was help on data collection and analysis. This may reflect the special circumstances of data collection in a strange land, or collected at home with direct and frequent contact with a dissemination advisor. The comparatively low rating for "a special services to foreign students" is hard to interpret. It may well have been a matter-of-fact comment that they were not given "special" services and for the most part treated like other students.

12 Judgment About the Selection Process

In both fellowship programs, there had been considerable interaction between home institution, home country, donor agency, and the individual fellow in the selection process. Both in evaluating fellows and in creating opportunities for them on their return, there is a unique contribution available from home country personnel and institutions. The donor agency, on the other hand very often have better insights as to appropriate overseas sources of training, the strengths and weaknesses of graduate institutions and program. Outsiders are also sometimes – although not always – in a better position to rise above internal politics and personal considerations in making selection.

It would not have been surprising to see the respondents urge a greater role for home country institutions and personnel and a smaller role for the outsider. But like their colleagues in the rest of Asia, there still is a great deal of sentiment for the kind of partnership that existed in the past (see Table 14.) This holds regardless of the time period they went abroad.

There is a similar unity among respondents and donor agencies as to the criteria that should be considered in making fellowship selection. Both donor agencies have emphasized two criteria – likelihood of success in graduate study and potential as a staff member (see Table 15).

13 Dealing With the Dissertation

Students from the Third World who expect to do a dissertation and receive a PhD degree have a variety of alternatives. Recognizing that the large Western research universities offer a broad range of graduate level courses and seminars, they can turn to such universities for a breadth that could not as yet expect to get at home. Some of the same considerations apply in regard 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 access) that can enrich almost any research project. At the same time, the student who expects to carry on a life-long career of research in his or her home country may want the dissertation to be the first step on which later work can be done. Table 16 reflects the view of the fellows from India and Indonesia.

The enthusiasm for course work abroad is almost unanimous. About half the fellows from both Foundation and USAID prefer doing their course work abroad and research in the home country. About 25 percent of the USAID fellows would want to carry out both course work and research abroad and 44 percent of the Foundation group would like to do both abroad. The major reason given for research abroad was the view that for many individuals this would represent their only opportunity of studying a society other than their own.

It is obvious that these figures will change over time as the Asian universities grown in social science breadth.

14 Support During Period of Study Abroad

The level of satisfaction that fellows express about their program is definitely linked with the amount of encouragement and support the donor agency gave them while they were studying abroad. In addition, it correlates with the success they have attained in their professional careers. Clearly, adequate assistance from the donor agency is one of the best ways to ensure that program participants will benefit from their study program.

Respondents were asked about five areas in which individuals studying

abroad are most likely to experience problems: Immigration, travel, academic work, family, and health. They were invited to report whether they had required help in any of these areas and, if so, whether the help they received from the agency funding their fellowship was adequate. As can be seen in Table 17, both funding agencies were needed and most successful in dealing with problems relating to travel, immigration and academic matters. Family and health problems were lower in being handled satisfactorily, but those are the two areas that some individuals coming to a strange land would find hard to deal with, and equally hard for the funding agency to sometimes become aware of.

15 Level of Satisfaction With Program as a Whole

Besides allowing a look at individual aspects of the overseas study experience, the questions on individual program components made it possible to correlate the fellow judgment about adequacy of programs with other variables. Table 18 indicates that the majority of fellows were quite pleased with their program regardless of the funding agencies.

The level of satisfaction that fellows expressed about their programs should have been related, and was, to their appraisal of the level of help they received from the funding agency on such matters as immigration regulation, travel plans, academic concerns, family needs and health problems (Table 19). This was true regardless of when they completed their fellowship (Table 20).

An important factor in level of satisfaction with the study program was extent of continued contact with the home institution during the period. The fellows were asked how frequently they were in touch with their home institution, as to progress on their study programs, research plans and their future roles at home (Table 21). Contact with the home institution significantly correlated with the general judgment the fellows made to the satisfactoriness of their total study program regardless of the donor agency. Fellows with frequent contact were considerably more likely to describe their study experience as "satisfactory" or "very satisfactory".

16 Level of Preparedness for Study Abroad

In terms of mathematical skills, knowledge of statistics, research methodology and theory of their discipline, most fellows felt they started their overseas study at least as well prepared as other students. Perceived level of preparedness had little or no apparent relationship with level and satisfaction with the study program (Table 22).

17 Language Problems

Of the many variable examined, language turns out to be one of the most important factors determining the success of a study program. The critical factor was whether English had been the medium of university instruction. As might be expected the most serious language problem occurred with Indonesian fellows where English had not been the medium of university instruction. This was true whether they were USAID or Foundation fellows (see Tables 24 and 25).

Table 26 and 27 show how the fellows' perception of the program were colored by language problems. Those reporting the least difficulty had more satisfaction from their overseas experience. Part of the problem will solve itself with the expansion of strong programs of graduate study in Asia so that fewer students need to go abroad for advanced training. For those who do, appropriate language preparation is essential and should be considered as a necessary investment on the part of the donor.

18 Graduate Advisor and Host Department

Home country institutions with USAID and Foundation have done a good job in placing their fellows in departments that are involved in Third World problems where they can work with advisors familiar with the subject and alongside other students from Third World countries. All three measures of Third World interest shown in Table 28 have steadily increased over time.

19 Problems Encountered on Return

When one looks at problems encountered upon returning home, the majority of the fellows, had minor or no difficulty except in the area of equipment. Almost one-third of fellows in both donor groups found this a serious problem. Economic reward was the next major group – about 28 percent, followed by institutional research interest. Difficulty finding a job was only 8 percent about Foundation group and 18 percent USAID group (Table 29).

Fewer than 8 percent reported any serious difficulty adjusting to family obligation, the tempo of life, cultural norms or the political situation at home when they returned from studying abroad. Financial “settling in”, and logistical assignment were the two areas that were a bit more difficult (Table 30).

It was in the area of professional development that the most dissatisfaction and concern was expressed – getting the resources needed to maintain their professional competence and to perform their duties successfully at their home institution. All five problem areas were considered serious by significant numbers of respondents from both USAID and the Foundation (see Tables 31). A higher percentage of recent fellows reported major differences, while the larger number of earlier fellows had few or no difficulties (Table 32).

20 Perceived Changes to Problems Facing the Returning Fellows

Respondents were asked to compare the problems they themselves encountered on their return with those which young people in a similar situation today would face (Table 33). The most striking difference is a perception by USAID and Foundation fellows that today’s returnees face a more difficult employment situation than they did. Finding an appropriate job was nowhere near the problem for them that they believed it would be for young social scientists returning today from study abroad. The need for qualified staff continues to exist, 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 economic awards, inadequate research funding, equipment and supplies and few opportunities for travel abroad appear to be a continuing problem. There is a perception of greater opportunities for additional training, but this is still an area of deficiency.

21 Networking

One of the essentials of social scientists in smaller countries or isolated settings are to maintain professional capacity in contact with a broader peer group. Nearly all the Foundation respondents report occasional or frequent contact with professional colleagues in their field at home and in other countries (both Third World and industrialized). The USAID fellows contacts were also high but not as high with faculty members in the rest of Asia or with as overseas faculty members. This reflects the fewer academics among the USAID group (Table 34).

Personal acquaintanceships also contribute to these fellows continued maintenance of professional capacity. A majority of both groups continue to have periodic contact with staff of the agency that funded their work or with fellow students, local families and other friends they met in the community where they studied. For many fellows, this is one of the major contacts with their peer group (Table 34).

22 Help in Maintaining and Expanding Professional Competence

A thread that runs consistently through almost all responses is the concern of returned fellows for ways to maintain and expand their professional competence. Fellows 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.

A higher percentage of USAID fellows reported that these needs were not recognized (Table 36). One possible reason for the difference may be

that a higher proportion of USAID fellows were in government rather than academic posts. In talking to senior people in both countries, academic leaders were much more aware of the needs of their staff to have opportunities to maintain their professional capacity than their counterparts in government agencies.

In both cases, the major source of help was their own employment agency or institution. Information on development in their professional field was the one area that external agencies played a significant role for both USAID and Foundation fellows.

It should be noted that the sizable numbers of persons listed in the column "help desired but not obtained" tells only part of the story. This does not mean that the others, who listed sources from whom they received help, were saying their needs were fully or even adequately met. Answers to other questions makes it clear that there is a substantial need, even today, for better ways to help returned fellows maintain and build their professional competence.

The question of what role the donor agencies might or can play was raised with the former fellows (Table 39) offers a list of unmet needs and categories then into those which the fellows believe can or cannot be of assistance. Both groups of fellows clearly gave this question some careful thought as to what areas of need an outside donor can be of help. For example, it is interesting to note that salary levels are not satisfactory for many of the fellows, but they do not see this as a problem that the donors should deal with. It is research funding, attendance at professional meetings, books and journals and post doctoral training that they feel outside agencies can help. Even in these areas, they see the donor agencies role as no more than three to five years – long enough so that their home country institution recognizes the value of this support and will begin to provide the necessary support.

23 Looking To the Future

In the past forty years, USAID, the Foundation and other donor agencies have worked with the countries of Asia to strengthen indigenous ability to apply social science skills to problems of development. Heavy reliance

has been placed on fellowships for overseas training to obtain social science research experience. This effort has been remarkably successful. A large number of those who studied abroad have returned to their home countries to work and live.

This study indicates that both Foundation and USAID fellows found their overseas experience relevant and useful. On their return, many have given policy advice to leaders in government and have themselves 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.

Today, India and Indonesia, as well as the other countries of Asia have universities with social science departments that meet these requirements. Traditional universities of India and Indonesia have built this capacity with the help of the Foundation and USAID. New institutions such as the Indian Institute of Management and the rural Universities of Indonesia were funded by the donors with particular emphasis on developing a core staff.

The major difference between USAID and the Foundation fellowship programs reflected in this study, is the groups selected for the fellowship. It is hard to find a USAID directive that spells out the selection process, but it is clear that the largest group chosen came from government and administration groups in education. The Foundation involved were clear in giving their highest priority to building academic capacity in the social sciences. In talking to some of the "old timers" in USAID that still were in India and Indonesia, they supported this view. One other factor they and some of the Foundation "elders" agreed on was that in the 1950's and 1960's, USAID and the Foundation staff in the field knew one another and discussed their own going programs and the needs in the two countries. In talking to some of these people, the impression one gets is that there was a general unwritten agreement that the Foundation would concentrate on building the university capacity and USAID would help develop the government capacity and in the field of general education. Whatever the case, both donors were quite successful if one looks at some of the important educational or policy making positions held by former fellows at the time of this study listed on page 8 of this report.

Clearly the primary goals of overseas fellowship programs in the social

science have been met. Are there still appropriate and necessary tasks that call for external assistance of the kind that support this earlier effort? The answer is yes. Institutions and programs have been built. Keeping them alive and thriving is a responsibility of home government and universities.

The recommendations that follow are based only in part on the responses of former fellows supported by USAID and the Foundation in India and Indonesia. A study with the same objectives and using the same questionnaire was carried out in the rest of Asia. This involved fellows supported for overseas training in the social sciences of the Ford Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation, Agricultural Development Council and the International Development Research Centre of Canada. The findings of that study were fairly close to findings of this study. The recommendations that follow include those from the above study, since the findings were so similar. In part, they also rest on interviews with university and government officials in Asia who have employed and could employ persons with social science competence. They also draw upon the author's experience and observations in a number of Asian countries.

1. **Funding for social science research is not available in adequate amounts in the developing countries.**

The results of social science research are used. Facts and figures, if they are available, have an impact on policy. One need only look at the project review or project identification of World Bank teams or international agencies to see how initially dependent they are on data locally gathered to illuminate the socio-economic problems of a nation or region.

Yet this is exactly the kind of work that gets low priority when a national allots its own scarce resources among developing needs. Substantial outside funding is needed if Asia's social scientists are to maintain and sharpen their research skills, deal with their country's problems and train a generation of successors.

The problem is not that social science research is perceived without value. Interviews with governmental policy leaders in Asia indicate a genuine appreciation of hard facts when economic and social problems when economic and social programs are being developed and

carried out. Yet, a large number of the former fellows responding to this survey said that the attitude of their employing agency toward research is critically important to their success, and there was inadequate institutional appreciation of the value of research in a number of problem areas related to development. When pressed on whether these funds weren't available from private sector or other agencies, they said yes, but like their own employer, only to work on problems the employer or the other groups thought important, on issues they considered relevant -- particularly research that was not of immediate and practicable value!

One difficulty may be that project funding is an unsatisfactory way to support social science research in a resource poor developing country. It is hard to imagine the kind of social science research project that would be funded by hard-headed policy lenders at the cost of a smaller budget for highway construction, the education of teachers, or even the breeding of high-yielding animals. Yet the success of any of these "practical" endeavors is likely to rest on the kinds of insights a healthy overall social science community can produce.

This suggests that there would be a special value at this time for outside agencies to provide "program" grants to support the research of well established Third World social scientists or social science research organizations. Such grants should be allotted in a way that makes them available to men and women who have demonstrated research competence in their work programs. There is a particular need to support those individuals who are teaching undergraduates and directing graduate research. Grants should not be tied to specific research project proposals but to an evaluation of the individual or institution's performance and promise.

The payoff is immediate and obvious. As the most promising social scientists in their countries, the persons supported would be as well placed as anyone, in the country or outside it, to judge the kind of research that is feasible and needed. Their own skills would be maintained. They would be helping to prepare a successor generation.

2. Competent social scientists in India and Indonesia as well

as the rest of Asia fear that they are getting out of touch with their professional colleagues elsewhere and with the advances in their professional field.

For a person whose academic and research experience are confined to institutions in the U.S. or European model, it may be hard to appreciate the conditions in which the men and women who responded to this survey carry out their work. The majority of these social scientist find themselves isolated and out of touch with their peer group. The number of educational institutions engaged in scholarly work in the social sciences are limited. At best there will be a handful of persons with whom, day by day, they can exchange ideas in their professional field. Another problem is the difficulty of maintaining professional contact with their colleagues. The cost and availability of transport to resit individuals in other regions limits the interaction they so badly need.

The problem of maintaining peer group relationships can be dealt with by a modest investment in linking them more closely to individuals and materials on current activities in their discipline. This would eliminate a major source of frustration for them, enrich the quality of their work, and give professionals in other countries in both the developing and developed countries the benefit of their contribution. This is what they former fellows are saying when they emphasize their need for better access to professional books and journals, travel to national and international meetings and other training opportunities.

A small number of chair professorships in social science fields at selected Asian universities would help deal with some of above stated needs. One of the major findings of this study is that there now exists a large number of mature and able scholars in the social sciences in Asia. To often, the respondents to this survey and others like them are received as "students" or "fellows" rather than the competent, mature professionals they are. In their own institutions, many of them have the respect and prestige that would be respected by a "chair" in a Western university. Many are forced to exercise more individual responsibility for very broad teaching and research programs that almost any Western social scientist does. This argues for a program of multi-year grants that will give

the grantee freedom to make their own judgments as to what activities will be most productive for them and their institutions. Table 34 indicates the varieties of ways they might want to use these funds. Some might want to use the time and funds for post-doctoral study. Some might save on visiting professors' collaboration in research and teaching. Some would use funds to support research, for equipment or supplies or travel or books and journals.

These are decisions which the kind of persons likely to be selected for "named professorships" support are best qualified to make for themselves.

A variety of other devices can be used to help a much larger number of social scientists keep abreast of what is happening in their discipline. Networking is recognized as an important means of allowing professionals to envelope and maintain their peer group relationship. What is badly needed is specific ways to allow these network to grow and flourish. This is particularly needed to overcome the isolation Third World country social scientists experience when they work in small institutions isolated from professional colleagues in the field and where problems of language and high travel cost restrict their membership in the world community of their discipline.

Funding to help support regional conferences and professional meetings could bring together scholars from neighboring countries facing similar problems. Travel funds for participation in international scholarly meetings should also be considered. Particular consideration should be given to interchange between professionals from different regions of the world. A number of former Asian fellows noted their need for getting a better understanding of development experience in Africa and Latin America and to see the relevance of work going on there to their own problems. Financial encouragement for regional scholarly journals, both to promote their publications and to encourage their distribution would build regional communities of scholars prepared to work on applied problems. Both grants to educational and research institutions are still important.

Particular attention should be given to provide the above opportunities to social scientists in nonacademic, post-government, research institutes, nonprofit agencies and the private sector. The need for these professionals to continue and grow is equally important. There is a need to encourage greater interaction between these social sci-

entists with their colleagues in academia so that they can both learn from each others experience.

On a highly targeted basis, there is a continued place for a program of conventional fellowships to take outstanding undergraduates abroad for graduate study. Throughout much of Asia, the basic capacity to offer post-baccalaureate study now exists and is being used. A number of countries are able to offer doctoral programs and prepare their own young people to serve as professional staff in their own teaching and research institutions. But there still is a need for limited fellowship abroad for a number of reasons: A continuing intake of persons who have studied outside their own country is a necessary source of new ideas and contact; it is in the interest of Western countries to have the stimulation of foreign students with their perception in their university graduate degree programs; finally, fellowships may be needed to be sure that the group of young people who study abroad reflect the economic and social groups in their country. It would be unfortunate if overseas study opportunities were limited to the wealthy and well off.

One question that has been raised by the donors if the above needs are essential to build and maintain professional capacity, why don't the countries do the funding? One reason is that the Third World countries, coping with generally limited financial resources and even more limited access to foreign exchange, will continue to need outside help if they are to meet these pressing needs. But, even if the countries have the funds to cover the costs of these various programs, there is no guarantee they will fund them.

The late Raj Krishna noted a critical factor that is often ignored – "People in power are knowledge proof, and it takes some time to change their views." What Raj was noting is that the concept of the needs and the means to maintain professional capacity is a new idea and that it takes time to see the value of this investment. The role of the donors has traditionally been to note neglected areas and provide short term investment until the importance and value of doing something about the need is recognized. The donors played this role in providing fellowship support to build professional capacity – at a time when many countries did not see its usefulness. Today, most countries recognize the importance of this kind of training and carry on their own program. That is why the donor's input is important in

helping maintain professional capacity in Their World countries. Once the countries see its value, they will take over.

The overwhelming impression from the study is that the fellowship programs under consideration was a wise and farsighted investment. They have borne out the highest expectations on which they were based. At the same time, they point to an unfinished agenda for the donors which could be equally rewarding in its outcome.